



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



PHOTO CREDIT: TERESA TORRES FOR USAID

EFFECTIVE ENGAGEMENT WITH INDIGENOUS PEOPLES: USAID ENHANCING LIVELIHOODS THROUGH ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY GUIDANCE DOCUMENT

JULY 2020

This document was produced by Tetra Tech under the Integrated Land and Resource Governance Task Order (ILRG; 7200AA18D00003/7200AA18F00015) for the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

CONTENTS

CONTENTS i
HOW TO USE THIS GUIDANCE..... 1
INTRODUCTION: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LIVELIHOODS..... 2
CHALLENGES/KEY ISSUES 4
LESSONS LEARNED: USAID CASE STUDIES..... 11
BEST PRACTICES..... 19

HOW TO USE THIS GUIDANCE¹

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has designed this livelihoods and economic opportunity programming guidance document to provide a practical tool for USAID Missions and operating units (OUs) to more effectively engage and partner with Indigenous Peoples in relevant activities. Consideration of Indigenous Peoples' own development priorities and facilitating their participation in program design and implementation through well-structured communication, consultation and engagement strategies helps foster local solutions as envisioned in the [Journey to Self-Reliance \(p. 32\)](#). This requires identifying, in a context-specific manner, Indigenous Peoples and engaging them as both partners in development programming. By effectively engaging Indigenous Peoples in the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of programs that aim to enhance their livelihoods and expand their economic opportunities, OUs can advance objectives with a deeper understanding of Indigenous Peoples' needs, capacities, and interests. Such informed engagement is vital to ensure livelihoods programs are designed to mitigate adverse impacts on Indigenous communities, avoid conflicts that could delay or derail projects, and prevent harm to Indigenous Peoples' livelihoods.

This guidance document is based on desktop research about poverty reduction through enhanced livelihood and expanded economic opportunity for Indigenous Peoples. The review draws issues, lessons and best practices from the broad literature on this theme, USAID program related documents, interviews with USAID development professionals, and content of relevant international standards. This guidance complements and is informed by the [USAID Policy on Promoting the Rights of Indigenous Peoples \(PRO-IP\)](#) and comprises one piece of USAID's collection of sector-specific guidance documents on engagement with Indigenous Peoples. A key question that USAID development professionals might have is which people are covered by the PRO-IP, given differences across countries in identifying Indigenous Peoples.

The PRO-IP recognizes that development programming has not always benefitted Indigenous Peoples who, in many contexts, remain marginalized, discriminated against, and located in isolated areas without adequate access to infrastructure and basic services. Extreme poverty and lack of economic options in rural areas, which are often linked to political marginalization and weak land and resource tenure, can inhibit the ability of indigenous peoples to engage in and benefit from development assistance. Consistent with the principles set forth in the [Journey to Self-Reliance](#) framework, the PRO-IP aims to ensure that USAID effectively engages and partners with Indigenous Peoples to help USAID programs better align with Indigenous Peoples' own priorities while safeguarding against unintended adverse impacts contributing toward a self-reliant future. Programming by USAID missions and OUs can address various challenges and promote practices that support this across the agency's work in different sectors.

This guidance aims to orient USAID development professionals in their efforts to design activities, consistent with the PRO-IP, that aim to enhance livelihoods and expand economic opportunity experienced by Indigenous Peoples.² Reducing extreme poverty by enhancing livelihoods and economic opportunities is a cross-cutting and multifaceted programming theme relevant for various USAID

¹ To access references, use the electronic version of the document with hyperlinks embedded.

² Challenges faced by Indigenous People (e.g., issues of discrimination based on age, sexual orientation, ability, gender, ethnicity, gender-based violence, and land rights violations) are also faced by non-indigenous vulnerable groups. The prevalence of these issues is high among Indigenous Peoples and may unevenly affect individuals within a People. The potential for and impacts of exclusion, marginalization, and jeopardy are typically, but not always, higher for Indigenous Peoples. In this guidance, gender, conflict and land rights are cross-cutting themes while other types of vulnerability, such as age discrimination, are beyond the scope.

sectoral programs. Guidance documents prepared for supporting the implementation of the PRO-IP for the following other sectors are relevant and inter-related: biodiversity, energy, agriculture and food security, education, sustainable landscapes, global health, and democracy, human rights, and governance. Also, this guidance is intended to be used together with other USAID planning and programming tools, including USAID's new [Social Safeguard Toolkit](#) (Social Impact Assessment Framework, Screening Tool, Sample Social Impact Assessment Statement of Work, Consultation Handbook, and Inclusive Development Analysis) and its Environmental Impact Assessment process.

INTRODUCTION: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LIVELIHOODS

[Over 370 million Indigenous People, who occupy 20% of the world's land \(p. 2\)](#), are among the most marginalized communities on earth, often facing multiple forms of discrimination, exclusion, and oppression. In every country in which USAID works, Indigenous Peoples lag behind the general population on many development indicators: [they often suffer from higher levels of poverty, have less access to education and healthcare, and have shorter lifespans](#). Across the globe, Indigenous Peoples are [progressing more slowly](#) than others in regard to poverty reduction.

Enhancing livelihoods, within Indigenous Peoples' own vision for their future, particularly through expanding economic opportunity, contributes to reducing extreme poverty and can help improve other dimensions of development. "A livelihood is a means of making a living. It encompasses people's capabilities, assets, income and activities required to secure the necessities of life ([IFRC webpage](#))." Support for enhancing livelihoods with a focus on expanding economic opportunities to reduce poverty among Indigenous Peoples is consistent with the 2015 [USAID Vision for Eradicating Extreme Poverty](#). In the [2015 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review: Enduring Leadership in a Dynamic World](#) (QDDR, p. 33), USAID committed to support foundation governance measures such as strengthening traditional management strategies and demarcating and legalizing indigenous territories as a means of improving indigenous livelihoods.

Accordingly, livelihood enhancement is not typically treated as a standalone objective. More often livelihoods are a focus within broader objectives of USAID programs and strategies e.g., economic growth, agriculture, food security, extreme poverty reduction, rural economic development, alternative development, conflict management and mitigation, resilience, urban and peri-urban economic growth, youth development, and environment and natural resources management. Activities often aim to expand economic opportunity with a focus on agriculture (including traditional and non-traditional crops), handicrafts, tourism, livestock, among other activities in both formal and informal economies including improved subsistence production, expanded production for local markets, production for and access to

IDENTIFYING INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

The context and circumstances of Indigenous Peoples varies in the different countries and regions where USAID works. In some countries, Indigenous Peoples constitute a small minority within the population, while in others they are the majority. In some countries, Indigenous Peoples have legal recognition and are able to maintain their distinct identities, spiritual practices, and customary relationships with their lands, yet in others their very survival is at risk. The terminology used to describe them also varies, with many countries refusing to acknowledge them as Indigenous Peoples.

Recognizing this variation, USAID does not have a single, standardized definition of Indigenous Peoples. Instead, USAID (like other international and inter-governmental organizations) identifies Indigenous Peoples based on a set of criteria which may be present depending on the region or country in which Indigenous Peoples are located. These criteria include: self-identification as distinct social and cultural group; recognition of this identity by others; historical continuity with pre-colonial and/or pre-settler societies; collective attachment to territories and their natural resources; distinct language or dialect; and/or resolve to maintain and reproduce their ancestral environments and systems as distinctive peoples and communities.

regional, national and global value chains or wage labor opportunities in some situations. Programs with Indigenous livelihoods components also have involved supporting policies that address Indigenous territorial and resource rights and foster environmental sustainability. This guidance emphasizes factors related to economic opportunity and related policy topics while recognizing that livelihood enhancement requires consideration of many factors including cultural identity, food security, nutrition, and holistic wellbeing,³ consistent with indigenous livelihoods strategies.

The PRO-IP recognizes the value of Indigenous Peoples' livelihoods strategies, stating that such strategies are "among the most sustainable" and can significantly contribute to the overall development of their countries. Indigenous Peoples' livelihoods activities are wide-ranging, [including shifting cultivation, pastoralism and agro-pastoralism, hunting and gathering, and fishing](#) as well as engagement as entrepreneurs and innovators in the diverse opportunities including forestry, green economy, eco-tourism, and agriculture and agroforestry. Traditional, local knowledge often melds with modern sciences and global good practices as Indigenous Peoples diversify their livelihoods including through integration into modern market economy.

Indigenous Peoples livelihoods are often interlinked with a cultural identity and historical continuity that predates colonial societies and relies on access to social networks. Pre-colonial indigenous economic systems were often complex, involving sophisticated and diverse trade and exchange networks. According to [a report about Indigenous Peoples of Asia](#), these systems traditionally focus on subsistence production and supplying local communities through needs-based trading and marketing and tended to be grounded in constructs of reciprocity and social responsibility. Commercial market-based economies focus on supplying the needs of others in impersonal trade. Indigenous economic systems evolve in part in response to expansion of commercial markets in and around their territories. [A report by the ILO](#) (p. 3) points out that Indigenous Peoples often combine their traditional occupations and land uses with alternative or complementary economic activities to survive and to enhance their livelihoods.

[Indigenous economic systems have fostered economic opportunity](#) and generated income. Yet, the livelihoods of Indigenous People also face challenges due to low productivity, limited capacity for market engagement and market-relevant skills, low levels of investment, increased contestation over resources, and limited opportunities to link to markets. Additionally, the overexploitation of natural resources by both outsiders and Indigenous community members themselves has negatively affected the social, economic, and environmental conditions of many indigenous communities.

Moreover, since livelihoods is a multifaceted construct (as described above), it can be insufficient to use daily income levels as indicators of indigenous livelihoods. [An overview of case studies and lessons learned from USAID's Parks in Peril Program \(p. 11\)](#) noted that for the Indigenous Peoples considered in the studies, having money was not a major indicator of well-being. Education for one's children, time to be with family, good health, access to nature, and food security were found to be key elements of living well; noting that money is viewed as useful as a means to education and healthcare. Notions of well-being vary across cultures and across Indigenous Peoples. For example, for herders, the herds act as a savings bank, confer status, are used for marriage payments, and increasingly for livestock sales. In some Indigenous Peoples' communities having money is not only not a symbol of well-being it could also be a source of social conflict due the redistributive nature of their societies.

Indigenous livelihoods in many places are threatened through [violent conflict](#); illicit market activities, assimilation policies, and irresponsible investment practices that can result in or directly cause dispossession, forced removal, or relocation; denial of civil, political, and economic rights. The lives of

³ Separate, cross-relevant PRO-IP sectoral guidance covering sustainable landscapes, agriculture and food security, and health, among others cover these other factors in detail.

social leaders and activists that advocate for change in these dynamics are often at risk while communities continue to experience negative impacts on livelihoods. Increasingly, and often interlinked with the above dynamics, indigenous livelihoods are also threatened by climate change dynamics, including changing crop production, foraging, and migration patterns. When traditional livelihoods systems are under stress, the social fabric within communities might erode e.g., through displacement or as young people opt out by moving to urban areas.

The unique characteristics of indigenous livelihoods, economic and social systems and the linkages among them need to be considered when designing and implementing programs. By engaging and partnering with Indigenous Peoples, governments, civil society and the private sector can reduce risks and threats, promote investment, and nurture opportunities that include and benefit Indigenous Peoples.

CHALLENGES/KEY ISSUES

This section draws attention to the challenges associated with programming designed to enhance Indigenous Peoples' livelihoods, primarily through economic opportunity. Applying the PRO-IP will help OUs address these challenges and better align USAID priorities and objectives with Indigenous Peoples' self-determined development.

There are constraints that need greater attention for integration of Indigenous Peoples into markets, including local, regional or global value chains, to enhance their livelihoods

- Supporting engagement of indigenous communities or their members in market-based opportunities requires differential approaches that consider the strengths and constraints that Indigenous Peoples face.
 - Efforts to improve Indigenous Peoples' bargaining positions and expand access to markets need to consider limitations that could stem from their limited exposure to markets, their limited access to information, and the nature (e.g., communal) and status (legally recognized, uncontested) of land and resource rights.
 - [As discussed in a recent OECD Working Paper](#), rural enterprise development and value chain participation can be constrained by lack of skills (including business management), distance from markets, and limited financial access, as is common in rural areas; and, due to relative geographic and cultural isolation as well as discrimination, these challenges are often amplified for Indigenous Peoples.
 - Capacity building methodologies aimed at livelihood promotion, for Indigenous as well as non-Indigenous communities, often only focus on short-term economic gains of the livelihood activity. For Indigenous Peoples, greater emphasis is needed to build capacity for long-term management, governance, and other social aspects and implications of engaging in markets consistent with Indigenous community well-being.
 - Linkages between livelihoods activities and the broader economic systems of Indigenous Peoples are often not considered sufficiently in activity designs. These indigenous economic systems can be diverse and may include redistribution incentives that prioritize essential

COLLABORATION TO STRENGTHEN INDIGENOUS COFFEE PRODUCERS IN MEXICO

In partnership with Conservation International and Starbucks Coffee Company, USAID established the [Conservation Coffee Alliance](#), which among other activities provided Indigenous coffee cooperatives in Mexico with training on sustainable agricultural practices while strengthening their ability to operate effectively on the international coffee market and provide benefits to members.

- social and cultural aspects of indigenous communities. The focus of livelihoods activities on short term economic gains may not appropriately consider long-term impacts that could result from changed land uses and shifting cultural practices.
- USAID has generated [success stories](#) of linking Indigenous producers to market opportunities. Continued success demands significant capacity building that is sustainable and equitable. USAID's [Accelerating Inclusion and Mitigating Emissions \(AIME\) Activity \(pp. 10 and 22\)](#), for example, contributed to market transactions between Indigenous producers and private sector actors by directly facilitating market interactions and negotiations and strengthening the capacity of Indigenous producers to develop and bring REDD+ compatible products to market.
 - Indigenous Peoples face obstacles to labor market participation similar to those faced by other rural people living in poverty. The barriers for Indigenous Peoples tend to be higher due to discrimination, language and/or other factors. Promoting employment opportunities for Indigenous Peoples and ensuring their success in the workforce requires designing skill-building approaches that are specifically-tailored to the context.
 - Indigenous Peoples may justifiably fear markets because of negative experiences of dependency on imported/non-local foods and natural resource degradation associated with markets and industrial production.
 - [Indigenous Peoples have often experienced severe financial poverty and health disparities](#) (p. 11- 22) particularly where they depend on ecosystems under pressure (from market dynamics and climate change) to support basic needs for food and well-being, and where expansion of cash crops promoted by livelihoods activities means increased consumption of imported food that might be less nutritional, less affordable, and less sustainable than consuming traditional crops grown locally.
 - Within a community, some members might believe that market-based approaches will inevitably erode traditional norms and practices, leading to inter- and intra-community tensions around whether to seize market-based opportunities.
 - The natural and cultural assets associated with indigenous territories can be leveraged by Indigenous Peoples as markets for tourism or ecotourism, but program assistance must be delivered in an equitable and sustainable manner. [Tourism activities involving Indigenous Peoples](#) can promote employment, generate income, and cultivate a sense of pride if some common pitfalls can be effectively avoided or mitigated.
 - Initial development of tourism operations with Indigenous Peoples or in or around Indigenous Peoples' territories must account for limited relevant experience of many indigenous communities while fostering empowerment so that Indigenous Peoples have the degree of ownership of the operations so that it serves to enhance a sense of pride and empowerment. Too often the ownership and initiative rests with outsiders who establish relationships of patronage with certain members of a community that creates friction and division within the community.
 - Allowing tourism within or near indigenous territories or land [sometimes raises ethical, social, economic, and human rights-related challenges](#). Without proper consultation and engagement strategies, indigenous communities experience infringement on land rights (see below), loss of resource access (e.g., [hotel development and fishing community access to coastline areas](#)) and low-wage labor while outside interests reap the gains.

- In some, [but not all](#), contexts, certain marginalized groups within Indigenous groups, such as women and youth, may not be able to fully reap the economic benefits of tourism. Differential approaches and situational analyses of livelihood issues affecting sub-groups within Indigenous communities will help assure equitable outcomes.
- Despite some notable successes and the potential to expand success, ecotourism [has not always delivered expected benefits](#) to Indigenous communities due to various factors, such as shortages in human, financial, and social capital; corruption and impunity; as well as issues around who has the rights to ecotourism benefits. Questions such as where within indigenous territories to place eco-lodges and how to adopt safeguards against harm require careful consideration and mechanisms for community involvement and ownership.
- Studies indicate that for ecotourism to promote livelihoods of indigenous communities, [some fundamental conditions must be met](#), including capacity to access benefits from ecotourism and obtain secure tenure (see discussion below and in Case Study 1).
- In some countries, mutual environmental and economic benefits have been achieved when governments and communities have followed co-management approaches to natural resource management and biodiversity (e.g. see [Bangladesh example pp. 22-23](#)), or other partnership models as illustrated in the section below with USAID case studies. These co-management approaches offer insights and tools relevant to ecotourism as well.

While market development can enhance Indigenous Peoples’ livelihoods and expand opportunities, the gains are often overshadowed by unmitigated risks associated with land-based investment, natural resource access and indigenous intellectual property rights

- Livelihood strategies, traditional knowledge and cultural heritage of Indigenous Peoples are often strongly linked with a collective attachment to land and natural resources. Customary institutions of Indigenous Peoples regarding resource allocation and use, therefore, play an important role in promoting livelihoods by governing resource allocation and use for stewardship of natural resources and managing conflict.
 - Indigenous Peoples livelihood are often placed in jeopardy when governments and outside investors misunderstand, disrespect, or undermine the role of [customary laws and institutions \(p. 22\)](#).
 - Understanding such institutions and harmonizing customary and statutory institutions can help avoid harm and [help achieve mutually-agreed upon approaches to natural resource management, shared conservation objectives \(p. 6–14\)](#) and more responsible investment practices.
- Indigenous Peoples’ resource rights and livelihoods are threatened when outside actors encroach on their traditional territories. Such actors can include [government bodies, private industry, biodiversity conservation interests](#), and others with an interest in Indigenous land and resources. Threats from outside actors can sometimes include activities of other indigenous communities. [The demand for lands held and used by Indigenous Peoples \(pp 27–57\)](#) is growing with population growth, agricultural production expansion, natural resource extraction, and infrastructure development.
 - Encroachment on traditional land and natural resources [increases Indigenous Peoples’ vulnerabilities](#) by undermining their livelihoods, shelter, and identity.

- Sometimes different ethnic groups' claims and rights may overlap. This overlap can result from conflict-related displacement, lack of adequate records of informal transfers and limited documentation of rights, or power dynamics among Indigenous Peoples in a region.
- As illustrated by the conflicts surrounding valuable almacega (which is used to make resin) in the Philippines, [the more valuable the resource, the more difficult it can be to navigate competing interests](#) and resolve resource conflicts while ensuring equitable access.
- Although land-based investment [could provide important benefits \(p. 20\)](#) to indigenous communities, land investors often do not respect indigenous land and resource rights, especially when the affected land is held and used by communities and/or multiple users (e.g., [agro-pastoral systems, p. 30](#)). In these circumstances, establishing equitable [benefit-sharing arrangements](#) and addressing tenure risks are crucial.
 - In many countries, the land and territorial rights of Indigenous Peoples remain unrecognized in statutory law and undocumented where legally recognized.
 - There is often an asymmetry of access to power, due process and adjudication of informal/non-formal land use rights and formal tenure security. Often, those [with formal land tenure security have more rights and power \(pp. 34-36\)](#) in society than those with informal/non-formal/traditional rights.
 - Rural [women are often particularly at risk due to their historical disadvantages](#). This risk is often accentuated for women within indigenous communities (see discussion of gender below).
- Human rights violations that threaten lives and livelihoods have occurred in indigenous territories in association with external actor land-based investments.
 - Land-based investments trigger violations of labor laws and standards, Indigenous displacement from their land areas, disruptions to hunting, gathering, and harvesting patterns as well as water access.
 - Businesses have been shown in some situations to have been directly involved in the taking of land and [associated with the intimidation and murders of indigenous human rights defenders \(pp. 9–10\)](#).
- Lack of recognition, documentation, and enforcement of Indigenous Peoples' rights to [land and natural resources](#) can trigger negative consequences beyond the loss of access to land and resource and human rights issues.
 - [REDD+ compatible land use choices](#) are less effective due to [incentive schemes and payment structures designed to benefit only those with secure tenure \(about REDD+\)](#)
 - Equitable benefits from income-generating activities [may be not be realized](#) by entire communities when only some have secure tenure.

THE ENDOROIS CASE FOR PROPERTY RIGHTS

The African Commission on Human and People's Rights ruled that the eviction of Indigenous Peoples for tourism development violated human rights. The African Commission [determined that the Endorois, who had a historic attachment to particular land](#), are a distinct Indigenous People. The Commission found that the Endorois had property rights over the land they traditionally occupied and used. The Commission's decision focused on the failure of the Kenyan authorities to respect the Endorois' right to refuse or to consent to development on their lands, and the government's failure to provide Endorois with any benefit from the tourism or adequate compensation for the loss they had suffered.

- Even where surface land rights are clear, rights to resources on the land (e.g., trees) and below the surface (e.g., sub-surface minerals, hydrocarbons) might be unclear or contested.
 - Governments often hold rights to sub-surface resources and grant access to outsiders for extraction without consultation with the Indigenous Peoples residing on that land.
 - The extractive processes, associated conflicts, and environmental damages have posed significant threats to [Indigenous Peoples' livelihoods \(see especially paragraphs 195, 208, 268 and note 571\)](#).
- Outside actors do not always respect Indigenous Peoples' intellectual property rights (IPR). Legal frameworks are not yet adequately developed to recognize Indigenous Peoples' collective ownership of intellectual property. The processes for protection of intellectual property (i.e. filing patents and providing scientific data as proof) can disenfranchise Indigenous Peoples and their traditional knowledge and language proficiency.
 - Protecting the IPR of Indigenous Peoples is made challenging due to numerous factors, in part due to the established notion of IPR itself. IPR is euro-centric and based in western interpretations of knowledge and property ownership. Indigenous Peoples' traditional knowledge and cultural expression is based upon an [array of factors that include cultural, historical and ethical issues](#), as well as the various forms of customary law governing such knowledge and expression.
 - The World Intellectual Property Organization's Intergovernmental Committee is working toward a negotiated legal framework.
 - In the meantime, when the intellectual property rights of Indigenous communities are not recognized or violated, Indigenous Peoples may potentially lose out on income generating activities and other benefits. [Issues arise \(p. 11\)](#) when Indigenous Peoples are denied their role in determining the use of indigenous IPR, such as their right to authorize the use of indigenous cultural or intellectual property, or the right for their IPR to be given full and proper attribution .

ABOUT INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

Article 31.1 "Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and traditional cultural expressions, as well as the manifestations of their sciences, technologies and cultures, including human and genetic resources, seeds, medicines, knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures, designs, sports and traditional games and visual and performing arts. They also have the right to maintain, control, protect and develop their intellectual property over such cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, and traditional cultural expressions." [UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples](#)

Standard approaches to defining results and work planning might not align with the realities of Indigenous communities

- [Indigenous Peoples' livelihood goals \(p. 165\)](#) do not necessarily conform to common development indicators, such as numbers of jobs and increased value of products or sales (measured in monetary units). Indigenous livelihood opportunities include significant positive externalities beyond jobs and income that are difficult to monetize. These may include ecosystem services, biodiversity, pollination, water quality improvement and other objectives.
- Timelines [might need to be adjusted](#) to meet expectations and processes for adequate consultation and to allow for capacity development to fulfill Indigenous livelihood objectives.

- One critical component that is often not adequately included in livelihoods programs for Indigenous Peoples is the connection of such programs to the broader, long term visions of Indigenous Peoples, ensuring sustainability once USAID programs and projects end.
 - When Indigenous groups and their representative organizations lack strategic frameworks for promoting livelihoods, it can be difficult for USAID programs and projects to effectively address their livelihoods issues.
 - USAID’s economic growth program in Paraguay addressed this problem by supporting “Life Plans”, strategic visions for Indigenous communities, as part of its technical assistance.
 - Indigenous governance structures are not always taken into account when designing and implementing programs; it can be unclear whether the livelihood activity is or is not supported by such governance structures.

Indigenous livelihood needs and opportunities vary by gender and generation

- Gender disparities within and among indigenous groups are a key challenge. Indigenous community tenure systems are often flexible enough to incorporate both communal and individual rights with communal governance structures; but in many contexts, [Indigenous women are not recognized](#) as rights holders.
 - According to a study by the Rights and Resources Initiative, longstanding [patriarchal stereotypes and discriminatory gender norms](#) often negatively impact women in indigenous communities.
 - Unrecognized rights and discriminatory norms make it difficult for women to participate in decision-making processes, access credit, and otherwise support their livelihoods.
- Indigenous women are not only affected by tenure insecurity but also by their status as women.
 - Indigenous women are often [at risk of being left out of new livelihood opportunities](#) due to gaps in education, language barriers, power dynamics, the risk of gender-based violence, and the effects of discrimination. For example, [an FAO brief on Indigenous Peoples in the Asia-Pacific Region](#) found that as land use shifted away from traditional uses for subsistence, indigenous women had to migrate to find alternative livelihoods and were disadvantaged by lack of education, language skills and gender discrimination.
 - A key lesson learned from [the Afro-Colombian and Indigenous Program \(ACIP; p. 17\)](#) is that, while the interests of indigenous women were promoted, women still had difficulty influencing decision-making and accessing support services.
 - [One study](#) of women’s roles in community decision-making procedures in Mozambique, Tanzania, and the Philippines found that women are often “either absent from consultations or present but silent” and thus unable to meaningfully participate in many land-use and management decision-making processes, including decisions regarding the allocation of community lands to investors. In Mozambique, for example, men have more authority and power in communities and within households than women, and male-headed households are in [a better economic position \(p. 7\)](#) as a result.
- Indigenous youth often face challenges due to language barriers, a lack of advocacy training, skills and influence, and strong incentives to migrate to urban areas for higher paying jobs.
 - USAID’s [Inclusion for Peace Activity](#) in Colombia addressed this challenge by providing tutoring programs tailored for indigenous and other ethnic minority students. USAID Guatemala has an [internship program](#) specifically designed for Indigenous youth that aims to

cultivate leadership and increase opportunities for indigenous youth who show aptitude and willingness to create prosperity for themselves and their communities.

In the context of ending armed conflict, peace-building, and stabilization, Indigenous Peoples face distinct livelihoods challenges; requiring differential approaches

- Indigenous communities have often been displaced due to armed conflict. Restitution of indigenous land rights requires group or communal restitution processes which can be challenging where there is limited recognition or lack of documentation of the nature and extent of these rights.
 - USAID’s [Land and Rural Development Program \(LRDP\)](#) developed innovative approaches to collective land restitution, including radio shows that provided guidance to Afro-Colombian and Indigenous women.
- When formal governance systems are imposed on indigenous communities or are perceived as unfair or inequitable by indigenous communities, this imposition can breed resentment among those communities, potentially leading to conflict. Such an outcome can be avoided if states and donors recognize and respect the customary institutions of Indigenous communities and reflect this in national policies and programs.

Barriers to effective engagement and adequate consultation can magnify other challenges

- Program design and implementation often lack sufficient understanding of consultation requirements and standards to employ them effectively.
- There has not always a clear understanding of criteria for identifying and determining which groups are “Indigenous Peoples” as now provided in the [PRO-IP](#).
- Consultation processes often face practical barriers, including community mistrust of outside actors, language and literacy barriers, and distance and costs, among others. The Consultation Handbook in [USAID’s Social Safeguard Toolkit](#) provides useful guidance on how to address these barriers.

LESSONS LEARNED: USAID CASE STUDIES

Below are five brief case studies of USAID programs that had a focus on Indigenous Peoples’ (as identified by the PRO-IP) livelihoods. Missions and OUs can draw ideas and lessons from these for new activity design. The successes, challenges and lessons presented are either directly related to Indigenous Peoples’ livelihoods or indirectly related by virtue of the relevance to a valuable program type.

TABLE 1. PARKS IN PERIL PROGRAM (PIPP) – ECUADOR, PERU, AND OTHER LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES (2002–2007)

Program Overview: PIPP strengthened Indigenous capacity to enter the ecotourism sector to achieve conservation of biological diversity. PIPP helped develop the tools, infrastructure, institutional and technical capacity, local support, and financing necessary to conserve protected areas.

Indigenous groups involved in the project included: Kichwa (or Quechua) community (in Ecuador); Achuar community (in Ecuador); Huaorani community (in Ecuador); Rumbo al Dorado (Peru) (Consisting of COMAPA Veinte de Enero, UPC Yarina; UPC Yacu Tayta, among others).

Theory of Change	Activities	Implementation Challenges	Successes	Lessons Learned
By strengthening Indigenous communities’ ability to develop and engage in ecotourism opportunities, the activity can contribute to the financial sustainability of both communities and protected areas, and reduce threats to protected areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ecotourism and tourism component of the PIPP worked with Indigenous communities and other stakeholders to advance ecotourism in protected areas while supporting livelihoods. In Peru, program interventions included creating a consortium of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and communities to develop and manage ecotourism activities. PIPP engaged local communities in management decisions, conservation activities, and alternative economic activities, fostering 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indigenous Peoples often had limited business experience and lacked administrative, financial management, and communication skills needed to operate tourism businesses. Companies rarely invested in community-based ecotourism due to the lack of incentives, a lack of planning to ensure the financial sustainability of business ventures, and uncertainty regarding the economic returns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on community-based ecotourism experiences, Indigenous Peoples were able to interact in an equitable fashion with the mainstream economy, obtaining jobs and developing relevant skills. Despite low profitability, tourism provided an effective compensation mechanism for environmental services provided by Indigenous Peoples in the Amazon. An ecotourism alliance between an Indigenous organization and a private company produced positive outcomes, including sound natural 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Networks and alliances that integrate community organizations with other stakeholders is key for long term success. In the case, community organizations were integrated with protected areas managers, government officials, and tourism operators. Effective implementation requires consensus and political will from all stakeholders – politicians, protected areas managers and institutions, communities, Indigenous Peoples, tourism businesses. Understanding Indigenous Peoples’ priorities and interests is critical when engaging in tourism programs with Indigenous communities. Although the income generated by ecotourism is small relative to average local salaries, ecotourism provides significant additional benefits to Indigenous Peoples (e.g., increased capacity in business planning and

TABLE 1. PARKS IN PERIL PROGRAM (PIPP) – ECUADOR, PERU, AND OTHER LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES (2002–2007)

Program Overview: [PIPP](#) strengthened Indigenous capacity to enter the ecotourism sector to achieve conservation of biological diversity. PIPP helped develop the tools, infrastructure, institutional and technical capacity, local support, and financing necessary to conserve protected areas.

Indigenous groups involved in the project included: Kichwa (or Quechua) community (in Ecuador); Achuar community (in Ecuador); Huaorani community (in Ecuador); Rumbo al Dorado (Peru) (Consisting of COMAPA Veinte de Enero, UPC Yarina; UPC Yacu Tayta, among others).

Theory of Change	Activities	Implementation Challenges	Successes	Lessons Learned
	support for the protection of these areas.		resource management and financial sustainability.	<p>management; development of transferable skills; additional complementary revenue-generating activities). Ecotourism also provides significant added benefits to conservation (e.g., Indigenous groups became aware of which forest species are tourist attractions and, as a result, reduced hunting of these animals). In addition to examining the context and benefits, it is important for project designers and implementers to recognize the potential risks of ecotourism to Indigenous Peoples, such as the loss of autonomy and culture.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecotourism can be an appealing development alternative for indigenous communities because it can promote livelihoods through sound natural resource management and conservation that can mitigate the susceptibility to economic activities based on exploitation and destruction.

TABLE 2: USAID LIVING IN A FINITE ENVIRONMENT (LIFE) PROGRAMS (1992–2008)

Program Overview: USAID funded three phases of [LIFE Programs](#) (LIFE 1, LIFE 2 and LIFE Plus) over 15 years. Each phase drew lessons from the prior phase, expanded partnerships and deepened capacity development. LIFE fostered an enabling environment for community based natural resource management (CBNRM) through facilitating policy development and strengthening of institutional capacity of CBNRM support organizations. It enhanced the involvement of marginalized Namibian communities by promoting awareness of CBNRM opportunities, contributing to changed attitudes toward wildlife and conservation. Through strengthened partnerships, participatory land use planning and community natural resources monitoring systems, LIFE supported the strategic introduction of wildlife in conservancies with low game densities and diversified income generation opportunities to increase non-financial benefits and new income to households, communities, and conservancies.

Indigenous groups involved in the project: LIFE supported many conservancies (see pp. 37-28 in the document linked in the title above) including those formed by San, Nama and other [Indigenous Peoples or marginalized ethnic groups of Namibia](#). The government of Namibia does not refer to such groups as Indigenous Peoples and instead uses the term “marginalized communities.”

Theory of Change	Activities	Implementation Challenges	Successes	Lessons Learned
<p>Through increased capacity and support, community-based approaches to wildlife conservation could improve both livelihoods and wildlife; the project can support existing government and NGO initiatives to devolve rights over wildlife and tourism to local communities to promote sustainable natural resource management on communal land.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LIFE increased income and other benefits to local communities through sustainable natural resource management; especially through wildlife-based tourism activities. LIFE supported the establishment of representative community-based management institutions called conservancies, which can make decisions on natural resource management and other development activities. These have defined geographical boundaries and land use rights. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was a lack of harmonization of policy and departmental mandates, leaving some important elements neglected. For instance, despite policies calling for community participation in Land Boards to address tenure and land use issues, mechanisms for such participation were often not put into place. Partnerships and support packages had to be tailored to address the needs of a broad range of community conservancies, clustered according to several key factors (age of conservancy, caliber 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LIFE supported the establishment of 44 registered communal area conservancies in Namibia covering more than 10.5 million hectares of land. LIFE increased community stewardship over wildlife, leading to a recovery of wildlife populations. LIFE diversified income generation opportunities while increasing total income and non-financial benefits to conservancies and their individual members. LIFE created, refined, and used a community-based monitoring and evaluation system where the communities chose what components to monitor to obtain information to meet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long-term support is required for successful CBNRM projects. Long-term support by USAID has stabilized the sector, allowed CBNRM supporters to have the legitimacy of an international backer, and provided the funding to implement, test, and incubate innovative ideas. Establishing an adequate policy and institutional framework is prerequisite to ensuring sustainable resource management benefits for communities. Success requires a heavy investment in the creation, expansion, and facilitation of partnerships engaged in CBNRM. By engaging a diversity of partners (governmental, non-governmental, private sector, and community), LIFE was able to facilitate a CBNRM movement. A reliable and useful monitoring and evaluation system, that responds to both the needs of the community at the grassroots level and the national

TABLE 2: USAID LIVING IN A FINITE ENVIRONMENT (LIFE) PROGRAMS (1992–2008)

Program Overview: USAID funded three phases of [LIFE Programs](#) (LIFE 1, LIFE 2 and LIFE Plus) over 15 years. Each phase drew lessons from the prior phase, expanded partnerships and deepened capacity development. LIFE fostered an enabling environment for community based natural resource management (CBNRM) through facilitating policy development and strengthening of institutional capacity of CBNRM support organizations. It enhanced the involvement of marginalized Namibian communities by promoting awareness of CBNRM opportunities, contributing to changed attitudes toward wildlife and conservation. Through strengthened partnerships, participatory land use planning and community natural resources monitoring systems, LIFE supported the strategic introduction of wildlife in conservancies with low game densities and diversified income generation opportunities to increase non-financial benefits and new income to households, communities, and conservancies.

Indigenous groups involved in the project: LIFE supported many conservancies (see pp. 37-28 in the document linked in the title above) including those formed by San, Nama and other [Indigenous Peoples or marginalized ethnic groups of Namibia](#). The government of Namibia does not refer to such groups as Indigenous Peoples and instead uses the term “marginalized communities.”

Theory of Change	Activities	Implementation Challenges	Successes	Lessons Learned
		<p>of performance to date, available natural resources and types of potential partners). This requires adequate time for assessment and customized planning rather than using a single recipe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More attention to sustainability is needed; sustainability plans for each conservancy are needed. • As opportunities expand, skill development and leadership training need to keep up. 	<p>their needs and that could feed into a national-level database.</p>	<p>government is critical for sustainable management of natural resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnerships and support packages need to continue to evolve to address changing and broadening nature of and needs of the conservancies. • CBNRM support organizations need skills in writing grant proposals and business plans as well as general organizational skills such as management, communications, and facilitation, • At the community level, there is a need to help conservancies understand the difference between managers and leaders. • Linked here is a study that is a recommended additional resource to learn about the success of Namibia’s conservancies in enhancing livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples and other local communities.

TABLE 3. PASTORAL LIVELIHOODS INITIATIVE II (PLI II) – ETHIOPIA (2009–2013)

Program Overview: [PLI II](#) strengthened livelihoods of pastoralists by improving community-based natural resource management, improving the ability of pastoralists to gain more economic value from their livestock and diversifying their ability to generate income.

Pastoralist groups involved: Borana pastoralists, Gelila-dura, Yigile Pastoralist Associations, Oromo pastoralists, Somali pastoralists.⁴

Theory of Change	Activities	Implementation Challenges	Successes	Lessons Learned
<p>Changing weather and climate patterns (resulting in severe droughts) along with population pressures, crop failures, environmental degradation, and other factors have created significant challenges for Ethiopia’s pastoralists. Pastoralists in Ethiopia often have a lower socioeconomic status compared to most Ethiopians, and often do not receive the same level of benefits from development programs aimed at</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLI II worked with pastoralist-owned cooperatives to improve rangeland and water resource management by identifying stakeholders and management units, producing natural resource and land use maps, conducting ‘Do No Harm’ analyses, implementing stakeholder action plans, formalizing land use agreements, among other activities. • PLI II improved the sales and value of livestock products, such as meat and milk, as well as other products and services, including cereal, gum and incense, fodder, aloe soap, and beekeeping. PLI II also strengthened livestock marketing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project had to ensure that programmatic interventions remained relevant and positively addressed the changing nature of Ethiopia’s pastoral areas. • Some of the pastoralist stakeholders involved in income generating activities expressed frustration related to an insufficient number of training and the long delays associated with obtaining government approvals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project encouraged the government to recognize that pastoral customary systems have distinctive strengths, and to foster hybrid solutions that incorporated aspects of such systems. • The project substantially increased income and profit levels for pastoralist groups. It also supported the establishment of women’s income generating groups and built their capacities. • The project helped increase and stabilize agricultural production (notably milk production and livestock offtake), food security, and livelihoods. • The project upgraded community coping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In designing and implementing activities, USAID should bear in mind that pastoralists live in a fluid continuum in which they commonly move back and forth among pastoralist, agro-pastoralist, and ex-pastoralist status, as circumstances and household desires dictate. • Approaches to addressing livelihoods need to be revised and tailored over time to reflect changing environments. Testing and refining innovative economic livelihoods interventions, while sharing information about successes and challenges, is key to project performance. • When weaker groups value capacity building activities and want guidance on management, facilitating information and experience sharing between economically strong and weak pastoralist groups can contribute to positive results, such as improvements in financial management, record keeping, business planning, and engagement.

⁴ There are different views today about whether pastoralist groups are Indigenous Peoples and USAID development professionals will need to apply the criteria in the PRO-IP to determine if the policy applies in contexts where such groups exist. This case study illustrates the relevant programmatic considerations when a pastoralist group is identified as an Indigenous People for USAID programming purposes. Under the IWGIA’s interpretation of UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), Oromo and Somalis pastoralists are identified as Indigenous Peoples (see <https://www.iwgia.org/en/ethiopia/714-indigenous-peoples-in-ethiopia>).

TABLE 3. PASTORAL LIVELIHOODS INITIATIVE II (PLI II) – ETHIOPIA (2009–2013)

Program Overview: [PLI II](#) strengthened livelihoods of pastoralists by improving community-based natural resource management, improving the ability of pastoralists to gain more economic value from their livestock and diversifying their ability to generate income.

Pastoralist groups involved: Borana pastoralists, Gelila-dura, Yigile Pastoralist Associations, Oromo pastoralists, Somali pastoralists.⁴

Theory of Change	Activities	Implementation Challenges	Successes	Lessons Learned
improving livelihoods.	including for export and cross border trade. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLI II provided training and classes on business, financial management, record-keeping, and literacy. It also helped pastoralist groups access emergency loans and social support services. • PLI II supported policy initiatives to recognize customary institutions and land tenure systems. 		capacities and reduced vulnerabilities to drought and climate change. Over 2,000,000 hectares of rangeland were put under improved management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutionalization of participatory natural resource management (PNRM) systems benefits more from the constructive cooperation of customary institutions, government and other key stakeholders than from production-oriented interventions. • PNRM contributes to increased community resilience and production.

TABLE 4. AFRO-COLOMBIAN AND INDIGENOUS PROGRAM (ACIP) – COLOMBIA (2011–2016)

Program Overview: [ACIP](#) aimed to increase socioeconomic and political inclusion of Afro-Colombian and Indigenous Peoples in three geographic areas – Pacific, Caribbean, and Central. It worked to increase employment of Afro-Colombians and Indigenous Persons in targeted sectors, among other objectives.

Peoples engaged in the program: Colombia has around 86 ethnic groups including Indigenous Peoples and Afro-Colombian Communities. The program engaged 230 organizations of or relevant to various Indigenous Peoples or Afro-Colombian Peoples from the Pacific, Caribbean or Center regions of Colombia (See pages 48-56 of [ACIP Final Report](#) for a list of organizations).

Theory of Change	Activities	Implementation Challenges	Successes	Lessons Learned
Engaging state institutions, civil society organizations, and private sector companies while leveraging commitments and investments from these entities can help close the historical gaps, access to economic opportunities, and discriminatory behaviors fueled by cultural misconceptions and prejudices affecting Indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 333 projects involving Indigenous Peoples were implemented over five years, with a component structure comprised of institutional strengthening, organizational strengthening, urban and rural economic development, and positive messaging of about ethnic communities. • ACIP trained and provided technical assistance to public offices; developed and implemented public policies at the national and local levels; and designed information systems and improved monitoring of development plans focused on Indigenous and Afro-Colombian areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanding economic opportunities for ethnic rural communities was difficult given that project areas were characterized by conflict, an absence of state presence, and a lack of basic services. • Difficulties accessing rural development areas, along with high transportation costs, deterred potential private sector partners from participating in value chain projects. • A key challenge for ACIP was breaking through deeply-embedded negative cultural paradigms and attitudes about Indigenous Peoples and Afro-Colombians. The ACIP Final Report identified that “a major driver of cultural misconceptions and stereotypes was the constant negative imagery and stories highlighted in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACIP achieved positive results with respect to employment generation, particularly for Indigenous women, in part because it incorporated a gender focus when designing employment training programs. The women benefited from increased professional development and career growth. ACIP also developed gender equity criteria in employment diversity protocols. • 1,346 state officials were trained to build their skills in applying tools and approaches designed for specific ethnic groups (“ethnically differentiated” tools). • Support to municipal and departmental development plans and four-year roadmaps and budgets resulted in the obligation of US \$1.24 billion in public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leveraging relationships with public sector institutions can help increase financial resources but also help to instill in public officials the importance of employing ethnically differentiated development models. • To best strengthen an indigenous organization, the project design, objectives, and activities must be tailor-made to the organization through participation of its leaders and/or members. Community buy-in is essential to successful and sustainable processes. • Increasing economic opportunities for indigenous youth in urban areas should not be perceived as charity, but rather as a win-win situation. Involving indigenous youth organizations, like Fundación Helping Youth and Raizal Youth, fosters community buy-in, promotes empowerment and enhances program effectiveness. • Urban employment models can win the support of private sector companies if those models demonstrate positive impacts on companies’ bottom lines.

TABLE 4. AFRO-COLOMBIAN AND INDIGENOUS PROGRAM (ACIP) – COLOMBIA (2011–2016)

Program Overview: [ACIP](#) aimed to increase socioeconomic and political inclusion of Afro-Colombian and Indigenous Peoples in three geographic areas – Pacific, Caribbean, and Central. It worked to increase employment of Afro-Colombians and Indigenous Persons in targeted sectors, among other objectives.

Peoples engaged in the program: Colombia has around 86 ethnic groups including Indigenous Peoples and Afro-Colombian Communities. The program engaged 230 organizations of or relevant to various Indigenous Peoples or Afro-Colombian Peoples from the Pacific, Caribbean or Center regions of Colombia (See pages 48-56 of [ACIP Final Report](#) for a list of organizations).

Theory of Change	Activities	Implementation Challenges	Successes	Lessons Learned
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACIP also leveraged public resources to increase funds for ethnic populations. 	<p>major media outlets,” which have portrayed ethnic minorities in situations of poverty and violence.</p>	<p>resource investment for ethnic communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACIP provided technical assistance to 83 land restitution cases, improving coordination between ethnic territorial organizations and government entities. Through work with 230 ethnic organizations, ACIP strengthened community development for approximately 592,045 Indigenous Peoples and Afro-Colombians, including leaders. 	

BEST PRACTICES

Opportunities to enhance livelihoods for Indigenous Peoples need to be developed in recognition of their broader territorial and sociocultural context. Below are some best practices that contribute to success in partnering with Indigenous Peoples to expand and enhance their livelihood opportunities. The applicability of the best practices will vary depending on the USAID program and project activities, and the decision of which best practices should be applied will need to be made on a case-by-case basis. Applying these best practices will also help USAID staff identify and mitigate risks of unintended negative consequences for Indigenous Peoples from livelihood or other types of programming that do not target Indigenous populations and that can still impinge on their livelihoods. This will be particularly important as USAID harnesses private sector investment toward development goals. These best practices are grounded in the recognition that Indigenous Peoples' livelihoods are intimately linked with cultural identities, territorial visions and rights, as well as their traditional norms and practices.

Do no harm, as a principle

- Putting into practice the principle of “do no harm” requires a [comprehensive understanding of the linkages](#) between land tenure, gender, and generational dynamics affecting various Indigenous communities.
 - The PRO-IP contains an operating principle entitled *Safeguard Indigenous Peoples’ Rights and Well-being*, which states that “sustained stakeholder engagement and consultation helps both USAID and Indigenous Peoples’ communities identify potential impacts of a proposed project or activity. This is crucial to formulating ways in which to safeguard against potential harm.”
 - The [USAID Issue Brief on Tenure and Indigenous Peoples](#) states “assistance to Indigenous Peoples through strengthening tenure security requires attention to issues and limiting factors with which Indigenous Peoples identify when they produce their own long-term plans for development. Therefore, development efforts should address the specific needs of Indigenous Peoples while ensuring that well-intentioned initiatives do not inadvertently harm these communities.”
 - Developing a nuanced approach to putting the “do no harm” principle into practice may also benefit from the utilization of PACT’s [Applied Political Economic Analysis](#) tool. This tool provides a framework that can help development interventions incorporate robust analytical research into political-economic decision-making as it pertains to Indigenous Peoples and their livelihoods.
- USAID OUs should recognize the need for differentiated approaches that allow Indigenous Peoples (and women within Indigenous communities) to evaluate value chain opportunities and approaches. In cases where USAID activities related to Indigenous Peoples are at risk of generating conflict, the guidance provided in the [USAID Livelihoods and Conflict Toolkit](#) is a good resource to consider, as it includes illustrations of a range of program options designed to reduce livelihood vulnerability, strengthen resiliency, and help people manage conflict-related shocks. USAID’s [Advancing Community Empowerment in Southeastern Myanmar \(ACE\) project](#),⁵ for example, presents some good examples of skill building and community engagement

⁵ ACE works with communities to enhance their capacity to meet the needs of people living in vulnerable conditions by broadening citizen participation for more inclusive decision making and strengthens mechanisms for more responsive and accountable local governance.

methods. ACE employed a women’s economic empowerment model that involved community participation and strengthened women’s abilities to support their livelihoods.

Develop improved assessment, engagement, and consultation approaches

- The PRO-IP contains a list of the essential elements of meaningful consultation, which include identification of Indigenous Peoples, communication with stakeholders early and often through the program cycle, two-way flow of information that facilitates mutual understanding of future or current programming, and opportunities for stakeholders to influence the planning and development process. The PRO-IP aims to ensure consultation and engagement with Indigenous Peoples so that USAID programs align with Indigenous Peoples’ development priorities and safeguard against harm. By adopting the guidance on consultation set forth in the [PRO-IP](#) and the [Social Safeguard Toolkit](#), OUs can better understand the internal dynamics of Indigenous communities, particularly whether some community members oppose certain types of market opportunities while prioritizing others, and how community members seek to preserve traditional means of livelihoods.
- In addition to the PRO-IP, there is a plethora of global standards and tools that USAID OUs can utilize in order to improve consultation and engagement with Indigenous Peoples. International standards on free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) and other relevant consultation standards can be found in key instruments, such as the [International Labour Organization Convention 169 – Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention \(1989\)](#), the [United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples](#), and international “soft” law guidance documents, such as the [Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure \(2012\)](#) and the [Akwé: Kon Voluntary Guidelines \(2004\)](#). [USAID’s Social Safeguard Toolkit](#), which includes a Consultation Handbook, aims to provide guidance and a framework for effective consultation, consistent with international best practices and human rights norms. The Consultation Handbook includes methods for determining whether to engage in consultations with Indigenous Peoples, a description of the essential elements of adequate consultation, guidance on when in the program cycle consultations should be conducted, and other useful information. [The Free, Prior and Informed Consent Primer](#) can help shape the design of consultation processes. It highlights the various phases of FPIC, which include developing frameworks, conducting initial due diligence, community engagement, and assessments, negotiating and drafting contracts, and it presents relevant steps in each phase that should be followed. The Primer provides guidance to ensure FPIC is respected when programs involve land-based investments and affect Indigenous Peoples’ land rights.
- USAID missions and OUs should consider developing specific strategies and approaches that address the issues pertinent to the locations in which they operate. Consider the following examples:
 - [USAID/Guatemala’s Indigenous Peoples Engagement Strategy](#) presents a compelling model that other missions should consider and modify as needed to fit their particular

INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS ON INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

“State and non-state actors should acknowledge that land, fisheries and forests have social, cultural, spiritual, economic, environmental and political value to indigenous peoples and other communities with customary tenure systems.”

[Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security \(Section 9.1\)](#)

Principle 5 of the Committee on World Food Security’s [Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems](#) states that responsible investment in agriculture and food systems respect legitimate tenure rights to land, fisheries, and forests, as well as existing and potential water uses. Principle 7 calls for state and non-state actors to respect cultural heritage and traditional knowledge, and support diversity and inclusion.

- country or regional contexts. The strategy is designed to dovetail with USAID/Guatemala’s strategy to create innovative and substantive partnerships between Indigenous entities, government, and the private sector; increase awareness, knowledge, and recognition of Indigenous Peoples’ rights, culture, history, and knowledge systems; and increase the participation of Indigenous women and men in development interventions through USAID, implementing partners and others.
- [USAID’s Guide to Community Engagement for Power Projects in Kenya](#), developed as part of the Power Africa program, establishes processes for conducting community engagement, including a checklist of engagement activities and considerations.
 - USAID/Colombia has also established clear strategies for engagement with Indigenous Peoples, including strategies for co-creating activities and [annual program statements \(APSs\)](#) for direct awards in collaboration with Afro-Colombian and Indigenous organizations.
 - USAID/Guatemala’s [Creating Economic Opportunities \(CEO\)](#) project is developing innovative approaches for reducing Indigenous poverty and migration while improving their living conditions. CEO is launching investment and export promotion campaigns to help bring economic benefits to Indigenous communities and is developing critical infrastructure and service platforms to attract investment. These service platforms will support market-based alliances with universities and technical vocational education and training providers, creating an enabling environment for skill building and entrepreneurship. The project aims to engage the private sector, women, youth, and Indigenous communities

Promote approaches that empower Indigenous Peoples in programming

- OUs should involve Indigenous Peoples directly in design, learning, and implementation (see [USAID/Colombia’s co-creation mechanisms](#) as an example). Indigenous Peoples’ empowerment is a policy objective in the PRO-IP. [The Inclusion for Peace Activity](#) in Colombia has supported community participation in government initiatives, such as in the design of development plans with a territorial approach. These plans are an important tool that lay the foundation for structural transformation of the rural areas of Colombia, creating improved living conditions and contributing to the construction of peace and stability. The Inclusion for Peace Activity has also promoted Indigenous participation in the design and implementation of key laws and policies, an often overlooked area for Indigenous Peoples’ engagement.
- OUs should use integrated assessments to foster shared visions and aligned incentives. For example, the [USAID/Cambodia Greening Prey Lang Activity](#) used an integrated assessment approach to find economic opportunities that are environmentally sound and culturally acceptable for communities living in or near protected areas.
- USAID also has successfully [supported indigenous groups in establishing Conservation Enterprises](#), and facilitated the creation of economic incentives for indigenous stakeholders to reduce threats to biodiversity.
- USAID’s [Community Tourism Alliance \(pp. 36–45\)](#) project in Guatemala presents a good example of how to institutionalize biodiversity conservation with the tourism sector and generate operational tools for Indigenous communities to engage in co-planning and co-management of tourism activity. The project introduced tourism to communities that had never received tourists before, changing cultural attitudes, and successfully integrated communities into the marketplace.
- USAID OUs should find options that allow income generation aligned with self-determined development, cultural identity, and traditional diets. In a [2011 hearing before the Tom Lantos](#)

Human Rights Commission, US House of Representatives, Sharon Cromer (then USAID Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator for Sub-Saharan Africa) noted, “...to open up a path toward sustainable livelihoods,...to get there, we know we will need to draw upon their own understanding of their ecosystems.” The USAID LRDP in Colombia [supported indigenous coffee enterprises](#) by connecting them with public-private partnerships.

- Consider using mapping and geographic information systems (GIS) to contribute to transparency about Indigenous land rights and reduce conflicting claims. The [TGCC Paraguay Chaco Activity](#) supported Indigenous Peoples to consolidate land claims and helped investors and commodity firms better understand the risks associated with existing or planned investments that overlap with land rights claims. The creation of a web platform, called *Tierras Indígenas Paraguay* (Indigenous Lands Paraguay), increased the availability of geospatial data on a public-oriented platform in order to boost the visibility of Indigenous lands and inform due diligence activities that reduce social and environmental risks. In collaboration with USAID/Colombia, Mercy Corps [trained communities](#) in using global positions systems (GPS); this helped mediate land conflicts involving Indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities.
- Build the capacity of the public sector to engage with Indigenous Peoples, partnering to enhance livelihood strategies and programs. The [Inclusion for Peace Activity](#) in Colombia is designed to close economic social inclusion gaps by building the capacity of the government to respond to the differential needs of ethnic communities. As a result, target government agencies, such as the Truth Commission, had increased capacity to respond to the needs of Afro-Colombian and Indigenous Peoples affected by conflict.

Realize the value of appropriate metrics: what gets measured gets changed

- Monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) plans should go beyond simply disaggregating Indigenous beneficiaries in indicator results counts. They should also include developing innovative measures of Indigenous Peoples’ benefits from and contributions to USAID programming. Indigenous Peoples should be given opportunities to participate in MEL activities through consultations that provide critical opportunities for identifying the drivers of marginalization, determining the appropriate project outcomes and also monitoring the impact of activity. Indigenous Peoples’ security and privacy concerns need to be sufficiently addressed when collecting data related to MEL, keeping in mind that, in some cases, data should not be collected if the security/privacy risks for Indigenous Peoples are too high. It is important to set up mechanisms for ensuring that the data collected addresses security risks and is reliable and representative. Examples of Indigenous Peoples-relevant indicators for baseline assessments and for monitoring progress for the purpose of MEL include:
 - USAID/Colombia Inclusion for Peace Activity’s monitoring and evaluation criteria, which includes indicators relevant to Indigenous Peoples such as:
 - Percentage change in the Afro-Colombian and Indigenous Communities Inclusion Index
 - Number of cultural heritage protection initiatives supported
 - Percentage change in mentions of ethnic inclusion and antidiscrimination messages in the media.
 - The USAID Securing a Sustainable, Profitable and Inclusive Forest Sector in Peru Activity (PRO-BOSQUES) developed the Indigenous Empowerment Index (IEI). The IEI was developed to monitor changes in the levels of empowerment of Peruvian native communities resulting from PRO-BOSQUES technical assistance interventions, designed to scale up and expand community control and oversight of forest resources to strengthen

Indigenous rights and improve forest-based livelihoods. However, the IEI can also be a useful tool for Indigenous organizations, development agencies, academia, and any entity that works in the forest sector looking to monitor the capacities and resources of Indigenous communities.

Resources and tools to facilitate responsible investment and conduct of third parties engaging with Indigenous Peoples or in Indigenous territories.

- USAID’s [Operational Guidelines for Responsible Land-Based Investment](#) provide key guidance on conducting due diligence, stakeholder engagement and mapping, and contract negotiations. The guidelines highlight how various international standards and performance standards call for the private sector to recognize, respect, and protect the land and resource rights of local communities, Indigenous Peoples, and others who hold legitimate rights to these assets. The guidelines state that “when a project fails to take adequate account of local land and resource rights, it can impose significant costs on local people, and on the project. It can inadvertently lead to costly delays, work stoppages, protests, and, in some cases, violence. Investors can face legal actions and suffer financial, brand, or reputational harm.”
- The [USAID Scientific Research Policy](#) (the intellectual property section) includes best practices for developing innovating strategies and approaches as well as harnessing research and science to meet the development needs of Indigenous Peoples. This [short video](#) produced by the World Intellectual Property Organization recognizes that legal frameworks need to be improved and also illustrates how awareness building and negotiations can be effective for Indigenous Peoples to claim their IPR.
- In addition to the tools listed on page 2 of this guidance (in the “How to Use this Guidance” section), here are some additional USAID resources to consult:
 - [USAID/Guatemala’s Indigenous Peoples’ Engagement Strategy](#).
 - [Indigenous Peoples and Conservation Organizations: Experiences in Collaboration](#).
 - [Promoting Nondiscrimination and Inclusive Development in USAID Funded Programs](#).
 - [Tenure and Indigenous Peoples](#).
 - [USAID’s Nature, Wealth & Power 2.0 Leveraging Natural and Social Capital for Resilient Development](#).
 - [USAID’s Nature, Wealth, and Power: Emerging Best Practices for Revitalizing Rural Africa](#).