STRENGTHENING WWF PARTNERSHIPS WITH INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

WWF

Please cite this publication as: Springer, Jenny and Janis Alcorn 2007. *Strengthening WWF Partnerships with Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities*. Gland, Switzerland and Washington, DC: WWF.

STRENGTHENING WWF PARTNERSHIPS WITH
INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

Jenny Springer and Janis Alcorn

2007

Table of Contents

FOREWORD

A decade ago, in 1996, WWF became the first major conservation organization to formally recognize the rights of indigenous peoples. More specifically, we recognized their rights to their traditional "lands, territories and resources" and endorsed the key principle of "free, prior informed consent."

We undertook this commitment because of WWF's recognition that indigenous peoples are among the earth's most important stewards. We undertook it also to help rectify what historically has been an erosion of the rights of indigenous peoples and because it had become clear by then that traditional conservation approaches were, in some cases, contributing to the erosion of these rights.

In recent years, as conservation approaches have shifted to work across larger scales, debate over the impact of conservation activities on indigenous communities has been rekindled. Consequently, we undertook a second commitment, in 2005, to assess our large-scale conservation activities as they relate to indigenous peoples and local communities and to evaluate the effectiveness of our policies in light of them.

Our initial step in pursuit of this commitment is this review of WWF policy and programme experience, involving a survey of WWF offices and interviews with members of indigenous organizations, outside experts and WWF staff. We appreciate the efforts of the authors in conducting this work and the contributions of all the external interviewees, the review's external advisory group and WWF staff who participated.

From the review findings, we are pleased to see a high level of commitment, on the part of staff, to working constructively and in partnership with indigenous peoples and other local communities – a commitment that is reflected in support for a wide range of community-based conservation activities throughout the WWF Network. Similarly we are encouraged to see the strong interest of indigenous groups to engage in collaboration with WWF on conservation activities, and to hear that the WWF policy is viewed as a strong foundation for positive collaboration.

At the same time, we recognize that we need to do significantly more to ensure consistent application of WWF's indigenous peoples' policy across our conservation programme. We hear the concerns expressed by indigenous peoples and other social groups about negative impacts of some conservation projects, and about the need for greater responsiveness to the connections between conservation interests and those of indigenous peoples. Further, we take note of calls by our own staff for greater recognition, capacity and support for work on the social aspects of conservation. We also recognize the need to increase our ability to hear ongoing input and feedback from concerned parties, and resolve problems as they occur.

Several actions have already been taken, or are in the process of being taken, at the field level to address specific concerns raised directly to WWF offices or WWF-International. However, as emphasized by the review, broader action at the Network level is also required to ensure that our policies towards indigenous peoples are applied successfully and consistently across our areas of operation. The annex to this report outlines the main elements of WWF's management response to the recommendations.

This review and the recommendations it contains represent the start of a process, not the end of it. The review is but an initial step; others must follow.

As we move forward, it will be particularly important not only to maintain but to expand the dialogue initiated during the course of this review with indigenous peoples' organizations. Continuing input will be an important part of an ongoing process to which WWF remains committed because of our

conviction that conservation cannot succeed unless it addresses the rights and needs of people living in the places we seek to conserve.

James P. Leape
Director General
WWF-International

Guillermo Castilleja
Executive Director, Conservation
WWF-International

Gland, Switzerland
October 2007

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We have learned a great deal from many people in undertaking this review. We would like to thank all the indigenous leaders, WWF staff members, experts and others who shared their experience, ideas and comments, and we hope the analysis and lessons contained here will be of help to them in their own work. We are particularly grateful to members of the external advisory group for their thoughtful advice on approaches to this work and needs for improvement. Any remaining limitations, errors or misinterpretations are our own. We extend thanks to the Ford Foundation and to the WWF Network for providing financial support for this work.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2005, World Wildlife Fund (WWF) made the following public commitments focused on strengthening partnerships with indigenous peoples and local communities:

- Openly re-evaluate WWF policy on indigenous peoples and strengthen its enforcement and monitoring mechanisms.
- Examine WWF's large-scale conservation programs as they relate to indigenous and local communities to expand support for effective partnership approaches as well as implement changes where necessary.
- Listen more closely to the voices of indigenous peoples and ensure that their concerns are addressed in design and implementation of WWF field projects.

This paper summarizes findings from a review undertaken as an initial step toward meeting the above commitments. The aim of this stage of activities was to gather internal and external perspectives on WWF's policy and program experience as it relates to indigenous peoples and local communities as a basis for recommendations to WWF senior management on ways to strengthen WWF policy and programs. Another key aim has been to create a bridge with indigenous perspectives and concerns through the review process itself. We hope that the analysis and lessons will also be of value to others engaged in conservation work.

The method employed has combined elements of self-assessment and external review. Main activities have comprised WWF staff surveys and interviews (mainly conducted by Springer) and external interviews (mainly conducted by Alcorn). The authors then jointly undertook analysis and writing, based on the experiences and perspectives shared through these activities.

Key findings from the review include the following:

- WWF's Statement of Principles on Indigenous Peoples and Conservation is generally considered to be strong and progressive, but needs to be more tangibly integrated into program operations.

- Civil society monitoring can be an effective means to improved policy implementation and needs to be strengthened.

- Many staff members would welcome a policy addressing work with local communities, in addition to WWF's policy on indigenous peoples.

- There is a broad commitment among the WWF staff to work collaboratively with indigenous peoples and local communities, and there are substantial programs of work on the ground. Indigenous groups feel that WWF needs to do more to ensure that people are involved as rights holders and key decision makers, and are interested in collaborating with WWF on this basis.

- Landscape-scale approaches offer opportunities as well as challenges for WWF to better achieve conservation goals by collaborating with indigenous peoples and local communities.

- WWF support for establishment of government protected areas continues to be a focal area for conflicts, while increasing support for co-management and indigenous and community conserved areas offers new opportunities for collaboration.

- Experience is emerging on strategies to "scale up" community conservation from site-based work; however, addressing broader policy and institutional contexts remains a key challenge.

- Participatory approaches are mainstreamed in WWF programs, but may differ from indigenous expectations for collaboration based on shared decision making.

- Territorial, land, and resource rights remain a core issue for WWF to address as a basis for collaboration with indigenous peoples and local communities.

- WWF is often seen as working primarily with government and other "elites," with less attention to alliance building with indigenous peoples' organizations (IPOs) and related civil society interest groups.

- Staff members working with indigenous peoples and local communities and with their organizations at various levels feel a need for greater institutional incentives and support for their efforts from WWF.

- Communication between WWF and indigenous organizations is often weak.

Main recommendations from the review include the following:

1. Commit resources for WWF capacity, awareness raising, and consistent implementation and monitoring of the WWF indigenous peoples' policy.

2. Develop WWF policy to address key elements of socially responsible conservation as they relate to local communities.

3. Integrate community-based and socially responsible approaches more fully into the WWF conservation program.

4. Expand institutional support for partnership approaches with indigenous peoples and local communities, including through increased technical capacity, knowledge sharing, communication and fund-raising.

5. Increase communication and strengthen partnerships with indigenous peoples' organizations and related civil society groups at country, regional, and international levels.

This is a critical moment for WWF to take advantage of the opportunities for developing conservation alliances with indigenous and other civil society organizations at multiple levels. Action is needed to bridge differences and pursue opportunities to achieve conservation goals through collaborative efforts. The five recommendations together offer an integrated road map for improving WWF policy and program implementation as it relates to indigenous peoples and local communities to enhance WWF's achievement of conservation goals in large-scale landscapes.

REPORT

1.0 Introduction

Around the world, large areas of global significance for biodiversity conservation are owned and managed directly by indigenous peoples and local communities who depend upon forests, fisheries and wildlife resources for their ways of life. The need for conservation action to involve these communities, respect their rights and needs in relation to natural resources, and support conservation based on their local institutions and knowledge has been widely recognized by the global conservation community.

At the same time, however, conservation bears the burden of an historical heritage of approaches that have failed to fully recognize the rights and roles of indigenous peoples and local communities, particularly in the form of government-managed protected areas overlapping traditional lands and territories. Despite changes in the direction of conservation approaches, indigenous peoples' organizations and others often remain critical of conservation, and strong critiques have raised the public profile of "conservation versus community" issues. Some observers have also viewed the evolving shift in conservation focus from specific sites to larger landscapes and seascapes as representing a retreat from people-oriented approaches.

In the context of these debates, as well as shifts toward large-scale conservation approaches, WWF made three public commitments in 2005[1] focused on strengthening partnerships with indigenous peoples and local communities:

- Openly re-evaluate WWF policy on indigenous peoples and strengthen its enforcement and monitoring mechanisms.

- Examine WWF's large-scale conservation programs as they relate to indigenous and local communities to expand support for effective partnership approaches as well as implement changes where necessary.

- Listen more closely to the voices of indigenous peoples and ensure that their concerns are addressed in design and implementation of WWF field projects.

Conservation is achieved by addressing new and recurring challenges to protect Earth's living ecosystem and the other species with which humans share the planet. Conservation is not something accomplished in one day or ten years, nor is it achieved by working alone—it requires collaboration and negotiation among allies who share a concern for other living beings and who respect each other's perspectives, rights and responsibilities. WWF's mission—to build a future in which humans live in harmony with nature—and its institutional guiding principles—including *to involve local communities and indigenous peoples in the planning and execution of its field programs, respecting their cultural as well as economic needs*—provide a firm foundation for achieving this necessary collaboration.

This paper summarizes findings from a review undertaken as a step toward meeting the above commitments. The aim of this stage of activities has been to gather internal and external perspectives on WWF's policy and program experience as it relates to indigenous peoples and local communities as a basis for recommendations to WWF senior management on ways to strengthen WWF policy and program implementation.

1.1 WWF Background and Organization

WWF is a global conservation organization guided by its mission to stop the degradation of the planet's natural environment and to build a future in which humans live in harmony with nature. WWF is structured as a network, comprising 60 major national, subregional and policy offices. A

Secretariat—WWF-International in Gland, Switzerland—coordinates common policies and priorities. Since WWF's founding in 1961, its program approaches have evolved over time from an initial focus on species conservation to conservation of broader habitats and—in the 1990s—to integrated conservation and development. Since the late 1990s, WWF programs have been evolving toward support for large-scale (ecoregion, landscape/seascape) and multi-scale ("local to global") initiatives.

In all landscapes, WWF necessarily engages with local communities, both indigenous and non-indigenous, many of whom maintain traditional lifeways. At a policy level, WWF specifically recognizes indigenous and traditional peoples as among the Earth's most important stewards because of their traditional values and spatial overlap with the most biodiverse regions of the world.[2] WWF was the first international conservation organization, in 1996, to establish a policy on indigenous peoples—*WWF's Statement of Principles on Indigenous Peoples and Conservation*—to guide its work. The Statement contains both safeguard elements—focused on avoiding negative impacts on the human and customary resource rights of indigenous peoples—and a positive commitment to develop lasting partnerships with indigenous and traditional peoples for conservation and sustainable management of their lands and territories, consonant with WWF's conservation objectives. WWF also worked with the World Conservation Union (IUCN)/World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) to develop a policy and guidelines on Indigenous and Traditional Peoples and Protected Areas (1999). In 2005, WWF worked with partners to produce guidelines for practitioners on integrating indigenous and gender aspects in natural resource management.[3]

Over time, WWF has periodically undertaken reviews of its people and conservation work to improve WWF's own practice and to generate broader learning on conservation issues and approaches. In the 1990s, Integrated Conservation and Development Projects (ICDPs) were a primary approach for field work with communities. WWF's ICDP review evaluated this experience and generated recommendations, many of which became integrated into approaches for working at larger landscape and ecoregion scales.[4] Other studies in the 1990s reviewed WWF's people-oriented conservation work, including analysis of staff perspectives and program approaches.[5] In the late 1990s, WWF commissioned case studies and organized a workshop on its experiences in collaboration with indigenous peoples around the world, resulting in a publication documenting this experience as well as crosscutting issues and lessons.[6] The present work continues WWF's tradition of learning from experience and working to address new challenges and opportunities as they arise.

1.2 Aims, Methodology, and Organization of This Report

The main aim of this review is to provide sufficient understanding of WWF's policy and program experience to inform management decision making on key capacities and actions required to support stronger partnerships with indigenous peoples and local communities. This includes the capacity to enable ongoing and more in-depth learning from program experience over time, as well as policy monitoring and enhanced communication.

Through the review process, another key aim has been to listen more closely to the voices of indigenous peoples and contribute to creating a bridge with their perspectives and concerns. This includes gathering views on how to improve institutional processes for understanding and resolving concerns about specific projects or programs as they arise on an ongoing basis. It was beyond the scope of this study to investigate and resolve specific issues or to follow up on specific interests in collaboration. Existing mechanisms—through direct contact with field offices or through regional program management in Gland and Washington, DC—have continued to provide a channel for voicing concerns and initiating collaborative actions.

Because the work of all conservation organizations occurs in a broader context of conservation issues and debates—and it is sometimes difficult to separate WWF's work from this broader field—we hope the analysis and lessons will also be of value to others. This review is not, however, designed to evaluate the global conservation enterprise per se, nor is it meant to address the question of whether a

new global conservation paradigm is needed—something that is being done through ongoing discussion within the Convention on Biodiversity, IUCN and UN frameworks.

The review has sought to elicit perspectives from within and outside WWF on WWF's policy and program experience, trends in WWF's work as it relates to indigenous peoples and local communities (including lessons and needs emerging from this) and ways to enhance WWF partnership approaches and activities. The method employed has combined elements of self-assessment and external review. Main activities have included WWF staff surveys and telephone interviews (mainly conducted by Springer) and external telephone interviews (mainly conducted by Alcorn). Analysis and writing were then undertaken jointly by the authors, based on the experiences and perspectives shared through these activities. Personal communication and rapid reviews of grey literature and project documents contributed additional information for illustrative boxes and text examples. (More detail on methods is provided in Appendix 1.)

External and internal perspectives offer WWF a rough barometer reading of opinions about WWF in relation to indigenous peoples and human rights. Most external interviewees were either indigenous or people who work closely with indigenous organizations and are sensitive to human rights issues. The number of external interviewees was limited, and experience varied across countries, regions and types of work; however, comments largely resonate with each other as a "focus group" to provide WWF with a picture of external opinion and advice. Likewise, the internal interviews and surveys produced responses that resonate with each other, despite their different situations, and qualify as a "focus group" reflecting diverse WWF perspectives. The paper includes some quotes from interviews and surveys, presented in italics, without being attributed to particular people or places to respect their privacy. Because of the divergence of perspectives on some aspects between internal and external groups, the paper distinguishes between the two in some sections.

Given WWF's size and decentralized structure and the diversity of activities encompassed by "programs as they relate to indigenous peoples and local communities," an in-depth study of WWF activities related to indigenous and rural communities was beyond the scope of our inquiry. Case studies were not conducted; illustrative boxes and text examples are based on limited available information, primarily reflecting perspectives gathered from personal communication and readily-available documents. Also, because external interviews primarily reflected experience from indigenous and human rights perspectives, external opinion regarding work with non-indigenous communities and on livelihoods/poverty reduction—a focus of WWF community work—was not captured to the same degree.

The report is organized in accordance with the three WWF commitments and—following an introduction to views on partnership (section 2.0)—includes sections on Policy, Programs, and Listening to Concerns. The Policy section (3.1) looks primarily at experience related to application of WWF's Statement of Principles on Indigenous Peoples and Conservation. This is followed by a section on Programs (3.2), including not only descriptions of types and trends of work as they relate to indigenous peoples and local communities but also an analysis of crosscutting issues, perspectives and lessons. The section on Listening to Concerns (3.3) draws primarily on perspectives of external interviewees, as a way to amplify indigenous voices in their own words and to communicate their perspectives to a broader audience within WWF. A concluding section (4.0) summarizes key findings and recommendations.

2.0 Views on Partnership

2.1 WWF Staff

All WWF survey respondents and interviewees stated that conservation success is not possible without the active participation of indigenous peoples and local communities. Staff members offered a range of perspectives on reasons for this:

- Indigenous peoples and local communities are owners, managers and stewards of land and resources in high-biodiversity areas. They are the appropriate people with rights and interests in lands and resources.
- Indigenous peoples and local communities are a critical constituency for conservation; their interest and support are essential both for direct management and as advocates for sustainable land and resource use.
- WWF works in national contexts where development needs are of higher priority than conservation; conservation needs to demonstrate economic and social relevance to governments and other constituencies.
- With most biodiversity found outside protected areas and financial and social sustainability concerns of traditional protected area approaches, there is no way around sustainable use and community-based conservation.
- Communities' conservation and sustainable management ethics, knowledge and traditions are important contributions to conservation.
- Local people depend on natural resources for their livelihoods. Poverty can lead to overuse and degradation of natural systems and we need to address these problems for conservation to be successful.
- Indigenous and local communities rely on natural resources for their livelihoods; we need to recognize the immediate local costs of conservation and work to ensure that livelihoods are not negatively affected.

These views from WWF staff members point to both ethical and practical foundations for collaborative approaches to work with indigenous peoples and local communities. In ethical terms, conservation can generate social costs as well as benefits, and staff members are concerned to prevent the former. Staff members also emphasized that indigenous and local communities are significant resource owners and managers—and that this role is increasing over time.[7] Several described considerable learning over time from their experiences of work with communities and to relationships that have deepened as this learning is incorporated into practice. Many advocated giving greater priority to community conservation approaches as necessary to achieve conservation goals and emphasized the importance of engaging broader constituencies of local people to achieve conservation across larger scales.

2.2 External Interviewees

Two strong perspectives on collaboration emerged from the external interviewees. On the one hand, indigenous peoples' organizations have serious concerns about how conservation is being implemented, and they are critical of aspects of WWF's work. On the other hand, there is a strong interest among indigenous groups in working on conservation and sustainable natural resource management with WWF and other groups, in the form of horizontal relationships or arrangements for WWF assistance under indigenous/community direction.

Concerns voiced by indigenous peoples regarding conservation include models of protected areas as intact wilderness without human intervention, views of local people as resource destroyers rather than as managers, replacement of traditional authorities by protected area managers and closer relationships of conservation organizations to government and other elites. In this context, while some interviewees saw WWF as having relatively good policies and practices in relation to other groups,

many felt that WWF also needs to do more to ensure that people are approached and engaged as rights holders and key decision makers.

Despite concerns, external interviewees expressed strong interest in collaboration. They generally appreciated WWF's work to conserve biodiversity and ensure sustainable use of natural resources. They particularly stressed (a) that priority areas for conservation often overlap with indigenous territories, (b) the importance of indigenous knowledge and the high correlation of cultural and biological diversity, and (c) the negative consequences for both parties if they do not work together. As one external interviewee noted: *Indigenous peoples are the key actors for protection of the forest, and if there was a good alliance between WWF and indigenous peoples' organizations, this would be a strong force in the fight with third parties who don't want conservation.*

Some external interviewees also pointed to experiences of shared learning and developing stronger collaborations with WWF programs over time. They noted with concern the growing perception of "conservation versus communities" and the risk of lost opportunities for collaboration associated with this. Many appreciated the review as an indication of WWF's interest in discussing issues, including difficulties between conservationists and indigenous peoples, and in developing stronger ties.

3.0 Addressing WWF Commitments

3.1 WWF Policies on Indigenous Peoples

Commitment: Openly re-evaluate WWF policy on indigenous peoples and strengthen its enforcement and monitoring mechanisms.

WWF's Statement of Principles on Indigenous Peoples and Conservation—prepared in 1996—is the main policy guiding WWF's work with indigenous peoples. It contains both safeguard elements—focused on avoiding negative impacts on the human and customary resource rights of indigenous peoples—and a positive commitment to develop lasting partnerships with indigenous and traditional peoples for conservation and sustainable management of their lands and territories, consonant with WWF's conservation objectives. Among other principles, the WWF policy specifically

- recognizes that indigenous peoples have the rights to the land, territories, and resources that they have traditionally owned or otherwise occupied or used and
- adopts the principle of free, prior, informed consent (FPIC) as a requirement for WWF support of interventions in indigenous lands or territories.

The policy endorses, and was developed in the framework of, key international rights instruments on indigenous peoples.

WWF also developed a joint policy statement with IUCN/WCPA in 1999 on Indigenous and Traditional Peoples and Protected Areas. In relation to protected areas, WWF promotes a policy based on the following principles:

- recognition of the rights of indigenous and traditional peoples with regard to their lands or territories that fall within protected areas
- recognition of the necessity of reaching agreements with indigenous and traditional peoples before the establishment of protected areas on their lands and territories
- recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples concerned to participate effectively in management of the protected areas established on their lands or territories

3.1.1 Contents and Use[8]

External interviews indicate that WWF's policies on indigenous peoples are highly valued by indigenous peoples' organizations and seen as offering good guiding principles for partnerships. Although a few external interviewees provided comments on specific points and others noted that it is generally good practice to periodically review policies in relation to new developments in international

standards, the primary interest and focus of external interviewees were on strengthening implementation.

WWF staff members also value the policies as important expressions of institutional values. However, knowledge and awareness of the policies were uneven across WWF programs participating in surveys and interviews. Some program staff members were not aware of them; others reported using the policies as a guide and resource for project work; and others were generally familiar with the policies, but reported limited active use of the policy documents. WWF does not currently have systems to support and monitor policy implementation at a Network level, and responses indicated that formal mechanisms are also not in place at country/program levels. Many staff members feel that their programs' principles and approaches are in keeping with the policies and some have their own bases of knowledge and capacity or work in supportive contexts. At the same time, this indicates that the specific rights-based standards of WWF policy are not being consistently communicated to the staff by senior management and that senior management does not have a systematic flow of information on progress and challenges in indigenous policy implementation. Many staff members did feel that increased institutional support and monitoring systems are needed and provided specific ideas for them (see Implementation, below).

3.1.2 Coverage

Staff members noted that they are working with many non-indigenous communities—as well as indigenous ones—in their field projects and that it also is necessary to ensure against negative impacts and to support community conservation strategies with these groups. Most WWF staff members interviewed on this point responded that it would be useful to have a broader social policy or statement of principles on local communities, while recognizing the special situation of indigenous peoples. Some also noted the need for better social science capacity and expertise to better differentiate among social groups in their field areas—including recognizing and addressing the specific situation of indigenous peoples in relation to other local communities.

3.1.3 Enforcement/Implementation and Monitoring

Staff and external interviewees identified a number of key constraints to policy implementation and monitoring, including limited internal and external awareness; need to clarify commitment at country levels; challenges of translating broad principles into locally relevant action; need for Network resources and capacity to support implementation; and lack of training, advisory services and up-to-date operational policy guidance. Key safeguard requirements need to be highlighted while also promoting strategies for proactive collaboration as contained in the policy.

External interviewees raised concerns that the policy is little known inside and outside WWF, especially at a country level. They noted that a policy must be known internally to be implemented, and externally so that indigenous peoples' organizations (IPOs) can play a role in monitoring. External interviewees with greater knowledge of WWF's structure were unclear about whether the Statement of Principles is a policy for the whole WWF Network, including National Organizations, or only for program offices managed by WWF International. They recommended a definitive statement from WWF about this and/or adoption at the country level.

External interviewees also emphasized that implementation of the policy principles is challenging and highly context-dependent, and they stressed the importance of dialogue. As one person noted: *The problem isn't what's written, but when you get down to reality, which is much more complex. You need openness to work with indigenous peoples, as it says. But people may not understand it, and the real cases are complicated.* Interviewees recommended that WWF engage in dialogue with indigenous groups and others to identify positive ways forward, especially in challenging political contexts: *We*

need to have more relevant discussions of local issues and how they relate to the policies, . . . how to do this when governments are so negative.

Staff members also highlighted the need for clear position statements and support for implementation in particular country contexts. As one program manager noted: *I'm familiar with the policies, but need to know how to translate the guidelines into day-to-day use and tap opportunities provided by the national context.* In some cases, WWF offices had, or were developing, country papers to articulate positions in national contexts, while others expressed interest in reviewing projects in relation to the policy at country levels and working more proactively to identify new opportunities for collaborative work.

At a Network level, the staff identified lack of guidance, training and advisory services on the policies as a constraint and recommended that these be put in place as an outcome of the review. The staff also suggested specific institutional mechanisms for increasing awareness and monitoring, such as including an introduction to the policies in staff induction processes and handbooks; developing shorter, more user-friendly versions—as well as clarifications as to definition and coverage—to support wider awareness and application; maintaining intranet information resources on the policies; and including questions about the policies in project concept templates and reports and in staff reviews.

Institutional Goals and Priorities

Studies of indigenous policy implementation have found that it is important to differentiate core policy requirements from best practices.[9] At the same time, interviewees both within and outside WWF felt that approaches to policy implementation should not focus only on safeguard compliance but should also include increased attention to proactive collaboration. As one external interviewee put it: *It's not clear that the policy is translating into institutional priorities—collaborating with indigenous peoples, communities and their organizations to recognize land rights and devote WWF resources to this. If WWF did this, there would be less need for a policy to be monitored. Policy monitoring alone is not likely to have much of an impact.*

The WWF staff voiced this interest in terms of increased integration of community conservation objectives into program targets and milestones, ecoregion strategies and landscape plans (building on current WWF objectives such as the community forestry milestone). *We need targets and milestones that reflect people issues—we need to be judged on this in our programs to make it real.* Once policy-relevant objectives are integrated into goals, monitoring against those goals becomes one means to monitor policy implementation.

Summary ideas for improvement from staff and external interviewees on policy implementation and monitoring include the following:

- Make the policy better known, including translating it into local languages.
- Clearly commit at country levels to implementing the policy and develop guidance on implementation of the policies in specific national contexts.
- Engage in dialogue with indigenous groups to identify best ways forward in implementing policy principles, particularly in challenging contexts.
- Designate an institutional point person to play a support and monitoring role in relation to the policies.
- Train staff members so they are aware of the policies, have guidance on how to apply them and are given opportunities for discussing problems in implementation. Provide training for all staff members, not only those working on community conservation.
- Develop operational guidance and internal monitoring mechanisms, including indicators.
- Increase integration of policy objectives into WWF program goals, and monitor against these.
- Ensure availability of sufficient funding in projects to implement the principles.

External Monitoring

Current mechanisms for expressing concerns are unclear and are producing mixed results. In some cases, concerns have been raised directly to WWF offices, and this has been an important means of learning, developing better mutual understanding and forging shared agendas. In other cases described, concerns have not been addressed, it has been a long process or groups have had to raise concerns at higher levels to get them resolved. This has meant in some cases that problems have festered.

External interviewees emphasized the importance of having a locus of accountability and a clear process for expressing, investigating and resolving concerns. Most recommended establishing clearly designated focal points at various levels (country and international), so that channels for raising and addressing concerns are clear. Independent monitoring through an ombudsman or inspection panel was mentioned by some, but seen by others as not to have worked well in other cases. It was suggested that this might be considered a recourse of last resort, while focusing primarily on collaborative efforts among the parties to resolve problems.

The WWF staff also noted that addressing concerns was an area where greater support should be provided by the Network. While it is important to establish clear communications channels at a country level and address issues directly, staff members felt that it would be helpful to have broader Network support to understand and address concerns that go beyond, or are not resolved at, a local level. As with external interviewees, staff members recommended raising indigenous organizations' awareness about the policy and developing a formal process for expressing and investigating concerns and communicating actions taken.

3.2 WWF Large-Scale Program Work as It Relates to Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities

Commitment: Examine WWF's large-scale conservation programs as they relate to indigenous and local communities to expand support for effective partnership approaches as well as implement changes where necessary.

WWF's conservation program work is highly varied, including strategies for protection and for sustainable use, actions at multiple levels from local to global and work with a wide range of partners. The decentralized structure of the organization contributes to diversity of practice, with protected area, sustainable development and campaign-oriented approaches existing side-by-side.[10] There is also wide variation in approaches from one office to another, based on the history of development of specific offices, the social and political contexts of conservation and orientations of individual WWF staff members.

To get a sense across this diversity of how current program work relates to indigenous peoples and local communities, we looked at several areas of work, with particular emphasis on trends associated with large-scale conservation. These areas of work are **landscape conservation, protected areas, community-based natural resource management (CBNRM)** and efforts to address **environmental impacts**. Research for this paper did not include case studies, but we include some brief examples to illustrate the nature of both promising approaches and problems encountered.[11]

Following the description of types and trends of work below, we identify a set of crosscutting issues and lessons associated with them. This section also includes ideas from review participants on how to address these issues to strengthen collaborative actions between conservation organizations and indigenous and local communities.

For purposes of this paper, we define large-scale conservation in terms of two key characteristics: spatial scale of attention and action at multiple (institutional and policy) levels. The attention to

increased spatial scale came out of conservation biology and recognition of the need for conservation across larger areas to conserve functioning and resilient natural systems, including viable species populations. In practice, this has tended to foster greater attention to mosaics of land use across large landscapes.[12] The second—work at higher policy and institutional levels—largely came out of social science and analysis, based on recognition of the need to address drivers and root causes, rather than only local impacts, and the need to create enabling environments for local action. In practice, this has led to development of multilevel strategies, sometimes referred to as "local to global" approaches.

These changes offer both new opportunities and challenges for effective partnerships with indigenous peoples and local communities. Views from staff and external interviewees offer a range of insights into how these opportunities and challenges are unfolding in practice.

3.2.1 Types of Work and Trends

Landscape Conservation

One trend in large-scale conservation is a greater attention to conservation and sustainable resource management across multiple-use landscapes and seascapes, which may include protected areas, community-managed areas, sustainable forestry and fisheries areas and other land uses. Landscape conservation offers potential to fulfill diverse rights and needs across these mosaics of land uses. WWF experience in landscape conservation has included research to understand biological values and social and economic contexts; facilitation of conservation strategy development; capacity building and technical support to specific groups of land owners and managers; and support to development of multi-stakeholder landscape management bodies.

Several WWF program staff noted that they have increased their engagement with indigenous peoples and local communities because regional biological and socioeconomic analyses have shown that important biodiversity areas overlap with community lands. For example, in the Terai Arc in Nepal, WWF's previous program focus on protected areas and buffer zones has expanded to support for communities in securing rights to forest lands and developing community forestry institutions across wildlife corridors in the broader landscape.[13] In Colombia, ecosystem analysis identifying coincidence with environmental goals in the life plans of indigenous groups provided a foundation for WWF support for legal designation processes for new indigenous territories in the Upper Putumayo watershed and socialization of existing management plans. While often taking global and "scientific" perspectives on biological values as a starting point, recognition of community-managed areas as critical constituents of broader landscapes has provided a basis for increased collaboration with indigenous and local communities.

At the same time, however, landscape conservation entails significant governance challenges. Relationships among actors are often complex and characterized by extreme power differentials among the parties, as, for example, among logging or oil companies, indigenous and local communities and the state.

Reflecting on watershed management in Peru, one external interviewee expressed concern that, where landscapes include indigenous territories, the primary rights of indigenous peoples are recognized and support provided (such as long-term commitment for covering transportation costs) for indigenous representatives to be able to participate in broader landscape management meetings. Especially where indigenous groups are relatively disempowered, special efforts are required to ensure that indigenous rights and interests are not undermined in landscape planning and management. For example, this is one key lesson of a landscape conservation initiative supported by WWF in Cameroon (Box 1).

One WWF staff member reflected that landscape conservation means becoming less of an implementer and more of a facilitator of multi-stakeholder processes, and that *skills in building*

alliances, extending political outreach, facilitating agreements and resolving conflicts are needed more in landscape conservation than technical or scientific skills. At the same time, it is important to recognize that conservationists represent one set of interests among others and are not just neutral mediators.[14]

Several staff members stressed that it is necessary to continue to engage directly with communities at a local level even as programs scale up to address broader threats or landscape management needs. Because larger-scale threats and management may not have immediate relevance for local communities, it is important to first support peoples' natural resource concerns at the site level, then work progressively to articulate the interests of multiple groups over larger landscapes and address regional development issues and landscape planning. Some staff members stated that they had been concerned initially that "scaling up" approaches could result in local disengagement by programs that had historically emphasized site-based community conservation, but in practice had generally seen development of multi-level approaches rather than disengagement.

Box 1: Southeast Cameroon – *Governance challenges of landscape conservation*

Background: Actors in the Congo Basin forests of Southeast Cameroon include government agencies, logging and hunting concessions, conservation organizations, traditional agricultural communities and indigenous forest peoples (Baka) in very asymmetrical relationships. Since 2000, WWF has worked with the government of Cameroon and other international agencies on land-use planning to define protected areas for conservation; concession areas; and community agriculture, forest and hunting zones. WWF has also supported park management and establishment of village-based institutions to claim and manage revenue shares owed to communities from logging and hunting concessions.

Issues: The land-use planning process included community mapping and village consultation forums. However, village leadership is dominated by agricultural communities, and subsequent research determined that the specific customary rights and resource use activities of the Baka were not being protected. Baka reported being restricted from areas where they used to hunt by logging, safari and park operations. They also reported allegations of harassment, abuse, illegal seizures of bushmeat and destruction of property by anti-poaching patrols. Current laws governing protected areas in Cameroon disallow hunting there, even for local use. Although this was mainly aimed to combat extensive commercial bushmeat hunting and trade, it has had a negative impact on the Baka. Baka participation in new village-based institutions has also been limited.

Responses and Further Considerations: Working with government park and forest management authorities, WWF, local NGOs, the Cameroonian Center for Environment and Development and the Forest Peoples Programme are supporting actions to address these problems. A key objective is to secure formal recognition and protection of Baka forest rights across land uses, including within park management plans developed on a basis of prior informed consent. Main activities include participatory documentation and mapping of Baka forest use and efforts to strengthen Baka representation in village-based management institutions. Recognition of indigenous forest rights in park management plans also provides a foundation for promoting broader policy change on land and resource rights in relation to conservation and forest management.

Protected Areas

Because of historical and continuing conflicts with indigenous peoples and local communities, protected areas have been the main focus of social justice critiques of conservation. Protected areas need not conflict with the rights and interests of local people—and indeed communities may seek protected area status to support their own conservation goals or to protect their lands against destructive activities by external actors. However, protected areas that have imposed separation of

people from nature, coupled with state control, have had severely negative impacts, especially on indigenous peoples.[15]

A “first-generation” approach to prevent and address these impacts, broadly integrated in WWF programs since the late 1980s, was integrated conservation and development (ICD) – which included support for alternative livelihoods for people living in and around protected areas (to reduce pressure on natural resources and indirectly compensate for protected area exclusions), negotiation of specific agreements for resource access and use and decreasing conflict with protected area managers. Recognition of the limitations of this approach, particularly from a perspective of rights, has led to new paradigms of conservation practice – including stronger measures to ensure respect for prior land and resource rights in the process of creating protected areas and promotion of alternative governance frameworks for protected areas grounded in community ownership and management.

In keeping with these new paradigms, the review indicates that WWF work on protected area projects has evolved to incorporate promotion of and support for increasingly well-defined safeguards in relation to government protected areas and increased support for co-managed and community conserved areas. Still, protected areas remain a focus of conflicts and were a focal concern of external interviewees. Main areas of criticism include insufficient consultation and consent processes and orientations towards more strict categories of state-managed protected areas. A key issue for many interviewees concerns how WWF and others – in supporting government establishment of protected areas as advocates, donors, technical service providers or in other capacities — use these channels of communication and influence with governments to promote respect for rights in protected area establishment and management. Finally, while most interviewees focused on recent or current programs, some noted that it was not sufficient to look forward, but also necessary to address negative impacts of past work, particularly involuntary displacement or restrictions on access resulting from government protected areas. As one interviewee noted: *In new projects, new approaches are being implemented. But this does not address existing and past problems.*

These issues are relevant to trends in WWF protected areas work, identified by the review as falling into two general areas:

- Support for networks of protected areas
- Support for new governance models such as co-management and indigenous and community protected areas

Networks of protected areas

In relation to large-scale conservation, one approach has been to promote networks of protected areas, based on recognition of the limitations of isolated single protected areas. In some areas this has taken the form of promoting pledges by government to place specific percentages of land area under protected status. Protected area networks may also be supported by new financial arrangements (such as trust funds) to fund operations and management.

One challenge of large-scale networks of government protected areas is that their establishment often relies on top-down decision making by senior government officials. The larger scale of protected area networks also increases the complexity of consultation and consent processes to ensure respect for prior land and resource rights and enable involvement of communities in decision-making. For these reasons, attention to the governance context for large-scale protected area creation is essential, to guard against imposition of restrictions on resource access by the people who have traditionally used and claimed these areas.

In Brazil, for example, the president pledged in 1998 to place 10 percent of the Brazilian Amazon under protection, in response to a WWF proposal. Because the Brazilian government recognizes—and constitutionally protects—the territorial rights of indigenous peoples, established institutions and processes are in place for verifying land claims to prevent overlaps with new protected areas. The

government of Gabon also pledged in 1999—at the Yaounde Summit, co-hosted by WWF—to increase protected areas to 10 percent of land area. However, before legally-mandated consultation processes with local communities were completed, the president established 13 parks through a presidential decree. In this case, subsequent resettlement and indigenous peoples' plans developed for the government's Forest and Environmental Sector Program have included provisions to protect traditional land uses of indigenous peoples within these areas, and ensure consultation with indigenous and local communities in development of management plans.[16] At the same time, these experiences illustrate the need for conservation groups to adapt strategies for protected area networks to different governance and rights contexts and to ensure community rights issues are integrated in engagement with governments, including as a basis for support.

Engagement with indigenous organizations and other civil society groups has proven beneficial in resolving conflicts over protected areas establishment. In Peru, for example, plans for a new Alto Purus national park in the Amazonian headwaters initially incorporated a territorial reserve for the Mascho-Piro, a people living in voluntary isolation. However, the Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana (AIDESEP), the Peruvian Amazon indigenous federation, objected to this as an infringement on the rights of the Mascho-Piro. After discussions with AIDESEP, WWF supported the AIDESEP position, including advocating for a broader agreement by the government to clarify the legal status of territories of indigenous peoples living in voluntary isolation. The Alto Purus complex was subsequently declared with the territorial reserve not incorporated into the surrounding national park.

Another challenge of large-scale networks is that working at a larger scale increases the likelihood of WWF being associated with protected areas that have historical conflicts with local communities whose rights were not recognized when the area was established. This is an emotionally charged issue, particularly in cases where the imposition of protected areas has resulted in indigenous peoples' loss of access to sacred sites, ancestral lands and vital resources. Many indigenous groups emphasize that – while established by government – protected areas have been actively supported by international conservation organizations. They advocate that WWF, along with other conservation groups, participate in efforts to clarify and address the issue of restitution in relation to protected areas.

A WWF position paper on protected areas states: "WWF believes that if it appears that indigenous or local people have been forced off land or lost ownership and access rights to create protected areas, restitution measures should be considered."[17] Some interviewees felt that that WWF is inherently in conflict with indigenous peoples' rights where WWF works in existing protected areas or private reserves that overlap indigenous territories, and they advocated that solutions be taken in accordance with WWF's indigenous peoples' policies and international human rights treaties and law.

New governance models: co-management and indigenous/community protected areas

A second broad trend indicated by the review is a shift from "integrated conservation and development" towards support for co-management and collaboration with indigenous and local communities in establishing conservation areas on their own lands. WWF staff members advocated greater attention to new protected area governance approaches such as community conserved areas.

Co-management covers a range of situations of collaborative decision making and responsibility, primarily between local communities and government. It can be differentiated from ICDPs by greater focus on participation in protected areas governance (not only a livelihoods focus). A 2004 WWF/World Bank survey of protected areas identified collaborative decision-making as an overall weakness, with protected area managers concluding that in general "the input and participation of local communities and indigenous peoples in management decisions are still not being addressed very effectively."[18]

The tenure arrangements underlying co-management may vary. In some cases, co-management is grounded in community ownership or, in the case of indigenous peoples, explicit recognition of an

indigenous territory: as part of management of its territory, an indigenous group establishes a co-management agreement with park authorities. In other cases, communities negotiate agreements for recognition of rights of resource access and use and are represented in park governance. However, many indigenous organizations and advocates see this model of co-management as a relatively weak level of recognition of rights for indigenous peoples. They argue that the starting point for a co-management agreement should be recognition of the area as an indigenous territory, rather than identification of it as a government protected area within which more limited rights are granted.

WWF supports a variety of co-management initiatives. In the Philippines, where enabling legislation for indigenous rights is in place, WWF supported an indigenous community in Sibuyan to delineate ancestral domain and obtain community title, as a basis for co-management agreements with the government (see Box 2). WWF-Indonesia has facilitated and supported co-management initiatives with indigenous peoples and local communities in several national parks in Indonesia, including Tesso Nilo, Sebangau, Bali Barat and Bunaken, with a focus on ensuring representation on park advisory, policy and management boards. In the case of Kayan Mentarang, WWF-Indonesia—together with the Alliance of the Indigenous People of the Kayan Mentarang National Park (FoMMA)—advocated the formal recognition of indigenous peoples, as "*adat*" owners and managers of the forest, as rightful partners in national park management. In 2002, the process resulted in establishment of the first Indonesian national park to be managed collaboratively.

Some local initiatives have provided a foundation for leveraging broader policy change. WWF-Indonesia, for example, contributed to policy reform processes advocating recognition of the rights of indigenous and local peoples inside Indonesian national parks, which resulted in a 2004 ministerial regulation (No. 19/2004) mandating collaboration in national park management. At the same time, interviewees familiar with Indonesia criticized WWF for not taking a stronger stance pushing for policy change recognizing indigenous territorial rights within all protected area types in Indonesia.

Box 2: Philippines – *Supporting territorial rights as a basis for co-management*[19]

Background: In 1997, WWF began implementing an Integrated Conservation and Development project in Sibuyan Island, with a focus on improving tenure security of the indigenous Sibuyan Mangyan Tababukid (SMT). The recently enacted Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act provided an opportunity for the community to apply for title to its ancestral domain.

Issues: Mt. Guiting-Guiting National Park overlapped a significant area of the community's territory, generating conflicts between the community and park management. Opposition to the ancestral domain claim, and WWF's role in supporting it, also emerged from local actors, including government and park management.

Response and Further Considerations: WWF continued to work with the SMT to support its ancestral domain application, along with other NGOs with specialized expertise in anthropological research, legal assistance and community mapping. The ancestral domain was obtained in 2001 and has provided a basis for the community to negotiate a co-management framework and joint activities with protected area authorities. Reflecting on the experience, WWF staff members emphasize willingness to take political risks and commitment to a holistic approach linking conservation with economic and cultural well-being as key foundations for collaboration.

Support for *indigenous and community protected areas* (and species conservation) is generally appreciated by local people because it responds to local interests in conserving land and natural resources that provide a foundation for livelihoods and cultural identity. In Oaxaca, Mexico, WWF has supported protected forests and biodiversity reserves on indigenous community lands. In Chile, WWF has supported development of a network of indigenous reserves and provided funding through a grants program for local projects, such as ecotourism facilities. A caution noted by one external

interviewee in relation to indigenous protected areas is the need to provide space for indigenous political processes to resolve differences within communities regarding conservation and development-oriented interests.

Community-Based Natural Resource Management

CBNRM is defined here as sustainable use of natural resources (forests, wildlife, fisheries) on community-managed lands outside of protected areas. WWF supports significant programs of community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) around the world. While approaches are varied, CBNRM usually involves some combination of support for (a) tenure and resource rights, (b) institutional strengthening, (c) development of sustainable management practices and (d) development of livelihoods activities that provide benefits and incentives for maintaining well-managed resources. Among WWF projects, sustainable livelihoods have been a particular area of focus.

An overall trend in WWF CBNRM work is efforts to "scale up" both geographically and through linked actions at multiple levels—addressing relevant policy, market, and institutional contexts. Approaches to scaling up community conservation identified by programs fell into several categories, including:

- facilitating lateral linkages across communities
- building capacity of support institutions
- promoting enabling policy and legislative frameworks
- addressing negative impacts on the environment and natural resource-dependent ways of life

Lateral linkages across communities range from informal cross-visits to development of more formal networks or federations of local resource users. Several programs commented on the usefulness of cross-visits as a way to initiate lateral linkages and promote replication of community conservation actions across larger areas, because changes are more readily accepted coming from members of a similar community than from an outside organization. More formal networks and federations of local resource managers supported by WWF include those that coordinate on management activities across larger scales and those that exist primarily for the purpose of sharing best practices, information and peer learning. For example, the Fiji Locally Managed Marine Areas network (FLMMA), comprising traditional fishing rights-owning groups plus governmental, nongovernmental and university-based support organizations, coordinates resource teams responding to requests for training and management planning for traditional fishing areas. FLMMA community members have meetings every two years to discuss issues of importance to them as resource owners and managers.

Capacity building of ***support institutions*** for community conservation covers a wide range of types of institutions, depending on the context and type of activity, and includes

- work with local indigenous federations to support institutional strengthening;
- capacity building of NGO service-providers so they can support larger numbers of communities across larger areas (as in Namibia—see Box 4); and
- training of government staff in participatory approaches to conservation, as a means to create space for community-led and co-management initiatives.

WWF programs such as the Latin America community forestry initiative (which began in Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama and has since expanded to Bolivia, Peru and Brazil) have focused on institutional aspects of livelihoods development, including culturally-appropriate community enterprises and links on equitable terms with private companies. Engagement with the companies seeks to strengthen their social standards as well as capacity to support scaling up, by providing market links for larger numbers of community enterprises and related information and skills. Payments for environmental services is a relatively new approach to generating a flow of benefits from resource management, with pilot work under way in Indonesia and elsewhere on incorporating environmental service payments to communities into river basin management.

Box 3: Namibia (and Southern Africa) – *Scaling up through support to establishment of support institutions*

Background: In **Namibia,** WWF began working in the early 1990s to support establishment of the San Nyae Nyae Conservancy, in the context of new national legislation recognizing conservancies as legal bodies with rights of ownership over huntable game and rights to revenues from the sale of game and from tourism. In places where conservancies have been established, wildlife populations are growing, and local communities are increasing income and employment opportunities from hunting, tourism and other activities. WWF has supported the creation of 31 community conservancies, and many other communities are seeking to establish them.

Issues: There has been increasing demand from communities for support services to establish and build capacity in conservancies as communities seek to take advantage of their benefits.

Responses and Further Considerations: In this case, WWF has shifted from a field implementation role toward a focus on supporting and building capacity of local NGOs. There are now more than 10 functioning NGOs, and a coordinating Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organizations (NACSO), which coordinates overall support services to conservancies. This allows for broader support to the increasing number of conservancies. Ensuring that service provision is demand-driven rather than supply-driven is a key ongoing challenge.

Building elsewhere in the region on experience in Namibia, WWF's **Southern Africa**–wide CBNRM Support Program has sought to scale up and create enabling conditions for CBNRM by supporting training and support institutions, regional learning forums and supportive policy frameworks.

Promoting ***enabling policy*** was described by staff members as a means to enhance sustainability of local efforts and generate "multiplier effects" through *policies and legislative frameworks that recognize the role of communities in the management and conservation of natural resources, that encourage the empowerment of communities and that create favorable conditions to the development of new community based actions.* Types of work described by staff members include promotion of participatory forest management legislation and guidelines, policies for devolution of wildlife management and attention to natural resource-based livelihoods in poverty reduction strategies. Many programs emphasized the need to invest in measuring and learning from results of field experience in order to leverage broader policy changes as well as to facilitate voices of local people in policy formulation processes. Alliances around policy change were also emphasized in relation to ***addressing environmental impacts***, as described further in the next section.

While identifying efforts to scale up community-based conservation as an important trend and direction for future work, many staff members felt that their current program efforts remain limited in scale. From the perspective of external interviewees, WWF is seen to have created important and innovative models for community-based conservation at particular sites, but without promoting significant policy change that would enable scaling up. Respondents also emphasized that scaling up involves engaging in much more complex social and political arenas, including in relation to tenure and resource rights, governance and markets. Program staff expressed a need for enhanced skills to engage effectively in these areas, as well as better crosscutting analysis and lesson-sharing to build skills and knowledge over time.

These particular issues were identified as priorities for increased WWF capacity and engagement:

- land and resource rights—for example, dealing with problems stemming from absence of laws allowing creation of indigenous lands, including indigenous protected areas
- institutions and governance—such as appropriate representation in land use planning and implementation processes, corruption and conflict resolution, devolution of management authority and equitable sharing of costs and benefits of conservation

- livelihoods—such as increasing economic benefits and beneficiaries (especially in contrast to the small-scale benefits of ICDPs) and building community capacity to negotiate equitable terms with the private sector
- involving people in larger-scale processes—for example, promoting understanding of why and how larger-scale management is relevant for local groups and facilitating meaningful involvement of people in landscape management activities
- documenting and communicating results of local projects so that CBNRM is better recognized as a way to implement national, regional and international sustainable development priorities

Addressing Environmental Impacts: Industry Engagement and Policy Advocacy

An important, shared interest of indigenous groups and conservation organizations is protection against negative impacts from environmentally destructive activities such as extractive industries and large infrastructure. As part of scaling up to influence global drivers of biodiversity loss, WWF is increasing engagement with industry and with policy processes relevant to environmental impacts.

WWF programs take a range of approaches to addressing the environmental impacts of industry. In some cases, WWF works with industries to promote incorporation of improved standards of environmental sustainability, while, in other cases, WWF takes more of a critical advocacy or campaign-oriented approach. WWF's main focus in industry transformation has been the forest industry, with related efforts in fisheries, aquaculture, agriculture (including soy and sugar industries) and other sectors. For example, WWF has supported the development of Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification standards, their translation into national standards in particular countries and their application within forest concessions to improve practices to certifiable standards.

FSC includes social principles on tenure and on indigenous peoples' rights, in recognition of the fact that concessions in many countries have been granted without consideration of indigenous and local community land claims. WWF technical assistance or proposed assistance to companies where land claims are unresolved is one source of conflict with indigenous groups identified by staff members and external interviewees. Responding to concerns from indigenous organizations and support groups in Indonesia, for example, WWF is working with them to develop a process for integrating social principles, including for free, prior, informed consent, early on in efforts to move Indonesian concessions to certifiable standards (Box 5). Other external interviewees questioned the approach of engaging with big timber companies, especially where the timber industry has long been marked by problems with corruption, and expressed concern that this engagement not be to the exclusion of support for community-based and indigenous forest management.

WWF advocacy approaches have been particularly active in relation to the oil and gas industry, including support for communities in Peru to document and communicate the negative impacts of oil exploration; collaboration with indigenous and environmental organizations to protest international development bank support for the Camisea project; and, at an international level, participation in the World Bank's extractive industries review.

While some external interviewees noted positive examples of collaboration on advocacy campaigns, others voiced criticisms that WWF does not actively join with civil society coalitions in campaigns against environmental impacts in their countries. Interviewees identified lack of WWF dialogue with indigenous organizations and social groups and limited understanding of their policy positions as main sources of conflict. In international policy arenas such as the Convention on Biodiversity, greater WWF understanding and coordination with the policy positions of indigenous organizations and networks were identified as needs, along with increased integration of indigenous concerns in the content of policy messages. It was recommended that specific point people be designated within WWF to engage with indigenous counterparts so that channels of communication for indigenous organizations are clear.

WWF work with Arctic indigenous peoples illustrates challenges stemming from WWF's diverse program structure and interests. WWF's Norway-based Arctic program (in collaboration with offices in Canada, Europe and the United States) has collaborated with Arctic communities to document their observations of negative impacts of toxics and climate change and support advocacy to address them in international arenas. Conflicts have arisen, however, in the area of species policy—for example, in relation to a WWF-US position in the mid-1990s against Canada's issuing of Inuit bowhead whale hunting permits outside the framework of the International Whaling Commission.[20] The presence or absence of ongoing relationships and communication has been a key factor affecting the potential for collaboration or conflict.

A broad concern of indigenous organizations is potential conflicts of interest arising from conservation NGO funding from corporations. Although WWF has traditionally received a relatively small percentage of its funding from corporations[21] some staff members noted that corporate fund-raising is likely to increase and recommended clarity and good communication regarding WWF's criteria and guidelines for corporate fund-raising related to indigenous issues.

Box 4: Indonesia – *Responding to concerns about land conflicts in the context of industry engagement*

Background: One of WWF's aims in Indonesia is to facilitate the achievement of more certified forests producers and manufacturers. Forest concessions face a range of difficulties in meeting certification requirements as defined by the Forest Stewardship Council, including showing their legality in terms of forest gazettement and concession delineation and obtaining free, prior, informed consent of communities. WWF began developing a "stepwise" approach to move companies toward meeting these requirements.

Issues: Indonesian indigenous and research organizations raised concerns to WWF that stepwise approaches would dilute critical social standards for the forest companies, in the context of a history of widespread land conflicts between concessions and indigenous communities.

Responses and Further Considerations: To address these concerns, WWF-Indonesia has initiated a project with these groups to facilitate a "best-practice" process, involving a company holding a forest concession and the *adat* communities living in and around it, to identify *adat* tenure and forest rights and reach agreements regarding company use/nonuse based on free, prior, informed consent (FPIC). They seek also to learn from the process and develop broader guidance on how to apply FPIC principles with *adat* communities and on how forest managers can comply with Forest Stewardship Council social principles.

3.2.2 Crosscutting Issues and Lessons

Participation and Collaboration

Genuine participation—grounded in shared agendas and shared decision making—was identified both internally and externally as a key issue to address in strengthening partnerships between indigenous and local communities and WWF.

As one internal interviewee noted: *The main lesson to share when working with indigenous communities—and generally with local communities in on-ground projects—is the importance of relationship building as part of the strategy to achieve conservation outcomes. This requires adequate time and resources to build secure relationships upon which conservation partnerships can be negotiated, and this aspect must be included within the overall strategy, not dropped when time or resources are tight.*

Staff members identified increased capacity in participatory approaches as a priority capacity-building need and felt that collaborative approaches needed to be more fully integrated across programs, geographically and across types of work. They also reflected on the tension between top-down biodiversity priority-setting processes and bottom-up, ground-level work as well as on the balance between being clear on their own agendas and responsive to the views and agendas of others.

External interviewees highlighted a key distinction between "participation" in conservation schemes designed by conservation organizations, government and others and true collaboration grounded in shared decision-making. Some external interviewees expressed frustration over being asked to be part of processes in which decisions have mainly been made in advance and they are just asked to give consent. They contrast this with being empowered as the primary actors in decision-making and management over their lands and territories.

External interviewees described several critical measures of true collaboration. One is the level of open, two-way communication flow and negotiation between parties (ongoing dialogue is the hallmark of collaboration among partners). Another measure is willingness to make changes in response to information or ideas from indigenous communities or to assist them with their own initiatives.

Indigenous organizations tend to make decisions through dialogue and consensus building, and they expect their partners to behave in a similar manner with them, while respecting each other's own internal political processes. Thus, another important measure of collaboration is respect for internal political processes of communities and indigenous organizations, which may include support for development of those processes in relation to outsiders. Formal agreements covering decision-making processes, partners' roles and conflict resolution mechanisms help to ensure shared influence on key decisions negotiated through the partnership. (See Box 6 for a description of a formal agreement in Peru.)

The following points reflect some key lessons[22] from external interviewees and staff members regarding best practices for collaboration:

- Clearly communicate key information with an analysis of options and consequences when seeking discussions and decisions from indigenous communities and organizations.
- Make a long-term commitment to dialogue and partnership.
- Be aware that "give and take" are needed; don't start with preconceptions.
- Make sure that communication is two-way, transparent, consistent and honest.
- Take time to understand traditional decision-making structures. Ensure that community decision-making processes and deliberation time are factored into project design and implementation.
- Build local capacity to engage and especially to develop their own agendas. Give communities the time and space to develop or modify their own organizations.

- Agree together upon facilitators for the collaborative process. Beware the pitfalls of working through educated elite or culture brokers.
- Invest in understanding and incorporating indigenous perspectives and knowledge in planning. Use joint data collection and analysis, including mapping, as a tool for building skills and discussing priorities.

There was a fair amount of convergence internally and externally on the following ways to strengthen collaboration based on lessons learned:

- Hire indigenous staff members and others who know the indigenous world and can facilitate collaboration.
- Work with local organizations that complement WWF's skills, and seek indigenous peoples' recommendations when selecting local partners and consultants.
- Work in multidisciplinary teams, including specialized social science expertise, to ensure good understanding of complex social dynamics. Build deeper knowledge of cultural characteristics and differences.
- Adopt adaptive management approaches and more flexible timelines to accommodate consultative processes and traditional decision-making styles, as well as to allow adjustments from taking on board local concerns.
- Enhance capacity and training in collaborative approaches.
- Increase autonomy for local offices to negotiate with local organizations.

Staff especially emphasized the need to be clear on WWF's own agendas and capacities and to work from these to define common agendas, while also remaining open to more holistic approaches to conservation that allow for inclusion of local interests and perspectives.

Territorial, Land and Resource Rights

Territorial, land and resource rights are a second cross-cutting issue requiring increased attention by WWF as a basis for collaboration with indigenous peoples and local communities. WWF's Statement of Principles on Indigenous Peoples and Conservation recognizes the territorial, land and resource rights of indigenous peoples as a fundamental basis for partnerships between WWF and indigenous groups.

It is widely accepted that territory is essential for indigenous peoples to maintain their cultural integrity and identities. Indigenous rights to traditional lands, territories and resources are recognized in international law. Security of tenure and resource rights also provides a critical foundation for long-term stewardship of land and natural resources by indigenous and local communities. Yet many countries do not officially recognize territorial or land rights of indigenous peoples, or the land and resource rights of local communities.

The review identified a range of situations regarding WWF's engagement on territorial, land and resource rights. In some countries, WWF has collaborated to promote expanded recognition of indigenous territorial rights or community resource rights at a policy level; in others, WWF has supported titling of community lands and indigenous territories where national law provides mechanisms for this, or increased protection of rights of resource access. WWF support for research and mapping of customary tenure and community resource use was identified as especially valuable by some external interviewees. Staff members describe efforts to strengthen community tenure and resource rights as grounded in concern to respect rights and respond to the priorities of indigenous and community partners, as well as in recognition by staff of the links between secure tenure and conservation.

In other countries, however, land tenure and resource rights have not been a focus of field activities, or WWF has not drawn actively on field experience to engage at a policy level on land rights. Land tenure and resource rights were also frequently identified as an issue in conflicts between WWF and indigenous organizations or support groups. Criticisms include insufficient upfront attention by WWF to

the potential impacts of conservation interventions on land rights, insufficient efforts to address them and limited awareness of the agendas of indigenous and community organizations seeking change. Concerns are most pronounced in relation to interventions, such as protected area creation or enforcement, which increase restrictions on land and resource rights. Even where positive changes are sought, such as expanded rights to use resources within existing protected areas or participate in co-management, indigenous and civil society groups may view these as weak or counterproductive where they see potential and are advocating for broader change.

Many external interviewees also shared the view that WWF (and other conservation organizations) should do more to advocate proactively with government to recognize indigenous rights, including land rights. They feel that there is considerable potential to "push the envelope" toward recognition of territories or a broader range of resource rights, even in countries with the most dictatorial governments, and that WWF is in a strong position to influence change because WWF has power and funds—which governments need. In some cases this contrasted with the views of staff members, who saw more limited political space and/or institutional capacity to influence land rights, especially at a policy level.

Ideas on strengthening collaboration and land/resource rights include the following:

- Remain aware of changing political dynamics and policy openings regarding land rights in terms of influencing broader policies or developing interim arrangements at site levels.
- Maintain the flow of communication with indigenous and civil society organizations to be aware of their positions and activities.
- Identify land tenure and resource rights as a priority area for increased capacity, guidance and cross-learning.
- Avoid negative impacts from conflicts with state-protected areas by devoting greater attention to community-conserved areas and other new governance models.

Higher-Level Political Relationships

Interviewees highlighted the importance of two aspects of higher-level political relationships beyond traditional, site-based project relations: (a) engagement with indigenous or rural community organizations and (b) engagement with larger civil society movements.

One external interviewee noted: *The social actors in an alliance should be at macro level, not scattered local communities.* When regional or national organizations are bypassed, the strains of an unbalanced partnership between a large international organization and a small community can make genuine collaboration difficult. This can also limit opportunities for larger-scale changes that support conservation at landscape and societal levels. Without vibrant links to the larger-scale associations and their interests, WWF misses opportunities for policy changes and may inadvertently prevent policy changes by standing with the status quo or being neutral and thereby seen as not supporting change.

Another external interviewee noted: *Indigenous peoples see conservation standing more on the side of government.* Several external interviewees described WWF and other conservation organizations as "elite" and "conservative," working closely with government and sometimes industry, which they often see as corrupt, rather than joining forces with local organizations that are promoting broader reform. Others felt WWF tends not to speak out on controversial issues. In addition to working more closely with coalitions for reform and especially avoiding contradictory positions, they want to see WWF doing more to use its relationships with government as channels for promoting policy change.

The WWF staff also emphasized the importance of stronger links with social groups in civil society to achieve conservation goals, especially as programs seek to build constituencies and promote supportive policy contexts for conservation across larger scales. Some reflected that WWF sometimes works in political cultures in which environment and social justice communities have had little

interaction, and this has hindered development of relationships. Others noted that conflicts can arise over differences in tactics and approach, even when objectives are shared.

Ideas on how to strengthen higher-level partnerships from WWF surveys and external and internal interviews include the following:

- Increase understanding of indigenous and rural residents' policy agendas at national and international levels, and identify opportunities for mutual support, even where WWF may employ complementary tactics or approach.
- Participate regularly in meetings where multiple civil society organizations strategize and discuss issues of broad interest.
- Ensure designated capacity at national and international (thematic, policy, etc.) levels to increase communication and build relationships with indigenous and civil society organizations; provide resources and incentives for this.
- Create advisory positions to advise country directors and senior managers on indigenous issues and perspectives.
- Include liaising with indigenous organization counterparts in job descriptions of midlevel managers and invest time in building alliances.
- Develop formal agreements for collaboration between indigenous federations and WWF.

Box 5: Peru – *Relationship and agreement with indigenous federation (nonlocal)*

Background: WWF has long supported conservation and sustainable resource use programs in the Peruvian Amazon, where large areas are claimed by indigenous peoples.

Issues: Concerns in specific cases, in particular WWF technical assistance on forest management to a timber concession partly overlapping a community land claim, were raised to WWF by the Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana (the Interethnic Peruvian Jungle Development Association, or AIDESEP), a national indigenous federation.

Response and Further Considerations: In addition to working together to support positive resolution of the specific land claim, the two organizations decided that a comprehensive agreement would help to avoid problems and strengthen collaboration. In 2005, WWF-Peru and AIDESEP signed a three-year agreement to work together.

In the agreement, WWF agrees to strengthen the capacity of the peoples, federations, and organizations who are members of AIDESEP to defend their rights and ensure conservation and sustainable management of the natural resources of their territories and community reserves. The lines of action include WWF assistance with delineation, land use zoning, and titling of territories; strengthening indigenous capacities to negotiate with private-sector parties whose decisions affect their territories; facilitation of indigenous involvement in decision making that directly or indirectly affects their territories; and assistance with developing policy and legislation proposals; and promotion of compliance with existing legislation and policy related to indigenous peoples.

Core principles listed in the agreement include transparency; respect for indigenous cultures, knowledge, and intellectual property; respect for human rights and gender equality; direct dialogue without intermediaries; and respect for indigenous organizations and autonomous collective institutions at local, regional, and national levels. Specific commitments of actions include at least two meetings a year; collaborative monitoring of agreed-upon actions; joint working groups for themes of mutual interest (for example, issues related to forestry concessions operating on, or adjacent to, indigenous territories; proposed water laws; actions of regional government bodies, etc.); and giving priority to hiring indigenous experts.

3.2.2 Institutional Support Needed within WWF

Interviewees and survey respondents identified a number of WWF institutional measures and types of support they felt would be required to strengthen and expand effective partnership approaches. A common thread running through them is a broader definition of conservation that includes related indigenous and community concerns, promoted in a range of ways including through public communication, institutional goals, increased technical support, partnerships, learning and core budgetary support. Many staff members felt that institutional support for collaborative approaches has been too limited, especially in comparison with other aspects and approaches of WWF's work. Staff members offered specific ideas based on knowledge of WWF organization; these also resonate with external views in several areas.

Public Communication

Communications measures identified include the following:

- leadership statements on the priority of work with indigenous peoples and local communities within WWF
- clear and coordinated positions about where WWF stands on issues affecting indigenous peoples, such as wildlife use and land/resource rights, especially where positions taken in one part of the world can affect program relationships in other places
- more explicit statements of WWF's approaches and positions, such as a succinct, articulated statement on communities and large-scale conservation and country position papers
- more dialogue within WWF (and especially between field implementation offices and the rest of the Network) to ensure that higher-level decision making is informed by views and lessons from the field

It was noted that a shift in messages is needed, from animal-focused stories to more complex portrayals of community conservation work, including hunting and other sustainable use activities. Critics have also noted that when public documents describe WWF's work only in terms of successes, it can give the impression that inherent challenges are not being recognized or problems addressed.

Integration in Institutional Goals and Measures

Staff commented frequently on the importance of better integrating people-oriented objectives into institutional goals. As one put it: *I would like to see WWF raise the profile of the potential synergies between conservation, indigenous rights and sustainable use of natural resources in indigenous territories at an international level, including greater inclusion within ecoregion visions, as well as program goals and milestones.* Others described people-oriented objectives in terms of community empowerment or constituency building. The staff felt that integration in goals and milestones would provide incentives for programs to invest in collaborative approaches and that this sort of encouragement and link to performance evaluation for programs are currently insufficient.

Staff members note also that while often much of what they do focuses on building partnerships and constituencies with indigenous peoples, local communities and support organizations, this is not "visible" or reported on within WWF because it is seen as process, rather than as an outcome (which is measured in terms of biodiversity). Some also note that they are necessarily oriented toward what they are being judged and measured on, and if people-oriented elements are not well represented in those measures, it is difficult to sustain a focus on them.

Technical Support and Partnerships

The staff noted that there are currently limited systems in place for supporting community conservation work in a technical way in WWF, with the result that programs spend a lot of time "reinventing the wheel." Staff members requested the following:

- implementation guidelines and training in key issue areas, including collaborative approaches, building sustainable relationships, land tenure, governance and inclusion of local voices in policy development and priority setting
- a more well-developed toolkit to move community resource management forward
- advisory services in relation to WWF indigenous peoples' policies and use of team structures to bring together relevant expertise around priority programs
- strengthened dialogue with others working in the field of community-based conservation
- engagement with other international conservation NGOs to increase their support and collectively promote community-based conservation approaches.

Crosscutting Analysis

Field staff members noted that—despite significant investments—they often are not able to demonstrate contributions to human well-being because they are not measuring or analyzing this aspect of their work. They requested that WWF do the following:

- Increase investment in crosscutting analysis of the conservation and socioeconomic results of community conservation approaches. Develop indicators to evaluate this work, and conduct cross-program analysis to enable WWF to demonstrate the effectiveness of community approaches for conservation and the value of conservation for achieving the kinds of livelihoods and empowerment goals valued by other key constituencies.
- Systematically evaluate community conservation programs, and document lessons learned. As one put it, we need to c*onsolidate WWF acknowledgement of the contributions of indigenous resource management to biodiversity conservation at an organizational level, including the production of scientific reports that support and justify these contributions.*
- Produce and distribute high-quality publications illustrating case studies and best practices.

Budgeting and Fund-Raising

Some staff members recommended ensuring adequate funding for community-based conservation, implementation of policy principles and monitoring, including increased fund-raising priority and review of funding proposals for inclusion of social components.

3.3 Listening to Indigenous Concerns

Commitment: Listen more closely to the voices of indigenous people and ensure their concerns are addressed in design and implementation of WWF field projects.

This dual commitment needs to be a *continuing* commitment. Many interviewees commented that WWF should commit to listening and communicating with indigenous and other civil society organizations in genuine and ongoing two-way communication. Regarding the second half of the commitment, interviewees expressed a range of views: from sharp criticisms based on negative experiences to comments on ways WWF programs engaging with indigenous groups could strengthen this collaboration.

Interviewees appreciated that WWF was making an effort to listen to their concerns through this review. While the rest of the report draws on comments and recommendations of both external interviewees and WWF staff, this section specifically highlights external interviewees' voices *quoted in italics* so that they can be heard in keeping with this third commitment. These points are opinions from interviewees, who in this section were either indigenous or people who work closely with indigenous organizations and are sensitive to human rights issues.

General

WWF needs to recognize territorial rights and self-determination rights and then find a way to cooperate with indigenous peoples on that basis. WWF can assist indigenous peoples by building their capacities, supporting their conservation systems, building bridges between the elders and the youth, and assisting government to protect their human rights in the face of extractive industry.

WWF is learning. . . . WWF wants to protect nature in one minute, but we indigenous have been caring for nature for centuries. We have conserved a lot in our way, but there is lack of understanding of this at the most basic level.

Communication

The willingness to discuss these things is a good start.

WWF needs to go to the people. That is the hard part. In my country, there are few indigenous peoples' organizations, and the ones that exist are not strong enough to enter into dialogue with outsiders. It is an excuse for WWF and other outsiders; they say they have no one to talk to, because the people are scattered in the forest. If you don't go to them, you cannot communicate with them.

Local office staff are not rewarded for feedback about problems in the field, which allows situations to fester.

Policy, Policy Implementation, and Monitoring

One comment on WWF's policy was that it should also include a commitment to the well-being of indigenous peoples:

Peoples are in danger of extinction now; why not add to the policy that WWF needs to protect peoples in danger of extinction? Why only focus on protecting their territory with its biodiversity when we know that the peoples living there are in danger of extinction?

Some interviewees questioned the statement that WWF will not support actions WWF deems to be unsustainable, even if implemented by indigenous peoples, especially questioning whose criteria would be used:

There is tension within the policy. It talks about rights to self-determination of indigenous peoples, but at same time if they do not behave like WWF wants them to behave, then WWF cannot work with them.

Several interviewees highlighted concerns about their and others' lack of knowledge of the policy:

I had never seen or heard of the indigenous peoples' policy before. It should be publicized, distributed widely so that people would know about it, and discussed. And when there are problems, it would serve as an instrument for channeling complaints.

The government doesn't know of the policy either. Civil society is ignoring it because WWF didn't make the policy known. WWF must train their own staff and other partners in civil society and indigenous peoples themselves about the policy.

Protected Areas and Land Rights

Protected areas that conflict with traditional indigenous territories were a focal concern of interviewees.

> *WWF begins with the assumption that government protected areas are the starting point, instead of thinking that the indigenous territory is the starting point.*
>
> *What does it mean to have national parks when these areas are the territories of indigenous peoples? What does that mean if territorial right is a basic human right of indigenous peoples?*
>
> *We have our methods for conserving, as do the conservation organizations. We need to meet together and exchange ideas so we can find a better way forward, instead of WWF just preventing access to areas. We need collaboration—before making reserves—for our opinions and concerns. Empower us to do the conservation.*
>
> *We are fighting for territorial rights, not protected areas under state ownership. We want WWF to support indigenous lands, instead of community reserves or other kinds of protected areas. The state categories won't bring better management, but if the lands are indigenous peoples' lands, indigenous peoples will defend them.*

Policy Advocacy

> *Because indigenous issues tend to be seen as marginal, what becomes useful is to have others speaking on indigenous rights in relation to, for example, water or extractive industry. . . . It tends to be that NGOs pick up on other issues and let indigenous groups pick up on indigenous issues—there needs to be education within an organization so indigenous issues are integrated.*
>
> *WWF should be careful not to undercut indigenous peoples' positions by taking up other partnerships in conflict with indigenous peoples or supporting policies that run counter to their positions.*

Participation

> *Consultation is not an adequate process for self-determination when someone else makes the decision.*
>
> *WWF needs more personnel or contracted people who are permanently working and are trained and know the indigenous world, because the indigenous world and ways are very distinct from those of the "west." . . . WWF has done good things, but due to the lack of these trained professionals who know the indigenous world, WWF could do much better.*
>
> *For prior informed consent, information has to be in the language of the people, and the information has to include an analysis of critical points about property rights.*
>
> *When they meet with a community, WWF should provide information about from whom they received funds and what are the interests of those companies. Explain if those companies have an interest in the territory (including its waters) for their own economic interests.*
>
> *If WWF wants to realize their activities, they have to discuss in advance with indigenous peoples about their intentions. WWF goes, looks around, and speaks to a few indigenous people, and after that they write the proposal without discussing it.*

We need a legal body of indigenous and WWF representatives that would give us the space to negotiate with each other about the way forward in our country. WWF does consult indigenous peoples, but indigenous peoples need a way to be involved in ongoing decision making and sharing of concerns up front, so we are involved in advance when there is going to be work on indigenous territory. This would be a better way to work.

WWF country offices should understand the changes in the past decade—indigenous peoples now have their own specialists and elites. It would be ideal if indigenous specialists and NGOs carried out projects for WWF.

Scaling Up

There are local projects earning quite a lot of respect on the ground. But what doesn't seem to be happening is translation up to policy at a country level on rights and knowledge of people in conservation.

Political Relationships – with Indigenous Peoples' Organizations

WWF is only relating to individual communities, but indigenous peoples have regional and national representative organizations and WWF is not relating to them.

WWF could be much more effective if they worked with national coalitions in political alliances and took other priorities on board, instead of working unilaterally with their own ideas.

Efforts at protection will be undermined if WWF alienates local organizations who generate anti-environmental movement. There is an increasing tendency to discredit something by saying it's "environmental," which means it is irrelevant. It is important to build local alliances to counter this. And it is important not to do things that undermine those alliances, like giving awards to corrupt agencies that local allies are fighting against.

Political Relationships – with Government

WWF could use their field experience, and if they see government doing human rights violations, then they could say "we won't work here because there are human rights violations," and government would listen because government needs WWF's resources.

WWF is constrained by its size—it has to have agreements with the state in order to work. So WWF has to sign agreements with countries that have unjust laws. The question is, How can WWF confront the government about its unjust laws when it has to sign an agreement with that same government?

WWF tends to work with "the top"—with formal bodies that bring the elite together (NGOs, government, conservationists) to make decisions without input from broader civil society.

The concerns voiced by interviewees were considered while formulating the following key findings and feasible recommendations.

4.0 Key Findings, Lessons and Recommendations

4.1 Summary of Key Findings and Lessons

1. ***WWF's Statement of Principles on Indigenous Peoples and Conservation is generally considered to be strong and progressive, but needs to be more tangibly integrated into program operations.***

   WWF's Statement of Principles—and the related Policy on Protected Areas developed with IUCN—are generally well regarded externally and seen as offering good guiding principles for effective partnerships. The primary focus and interest of external interviewees is on effective implementation. The WWF staff see these policies as important expressions of institutional values, though active use of the policy documents is limited, and WWF does not have program support and monitoring systems in place to ensure that policy is linked consistently to program implementation.

   Policy application is hampered by several key constraints. These include limited internal and external awareness; need to clarify commitment at country levels; challenges of translating broad principles into locally relevant action; need for Network resources and capacity to support implementation; and lack of training, advisory services, and up-to-date operational guidance. Key safeguard requirements need to be highlighted, while also promoting strategies for proactive collaboration as contained in the policy.

2. ***Civil society monitoring can be an effective means to improved policy implementation and needs to be strengthened.***

   Outcomes and satisfaction with WWF's response to concerns has been mixed. Concerns raised by indigenous organizations directly to WWF offices have provided an important catalyst in some cases for improved mutual understanding, problem resolution and forging of shared agendas. However, in other cases, concerns have not been addressed in a timely or effective way. Representatives of indigenous and civil society organizations feel strongly that they have an important role to play in monitoring policy implementation, and recommend establishing designated internal focal points and communications channels (country and international) so channels for raising and addressing concerns is clear. Independent monitoring through an ombudsman or inspection panel was mentioned by some but seen by others not to have worked well in other cases. It was suggested that this might be considered as a recourse of last resort, while focusing primarily on collaborative efforts among concerned parties to resolve conflicts. WWF staff members also feel that responding to concerns is an area where greater support should be provided by the Network. Support is needed for "case work" to understand and resolve specific conflicts identified by monitoring.

3. ***Many staff members would welcome a policy addressing work with local communities, in addition to WWF's policy on indigenous peoples.***

   Staff members note that they are working with many non-indigenous as well as indigenous communities in their field projects and that it also is necessary to ensure against negative impacts and support community conservation strategies with these groups. They felt a policy articulating WWF's approach to collaborative work with local communities would be helpful, in addition to the existing indigenous policy.

4. ***There is broad commitment among the WWF staff to work collaboratively with indigenous peoples and local communities, and substantial programs of work on the ground. Indigenous groups feel that WWF needs to do more to ensure that people are involved as rights holders and key decision makers, and are interested in collaborating with WWF on this basis.***

Involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities is broadly integrated across WWF program approaches, and staff members see this engagement as essential—both to ensure against negative impacts and because indigenous peoples and local communities are important partners for conservation. Staff members note that indigenous and local communities are owners and managers of priority areas for conservation, with increasing formal recognition, and that they need to demonstrate the social and economic relevance of their work for local constituencies. External interviewees reflect indigenous interests in partnership with WWF, but also express criticisms of the extent to which they are approached and engaged as rights holders and decision-makers. Criticisms reflect broader backlash against conservation approaches that conflict with indigenous rights and interests, including concern that this will result in lost opportunities for collaboration across many areas where interests are shared.

5. ***Landscape-scale approaches offer opportunities as well as challenges for WWF to better achieve conservation goals by collaborating with indigenous peoples and local communities.***

   Indigenous and local community lands make up a significant expanse of high-biodiversity areas. WWF staff members feel that community partnerships are increasingly necessary to achieve the goals of landscape-scale conservation, and they report increased collaboration with indigenous and local communities in conservation of their lands and resources as WWF programs have sought to work across the broader landscape. Indigenous organizations also want increased support for their conservation initiatives. At the same time, power imbalances among actors across larger landscapes mean that special attention and sustained support are required to ensure recognition of indigenous and community rights and ongoing representation in decision-making at a landscape scale.

6. ***WWF support for establishment of government protected areas continues to be a focal area for conflicts, while increasing support for co-management and indigenous and community conserved areas offers new opportunities for collaboration.***

   Two main trends in WWF's protected areas work are support for broader networks of protected areas and support to new governance types including co-managed and community conserved areas. Government protected areas remain a key area of conflict because historical and continuing impacts on lands, livelihoods and cultures. Many indigenous groups emphasize that—while established by government—protected areas are actively supported by international conservation organizations and that therefore WWF and others share responsibility for ensuring that rights are respected in their establishment and management. Attentiveness to the governance contexts within which protected areas are promoted is particularly important in relation to larger-scale networks, to guard against imposition of restrictions on resource access by the people who have traditionally used and claimed those areas. WWF support for indigenous and community conserved areas is growing and generally appreciated, and co-management approaches offer opportunities for collaboration, though many indigenous groups see recognition of territorial rights as a necessary foundation for co-management. Restitution of lands currently in protected areas remains an unresolved issue.

7. ***Experience is emerging on strategies to "scale up" community conservation from site-based work; however, addressing broader policy and institutional contexts remains a key challenge.***

   Emerging WWF program strategies for scaling up community conservation include facilitating lateral linkages across communities, building capacity of support institutions and drawing on field experience to leverage broader policy change. Efforts to scale up livelihoods benefits to communities through market-based approaches have been a particular emphasis within WWF. At the same time, much WWF-supported community conservation remains limited in scale. Externally, WWF is seen to have created innovative models for community-based conservation at particular sites, but without promoting significant policy change in recognition of rights that would

enable scaling up. Staff members expressed interest in capacity-building activities to enable them to engage more effectively in issues related to land tenure and resource rights, governance and scaling up sustainable livelihoods. They also expressed a need for crosscutting analysis and lesson-sharing to build knowledge and support over time.

8. ***Participatory approaches are mainstreamed in WWF programs, but may differ from indigenous expectations for collaboration based on shared decision making.***

   Indigenous peoples' organizations distinguish between "participation" in conservation schemes designed by conservation organizations, government, and others and true collaboration grounded in shared decision-making. They are concerned to improve two-way communication flow and negotiation, have earlier involvement in WWF project and program planning for work in indigenous areas and establish formal agreements or bodies to manage partnerships. Clear decision-making roles and support for participation in landscape governance are emerging needs in relation to large-scale conservation. These issues are linked to indigenous peoples' rights of participation, self-determination and self-governance.

9. ***Territorial, land, and resource rights remain a core issue for WWF to address as a basis for collaboration with indigenous peoples and local communities.***

   It is widely accepted that territory is essential for indigenous peoples to maintain their cultural integrity and identities, and secure tenure is a critical foundation for long-term stewardship of land and resources. Yet many countries do not officially recognize territorial or land rights of indigenous people or the land and resource rights of local communities. In some areas, WWF and indigenous and community groups have established collaborations around efforts to secure tenure and resource rights including through community mapping, land titling, land-use planning and policy-level change. However, land rights were also frequently identified as an area of conflict, especially in relation to protected areas. Indigenous groups are concerned about negative impacts of conservation interventions on land rights, and also want to see WWF doing more proactively to support land rights as a foundation for their collaboration in conservation.

10. ***WWF is often seen as working primarily with government and other "elites," with less attention to alliance building with indigenous peoples' organizations (IPOs) and related civil society interest groups.***

    Indigenous peoples' organizations (IPOs) and their civil society allies are concerned about the broader policy environment affecting their long-term political struggle for human rights, land rights and self-determination. WWF tends to emphasize local projects—many of which are very valuable—but indigenous organizations are looking for political alliances for policy change in relation to their issues of core concern. WWF partnerships with indigenous peoples and local communities have been primarily at a local level; at national levels WWF is often seen as more closely allied with government and other elites, though partnerships with higher-level organizations of indigenous peoples and related civil society interest groups are developing in some areas. While recognizing that agendas will not entirely coincide, there is a need for increased dialogue and engagement to increase understanding of positions, identify areas of mutual concern and avoid or resolve differences in policy positions. The WWF Statement of Principles can serve as a guide for assessing the appropriate role for WWF to play in these cases, including ways WWF can use its influence with government. Alliances also offer opportunities to increase WWF's effectiveness in landscape-level conservation and advocacy on negative environmental impacts.

11. ***Staff members working with indigenous peoples and local communities and with their organizations at various levels feel a need for greater institutional incentives and support for their efforts from WWF.***

    Many staff members would like to see broader definitions of conservation, integrating related indigenous and community concerns, better reflected in institutional incentives, support and communications. They feel that increased integration of people-oriented objectives in goals,

milestones and measures is needed to enhance incentives and recognition for program investment in collaborative approaches. Staff members also request support for crosscutting analysis of the conservation and socioeconomic results of community conservation work, increased investment in technical support and partnerships and increased funding support for community conservation initiatives and to ensure adequate implementation and monitoring of WWF policy principles. Staff members generally expressed interest to remain involved in policy, capacity and learning activities following from the review. The richness and diversity of practice and experience across WWF also highlights the value of cross-program exchanges and peer learning.

12. Communication between WWF and indigenous organizations is often weak.

A key crosscutting concern is communication and relationships—at many levels. Communication was seen as a significant ongoing weakness that hampers the development of positive relationships. Collaboration involves keeping communication paths open to understand different perspectives and to adapt to changing situations as collaboration proceeds. Supportive elements that were identified as needing to be strengthened include hiring of indigenous staff, establishment of regular protocols for sharing information, work with indigenous experts and recommended consultants and designated focal points in WWF for raising issues or opportunities for collaboration.

4.2 Recommendations

This is a critical moment for WWF to take advantage of the opportunities for developing conservation alliances with indigenous and other civil society organizations at multiple levels. Action is needed to bridge differences and pursue opportunities to achieve conservation goals through collaborative efforts. The five recommendations together offer an integrated road map for improving WWF policy and program implementation as they relate to indigenous peoples. Many are also relevant to work with local communities. The recommendations focus especially on actions and capacities at a Network level, while also pointing to needs or follow-up at regional and country levels.

Commitment: "**Openly re-evaluate WWF policy on indigenous peoples and strengthen its enforcement and monitoring mechanisms"**

1. Commit resources for WWF capacity, awareness raising, and consistent implementation and monitoring of the WWF indigenous peoples' policy.

- **Central Network:** Clarify commitment and accountability for policy implementation at a Network level; establish focal point and working group to ensure capacity for policy updating, awareness-raising, implementation support to programs and policy monitoring.
- **Country level:** Make firm country-level commitments to the policy, establish indigenous peoples' focal points in key program/national offices, increase internal awareness and work with indigenous peoples' organizations on how to implement the policy in local contexts.
- **Policy updating:** Review and update policy periodically in relation to new developments; engage in dialogue and increase WWF understanding of emerging issues such as restitution, as a basis for further developing positions or guidance.
- **Monitoring and response:** Establish communication channels for complaints and feedback; and develop a complaints resolution mechanism, working through focal points at different levels to investigate and resolve concerns.

2. Develop WWF policy to address key elements of socially responsible conservation as they relate to local communities.

- **Policy on local communities:** Identify and develop additional policy or statements needed to articulate WWF's approach to work with local communities more broadly, covering positive and negative social impacts of conservation for communities.

Commitment: "**Examine WWF's large-scale conservation programs as they relate to indigenous and local communities to expand support for effective partnership approaches as well as implement changes where necessary"**

3. Integrate community-based and socially responsible approaches more fully into the WWF conservation program.

- **Case work:** Take a deeper look at selected cases to address concerns and opportunities particular to those areas; build capacity and partnerships between relevant indigenous organizations and WWF offices through these cases, and learn lessons jointly.
- **Program planning/management:** Increase analysis of social issues, including social impact, in field program planning, especially for protected areas; build flexibility into program planning/management processes in order to respond to local interests and concerns.
- **Future program opportunities:** Identify and develop opportunities for collaborative work with indigenous peoples in priority large-scale programs, and integrate these into program strategies and results.
- **WWF positions:** Clarify and be prepared to voice stronger positions on issues of importance to indigenous partners; increase collaboration with indigenous organizations in international policy work and partnership activities.
- **Goals and monitoring**: Increase integration of rights and livelihoods-related objectives into institutional goals such as WWF targets/milestones; identify and incorporate relevant indicators in results monitoring.

4. Expand institutional support for partnership approaches with indigenous peoples and local communities, including through increased technical capacity, knowledge sharing, communications and fund-raising.

- **WWF capacity:** Strengthen in-house capacity to deal with social aspects and consequences of conservation including by hiring and better coordinating expertise in relevant social issues. Cultivate more extensive partnerships with organizations with complementary expertise, such as in human rights.
- **Program support**: Increase program support through learning activities, guidance, training, toolkits and advisory services. Key areas include collaborative approaches, land tenure and resource rights, governance (including landscape governance), scaling up livelihoods benefits and scaling up through field-policy links.
- **Community conservation impacts:** Increase cross-analysis and learning on community conservation outcomes; document and disseminate results to governments, international agencies and others to promote linkages among livelihoods, empowerment and conservation goals.
- **Funding:** Ensure that projects include sufficient funding to incorporate implementation of policy principles and good practice standards of collaborative work.

Commitment: **"Listen more closely to the voices of indigenous peoples and ensure their concerns are addressed in design and implementation of WWF field projects"**

5. Increase communication and strengthen partnerships with indigenous peoples' organizations and related civil society groups at country, regional, and international levels.

Increased communication and relationship with indigenous peoples' organizations are a crosscutting recommendation identified as a priority coming out of this review. While requiring

different approaches, increased engagement with civil society groups is also needed. Increased communication is a starting point for addressing several identified needs, including to increase awareness of WWF's policy on indigenous peoples; translate policy principles into locally relevant action; prevent problems and misunderstandings "upstream"; identify areas of mutual interest and opportunities for field program collaboration; share views on policy issues; and identify how positions can be mutually supportive.

- **Improved communication:** Increase flow of communication between WWF and indigenous organizations through designated country focal points, regional and thematic working group members and international focal point; organize meetings of WWF staff members and indigenous peoples' organizations, especially at country and regional levels, to discuss locally specific issues and strategies; seek ongoing feedback on WWF partnership practice.
- **Staffing:** Hire indigenous staff and others—such as indigenous experts and recommended consultants—who know the indigenous world and can facilitate collaboration. Include liaising with indigenous organizations counterparts in job descriptions of relevant staff members, and invest time in building alliances.
- **Improved collaboration**: Explore and develop mechanisms for WWF to link with indigenous organizations and experts on an ongoing basis.
- **Country-level monitoring**: Track indigenous perspectives regarding WWF programs and activities semiannually to enable proactive, adaptive management in response to opportunities and concerns.

Appendix 1: Review Methods and Activities

This paper synthesizes the results of a process to review and learn lessons from WWF policy and large-scale program experience as they relate to indigenous peoples and local communities.

These are the overall guiding questions for the review:

1. What are current strengths of WWF program experience with indigenous peoples and local communities, particularly in the context of scaling up? What are innovative approaches and best practices with potential for broader application?
2. What are current weaknesses in WWF program partnerships with indigenous peoples and local communities, particularly in the context of scaling up? What are constraints to effective partnerships?
3. How and to what extent are WWF policies on indigenous peoples serving as a resource for building effective partnerships and ensuring against negative impacts? What are constraints to the effectiveness of WWF institutional policies?
4. How can weaknesses and constraints to effective partnerships be addressed? How can effective approaches be supported more broadly? How can constraints to WWF policy implementation be addressed?

The review design was developed with advice from an external advisory group with expertise on indigenous peoples and community-based conservation. Members of the advisory group are Peter Brosius, Joji Carino, Johnson Cerda, Marcus Colchester, Ashish Kothari, Alejandra Martin, Samuel Nguiffo and Gonzalo Oviedo. Resource and capacity constraints meant that it was not possible to take up all recommendations of the advisory group; however, key points, especially regarding more in-depth case work, have been incorporated into the recommendations of this report.

This report presents perspectives and insights gathered through the following activities:

- A program survey emailed by Jenny Springer to WWF offices and affiliates. Nineteen responses were received. The survey was designed to gather information and views from WWF staff on program experience working with indigenous and local communities in the context of large-scale conservation, lessons learned and recommendations for improvement. Survey responses – initially proposed for write-up in a separate report – were integrated in this report due to close synergies and overlap with material gathered through other activities.
- Twenty-four interviews conducted with external interviewees (19 by Alcorn and 5 by Springer). These were drawn from a list of candidates recommended by the review's external advisory group, by WWF and by Alcorn. Almost all interviews reflected indigenous and rights perspectives.
- Fifteen interviews conducted with WWF staff members (14 by Springer and one by Alcorn), most with a particular focus on WWF priority large-scale programs and experience relevant to the aims of the review.
- A rapid review of WWF project documents, available grey literature and published literature relevant to specific points.

Analysis and writing were undertaken jointly by the authors, based on the experiences and perspectives shared through these activities. Drafts were reviewed and comments received from the external advisory group and a contact group of WWF staff members, who also provided input to recommendations to management.

Research activities for this report did not include an in-depth study of particular cases. The illustrative examples of WWF's engagement with communities and indigenous peoples, presented in boxes in the report, are not based on case studies. They are meant to illustrate points in the text, reflecting reviewer comments, and are based on limited available information from personal communications with individuals familiar with the projects in question, from project documents and in one case (Cameroon) from a field visit taken by Jenny Springer in the course of other, related work.

The review process was informed by discussions with members of the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (IIFB) at a June 2005 meeting to present and hear feedback on plans for the review. Coordination with the IIFB and the International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests was helpful in developing and contacting the potential list of external interviewees.

Criteria for developing the external list included knowledge of conservation and indigenous issues, expertise in policies on indigenous peoples, familiarity with WWF programs and regional representation. Criteria for internal interviews included expertise and relevant program work, link to priority large-scale programs and regional balance. There was also an element of self-selection in the interviews in that interviewees chose to respond to a request for a telephone interview and scheduled time for the call. In a couple of cases, external interviews were conducted when the opportunity presented itself in the course of other work.

WWF Offices Returning Surveys
Australia, Canada, Cambodia, Central America, Chile, China, Ecuador, Germany, Laos, Mediterranean, Mongolia, Norway, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, South Pacific, Southern Africa, Sweden and Switzerland

WWF Internal Interviewees
Internal interviewees included project staff members, program staff members, and/or country CEO/Directors from the following WWF offices:
Arctic, Australia, Brazil, Cameroon, Central America, Chile, Guianas, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal and United States

External Interviewees
External interviewees included representatives of indigenous peoples' organizations, representatives of government and international agencies funding indigenous peoples' organizations, and NGO staff members from the following countries:
Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Democratic Republic of Congo, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Namibia, Peru, Philippines, Russia and UK

We are very grateful to the interviewees for sharing their time and insights with us.

Appendix 2: Moving Forward Together - WWF Management Response

The review contains five main recommendations that the senior leadership of WWF believes will strengthen our collaboration with indigenous peoples and local communities and enable us to ensure adherence to high standards for that collaboration throughout the WWF conservation programme.

Having carefully reviewed these recommendations WWF endorses and accepts them and commits to the following priority actions to ensure their implementation:

Recommendation # 1: Commit resources needed to increase WWF's capacity to raise awareness and to consistently implement and monitor its indigenous peoples policy across the WWF Network.

The ***WWF Statement of Principles on Indigenous Peoples and Conservation*** is a policy for the whole WWF Network. We are updating the Statement of Principles to reflect recent international policy developments and will reissue it in 2007.

To ensure more effective policy implementation, WWF is taking steps to increase policy oversight and support capacity at field office and Network levels. We have designated an indigenous policy focal point within WWF with responsibility for policy development and updating, coordination of support for monitoring and implementation and broader capacity-building. At a field level, some WWF offices now have focal points or working groups on indigenous issues, and we are establishing these in other relevant offices. Oversight accountability is also being made clear at national levels and within WWF-International.

Through these increased capacities, WWF has begun and will continue to address constraints to policy implementation noted in the review including communication, training, dialogue, adaptation to local contexts and monitoring systems. We have also established a small grants fund to support field office focal points to implement such activities. One priority is to establish a clearer internal system for responding to and resolving any concerns that may be raised to WWF.

To secure the necessary financial resources to implement these actions, we will work with WWF offices to promote investment in WWF core capacities for ongoing social policy development, implementation and monitoring as a priority component of our work. We will also increase mainstreaming of financial needs for policy implementation into proposals for field projects.

Recommendation # 2: Develop WWF policy to address key elements of socially-responsible conservation as they relate to local communities.

Starting in 2007, WWF is initiating work to develop a broader social policy, drawing on our field experience and addressing positive and negative impacts of conservation on local communities.

Recommendation # 3. Integrate community-based and socially-responsible approaches more fully into the WWF conservation programme.

WWF will ensure that best practices regarding socially-oriented approaches to conservation are integrated in our standards for programme and project management. As a first step, we have produced guidelines for fully integrating and implementing the WWF Statement of Principles on Indigenous Peoples and Conservation in our programme management standards. We will also develop and field test guidelines for social impact assessment and monitoring, as a basis for integration in programme management standards.

To support direct implementation, WWF is also ensuring, beginning this year, that specific resources and capacity are in place to support enhanced social safeguards and community partnerships in the

Network's highest priority field programmes, and to share lessons from these experiences for the benefit of other programmes.

WWF is currently developing a new strategy for our global conservation programme, emphasizing links to broader international agendas including poverty reduction. The review provides a timely and important contribution to this effort, in highlighting synergies among conservation, human rights and indigenous issues and how they can be integrated in programme strategies.

Recommendation #4: Expand institutional support for partnership approaches with indigenous peoples and local communities, including through increased technical capacity, knowledge-sharing, communication and fundraising.

Increased integration of socially-oriented approaches in the WWF conservation programme will depend critically on stronger internal capacity and institutional support. Therefore, WWF will strengthen our capacity to address social aspects of conservation by assessing, better coordinating and increasing our in-house expertise.

Recommendation #5: Increase communication and strengthen partnerships with indigenous peoples' organizations and related civil society groups at country, regional and international levels.

WWF views this recommendation as a priority. In the past, such dialogue has been critically important to WWF, helping to inform both WWF's Statement of Principles and our contributions to international policy frameworks such as the World Parks Congress Durban Accord. We expect that establishment of focal points will increase the flow of communication between WWF and indigenous organizations and related civil society groups, helping us to increase mutual understanding, identify shared agendas for field programme and policy partnerships and ensure that any conflicts that may arise are resolved in a timely manner. In addition, we are increasing proactive efforts to cultivate partnerships with organizations, particularly local organizations, with complementary technical expertise on social and indigenous issues. We will also examine capacity needs for partnership development, with particular attention to hiring of indigenous staff.

Because many issues are local or regional in nature, we see country and regional-level meetings as an important means for identifying ways that WWF and indigenous organizations can work together on shared concerns with conservation and indigenous rights. We are supporting and seek to continue to support country and regional-level dialogues on the intersection of indigenous and conservation issues and how WWF, governments and other actors can support collaborative efforts. At an international level, WWF has increased its work on the Convention on Biological Diversity and will continue to support the implementation of Convention's provisions on indigenous peoples, their knowledge, innovations and practices and on the equitable sharing of benefits arising from such knowledge, innovations and practices.

NOTES

[1] *World Watch Magazine*. January/February 2005. Vol. 18, No. 1: 6-7.

[2] Oviedo, G., L. Maffi, and P. B. Larsen. 2000. *Indigenous and Traditional Peoples of the World and Ecoregion Conservation*. Gland, Switzerland: WWF International.

[3] Gertrud Bjørning and Elisabeth Kiørboe. eds. 2005. *Integrating Indigenous and Gender Aspects in Natural Resource Management, Guidelines for Practitioners*. Gland, Switzerland: WWF, IWGIA, KULU, Nepenthes, and DIIS.

[4] Larson, P. S., M. Freudenberger, and B. Wyckoff-Baird. 1998. *WWF Integrated Conservation and Development Projects: Ten Lessons from the Field 1985–1996*. Washington, DC: WWF.

[5] Jeanrenaud, Sally. 2002. *People-Oriented Approaches in Global Conservation: Is the Leopard Changing Its Spots?* London: IIED and IDS.

[6] Weber, Ron, John Butler, and Patty Larson, eds. 2000. *Indigenous Peoples and Conservation Organizations: Experiences in Collaboration*. Washington, DC: WWF.

[7] For example, a 2002 study (White, Andy and Alejandra Martin. 2002. *Who Owns the World's Forests? Forest Tenure and Public Forests in Transition.* Washington, DC: Forest Trends and Center for International Environmental Law) found that in developing countries, community-owned and -administered forests totaled at least 377 million hectares, or at least 22 percent of all forests—three times as much forest as is owned by industry or individuals. The study also showed that the area owned and administered by communities doubled between 1985 and 2000 and is expected to at least double again to 700 million–800 million hectares, reflecting strong demands on governments to recognize community property rights and devolve forest management.

[8] Copies of the policies were circulated to interviewees (in English, French, and Spanish) as background. Not all interviewees read or commented on the content of policies in detail.

[9] Griffiths, Tom. 2003. *A Failure of Accountability: Indigenous Peoples, Human Rights and Development Agency Standards.* Moreton-in-Marsh, U.K.: Forest Peoples Programme.

[10] Alcorn, Janis. "Dances Around the Fire: Conservation Organizations and Community-Based Resource Management" in Brosius, J.P., Tsing, A.L. and Zerner, C., eds. 2005. *Communities and Conservation: Histories and Politics of Community-Based Natural Resource Management*. Lanham, Md.: Alta Mira Press.

[11] It is important to note that understandings of particular situations are preliminary. Recommendations to establish ongoing capacity to understand specific situations through external monitoring and program learning mechanisms are included in the recommendations section.

[12] Loucks, C., J. Springer, S. Palminteri, J. Morrison, and H. Strand. 2004. *From the Vision to the Ground: A Guide to Implementing Ecoregion Conservation in Priority Areas.* Washington, DC: WWF.

[13] WWF International. March 2006. *Species and People: Linked Futures*. Gland, Switzerland: WWF International.

[14] This was one lesson from integrated conservation and development projects identified in Larson, P. S., M. Freudenberger, and B. Wyckoff-Baird. 1998.

[15] Colchester, Marcus. 2003. *Salvaging Nature: Indigenous Peoples, Protected Areas and Biodiversity Conservation.* Montevideo, Uruguay and Moreton-in-Marsh, U.K.: World Rainforest Movement and Forest Peoples Programme.

[16] Schmidt-Soltau, K. July 2005. Gabon – Forest and Environment Sector (PSFE) Project: resettlement policy framework and resettlement process framework. World Bank, Forest and Environment Sector (PSFE) Project; Schmidt-Soltau, K. July 2005. Gabon – Forest and Environment Sector (GEF) Project: indigenous peoples development plan. World Bank, Forest and Environment Sector (PSFE) Project.

[17] WWF International. August 2003. *WWF Position Paper: Protected Areas.* Gland, Switzerland: WWF International.

[18] WWF International. June 2004. *Are Protected Areas Working? An Analysis of Forest Protected Areas by WWF*. Gland, Switzerland: WWF International.

[19] Box 2 draws on information from Tongson, Edgardo and Thomas McShane. 2004. *Securing Land Tenure for Biodiversity Conservation in Sibuyan Island, Romblon, Philippines*. Helsinki, Finland: EGDI and UNU-WIDER.

[20] WWF species policy does recognize aboriginal whale hunting rights.

[21] Approximately 2-4 percent for WWF-US in fiscal year 2006; this number is based on audited revenues.

[22] These points echo the findings of a previous WWF study of lessons learned from WWF experience collaborating with indigenous peoples: Weber, Ron, John Butler, and Patty Larson, eds. 2000. *Indigenous Peoples and Conservation Organizations: Experiences in Collaboration*. Washington, DC: WWF.

Photo Credits:

Left to right, top to bottom: Seri girl from the Comca'ac culture in Sonora, Gulf of California, Mexico © WWF-Canon / Gustavo Ybarra; Yakut woman and man, Siberian Coastal Tundra, Republic of Sakha, Russian Federation © WWF-Canon / Hartmut Jungius; Fisherman on a river shore hanging nets up to dry in the late sun, Morehead district, Western Province, Papua New Guinea © Brent Stirton / Getty Images / WWF-UK; BaAka woman, Central African Republic © WWF-Canon / Martin Harvey; Kenyah Dayak woman gathering medicinal plants, Kayan Mentarang East Kalimantan, Indonesia © WWF-Canon / Alain Compost; Amahuaca man and grandson, Ucayali, Peru © WWF-Canon /André Bärtschi.

Funding

This publication is made possible by the generous support of the Ford Foundation and the WWF Network.

WWF International

Av. du Mont-Blanc
CH-1196 Gland
Switzerland

Telephone: +41 22 364 9111
Fax: +41 22 364 0640

Website: www.panda.org

WWF US

1250 24th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
USA

Telephone: +1 202 293 9211
Fax: +1 202 293 9211

Website: www.worldwildlife.org