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III. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

Responding to emerging needs of indigenous peoples in all regions of the world with regards to the conservation of their knowledge and practices, in 1995 the IPBN established the Indigenous Knowledge Program (IKP). The IKP was conceptualized as an initiative aimed at supporting indigenous communities in the promotion, protection and conservation of their knowledge, practices, and associated biological resources, through policy, education, research and community development. The three year program’s goal was to contribute to the preservation of biodiversity and indigenous cultures, reduce poverty among communities and lay the foundation for sustainable livelihoods in the future. The program aimed to support:

1. concrete activities at the community level that promote the sustainable development of indigenous communities;
2. research by and for indigenous peoples, and capacity building to establish priority research topics and to direct research activities; and
3. indigenous peoples’ activities at the policy level to ensure that their concerns are reflected in regard to the conservation and protection of indigenous knowledge and that indigenous peoples are included in decision-making processes at the international and national levels.

The objectives and outcomes of the program were to be based on the priorities of indigenous peoples and also, indigenous peoples were to play the lead role in the execution and implementation of the program’s activities.

The program’s structure consists of a Secretariat, a Steering Committee and a Program Advisory Group. The main funding mechanisms of the IKP has been a Small Grants Program for research and community development activities. The Small Grants Program would assist with the conservation of biological diversity, the revitalization of indigenous culture and the reduction of poverty while laying the foundation for sustainable livelihoods.

The IKP effectively started its operations in February 1996. Completion date, following an extension from the target date was July 1999. However, the Secretariat ran out of core funds by February 1999 after which no substantive new activities were undertaken other than administration of previously approved Small Grants projects.

The overall objective of this program was: To contribute —through activities that help to preserve indigenous knowledge systems and garner acknowledgment for indigenous peoples’ innovations and/or compensation for their contributions— to: (i) the conservation of biological diversity; (ii) the continuation and revitalization of indigenous cultures; (iii) the reduction of poverty among indigenous communities and laying the foundation for their sustainable livelihoods. The program objective was: Operationalize the program framework. Three strategic objectives have been formulated. Strategic Objective I was: Promote the adoption of sui generis systems for the protection of indigenous knowledge. Strategic Objective II was: Promote the awareness and understanding of the role and importance of traditional practices and knowledge in sustainable development. Strategic objective III was: Promote the sustainable livelihoods of indigenous communities based on their traditional cultures and knowledge systems.
Findings

In its findings, the evaluation concludes that there is a firm common agreement that the Indigenous Knowledge Program was an appropriate and relevant initiative and concept. A strong fundament of the program was the ‘for indigenous peoples, by indigenous peoples’ concept, namely through steering of the program by indigenous activists from various regions of the world. The immediate objectives under each strategic objective were adequate. Overall, the program was logical and coherent in its design.

Local level

The Small Grants Program (SGP) as funding mechanism for community initiatives has been welcomed as an appropriate way of local level strengthening. Dissemination of information about the IKP and its SGP has been flagged by regional coordinators as a special difficulty due to the limitations in funds for traveling and communication. The non-availability of the SGP promotional brochure in the local languages was an additional problem.

General information has been provided to, and awareness and understanding has increased at the local level about the importance and the protection of indigenous knowledge. The program target of 50 Small Grants projects has not been achieved. Only 15 projects were approved. In general, recipients were satisfied with the level of accompaniment for the Small Grants projects they received from the regional coordinator.

An analysis of the results of the SGP including a description of the various uses of indigenous knowledge in development settings was not conducted, neither published and disseminated for use as an input for advocacy and research activities. Some projects focused on strategies to preserve indigenous knowledge at the local level, but methodologies used in the SGP projects have not been identified or described systematically nor disseminated for wider information as positive cross-learning examples. Although the Program Document describes the Small Grants Program as the ‘backbone’ of the IKP, this preferential position was not so obvious in practice, neither in terms of time and efforts nor in budgetary allocation. More resources were put in the international work of IKP.

The consultant made an on-site visit to one of the Small Grants Development projects, a UNDP sponsored project in the Amazon region of Ecuador: ‘Project for the Recuperation and Development of Indigenous Knowledge for the Conservation of Ecosystems and Biodiversity in the Amazon Forest of Yana Yacu’. The submitting and executing organization was the ‘Instituto Quichua de Biotecnología Sacha Supai’ (IQBSS). This project can be denominated a success story of local level development based on a self-formulated development strategy that is true to the traditional indigenous customs and values. Not only is indigenous knowledge conserved and developed, also the basis has been laid for the sustainable livelihood of the community. As put in simple words by the community leader: “We apply what we know in ways natural to us”. The project contributed substantially to the long-term development objectives of the community who is well-aware of what it wants and where it wants to go.

In an extrapolation of this experience to the overall IKP program and the Small Grants Program in particular, it can be said that the implementation of a well-prepared project proposal being part of a broader perspective and based on proper values and visions, can have an enormous beneficial impact on the community level, in spite of the ‘small’ sum of money that is made available. Dedication of participants in project implementation is crucial, as is participatory project management. The
possibility of disseminating project experiences is an important factor. Spin-off effects, such as the increased awareness, interest and understanding of the community in conservation activities, protection of culture and indigenous knowledge systems, potential for further projects and activities, establishment of relationships with government and other organizations, greater flows of information exchange and awareness about information sources, etc. may not be underestimated.

**National and regional level**

No regional information centers were established. A number of regional workshops were organized or supported by IKP, although not the number foreseen in the Program Document. No national workshops have been organized by the IKP, nor workshops between indigenous peoples, governments and NGOs. Apart from the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) recommendations formulated during regional and international events were apparently not systematically submitted to major international institutions, organizations and processes nor to national governments. The making of an inventory of existing national legislation has not been done systematically, nor were national guidelines for the protection and promotion of indigenous knowledge elaborated.

In spite of these non-achievements, respondents unanimously pointed out that at least their own participation at the national and regional level has increased in effectiveness and intensity thanks to their greater involvement in and understanding of indigenous knowledge issues. The program may have been too ambitious regarding the development of *sui generis* systems for the protection of indigenous knowledge (in approximately five countries) which has not been achieved.

**International level**

The IKP has been successful in increasing the effective participation of indigenous peoples’ representatives at the international level, particularly in the CBD process. During the years of its existence IKP members built an experience in the procedures and politics of international meetings, which was a welcome contribution in guiding other indigenous participants with lesser experience. An identification of what are ‘relevant’ forums and strategies for participating in these, have not, or not very noticeable, been done. There is no overview available which ones of the many international forums IKP has prioritized and why, apart from the CBD. It could not be distilled which contributions were submitted to which forums, and what the ultimate effect of the submission was.

Regarding information management, the program has been weak in building a two-way institutional informational capacity. No assessment has been done on the basic information needs of indigenous peoples’ organizations, nor an explicit assessment of relevant issues or themes related to indigenous knowledge. Although much information was available, it has not been systematized and no ways were made public for easy access by those in need, while from the other hand there did not seem to be much demand for information coming from the target group. An inventory of existing research on current policies and policy alternatives on the preservation and protection of indigenous knowledge has not been conducted.

**Contribution to the objectives**

The IKP has made a contribution to the conservation of biological diversity, mainly through its international work aimed at raising awareness and acknowledgement for indigenous knowledge but less through the preservation of indigenous knowledge systems. Through some of the Small Grants projects, the program appeared to have contributed to the continuation and revitalization of indigenous
cultures as well as to laying foundations for the sustainable livelihoods of indigenous communities. The contribution to the reduction of economical poverty has been minimal; however, a contribution has been made to the reduction of cultural impoverishment.

The program has been weak in obtaining tangible results regarding the adoption of *sui generis* system. The IKP did promote the awareness and understanding of the role and importance of traditional practices and knowledge in sustainable development, also mainly through its international activities and to a lesser extend by means of the SGP activities.

Very important is the fact that the program was conceptually a long-term program and many results will only be visible in the long run.

**Institutional aspects**

Targeted activities and work plans – which were produced quite consistently by the Secretariat – were met relatively well, and regular progress reports were made by the Secretariat for consideration at SC meetings. Contacts of Small Grants recipients with the Secretariat have been described as satisfactorily.

An important difficulty in the operational aspect was the absence of well-functioning regional coordinators for the African and Arctic regions. Another major problem has been the lack of a full-time Program Coordinator. A permanent Program Coordinator was never appointed. This absence led to a discontinuity in program activities and a weakness in further fundraising for other program activities. The appointment of an interim Program Coordinator was a rather late decision, when available funds were already little and it was difficult to get the program back on track. The SC self-evaluation of Whakatane, Aotearoa-New Zealand was a critical assessment of this situation but there was no proper coordination afterwards to implement the decisions taken in that meeting.

The lack of secure funds has been a bottleneck for the program. Many activities could not be planned ahead as there was no certainty of the necessary finances. A number of planned activities could not be undertaken for which reason the planned outputs were not met. The available funds appeared to have been administered properly. An external auditing, however, has not been conducted during the time of the program.

An important activity that did not take place, was the need-assessment for regional coordinators and their actual training for taking upon them the responsibilities for regional program activities, including the administration of funds. This would ideally lead to decentralization and ‘regionalization’ of program activities. No specific division of tasks among the regions was undertaken.

**Special difficulties**

There were overlaps in functions and roles between initiative-takers, executors and monitors of the program. These overlaps, although not incompatible and somehow natural and the most simple solution, narrowed the diversity in visions, mutual accountability and feedback necessary for steering the program. The fact that there were no active ‘outside’ indigenous representatives in the AG contributed to an AG weakness.

A difficulty was the unproven assumption that the whole of the projected budget would become available for the execution of the program. The program had a range of diverse but coherent activities...
leading to its strategic objectives, but due to the lack of funds a number of those were not or incompletely executed. In the prioritization of the available funds the original coherence and balance between program activities appeared to have been lost. There was a discrepancy in local, national and international level activity and impact of the program with a notable emphasis on the international activities.

Steering Committee members, also regional coordinators (RC), faced a different type of difficulty, having to do mainly with the flow of information between themselves and the target groups. There was no specific regional budget. An overall information management strategy has not been developed which was most notable in the regional work, where this management was completely dependent on the initiatives of the RC. The distance, both physical and functional, between the coordinators and local organizations, was part of the difficulty in promoting the Small Grants Program (SGP). Information interaction with another target group, namely relevant regional and international forums and organizations, could have been more optimized in the existence of an information management strategy.

An important concern is the fact that information released through reports of SGP project is not legally protected and no clear policy has been made public about those although it is likely it does exist. Another difficulty was the lack of prioritization of ‘relevant’ forums in terms of policy influencing.

Conclusions and recommendations

IKP, being one of very few programs of its kind and scale, proved to fill a big gap at all levels in matters pertaining to indigenous knowledge and its protection. Discussions on these topics were welcomed by all interested parties and many have expressed the need for further policy discussions. IKP furthermore served as a valuable vehicle for more interaction on the topics related to indigenous knowledge, among indigenous peoples and between indigenous peoples and governments, agencies, national, regional and international organizations and other instances and processes.

The IKP showed that a program can be successful in its autonomous indigenous steering with regards to influencing international policies. It has been weak in obtaining tangible results at national level where politics are of a rather different and difficult nature, but then again it did make a difference for those indigenous communities and organizations that participated in the Small Grants Program.

A second phase of the program should start afresh as soon as possible, taking advantage of the political momentum. The basic principle of the second phase of the Indigenous Knowledge Program (‘IKP-2’) is that it will build upon the experiences and achievements of the first phase. IKP-2 will not be substantially different in its structural setup. The objectives of the first phase are still relevant, appropriate and achievable for the second phase program. The duration of the second phase would be three years. The outcomes of the first phase will be included in the development of the second phase proposal. In its activities the second phase program will focus on unfinished business from the first phase which have not lost their relevancy and importance.

The basic strategies for achieving a meaningful contribution to the protection and development of indigenous knowledge as identified in indigenous peoples’ meetings will remain in the second phase, namely the need for access to and dissemination of information, awareness raising at all levels, indigenous capacity building and support to local initiatives. Levels of strategic intervention will be the same in IKP-2, namely local, national, regional and international. Emphasis, however, need to be laid more than before on local, national and regional level. At the local level, the Small Grants
Program needs to be continued and further extended, giving even more organizations the opportunity to participate in it. Special attention should be given to strategic activities at national and regional level including some more focus on capacity building in legal and legislation aspects and on increased informed indigenous participation in national and regional forums.

Internationally, more emphasis should be given to written inputs in the form of submissions to Secretariats of conventions and other international processes. To this end, it is recommended that the second phase program takes into account provisions for more technical support to the program, e.g. by indigenous experts to write discussions papers, background papers, statements, submissions to conventions and processes, reports of crucial meetings, etc. It is also recommended to have a regional technical support person or a ‘regional secretary’ in each region for technical support to the SC members who will continue to cover the political steering of the program.

In its strategy, the second phase program needs to address the issue of information management, and an information management and communication strategy needs to be developed to guarantee a more structured and planned information exchange process. Clear criteria need to be in place for defining ‘relevant’ forums in which to intervene, and a prioritization will have to be made given the wide variety.

It is recommended to establish IKP-2 as an independent program, while acknowledging its history. The basic structure of the IKP can be maintained in the second phase: a regionally based Steering Committee whose members are also the regional coordinators, a central Secretariat, and an Advisory Group made up of donors, indigenous representatives, founders and experts. There will still be a central Secretariat consisting of a full-time indigenous Program Coordinator and a Program Administrator.

Although the program should move to being a fully autonomous program, establishing its own legal personality is currently not unanimously considered a first priority and for the time-being, until further discussions have identified the best option(s), the program can continue to be hosted by a trusted institute. With the hosting institute it shall be negotiated to pay less overhead costs in order to reserve more funds for the regional secretaries and SGP projects. A fundraising strategy must be outlined from the start. Through periodic evaluations an assessment will be made how the program moves towards a more independent position and/or a more regional approach. The Advisory Group should take a more proactive role when the Steering Committee seems to be hesitant to take decisions, while still respecting that the ultimate decisions are taken by the SC.
IV. BACKGROUND

To respond to growing concerns about the global loss of indigenous knowledge, in 1994, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) commissioned a study on the conservation of indigenous knowledge. The findings indicated the need for increased global acknowledgement of the value of traditional knowledge and beginning a dialogue with indigenous peoples and others on ways to preserve the knowledge, practices and innovation systems of indigenous peoples. Concurrently, the Indigenous Peoples Biodiversity Network (IPBN) was created. Responding to emerging needs of indigenous peoples in all regions of the world with regards to the conservation of their knowledge and practices, in 1995 the IPBN established the Indigenous Knowledge Program (IKP).

The IKP was conceptualized as an initiative aimed at supporting indigenous communities in the promotion, protection and conservation of their knowledge, practices, and associated biological resources, through policy, education, research and community development. The program received initial financial support from the International Development Research Centre and the Swiss Development Cooperation. As the program has developed, support expanded to include the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the United Nations Development Programme.

The three year program’s goal was to contribute to the preservation of biodiversity and indigenous cultures, reduce poverty among communities and lay the foundation for sustainable livelihoods in the future. The program aimed to support:

1. concrete activities at the community level that promote the sustainable development of indigenous communities;
2. research by and for indigenous peoples, and capacity building to establish priority research topics and to direct research activities; and
3. indigenous peoples’ activities at the policy level to ensure that their concerns are reflected in regard to the conservation and protection of indigenous knowledge and that indigenous peoples are included in decision-making processes at the international and national levels.

The objectives and outcomes of the program were based on the priorities of indigenous peoples and also, indigenous peoples were to play the lead role in the execution and implementation of the program’s activities.

The program’s structure consists of a Secretariat, a Steering Committee and a Program Advisory Group. The Secretariat, made up of a Program Coordinator and an Administrator, is responsible for coordinating the program’s activities. The Steering Committee is the executive body, identifying program priorities and approving activities. It was intended to be made up of eight indigenous leaders who would also function as the regional coordinators representing the Arctic region, East Africa, West Africa, South Asia, Southeast Asia, North America, the Pacific, Central America and South America. The Advisory Group would consist of the program’s founding member organizations and donor agencies that participate on a voluntary basis.

The Indigenous Knowledge Program has been set up to function as a framework, encouraging maximum flexibility and responsibility to the needs of indigenous peoples’ organizations and communities, including those who have little experience in dealing with unilateral and bilateral
development agencies. Indigenous communities and tribal peoples around the world would be the beneficiaries of the program. The areas of focus have been the Arctic region, South and Central America, Africa, Asia and the Pacific.

The main funding mechanisms of the IKP has been a Small Grants Program for research and community development activities. The Small Grants Program (SGP) would support activities in the fields of conservation of biological diversity, the revitalization of indigenous culture and the reduction of poverty while laying the foundation for sustainable livelihoods. Indigenous peoples and organizations made applications for project funding in accordance with their goals and belief systems.

The IKP was due to start on January 1996 for 36 months. As IKP is not a legal person in itself, it required a host institution especially for contractual agreements e.g. with donors and SGP recipient organizations. Cultural Survival Canada (CSC) hosted the program between 1996 and June 1998, after which the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) hosted the secretariat till February 1999. The program effectively started its operations in February 1996 after a signature of the contractual agreement between Cultural Survival Canada and the International Development Research Centre which was also an initial and major donor of the program. Completion date, following an extension from the target date was July 1999. However, the Secretariat ran out of core funds by February 1999 after which no substantive new activities were undertaken other than administration of previously approved Small Grants projects.
V.

INTRODUCTION TO THE EVALUATION

The Program Document calls for two evaluations: (a) mid-term evaluation 18 months after the start; and (b) a final evaluation at the end of the program. The mid term evaluation was not carried out; however, the Steering Committee conducted a self-evaluation of the Program at a special meeting in Whakatane, Aotearoa-New Zealand in November 1998. Prior to the current evaluation which is being funded by UNDP, an earlier evaluation, commissioned by UNDP and IDRC, was initiated in 1999 but not completed.

The Whakatane self-evaluation examined how well the program had performed and recommended corrective measures to improve the program implementation and intended outcomes to ensure success in meeting objectives. In doing so, the self-evaluation was intended to provide further guidance concerning program activities by devising clear indicators for the final evaluation. Success criteria to be taken into consideration in the final evaluation were also defined.

The overall objective of this program was: To contribute – through activities that help to preserve indigenous knowledge systems and garner acknowledgment for indigenous peoples’ innovations and/or compensation for their contributions – to: (i) the conservation of biological diversity; (ii) the continuation and revitalization of indigenous cultures; (iii) the reduction of poverty among indigenous communities and laying the foundation for their sustainable livelihoods.

The program objective was: Operationalize the program framework. The immediate objective of the Program objective was: To have coordination and monitoring mechanisms established and functioning.

Three strategic objectives have been formulated. Strategic Objective I was: Promote the adoption of sui generis systems for the protection of indigenous knowledge. The immediate objectives of strategic objective I were:

1. Promote the inclusion of policies and strategies related to the preservation and of protection of indigenous knowledge in relevant international fora;
2. Enhance the knowledge of indigenous peoples representatives and organizations to participate in decision-making processes and to develop alternative strategies for the protection of indigenous knowledge.

Strategic Objective II was: Promote the awareness and understanding of the role and importance of traditional practices and knowledge in sustainable development. The immediate objectives of strategic objective II were:

1. Enhance the capacity of indigenous peoples to generate, systematize and disseminate information on issues related to the preservation and protection of indigenous knowledge;
2. Enhance the capacity of indigenous peoples’ organizations to conduct research on themes related to the preservation and protection of indigenous knowledge and translate it into strategies for community development.

Strategic objective III was: Promote the sustainable livelihoods of indigenous communities based on their traditional cultures and knowledge systems. The immediate objectives of strategic objective III were:
1. Support the development of strategies for community development based on the preservation of traditional practices and local knowledge systems;
2. Promote the inclusion of the results of successful strategies in national, international and multilateral development programs (e.g. CGIAR, FAO, IDB, IBRD, UNDP, UNEP, etc.).

Activities of the program are described in the Program Document: ‘The Indigenous Knowledge Program: An Initiative of the Indigenous Peoples Biodiversity Network, Ottawa, September 1996’ (Annex 2). This document, together with the Terms of Reference for the Evaluation of the IKP (Annex 3), constituted the main background against which the program has been evaluated.
VI. DESCRIPTION OF METHODOLOGY FOLLOWED

In the evaluation of the Indigenous Knowledge Program, the next approaches have been followed:

1. Revision of the Terms of Reference for the Evaluation, in coordination with the Steering Committee of the IKP, UNDP and IDRC (Annex 3: Terms of Reference);
2. Reviewing of documents, among others the Program Document, progress reports, financial reports, Small Grants Projects (SGP) and SGP reports (Annex 4: List of documents reviewed);
3. Developing and sending out written questionnaires (Annex 5: Questionnaires), to 48 recipients, namely the Steering Committee members, the interim Program Coordinator, members of the Secretariat, the housing institute (IDRC), members of the Advisory Group, international agencies and organizations that have dealings with traditional knowledge, and Small Grants recipients (Annex 6: List of questionnaire recipients);
4. Telephone interviews with some persons that preferred to answer verbally rather than filling out the questionnaire, or from whom some further information by telephone was required;
5. Site visit to one Small Grants Development project, namely the ‘Project on Recuperation and Development of Indigenous Knowledge for the Conservation of Ecosystems and Biodiversity in the Amazon Forest of Yana Yacu Sacha’, in Pastaza, Ecuador (Annex 7: Itinerary);
6. Writing of a first draft of the evaluation report and proposal for a second phase of the IKP, and sending it to members of the Steering Committee, interim Program Coordinator, UNDP and IDRC for comments;
7. Incorporation of the received comments in the final evaluation report and second phase proposal;
8. Submission of the final report to the Steering Committee of IKP, IDRC, UNDP and the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS).

The evaluation stretched out over a period of two-and-a-half months (Annex 8: Time line).
VII. FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

A. Appropriateness of the program’s concept and design

The concept of the Indigenous Knowledge Program, the basic idea upon which the program was constructed, was support for the protection of indigenous knowledge by strengthening indigenous peoples to do so themselves. There is a firm common agreement emerging from the responses from interviewed persons (either by questionnaire or telephone), review of documents, reports from relevant processes related to indigenous knowledge and the consultant’s own experiences, that the Indigenous Knowledge Program was an appropriate and relevant initiative and concept, given the existing threats to indigenous knowledge and the need for strengthening ways and means for indigenous peoples to confront these threats. This is elaborately argued for in the Program Document, in the many indigenous statements on indigenous knowledge and intellectual property rights, in the Convention on Biological Diversity, in the policy discussions on forests (Intergovernmental Panel on Forests and Intergovernmental Forum on Forests process) and a variety of other processes at all levels. A strong fundament of the program was also the ‘for indigenous peoples, by indigenous peoples’ concept, namely through steering of the program by indigenous activists from various regions of the world.

The program was designed around three strategic approaches:

1. the promotion of the adoption of *sui generis* systems for the protection of indigenous knowledge;
2. the promotion of awareness and understanding of the role and importance of traditional knowledge;
3. the promotion of sustainable livelihoods of indigenous communities based on their traditional cultures and knowledge systems.

These approaches should lead to achieving the overall development objective, namely the contribution to the preservation of biodiversity and indigenous cultures, reduction of poverty among communities and laying the foundation for sustainable livelihoods in the future. These strategies have been identified in various meetings of indigenous peoples as priorities for the effective protection of indigenous knowledge and as such, the strategic objectives are also relevant and appropriate in their design.

The immediate objectives under each strategic objective were adequate. Only for the promotion of *sui generis* systems, immediate objectives focusing more on the national level where legislation is being made, would be expected. From the other hand, the expected outputs did indeed relate to the promotion of *sui generis* systems through national and international action in relevant forums. The outputs under the other objectives were also those that could be expected to achieve the immediate objectives.

The Small Grants Program (SGP) as funding mechanism for community initiatives has been welcomed as an appropriate way of local level strengthening. There are of course inherent limitations, among others the limitations in number and financial amount to which a small grants project can be financed, the administrative procedures, the limited impact of small-scale and local initiatives on the broad and complex problem of loss of indigenous knowledge and the difficulty in measuring the impact of local activities versus global problems.
Overall, the program was logical and coherent in its design.

**B. Assessment of achievements and impact at local level**

A general remark must be made at the outset of the following headers, namely that an inevitable difficulty in assessing the effectiveness and achievements of the program, is the (im)possibility to quantify its results, as this program is focused on rather intangible outcomes such as awareness, capacity building and changes in policy. In addition, it is hard to measure specifically the contribution of this program versus many other influences and forces.

1. **Introduction**

The Program Document argues effectively for the importance of the maintenance of indigenous peoples’ cultures and customs, which are rooted at the very local level, in order to maintain the indigenous knowledge systems and provide the basis for preservation and continuous development of the actual knowledge itself. It is outlined that protection of this knowledge begins with an efficient information flow and level of awareness, while local communities must be strengthened in their capacity to undertake research for maintaining or further developing their knowledge systems. A special problem that the local level faces, is that of insufficient legal protection against illegal bioprospecting (‘biopiracy’).

2. **Planned program activities and outputs at local level**

The program’s specific strategy aimed at the local level is the Small Grants Program (SGP). The SGP was designed to provide funding to indigenous organizations or individuals affiliated with organizations, to:

- undertake research for capacity building, policy influencing and management of relevant activities;
- undertake concrete community development activities to support community structures necessary for the generation of indigenous knowledge, policy development, capacity building and sustainable development initiatives. Please refer to Annex 9 (Brochure of the Small Grants Program of the Indigenous Knowledge Program) for the accurate text and further information on the project submission and selection procedures.

Within the SGP, research activities could be supported to the amount of up to CAD 15,000 or USD 12,000 while community based socio-cultural conservation activities could be supported to the amount of up to CAD 35,000. or USD 25,000.

Specific activities within the program that would be undertaken at the local level, included:

- dissemination of information about the IKP and its Small Grants Program;
- general information about indigenous knowledge;
- collection of Small Grants projects and assistance in the development, monitoring and evaluation of approved SGP projects;
- undertaking of studies on socio-economic development based on traditional cultures and knowledge systems.
At the end of the program, a major expected output was that methodologies to preserve indigenous knowledge at the local level would have been tested and identified, and these findings would have been published for wider awareness on these methodologies. Indigenous peoples’ organizations would have become aware of the significance of indigenous knowledge. Different (alternative) strategies for community development would have been documented, tested, evaluated and analyzed.

3. Achievement of criteria and indicators

Dissemination of information about the IKP and its SGP has been flagged by regional coordinators as a special difficulty due to the limitations in funds for traveling and communication. Effective communication with the local communities remains largely based on personal contact and/or compact but straightforward written information. The non-availability of the SGP promotional brochure in the local languages was an additional problem and mention was made that the brochure did not adequately reflect regional priorities and concerns. Moreover, information disperses rather slowly to the communities, reason why some of the regional coordinators are only now, or still, receiving requests for participation in the SGP.

General information has been provided to, and awareness and understanding has increased at the local level about the importance and the protection of indigenous knowledge, mostly by means of participating community members in national, regional and international workshops. In a number of the approved Small Grants projects, local, sub-regional or national workshops were part of the project, during which these issues were discussed.

Due to the above-mentioned and other difficulties, including the fact that regional coordinators were not full-time dedicated to IKP activities and financial and fundraising constraints (to be dealt with under the respective sections and in chapter VIII. ‘Assessment of Special Difficulties, Conclusions and Lessons Learned’) the program target of 50 Small Grants projects has not been achieved. Only 15 projects were approved, of which 3 Small Grants Development (SGD) projects (2 in Malaysia and 1 in Ecuador), 3 projects in Central America, 3 in South America, 2 in South-East Asia, 2 in South Asia and 1 each in North America and East-Central Africa. In general, recipients were satisfied with the level of accompaniment for the Small Grants projects they received from the regional coordinator.

The criteria for the approval of a SGP proposal were clear and simple. The approved projects were rather diverse in nature, but can roughly be categorized as follows: projects aimed at information dissemination, capacity building and policy development by indigenous peoples by means of workshops (3), research projects, mainly of the base-line type or for the documentation of existing knowledge (7), projects aimed at developing alternative development activities (3) and other types of projects (2). Within these broad categories, there was still a diversity of the type of activities undertaken in the projects, which is probably the result of the rather broad definition of eligibility and even somewhat confusing criteria as stated in the promotional SGP brochure. A summary of the nature of the Small Grants projects is given in Annex 10.

Although not examined in all detail, the Small Grants projects in their design appeared to be forming a good basis for further action, building on their results. However, only in some cases a good indication of the SGP outcomes could be obtained due to the fact that some recipients did not submit a final report or the submitted report was rather limited in describing the results. In two instances, communication was lost with the recipients. A mid-term evaluation as stipulated in the Program Document was not held, and the analysis of the results of the SGP was not conducted, neither published and disseminated for use as an input for advocacy and research activities. The analysis of three projects describing the
various uses of indigenous knowledge in development settings as proposed after the Whakatane self-evaluation, was also not conducted. Although some projects focused on strategies to preserve indigenous knowledge at the local level, methodologies to do so serving as positive cross-learning examples were not systematically identified or described nor disseminated for wider information.

Although the project document describes the Small Grants Program as the ‘backbone’ of the IKP, this preferential position was not so obvious in practice, neither in terms of time and efforts nor in budgetary allocation. More resources were put in the international work of IKP. An exception appears to be the Central American region where much efforts were put in networking and support to targeted recipient organizations. South and Southeast Asia also appeared to be strong in networking.

The assessment of the effects of the small grants is limited without an on-site assessment. Also, a baseline situation of the status before the project is missing and a comparison between ‘before’ and ‘after’ depends on written information as submitted in project reports. Only one Small Grants project has been visited on-site, which is described in more detail in chapter IX. ‘Assessment of a UNDP Sponsored Small Grants Development Project in Ecuador’. Some careful general conclusions about the impact of the IKP project on overall functioning and capability of small grants recipients to participate in indigenous knowledge related processes, influence policies, manage information and undertake research will be drawn in that chapter.

C. Assessment of achievements and impact at national and regional level

1. Introduction

It is a well-known fact that the insufficient awareness on the role and importance of indigenous knowledge and the lack of appropriate policies and legislation for the protection thereof, often finds its origin in the insufficient political priority by national governments, whether due to their ignorance or limited information. Indigenous participation in national and regional discussions and decision-taking affecting indigenous peoples is limited, even though national and regional policies often have substantive effects right to the very local level. Likewise, indigenous peoples and communities are often vulnerable to ‘biopiracy’ or inappropriate valuation and use of the indigenous knowledge due to the absence of legislation and a limited awareness of the threats. The Indigenous Knowledge Program rightfully proposes a number of strategies and activities at the national and regional level to confront these and other not specifically mentioned circumstances.

2. Planned program activities and outputs at national and regional level

At the national and regional level, the program was especially targeted at strengthening indigenous peoples and organizations for participating more effectively (‘become active partners’) in policy influencing and on increasing the awareness and flow of information about the existing and desired ways to protect indigenous knowledge, with the emphasis on laying the basis, e.g. through the development of appropriate guidelines, for the development of *sui generis* systems for this protection. Ways described in the Program Document to achieve this were, among others:

- developing and distributing an information kit and background material as basic information in the discussions on indigenous knowledge;
- facilitating the participation of indigenous representatives in relevant workshops;
- supporting the organization of (40) national workshops on indigenous knowledge;
- supporting the organization of (10) workshops among indigenous peoples, NGOs and governmental institutions;
- development of an inventory of existing national legislation related to or affecting the preservation and protection of indigenous knowledge and dissemination of this inventory;
- elaboration of national guidelines (in approximately 10 countries) for the protection and promotion of indigenous knowledge;
- establishing regional centers for the gathering, management and dissemination of information related to indigenous knowledge;
- supporting the organization of (10) regional workshops on thematic areas related to indigenous knowledge preservation and protection.

The program also intended to actively support national dialogue between governments, the academic sector, NGOs and indigenous peoples’ organizations on measures, strategies and activities that promote the continuation of indigenous knowledge systems. It was expected that the developed guidelines would be included in national legislation, and that in approximately five countries, legislation regarding indigenous knowledge would have been approved. Guidelines and recommendations on thematic issues formulated at national and regional level, would also serve as an input to relevant forums.

3. Achievement of criteria and indicators

The difficulties regarding information dissemination also apply at the national and regional level. No regional information centers were established. Regarding the organization of workshops, a number of workshops were organized or supported by IKP, although not the number foreseen in the Program Document, among other due to the limited availability of funds and availability of time by the regional coordinators. Some workshops were held back-to-back with other events for purposes of financial efficiency. Please refer to annex 11 for an overview of IKP sponsored or supported workshops.

No national workshops have been organized by the IKP, nor workshops between indigenous peoples, governments and NGOs. Apart from the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) which was understandably the major focus of attention for the IKP, recommendations formulated during regional and international events were apparently not systematically submitted to major international institutions, organizations and processes nor to national governments. From the documentation received and information obtained through interviews, making an inventory of existing national legislation has not been done systematically, nor were national guidelines for the protection and promotion of indigenous knowledge elaborated.

In spite of these non-achievements, respondents unanimously pointed out that at least their own participation at the national and regional level has increased in effectiveness and intensity thanks to their greater involvement in and understanding of indigenous knowledge issues. This has been especially underlined in the Central and South American regions of IKP. In Panama for example, tangible progress have been made in changes in legislation regarding collective and traditional knowledge, which is undoubtedly partly thanks to the bigger influence of the increased and informed indigenous participation.

However, in this regard the program may have been too ambitious, namely the development of sui generis systems for the protection of indigenous knowledge (in approximately five countries). Three years is a rather short time in policy processes, and the sui generis concept is not widely known in the bureaucratic apparatus of many countries.
D. Assessment of achievements and impact at international level

1. Introduction

Internationally developed policies, programs and even legislation in the case of binding agreements, can have far reaching effects for indigenous peoples at all levels, especially as indigenous peoples have consistently been marginalized in their participation in discussions and decisions on issues affecting them. Effective indigenous participation in relevant international forums and the influencing of international policy-making have been appropriate targets for IKP action.

2. Planned program activities and outputs at international level

A number of activities have been designed to achieve the expected outcomes at the international level, among others:

- identification of relevant forums and prioritization of these;
- ensuring and increasing effective participation of indigenous peoples in relevant forums;
- make specific contributions to relevant forums;
- submission of guidelines and recommendations to relevant forums;
- guarantee the access to basic sources of information;
- assess the need of indigenous peoples for information.

These activities would lead to the achievement of the immediate objectives and outputs such as:

- the identification and development of strategies for participation in relevant international forums;
- the assessment of relevant issues and themes related to indigenous knowledge;
- the assessment of basic sources of information and type of demand of indigenous peoples’ organizations for information;
- elaboration of an inventory of existing research on current policies and policy alternatives for the preservation and protection of indigenous knowledge;
- establishment of a roster of experts on issues related to indigenous knowledge;
- publishing and dissemination of the results of the small grants programs as an input for advocacy and research activities;
- publishing and dissemination of the final analysis and recommendations resulting from the SGP.

3. Achievement of criteria and indicators

The IKP has definitely been successful in increasing the effective participation of indigenous peoples’ representatives at the international level, particularly in the CBD process, confirmed by the various questionnaire responses, the previous Whakatane self-evaluation, replies from international agencies and organizations and the consultant’s own observations. In several international conferences, including the Global Biodiversity Forum which gained a good reputation during the past years, expert meetings, roundtables, Conferences of the Parties of notably the CBD, trade-related intellectual property issues, and other international instances, spaces and processes, indigenous representatives were able to participate, increasingly more effectively. Especially the meaningful participation of indigenous representatives at the third Conference of the Parties (COP 3) of the CBD in Buenos Aires led to a chain reaction of incentives for donor agencies to finance travel costs of indigenous representatives in these meetings. A substantial contribution to this willingness was the
acknowledgment by donors of the coordinated manner in which indigenous organizations, including IKP, planned the indigenous participatory process and requested financial assistance for this.

During the years of its existence IKP members built an experience in the procedures and politics of international meetings, which was a welcome contribution in guiding other indigenous participants with lesser experience. This experience has also been valuable in influencing the progress and outcomes of those meetings, e.g. through participation in elaborating text for adoption, lobbying with influential participants, etc.

However, the identification of what are ‘relevant’ forums and strategies for participating in these, have not, or not very noticeable, been done. There is no overview available which ones of the many international forums IKP has prioritized and why, apart from the CBD. Although it is very likely that this has been done, from the received information it could not be distilled which contributions were submitted to which forums, and what the ultimate effect of the submission was.

The assessment to what extent the IKP as one specific entity has contributed to the influencing of international policies is difficult to quantify. Without doubt it has been successful in influencing the Convention on Biological Diversity processes, to be made up from responses received from the CBD Secretariat and the consultant’s own experience. The CBD process increasingly acknowledges the importance of indigenous knowledge in the conservation of biological diversity and does mention this specifically in its communications and decisions. This has a multiplier effect towards other international processes, given the lead position of the CBD process in biodiversity and traditional knowledge issues.

Regarding information management, the program has been weak in building a two-way institutional informational capacity. No assessment has been done on the basic information needs of indigenous peoples’ organizations, nor an explicit assessment of relevant issues of themes related to indigenous knowledge. Although much information was available, it has not been systematized and no ways were made public for easy access by those in need, while from the other hand there did not seem to be much demand for information coming from the target group. An inventory of existing research on current policies and policy alternatives on the preservation and protection of indigenous knowledge has not been conducted. An analysis of possible factors influencing these information management problems is being done under the chapter VIII. ‘Assessment of Special Difficulties, Conclusions and Lessons Learned’.

Although it was informally well-known to the participants in the IKP who are experts in indigenous knowledge issues, no formal roster of experts has been set up. This should have led to more transparency for other indigenous organizations and a wider range of possible contributors to the program and its activities.

Obviously, because the Small Grants Program (SGP) has not been completed yet at the time of this evaluation, its results, experiences and recommendations have not been elaborated and distributed.

E. Contribution of the achievements to the overall development objective and strategic objectives

The overall development objective of the Indigenous Knowledge Program was: to contribute – through activities that help to preserve indigenous knowledge systems and garner acknowledgement for
peoples’ innovations and/or compensation for their contributions – to: (i) the conservation of biological diversity; (ii) the continuation and revitalization of indigenous cultures; (iii) the reduction of poverty among indigenous communities and laying the foundation for their sustainable livelihoods.

The strategic objectives were:

1. Promote the adoption of *sui generis* systems for the protection of indigenous knowledge;
2. Promote the awareness and understanding of the role and importance of traditional practices and knowledge in sustainable development;
3. Promote the sustainable livelihoods of indigenous communities based on their traditional cultures and knowledge systems.

The conclusion can be drawn that the IKP has made a contribution to the conservation of biological diversity, mainly through its international work aimed at raising awareness and acknowledgement for indigenous knowledge but less through the preservation of indigenous knowledge systems. However, through some of the Small Grants projects, the program appeared to have contributed to the continuation and revitalization of indigenous cultures as well as to laying foundations for the sustainable livelihoods of indigenous communities. The contribution to the reduction of economical poverty has been minimal; however, a contribution has been made to the reduction of cultural impoverishment.

The program has been weak in obtaining tangible results regarding the adoption of *sui generis* systems, although discussions regarding this issue have increased substantially over the last years, notably at the international level and recently more and more at national level. The IKP did promote the awareness and understanding of the role and importance of traditional practices and knowledge in sustainable development, also mainly through its international activities and to a lesser extend by means of the SGP activities. Some remarks will be made in chapter IX. ‘Assessment of a UNDP Sponsored Small Grants Development Project in Ecuador’.

The quantification of the impact is difficult, as repeatedly mentioned in this evaluation. Many outputs and indicators have not been fulfilled as stated in the project document, and a conclusion could be drawn that the objectives would than not have been achieved. However, an assessment of achieving the outputs and indicators only is limited because they do not describe indirect effects and impacts. From the other hand, the specific contribution of IKP is impossible to distinct from other organizations and influences directed at the issues of indigenous knowledge. Very important is the fact that the program was conceptually a long-term program and many results will also only be visible in the long run.

**F. Assessment of institutional aspects**

1. **Introduction**

In order to get the program up and running, the program objective was to operationalize the program framework, through the establishment and functioning of coordination and monitoring mechanisms. Foreseen outputs were an established and functioning secretariat, the establishment of regional coordination, establishment of the Small Grants Development and Research program and establishment of a program planning mechanism.
2. Planned program activities and outputs

As the Program Document states, the Indigenous Knowledge Program should be seen as a framework, set up to guarantee maximum flexibility. The document stresses the experimental nature of the program in a rapidly changing institutional and political environment, while supporting a highly diverse and politicized movement.

The program’s structure was set up in such a way as to ensure the indigenous steering of it. It consisted of the following main elements: (i) the Program Secretariat; (ii) a Program Steering Committee; and (iii) an Informal Program Advisory Group.

The Steering Committee (SC) is the executive body of the IKP, made up of eight indigenous leaders selected to also be regional coordinators for the IKP. The regions represented by the SC would be East Africa, West Africa, South Asia, Southeast Asia, North America, the Pacific, Central America and South America. Regional Coordinators and their organizations should exercise the regional coordination function. The Steering Committee would be responsible for advancing the IKP by identifying program priorities and approving activities, and oversee the Secretariat’s work towards administering the program and works in cooperation with the Coordinator to implement program activities at the local and regional levels.

The Secretariat would be responsible for coordinating the Program’s activities. It would have two full time staff persons: a Coordinator and an Administrator.

The Advisory Group (AG) would initially consist of the Program’s founding member organizations, i.e.: Cultural Survival Canada (CSC), the Indigenous Peoples Biodiversity Network (IPBN), the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Rural Advancement Foundation International (RAFI), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and the Swiss Development Cooperation. This initial group of members would be joined by representatives of other donor organizations, specialists in biodiversity, intellectual property rights, legal aspects, indigenous peoples community development issues, key indigenous leaders from the regions (those who speak for large numbers of groups) and individuals with experience in fundraising.

Core funding was received from DANIDA (Danish Development Assistance), to the amount of CAD 250,000 per year for 1997 and 1998 each. IDRC contributed with CAD 405,500 earmarked for small research grants and some monitoring and evaluation training for Regional Coordinators; the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC) donated CAD 130,000 and UNDP USD 77,000, for three small grants development projects and two consultancies. The total funding was thus approximately USD 963,000 for the period 1996 – 1998. The Program Document had foreseen a total budget of CAD 6,371,380 for four years (1996 – 1999).

The Secretariat of the IKP was based in the office of Cultural Survival Canada (CSC), one of the founding member organizations directed by Alejandro Argumedo, who was also coordinator of the Indigenous Peoples’ Biodiversity Network (IPBN), another initiative taker. As the IKP was not a legal entity, it required a legal entity to act on its behalf, e.g. when purchasing goods and services, signing contracts and administering donor funds. This role was fulfilled by CSC between 1996 and May 1998, and afterwards by IDRC who offered to host the program temporarily after CSC ran into financial problems. A more permanent solution was not found and the administrative tasks of the IKP are currently, at the time of this evaluation, still being taken care of by IDRC although the funds available for the Secretariat already ran out since February 1999.
Very summarized, expenses were made for: Salaries; Travel; Administration; Small Grants Projects; Publications; Workshops; Secretariat Expenses; Regional Coordination. Both CSC as well as IDRC charged 10% overhead costs of the handling budget for their IKP related expenses and services. The regional coordinators received a fixed monthly expenses remuneration. It was the intention that the responsibility to administer program funds and identify, implement and monitor activities would gradually be handed over to the regional coordinators, leaving the Secretariat with the responsibility for global-level activities and for the coordination of activities between the different regions. To ensure that regional coordinators would have the capacity to carry out these responsibilities, the Secretariat would formulate and implement an internship or training program for the regional coordinators.

Specifically, the Program Document describes the following indicators:

- Program Coordinator and Administrator recruited
- Steering Committee/Advisory Group selected and established
- Regional Coordinators selected and designated
- Needs of the regional coordinators in terms of communication equipment assessed/equipment acquired and installed
- Needs for training assessed
- Regional Coordinators trained
- Objectives of the Program disseminated through the Regional Coordinators
- Project proposals for activities at the community/local level collected
- Agreement on a regional division of labor
- Progress reports and detailed work plans every 6 months
- Mid-term evaluation and incorporation of its recommendations
- Final evaluation.

3. Assessment of implementation, housing, management and financial arrangements

The Steering Committee (SC) was formed as scheduled, as well as the Advisory Group. SC members were chosen based upon the Terms of Reference included in the Program Document. There are no written records of a selection or election process. A number of SC members were also active members of the Indigenous Peoples’ Biodiversity Network (IPBN), most if not all well-known individuals in the international indigenous peoples’ movement and some with an already existing regional network behind them. SC meetings took place mostly back-to-back with international meetings, thus ensuring both participation of IKP members in those meetings and the opportunity to meet among each other.

Targeted activities and work plans – which were produced quite consistently by the Secretariat – were met relatively well, and regular progress reports were made by the Secretariat for consideration at SC meetings, where the direction of the program was evaluated and decisions were taken about further activities. Contacts of Small Grants recipients with the Secretariat have been described as satisfactorily.

An important difficulty in the operational aspect was the absence of well-functioning regional coordinators for the African and Arctic regions. The Arctic region was initially not mentioned in the Program Document but considered to be important in the activities of the IKP and thus added to the target regions. Although an African coordinator was initially appointed, the contact was gradually lost. The weakness of internal organization among indigenous peoples’ organizations and networks in Africa and the low international visibility of many existing organizations in Africa, have been mainly
debit to this situation. Communication problems with the later Arctic regional coordinator appeared to be responsible for the weak coordination of this region.

Another major problem has been the lack of a full-time Program Coordinator. Up to two times, a candidate coordinator was selected and approved by the Steering Committee, but each time the final appointment did not go through, first because of last minute withdrawal of the candidate (1997) and secondly because of non-obtainment of a working permit in Canada, where the Secretariat was based (1998). As a result, in November 1998 Alejandro Argumedo was appointed by the SC to be interim Program Coordinator for a period of three months with agreed tasks to fulfill. A permanent Program Coordinator was never appointed. This absence led to a discontinuity in program activities and a weakness in further fundraising for other program activities.

The lack of secure funds has been a bottleneck for the program. Many activities could not be planned ahead as there was no certainty of the necessary finances. A number of planned activities could not be undertaken for which reason the planned outputs were not met. The program actually ran out of available funds and since February 1999 no more substantial activities were undertaken, other than continuing administration of ongoing Small Grants projects. Many SC members, however, continued to participate in name of the Indigenous Knowledge Program in a number of international forums, and to the outer world, the program has not stopped.

An important activity that did not take place, was the need-assessment for regional coordinators and their actual training for taking upon them the responsibilities for regional program activities, including the administration of funds. This would ideally lead to decentralization and ‘regionalization’ of program activities. No specific division of tasks among the regions was undertaken.

A concern voiced by several Steering Committee members, was the non-availability of an updated Small Grants Program informational brochure. Importantly, this brochure would have to be translated in local languages or at least in common languages in the region. In their work, regional coordinators were also confronted with the lack of funds to travel and network in their regions. Many of the target indigenous organizations did (do) not have cheap, secure or continuous access to electronic means of communication, while personal contact is traditionally the preferred way of communication among indigenous peoples.

The Secretariat, initially hosted at Cultural Survival Canada (CSC) was moved to the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) after CSC ran into financial problems. A rather intensive discussion took place whether to have an autonomous IKP Secretariat in stead of being hosted at another institute, but for reasons of continuity and easiness, the Steering Committee decided to have the Secretariat hosted temporarily at IDRC. A decision to change this temporary situation was never taken.

The available funds appeared to have been administered properly. An external auditing, however, has not been conducted during the time of the program. Some concern has been raised that the Small Grants Program, the ‘backbone’ of the program, received too less attention within the overall activities, especially in relation with the international work of the IKP. Also, although common, a rather big part of the budget went into overhead costs and salaries. The SGP was administered rather effectively, although some reports seem to be missing. An identified weakness regarding the SGP is also that there is no documented account of the impacts of the individual grants, and procedures for this do not exist.

The Advisory Group (AG) did not function as it could have functioned, namely in guiding the program and proposing alternatives where necessary. There were no ‘outside’ representatives from other
indigenous organizations in the AG as foreseen in the Program Document, which would have been very helpful in guiding the program. As the other AG members recognized the autonomy of the indigenous steering of the program, apparently they did not want to ‘interfere’, maybe leaving the program left on its own where it could have used some sincere advice from more experienced institutions.

The Steering Committee undertook a self-evaluation in November 1998 in stead of the planned mid-evaluation, and a number of recommendations to get the program back on track were formulated. However, the inability to raise funds and the absence of a well-functioning Program Coordinator soon led to a further discontinuity of the program.
VIII. ASSESSMENT OF SPECIAL DIFFICULTIES AND LESSONS LEARNED

In its execution, the Indigenous Knowledge Program (IKP) has experienced a number of difficulties, many of which have been touched upon already in previous chapters but which will be summarized again here, in addition to others of a more general nature.

As mentioned, the program was based on a well justified conception and was coherent and logical in its design. However, there were overlaps in functions and roles between initiative-takers, executors and monitors of the program. Many of the Indigenous Peoples’ Biodiversity Network (IPBN) members were also Steering Committee members and Regional Coordinators for the IKP. Cultural Survival Canada (CSC) was directed by the same person that was considered as the ‘face’ of the IPBN and later interim Program Coordinator. The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) was co-founder, advisory board member and later housing institute for the Secretariat, which was also true for CSC and partly for IPBN. These overlaps, although not incompatible and somehow natural and the most simple solution, narrowed the diversity in visions, mutual accountability and feedback necessary for steering the program. The fact that there were no active ‘outside’ indigenous representatives in the AG contributed to this AG weakness.

A ‘political’ aspect for consideration in future steps, is the nature of the IKP: is it a representation of indigenous peoples and does it act like that (e.g. speaking on behalf of indigenous peoples), is it a ‘pure’ support program by indigenous individuals, is it an indigenous network of existing organizations for the support of indigenous knowledge, is it ‘owned’ by the initiative-taker IPBN or even of one person, is it a new indigenous organization or all of these? In its activities IKP has varyingly expressed itself as all of these, which has sometimes been conceived as confusing.

A difficulty was the unproven assumption that the whole of the projected budget would become available for the execution of the program. The program had a range of diverse but coherent activities leading to its strategic objectives, but due to the lack of funds a number of those were not or incompletely executed. Related to this, the program was in many ways experimental: it left off from the concept that there would be a flexibility in budgetary allocations. However, in the prioritization of funds the original coherence and balance between program activities appeared to have been lost. There was a discrepancy in local level, national and international level activity and impact of the program with a notable emphasis on the international activities.

The weakness in fundraising in itself was a factor of importance. The absence of a full-time Program Coordinator undoubtedly influenced the level of fundraising. A financing strategy was formulated only in early 1999, when the program was already on the verge of running out of funds, and that strategy was never discussed or adopted, nor implemented.

The absence of a Program Coordinator also left the program without proper coordination. The Program Administrator was not mandated to take ‘political’ decisions and could only urge the SC members to make certain pressing decisions. As a result, activities increasingly got an ad-hoc nature, and the program moved from one international meeting to the other. Again, the appointment of an interim Program Coordinator was a rather late decision, when available funds were already little and it was difficult to get the program back on track. The SC self-evaluation of Whakatane, Aotearoa-New Zealand was a critical assessment of this situation but there was no proper coordination afterwards to implement the decisions taken in that meeting.
Steering Committee members, also regional coordinators (RC), faced a different type of difficulty, having to do mainly with the flow of information between themselves and the target groups. The compensation they received for expenses made related to their work for the IKP was by far not enough for an intensive maintenance of information flows or networking in the extensive regions in which they had to operate. The remuneration was also perceived differently by the RCs; some considered it a ‘salary’ for their IKP work while for others it was strictly an expenses compensation.

Regional workshops where IKP information could be spread mostly attracted the indigenous organizations that do already have means of communication and were aware of IKP, and ways to reach the more remote local levels could not be funded. There was no specific regional budget. Even the IKP informational brochure, a rather low-budget means of communication, was not timely available and needed to be translated in local or at least common languages for a wider understanding. An overall information management strategy has not been developed which was most notable in the regional work, where this management was completely dependent on the initiatives of the RC.

The regional coordinators were not full-time IKP dedicated, given the fact that they are mostly active individuals within their region, often leaders of an already existing indigenous national or regional organization. Although this experience and understanding were strengths for the effective functioning of the RCs, the abundance of IKP related work required an almost impossible dedication of time and efforts and it is not a surprise that they could not cope with all tasks expected from them. Also in decision-taking the SC was at times slow, because of delays in communication, technical problems or access to communication facilities. There was a fair gender balance within the Steering Committee (3 women out of 8 members in total, of which 2 men of the Arctic and African region have not participated as active as the other regions).

The distance, both physical and functional, between the coordinators and local organizations, was part of the difficulty in promoting the Small Grants Program (SGP). Many local organizations would like to and benefit from the SGP but did not have the internal capacity to develop project proposals according to the IKP standards. Regional coordinators did not have the time and funds for attending all requests for clarifications on the project requirements or on received project proposals and a number of good ideas and initiatives could not be materialized.

Apart from indigenous organizations, information interaction with another target group, namely relevant regional and international forums and organizations, could have been more optimized in the existence of an information management strategy. Submission of indigenous declarations and recommendations did not take place consistently and the IKP could have been much more influential if there were more written input in discussions on indigenous knowledge.

An important concern is the fact that information released through reports of SGP project is not legally protected and no clear policy has been made public about those although it is likely it does exist. A number of reports from SGP recipient contain important information on medicinal plants, traditional technologies or other ancestral knowledge, and it is not clear how this information generated and released through the IKP is being protected.

A difficulty was the lack of prioritization of ‘relevant’ forums in terms of policy influencing. Many instances deal in one way or the other with indigenous knowledge and the IKP had a hard way to make a strategic choice. Given the limitations in active members and financial resources, a more stringent selection should have been made for focusing the attention of the program.
Not so much a difficulty but a special consideration must be given to the fact that the IKP was indeed experimental in many ways, moving in a highly political environment where the achievement of impacts can not be described in terms of program activities and programmatic execution of those, but are rather subject to group dynamics and interpersonal and negotiation capacities.

In the lessons learned and on a more positive note, IKP, being one of very few programs of its kind and scale, proved to fill a big gap at all levels in matters pertaining to indigenous knowledge and its protection. Discussions on these topics were welcomed by all interested parties and many have expressed the need for further policy discussions. IKP furthermore served as a valuable vehicle for more interaction on the topics related to indigenous knowledge, among indigenous peoples and between indigenous peoples and governments, agencies, national, regional and international organizations and other instances and processes.

The IKP showed that a program can be successful in its autonomous indigenous steering with regards to influencing international policies. It has been weak in obtaining tangible results at national level where politics are of a rather different and difficult nature, but then again it did make a difference for those indigenous communities and organizations that participated in the Small Grants Program.
IX. ASSESSMENT OF A UNDP SPONSORED SMALL GRANTS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT IN ECUADOR

A. Introduction

One of the Small Grants Development projects (a project with a strong component on community initiatives for sustainable development) approved within the Small Grants Program of the IKP was a project in the Amazon region of Ecuador: ‘Project for the Recuperation and Development of Indigenous Knowledge for the Conservation of Ecosystems and Biodiversity in the Amazon Forest of Yana Yacu Sacha’. The submitting and executing organization was the ‘Instituto Quichua de Biotecnología Sacha Supai’ (IQBSS). The approved UNDP contribution was US$ 25,000. The project had a planned duration of 12 months.

The objectives of the project were to ‘contribute to the strengthening of a sustainable development model based on ancestral indigenous knowledge and technologies of ecological management of the territory…’, and to ‘contribute to the recuperation and development of knowledge and technologies of indigenous ancestral wisdom …’ (please refer to Annex 12 for the project document). Main activities were the establishment of a ethnobotanical forest garden of medicinal and sacred plants as well as nutritional and fruit trees, and a gene bank of traditional crops.

For the assessment, the consultant made an on-site visit to the Yana Yacu Quichua community in the Amazon region of the Pastaza province in East Ecuador, from 14 – 16 December 2000, following orientation meetings in Quito on 12 December and in Puyo, Pastaza on 13 December 2000.
B. Background and context

According to the information received from the Quichua Institute for Biotechnology Sacha Supai (IQBSS) the IKP project fitted neatly into a well-planned strategy for maintaining indigenous culture and knowledge while at the same time safeguarding indigenous territory and traditional ecosystems on which the survival of this culture and knowledge depends. Yana Yacu is a carefully planned community in an Ecuadorian Amazonian area close to the border with Peru that had no indigenous communities before and which would otherwise have been occupied for (unsustainable) resource extraction or military purposes. The indigenous organization Organización de los Pueblos Indígenas de Pastaza (OPIP) decided to have the area colonized by indigenous communities before others would occupy it. Within this indigenous colonization initiative, a small number of young indigenous families from nearby villages moved to the virgin area alongside the Rio Negro, thus establishing the Yana Yacu community of approximately 15 families in 1992. The initiative was preceded by a zoning study with financial assistance of Solsticio, Denmark and the new community also received financial assistance for making an air strip of 450 meters by Solidaridad, Spain.

In 1993, the Quichua Institute for Biotechnology was established by Quichua indigenous persons from the Pastaza region, who now also live in Yana Yacu during part of the year. Objectives of the institute were, among others, to contribute to the maintenance and development of indigenous technologies as they relate to ecosystem and biodiversity management. Members of the institute learned about the Indigenous Knowledge Program in 1997 from the then Program Administrator Andrea Lindores, and the project contract was signed in November 1997. The first disbursement of US$ 10,500 covered the period January – June 1998 of the project. The second disbursement was received only in February 1999 due to the internal administrative changes in the IKP.

IQBSS afterwards also received financial assistance from WATU Acción Índígena, Spain, to establish a Center for Capacity Building within the community, which would serve as a meeting and teaching center regarding issues of medicinal and sacred plants, traditional crops and agricultural innovations based on indigenous technologies. Construction activities for establishing the center are currently undertaken. The project with WATU also contributes to further cultivation of medicinal plants and the recuperation of traditional indigenous nutritional crops.

C. Description of the project execution

The Yana Yacu community is situated along a branch of the river Rio Negro in the frontier area of Ecuador with Peru, in virgin Amazonian rainforest. The community can only be reached by airplane, a small, one or two motor, four to five seat aircraft (bigger planes would not be able to land on the 450 meter sand airstrip). Under rainy conditions the airstrip cannot be used. The aircrafts leave from Puyo, Pastaza, and it takes a little over a one hour flight to reach the easterly located community. Puyo is a town in Pastaza which can be reached by bus from Quito in a six-hours drive.

The community has no electricity nor running water. For drinking, cooking and washing, river water is used. There are no governmental health services and the village depends on one of the community members that is currently specializing himself in traditional medicine. For serious cases one needs to fly to Puyo. The nearest military post is 20 minutes by flight away. There is a small school with one teacher, and parents also teach one day per week each. Each of the 12 families (couples aged 17-30) currently have at average 4-5 children. The community has a radio transmitter running on solar energy,
with which contact is maintained with Puyo. There are no constructed sanitary provisions. Houses are approximately 200 meter apart from each other.

Each family has an own ‘chacra’ or agricultural plot where it grows its daily supplies of staple food such as *yuca* (cassave/manioc) and plantain. The family *chacras* are within a distance of a few kilometers from the village. Protein sources are mostly fish from the river and hunted bush meat from wild animals and birds. Most families have chicken for eggs. Apart from the family *chacras*, each family is also responsible for one of the medicinal plant or traditional crop cultivation areas that were initiated within the IKP project. Men usually do the clearing of the agricultural areas, hunting, fishing and construction work, while women are more dedicated to seeding, daily maintenance of the fields, child raising and cooking. Consumption patterns of the villagers have not changed due to the project activities; however, the variety of crops on the *chacras* did increase substantially.

Within the IKP project, four areas or ethnobotanical gardens of 0.6 – 1 ha. were cleared and replanted with plant material or seeds collected from the forest or brought along from other communities during exchange workshops. The *chacras* each have a dominance of certain types of cultivation, e.g. one for medicinal and sacred plants, one for fruit trees or nutritional crops. However, the areas have a diversity in species, ranging from fast growing staple crops to fruit trees that will deliver only after 10 or more years, thus extending the period in which the land will be ‘productive’. Traditionally, a *chacra* is in use for about 15 years, but within the IKP initiative, one area is expected to be used in a cycle of about 30 years. Also, the necessary amount of land to sustain the community in its traditional agricultural method will be less given the slower rotational time of the agricultural plots.

A selection of the plant or seed material has been made based upon: the usefulness of the species (nutritional, medicinal or sacred), traditional use, availability or scarcity (i.e. the cultivation of threatened species or those that are found only in far remote areas and can now be brought within reach of the village), traditional diversity of species (e.g. 10 different types of *yuca* in stead of only the 2 – 3 most commonly used ones), potential for commercialization of the products, longer term production and potential for technological innovation (growing/replanting potential). A smaller area has been dedicated as gene bank where seeds are grown in small plastic bags. Originally the seeds were planted in tree trunks but the roots often grew through the wooden material making mortality high when removing the seedlings. In the plastic bags mortality has been reduced to 10%. Seeds and plants were collected, mainly by women, in the forest or from other communities based on knowledge about the seedling season. The collection of medicinal and sacred plants has been especially difficult as many of these plants do not multiply by collectable seeds.

No pesticides are used although there are pests such as ants, fungi and threats from hares, rats and other animals. However, the diversity of species, extensiveness of the area and number of each species prevents large scale destruction. Around the experimental *chacras* palm trees were planted, known to form a natural protection against erosion in the low hilly area as well as keeping out unwanted large forest animals.

The variety of species was impressing, ranging from medicinal plants against all sorts of illnesses such as bone diseases, *leishmaniasis* and stomach problems, to sacred plants such as the *ayahuasca* and *sangre de drago*, from many *yuca* varieties till scarce fruit trees, and from plants used for natural artisanal colors to plants that are known to be of nutritional importance to animals and birds and trees used for their wood or other products. One of the ‘long-term’ *chacras* of 2.5 ha, for example, housed 124 different medicinal plant species and 54 fruit species, having a total of 2,700 cultivated plants.
The community members were involved prior to and from the start of the project through regular village meetings where strategic approaches and activities were and still are discussed. Both men and women equally participated in all activities, of course with a different task allocation. During small workshops in which indigenous experts, including healers and elders from other communities participated, knowledge about medicinal and sacred plants was shared. Another noteworthy participatory and teaching method for the transfer of traditional knowledge is the teaching by parents in the local school: once a week one parent teaches what he/she knows best, whether that be hunting or fishing techniques, knowledge about the nature, maintaining agricultural plots or ancestral stories and teachings.

D. Achievements and impacts; spin-off effects

Without going into too much detail, it can be mentioned that the foreseen indicators for completed activities have been achieved. Please also refer to the project reports submitted by IQBSS to UNDP (Annex 13: IQBSS project reports), which have been found to be quite accurate in the on-site assessment. The project achieved its objectives, namely the strengthening of a sustainable development model based on ancestral indigenous knowledge and technologies and the contribution to the recuperation and development of ancestral indigenous knowledge and technologies. It also complied with each of the following IKP objectives for Small Grants projects, namely to:

- support the continuation of the socio-cultural structures that have generated indigenous knowledge;
- develop/identify and implement policies/activities to encourage community conservation;
- build capacity of indigenous peoples’ organizations with regard to the conservation of indigenous knowledge;
- support community initiatives for income generation and sustainable development.

The project can be denominated a success story of local level development based on a self-formulated development strategy that is true to the traditional indigenous customs and values. Not only is indigenous knowledge conserved and developed, also the basis has been laid for the sustainable livelihood of the community even though commonly used ‘essential’ wealth indicators such as electricity and running water are not in place. As put in simple words by the community leader: We apply what we know in ways natural to us.

The project contributed substantially to the long-term development objectives of the community who is well-aware of what it wants and where it wants to go. It foresees growth of the community through natural expansion of the current families (does not favor more new families to ‘immigrate’) and looks forward to the expected outputs from the ethnobotanical gardens. A particular strength in the development concept of the village and its leadership (both the community leadership as well as the IQBSS leaders) is the conscious reduction of dependence on Western supplies, including commercial seeds and technologies not inherent to indigenous peoples, and its money economy. The community is by far self-sufficient and cash incomes from the agricultural products can be invested in complementary development needs such as education, health care and communication, without having to wait for the government to do so.

The IKP project led to important spin-off effects, among others in developing other project proposals building on the IKP success. The community is currently building a Center for Capacity Building with financial assistance of WATU Acción Indígena from Spain, which will serve as a teaching and capacity building center for others, in particular other indigenous communities and organizations, to learn from...
the Yana Yacu experience. In this spin-off, the IQBSS project also succeeded in addressing the IKP objectives of strengthening the capacity of indigenous organizations to offer high quality training to indigenous peoples; convey the outcomes of program research and training facilities to key audiences; and ensure efficient management of research, training and dissemination activities.

E. Special difficulties, conclusions and lessons learned

A difficulty that the community and the organization will face is still the legal protection of the ancestral knowledge. In the report, for example, the names and potentials of many medicinal and sacred plants are mentioned. Unlike another SGP recipient, IQBSS did not state explicitly that the information in the report may not be used in any form without written prior permission of the authors, the community and the indigenous people that hold the knowledge. A biotechnology company with bad intentions can easily use the given indications, reducing its efforts of identifying potential medicinal plants and use the information to its own benefit, without ever acknowledging the rights of the holders of such knowledge or a compensation of its use. Also in this instance, legal protection of indigenous knowledge shows to be a crucial factor, and not only SGP recipients but also the IKP itself needs to address the question of how to protect information that becomes available through IKP sponsored projects.

Apart from the late transfer of the second disbursement and the smaller amount than agreed by IKP and the existing infrastructure and communication problems, no more special difficulties in the execution of the project have been identified.

The Yana Yacu project has been completed satisfactorily according to its objectives, activities and indicators, and has achieved more than just the project goals. Important spin-off benefits, especially regarding the sustainability of the project results and broader dissemination of the results and benefits, have been identified. The project was logic and coherent in its design and based upon a long process of preparation and policy development, fitting into a conceptual framework of autonomous indigenous development based on territorial integrity, management of natural resources with respect for the biological diversity and natural ecosystems, and traditional knowledge.

In an extrapolation of this experience to the overall IKP program and the Small Grants Program in particular, it can be said that the implementation of a well-prepared project proposal being part of a broader perspective and based on proper values and visions, can have an enormous beneficial impact on the community level, in spite of the ‘small’ sum of money that is made available. Dedication of participants in project implementation is crucial, as is participatory project management. The possibility of disseminating project experiences is an important factor. Spin-off effects, such as the increased awareness, interest and understanding of the community in conservation activities, protection of culture and indigenous knowledge systems, potential for further projects and activities, establishment of relationships with government and other organizations, greater flows of information exchange and awareness about information sources, etc. may not be underestimated.
X. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Conclusions

The Indigenous Knowledge Program (IKP) did fulfill a critical need for support to initiatives for the preservation and protection of indigenous knowledge. At the local level, the Small Grants Program (SGP) projects appeared to be forming a good basis for further action, building on their results. The implementation of a well-prepared project proposal being part of a broader perspective and based on proper values and visions, can have an enormous beneficial impact on the community level, in spite of the ‘small’ sum of money that is made available. Dedication of participants in project implementation is crucial, as is participatory project management. The possibility of disseminating project experiences is an important factor. Spin-off effects, such as the increased awareness, interest and understanding of the community in conservation activities, protection of culture and indigenous knowledge systems, potential for further projects and activities, establishment of relationships with government and other organizations, greater flows of information exchange and awareness about information sources, etc. may not be underestimated.

At the national and regional level, the participation of indigenous peoples’ organizations has increased in effectiveness and intensity thanks to their greater involvement in and understanding of indigenous knowledge issues. Internationally, IKP has been successful in increasing the effective participation of indigenous peoples’ representatives, particularly in the CBD process. This had a multiplier effect towards other international processes, given the lead position of the CBD process in biodiversity and traditional knowledge issues.

Overall, IKP has made a contribution to the conservation of biological diversity, mainly through its international work aimed at raising awareness and acknowledgement for indigenous knowledge but less through the preservation of indigenous knowledge systems. However, through some of the Small Grants projects, the program appeared to have contributed to the continuation and revitalization of indigenous cultures as well as to laying foundations for the sustainable livelihoods of indigenous communities. The contribution to the reduction of economical poverty has been minimal; however, a contribution has been made to the reduction of cultural impoverishment.

The program has been weak in obtaining tangible results regarding the adoption of sui generis systems, although discussions regarding this issue have increased substantially over the last years, notably at the international level and recently more and more at national level. The IKP did promote the awareness and understanding of the role and importance of traditional practices and knowledge in sustainable development, also mainly through its international activities and to a lesser extend by means of the SGP activities.

IKP, being one of very few programs of its kind and scale, proved to fill a big gap at all levels in matters pertaining to indigenous knowledge and its protection. Discussions on these topics were welcomed by all interested parties and many have expressed the need for further policy discussions. IKP furthermore served as a valuable vehicle for more interaction on the topics related to indigenous knowledge, among indigenous peoples and between indigenous peoples and governments, agencies, national, regional and international organizations and other instances and processes.
The IKP showed that a program can be successful in its autonomous indigenous steering with regards to influencing international policies. During the years of its existence IKP members built an experience in the procedures and politics of international meetings, which was a welcome contribution in guiding other indigenous participants with lesser experience.

The lack of secure funds has been a bottleneck for the program. A number of planned activities could not be undertaken for which reason the planned outputs were not met. The available funds appeared to have been administered properly. An external auditing, however, has not been conducted during the time of the program.

B. Recommendations

The main recommendation is that the program gets a follow-up. The current three-year program which was scheduled over the period 1996 – 1999 can be considered completed. The IKP did have a number of important achievements as stated before, and those achievements need to be strengthened and their impact needs to be optimized. Some suggestions to this end are:

- make a compilation, probably in the form of a publication, of joint indigenous statements, declarations, recommendations, principles, etc. e.g. as made during IKP supported workshops and the Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity, for wider circulation, including an executive summary of recurring principles and proposals;
- develop a publication of the results of IKP sponsored Small Grants Program projects, their achievements and their significance for the recipient organizations (implementation of the expected output as stated in the Program Document: ‘Analysis of the results of the small grants programs published and disseminated and used as an input for advocacy and research activities’);
- circulate the results of the evaluation to interested parties.

A second phase should start afresh as soon as possible, taking advantage of the political momentum. A draft outline for the second phase of the program (‘IKP-2’) with more details and contextual remarks is given in the next chapter, ‘Draft Outline for a Second Phase of the Program’. Some recommendations made therein, are:

- IKP-2 should build upon the experiences and achievements of the first phase. The objectives of the first phase, which are still relevant, appropriate and achievable, can be maintained.
- The second phase program should focus on unfinished business from the first phase which have not lost their relevancy and importance.
- The effectiveness of the different structural components of the program should be strengthened, providing guarantees for a conscientious, disciplinary execution of the program by fully dedicated and enthusiastic people with consistent monitoring of the execution of agreed activities.
- The basic strategies for achieving a meaningful contribution to the protection and development of indigenous knowledge as identified in indigenous peoples’ meetings have not changed in the past years of the IKP, namely the need for access to and dissemination of information, awareness raising at all levels, indigenous capacity building and support to local initiatives, and should be maintained.
- At the local level, the Small Grants Program needs to be continued and further extended, giving even more organizations the opportunity to participate in it.
- Special attention should be given to strategic activities at national and regional level including some more focus on capacity building in legal and legislation aspects and on increased informed indigenous participation in national and regional forums.
- Internationally, more emphasis should be given to written inputs in the form of submissions to Secretariats of conventions and other international processes. To this end, it is recommended that the second phase program takes into account provisions for more technical support to the program, e.g. by indigenous experts to write discussions papers, background papers, statements, submissions to conventions and processes, reports of crucial meetings, etc.
- It is also recommended to have a regional technical support person or a ‘regional secretary’ in each region to provide technical and logistical support to the program.
- Clear criteria need to be in place for defining ‘relevant’ forums in which to intervene, and a prioritization will have to be made given the wide variety.
- An information management and communication strategy needs to be developed to guarantee a more structured and planned information exchange process.
- The program should include provisions for the translation of crucial documents in at least English, Spanish and French.
- The IKP promotional brochure should be available in common and/or local languages.
- A fundraising strategy must be outlined from the start.
- The program should move to being a fully autonomous program, in due time establishing its own legal personality. For the time-being, until further discussions have identified the best option(s) to do so, the program can continue to be hosted by a trusted institute. With the hosting institute it shall be negotiated to pay less overhead costs in order to reserve more funds for the regional secretaries and SGP projects.
- The Advisory Group should take a more proactive role when the Steering Committee seems to be hesitant to take decisions, while still respecting that the ultimate decisions are taken by the SC.
- Special attention should be paid to the development of reasonable criteria and indicators for assessing the achievement of outputs and impacts, and a more disciplined monitoring of those need to be in place.
XI. **DRAFT OUTLINE FOR A SECOND PHASE OF THE PROGRAM**

**A. Introduction**

The basic principle of the second phase of the Indigenous Knowledge Program (‘IKP-2’) is that it will build upon the experiences and achievements of the first phase. IKP-2 will not be substantially different in its structural setup, and in broad terms the objectives will be similar, although there will likely be a strategic shift in the direction of more attention to legal aspects of protecting indigenous knowledge. Differences will also have to be in strengthening the effectiveness with which the different structural components of the program function, a bigger emphasis on regional and national policy influencing and local indigenous peoples’ strengthening, and providing guarantees for a conscientious, disciplinary execution of the program by fully dedicated and enthusiastic people with consistent monitoring of the execution of agreed activities. The duration of the second phase would be three years, which is not long in policy debates but is limited enough to allow for timely adjustments in the eventual follow-up.

**B. Background and justification**

Broadly, the context, background and justification of the second phase will be similar to those of the first phase. The importance of indigenous knowledge and its (legal) protection, preservation, continuation and development is more, but by far not enough, recognized. The outcomes of the first phase will be included in the development of the second phase proposal. A number of current processes and developments will need to be included in the context of the IKP-2 proposal, such as the increased indigenous participation in national, regional and international forums, the greater acknowledgement of indigenous knowledge and an increasing willingness to give appropriate attention for its protection by governments, organizations and agencies, ‘new’ forums discussing indigenous knowledge such as the World Trade Organization, World Intellectual Property Organization, the United Nations Commission on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), many regional agreements and processes, etc. and the increased access of indigenous organizations to information.

**C. Strategic and special considerations**

The basic strategies for achieving a meaningful contribution to the protection and development of indigenous knowledge as identified in indigenous peoples’ meetings have not changed in the past years of the IKP, namely the need for access to and dissemination of information, awareness raising at all levels, indigenous capacity building and support to local initiatives. Levels of strategic intervention will be the same in IKP-2, namely local, national, regional and international. Emphasis, however, need to be laid more than before on local, national and regional level, as the topic of indigenous knowledge is increasingly discussed, influenced and decided at those levels.

At the local level, the strategy of Small Grants Program (SGP) support to local initiatives for maintaining indigenous knowledge, either by research or by support to the traditional structures that are essential for its maintenance, will be continued. Nationally, more concrete emphasis need to be given
and funds dedicated for strengthening indigenous participation in national discussions on (legal) protection of indigenous knowledge and in the development of actual legislation.

At the regional level, a tendency is seen of the establishment of more regional pacts and agreements, including trade and environmental agreements, in which the topic of indigenous knowledge is insufficiently covered although these regional agreements do have potential impacts on indigenous peoples in general and indigenous knowledge in particular. Also at regional level, increasingly countries do pay attention to the regional preparations for Conferences of the Parties (COP) of relevant conventions such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and other international processes, so that there is a shift in decision-taking opportunities from international to regional. Indigenous peoples’ participation in those forums is definitively insufficient and the second phase program will dedicate strategic attention to this phenomenon.

Internationally, IKP did increase awareness on issues pertaining to indigenous knowledge and that strategy needs to be continued. More emphasis should be given to written inputs in the form of submissions to Secretariats of conventions and other international processes. To this end, it is recommended that the second phase program takes into account provisions for more technical support to the program, e.g. by indigenous experts to write discussions papers, background papers, statements, submissions to conventions and processes and reports of crucial meetings.

In its strategy, the program needs to address the issue of information management. It must be clear how exactly information will be channeled and to whom, how information will be collected, in which forms it will be made available or disseminated, who will be responsible for which aspects of this information flow and what the budgetary implications are. The program should include provisions for the translation of crucial documents in at least English, Spanish and French to prevent the creation of a different level of information supply to the various regions.

A fundraising strategy must be outlined from the start. It is unlikely that all of the necessary funds will be available right from the start; however, a well-implemented fundraising strategy should prevent that the program runs into financial problems and does not achieve its objectives.

Clear criteria need to be in place for defining ‘relevant’ forums in which to intervene, and a prioritization will have to be made given the wide variety.

**D. Objectives and activities**

The objectives of the IKP as described in the Program Document of September 1996 are still relevant, appropriate and achievable. The overall development objective of the Indigenous Knowledge Program was: to contribute – through activities that help to preserve indigenous knowledge systems and garner acknowledgement for peoples’ innovations and/or compensation for their contributions – to: (i) the conservation of biological diversity; (ii) the continuation and revitalization of indigenous cultures; (iii) the reduction of poverty among indigenous communities and laying the foundation for their sustainable livelihoods.

The strategic objectives were:

1. Promote the adoption of *sui generis* systems for the protection of indigenous knowledge;
2. Promote the awareness and understanding of the role and importance of traditional practices and knowledge in sustainable development;
3. Promote the sustainable livelihoods of indigenous communities based on their traditional cultures and knowledge systems.

In its activities the second phase program will focus on unfinished business from the first phase which have not lost their relevancy and importance. It will give special attention to strategic activities at national and regional level including some more focus on capacity building in legal and legislation aspects and on increased informed indigenous participation in national and regional forums, and contain a more structured and planned information exchange process. The Small Grants Program will be continued and further extended, giving even more organizations the opportunity to participate in it.

E. Implementation arrangements

It is recommended to establish IKP-2 as an independent program, while acknowledging its history. The basic structure of the IKP can be maintained in the second phase: a regionally based Steering Committee whose members are also the regional coordinators, a central Secretariat, and an Advisory Group made up of donors, indigenous representatives, founders and experts.

It is recommended to have a regional technical support person or a ‘regional secretary’ in each region. Whereas SC members will continue to cover the ‘political’ steering of the program, the regional secretaries will function as a technical team based in the different regions. This will also mean a further ‘regionalization’ of the program and diminish dependency on the Secretariat. The regional secretaries will be full-time, paid workers with a regional budget for communication, regional travel and office supplies, providing technical support to the SC members, to (possible) SGP recipients in disseminating the appropriate information, developing the proposal and monitoring its execution, and writing reports, draft position submissions for adoption by the SC, background information papers and draft statements for international meetings to be attended by the SC members. The regional secretaries will maintain contact among each other and send all relevant information to each other. They will meet periodically (e.g. once a year) to exchange experiences. Their work can be supported by indigenous experts from the IKP roster of experts who will be contracted as consultants for writing papers, reports, etc.

Steering Committee members will be volunteers and political activists, attending relevant international and regional meetings, define the direction of the IKP-2 and guide the regional secretaries in their daily work. They will receive an expenses and communications budget. Decisions will be taken by the SC. The regions will increasingly fundraise for their own regional activities and international activities of the SC member of that region.

There will still be a central Secretariat consisting of a full-time indigenous Program Coordinator and a Program Administrator to fulfill the legal requirements of signing on behalf of the program with donors and SGP recipients, developing work plans for adoption by the SC, maintaining the administration of the program in general and the SGP in particular, making reports to donors, keep track of the implementation of the program and organize SC meetings and periodic meetings of the regional secretaries. Although the program should move to being a fully autonomous program, establishing its own legal personality is currently not unanimously considered a first priority and for the time-being, until further discussions have identified the best option(s), the program can continue to be hosted by a trusted institute. With the hosting institute it shall be negotiated to pay less overhead costs in order to
reserve more funds for the regional secretaries and SGP projects. Through periodic evaluations an assessment will be made how the program moves towards a more independent position and/or a more regional approach. The position of Program Coordinator and Administrator should be advertised widely to ensure more transparency, replies and choice. Certain creativity needs to be used in order to overcome restrictions regarding work permits if the host institute is in a country with rigid requirements.

The Advisory Group should take a more proactive role when the Steering Committee seems to be hesitant to take decisions, while still respecting that the ultimate decisions are taken by the SC. Also, IKP provides a yet unused opportunity for the donor agencies to establish more contacts among themselves and with other, indigenous and non-indigenous organizations, institutes and agencies on issues related to indigenous peoples in general and indigenous knowledge in particular.

From the outset, special attention must be paid to the development of reasonable criteria and indicators for assessing the achievement of outputs and impacts, and a more disciplined monitoring of those need to be in place, both by the Secretariat as well as by a recurring item on the agenda of Steering Committee meetings covering evaluation of the program.
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