



DRG LEARNING, EVALUATION, RESEARCH (DRG-LER) II ACTIVITY

USAID POLICY ON PROMOTING THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES: LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS

September 2021

Prepared under Contract No.: GS-10F-0033M / 7200AA18M00016, Tasking N041

DRG LEARNING, EVALUATION, AND RESEARCH ACTIVITY II

USAID POLICY ON PROMOTING THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES: LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS

SEPTEMBER 2021

Prepared under Contract No.: GS-10F-0033M /7200AA18M00016, Tasking N041

Submitted to:

Brandy Witthoft, USAID COR

Submitted by:

Ron Wendt, Jessica Wallach, Mayumi Rezwan, Phoebe Bui, Sarah Siddiqui, Kareem Kysia,

Contractor:

NORC at the University of Chicago
4350 East West Highway, 8th Floor
Bethesda, MD 20814
Attention: Matthew Parry
Tel: 301-634-5444; E-mail: Parry-Matthew@norc.org

DISCLAIMER

The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES	II
ACRONYMS	III
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	IV
I. OVERVIEW AND OBJECTIVES	I
II. METHODS AND APPROACH	2
DESK REVIEW	2
OPERATING UNIT OUTREACH	4
LIMITATIONS	5
III. FINDINGS	5
STREAM 1A: REVIEW OF PUBLICLY AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS ON PROJECT ACTIVITIES	5
STREAM 1B: REVIEW OF PUBLICLY AVAILABLE USAID SOLICITATIONS	31
STREAM 2: SAMPLE OF OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS' AND DONORS' POLICIES	36
STREAM 3: PUBLICATIONS FROM INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' ORGANIZATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS FOCUSED ON INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' DEVELOPMENT	44
IV. CONCLUSIONS	53
ANNEX A. LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS OUTLINE	55
ANNEX B. METHODS AND LIMITATIONS	73
ANNEX C. SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE	91
ANNEX D. SOURCES OF INFORMATION	97

TABLES

Table 1: Landscape analysis Overview.....	2
Table 2: Operating Units selected for semi-structured interviews	5
Table 3: Sample of “Stand Alone” Programs.....	6
Table 4: International Organizations’ and Donors’ Policies	36

ACRONYMS

AIPP	Asian Indigenous People's Pact
CDCS	Country Development Cooperation Strategy
DEC	Development Experience Clearinghouse
DRG-LER	Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance Learning, Evaluation, and Research
FPIC	Free, Prior, and Informed Consent
GBV	Gender Based Violence
IDA	Inclusive Development Analysis
IP	Indigenous Peoples
IPACC	Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee
IPLC	Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities
IWGIA	International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs
NSWALC	New South Wales Aboriginal Land Council
OUs	Operating Units
PRO-IP	Policy on Promoting the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
RDCS	Regional Development Cooperation Strategy
SIA	Social Inclusion Analysis
SSIs	Semi-Structured Interviews
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

NORC conducted a landscape analysis of over 200 USAID documents and solicitations and conducted semi-structured interviews with 16 Operating Units (OUs) to build an internal knowledge base and analysis framework on how OUs are including Indigenous Peoples into development activities. NORC also reviewed seven relevant policies of bilateral and multilateral donors and 14 publications from Indigenous Peoples' organizations to compare USAID's Policy on Promoting the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (PRO-IP) to policies of other donor and Indigenous Peoples' organizations. This report summarizes the results of this analysis. NORC will use the findings of the landscape analysis to inform the next phase of its work: the development of learning of tools and frameworks to continue monitoring the extent of Indigenous Peoples' integration into USAID's portfolios in the future.

Findings from the review of USAID activities reveal mixed results in implementing the PRO-IP's objectives and operating principles. It was clear that Operating Unit (OU) staff are working hard to adapt and apply the policy, but face numerous barriers that are often specific to their region or context. NORC found that Indigenous Peoples' concerns across sectors and portfolios were commonly considered with written analyses conducted at the beginning of activities, and generally, programs consistently and successfully identified, partnered with, and supported the work of Indigenous Peoples' organizations. However, depth of engagement and communication with Indigenous Peoples (Objective 1 of PRO-IP) varied greatly depending on the nature and objective of the activity or program. Across all types of programs there was a gap observed in the standardization and documentation of processes to: identify Indigenous Peoples within the context of the relevant geographic zone, establish rules of engagement, engage with Indigenous Peoples through every stage of the program cycle, and distinguish unique impacts and considerations of Indigenous Peoples' rights separate from those of other social groups and populations of interest.

Objective 2 of PRO-IP promotes the integration of Indigenous Peoples' concerns across USAID sectors and portfolios, involving the standardization of tools and approaches to assessing Indigenous Peoples concerns and planning to address them. NORC found, in general, the specific tools outlined in the PRO-IP such as Social Inclusion Analysis (SIA) or Inclusive Development Analysis (IDA) were not being used in projects. While OU staff clearly recognized the importance of conducting analyses to understand equity concerns and identify risks, they sometimes were not aware of PRO-IP tools, or found that other existing tools were better suited to their specific context. Pre-existing tools like Political Economy Analyses or Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) analyses that are similar in scope and purpose were more consistently used. However, with these tools, Indigenous Peoples are often considered as one category in a list of 'vulnerable populations', when they should be considered separately since they can refuse development activities if their right to free, prior, and informed consent is respected. Additionally, there were deeply rooted challenges with labelling populations as indigenous in Africa and Asia due to political sensitivities in these regions.

In terms of empowerment for Indigenous Peoples (Objective 3 of PRO-IP), projects were highly aligned with the PRO-IP guidance to partner closely with Indigenous Peoples' organizations, but there were consistent challenges with capacity building to allow these organizations to meet USAID's reporting and administrative requirements. This was part of why NORC found a trend in smaller-scale grants for any direct funding to Indigenous Peoples; larger scale direct funds were very rare and concentrated in certain regions and sectors.

Trends in monitoring, evaluation and learning (key to fostering an enabling environment as guided by Objective 3 of the PRO-IP) indicate that while many programs include Indigenous Peoples in their indicator frameworks, a majority of program indicators disaggregate program outcomes by Indigenous Peoples in the same manner as other social groups. We observed that these monitoring frameworks did not often present the criteria of who is considered Indigenous in order to accurately measure outcomes, did not clearly document Indigenous Peoples' own definition or determination of outcome "achievement", and did not always measure the quality of engagement with Indigenous Peoples.

Objective 4 of the PRO-IP focuses on improving the enabling environment for Indigenous Peoples and their organizations to advocate for their rights and promotes activities to reform or improve domestic legal frameworks. NORC found that many projects included analysis of domestic legal frameworks surrounding Indigenous Peoples as either background research or part of the USAID Gender Equity and Social Inclusion analysis. However, in terms of project activities to reform these frameworks, there were few projects that had activities specifically aimed at enacting policy change or increasing knowledge on legal rights, and they tended to be "stand alone" projects clustered in specific regions and sectors.

In terms of solicitations, NORC found that most OUs are not fully incorporating PRO-IP guidance in their solicitation process or evaluation criteria. However, this general trend masks high levels of variability between OUs and regions. NORC found that direct funding opportunities are increasing, but these are for small grants generally. While many of the solicitations had language around general capacity building activities (Objective 3 of the PRO-IP), only two included language on offering capacity building assistance to help Indigenous Peoples compete for and manage direct funding from USAID.

NORC's review of other organizations' policies for engaging with Indigenous Peoples revealed that the PRO-IP was largely congruent with other organizations' guidance. However, differences included specific guidance in relation to obtaining free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), compensation to Indigenous Peoples when land or access to resources are impacted, sharing learnings and data, and mechanisms of redress for grievances. NORC also reviewed publications from Indigenous Peoples organizations and found that they often call for more participatory approaches than what is mandated by USAID. While these publications generally line up with the objectives and priorities of PRO-IP, they also raise several concerns about permission to consult, discrepancy among government sectors, difficulty in meeting donor requirements, and recognizing historical failures.

I. OVERVIEW AND OBJECTIVES

Under the Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance Learning, Evaluation, and Research (DRG-LER) II Activity, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has requested NORC to build an internal knowledge base and analysis framework on how USAID's Operating Units (OUs) are including Indigenous Peoples into development activities. In order to ultimately develop learning tools and frameworks to monitor and evaluate the extent of Indigenous Peoples' integration in USAID's portfolios, NORC is carrying out the work in four stages:

Stage 1: Review USAID's current documented activities and policies with Indigenous Peoples

Stage 2: Draft framework of indicators and learning questions

Stage 3: Pilot indicator framework through country data portraits

Stage 4: Develop annual survey tool to track longitudinal change

This report presents findings at the end of Stage 1 activities, with the intended purpose to inform the design and implementation of the subsequent stages.

This landscape analysis is largely centered around USAID's Policy on Promoting the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (PRO-IP). The PRO-IP was released by USAID in March 2020 as an effort to correct the historical trend of informing rather than including Indigenous Peoples in decisions and activities that may impact them. The Policy's aim is to ensure that "...each USAID project and activity that affects the lives, territories, resources, and/or livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples engages them directly and meaningfully in its design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation," which will strengthen the design and management of Agency-funded programs to achieve the ultimate goal of benefiting Indigenous Peoples in the most effective way. PRO-IP is supplemented by USAID's sector specific guidelines, which provide practical tools in the form of case studies, resources, and best practices for USAID programs that affect Indigenous Peoples. The Policy's goal is reflected by its four objectives:

1. Strengthen engagement with Indigenous Peoples to safeguard against harm and support their development priorities and self-reliance
 2. Increase the integration of Indigenous Peoples' concerns across all sectors of USAID's portfolio of investments and promote cross-sectoral development approaches
 3. Empower Indigenous Peoples and their representative organizations to advocate for, and exercise, their rights and practice self-determined development
 4. Foster an enabling environment for Indigenous Peoples to advocate for and exercise their rights
- Further, the Policy identifies five operating principles that will assist OUs to achieve the objectives:
5. Identify Indigenous Peoples;
 6. Analyze Indigenous Peoples' Opportunities and Challenges;
 7. Engage Indigenous Peoples;
 8. Safeguard Indigenous Peoples' Rights and Well-being; and
 9. Establish Partnerships with Indigenous Peoples.

Guided by these objectives and operating principles, the research team extracted and analyzed themes, trends, and points of interest related to the integration of Indigenous Peoples in current USAID programming through review of USAID documents as well as interviews with USAID OUs. Additionally, the research team analyzed USAID’s PRO-IP in relation to policies and programming of other international donors and organizations, as well those of Indigenous Peoples’ organizations and organizations focused on Indigenous People’s development, to identify convergences and gaps in USAID’s approach to the integration of Indigenous Peoples. The analysis components and corresponding sources of information are summarized in Table 1:

Table 1: Landscape analysis Overview

ANALYSIS COMPONENT	INFORMATION STREAMS	
	DESK REVIEW	OU OUTREACH
CURRENT USAID PROGRAMMING AND PROCESSES	<u>Stream 1A</u> : USAID documentation of programs and activities <u>Stream 1B</u> : USAID solicitations	Interviews with USAID OU staff
USAID POLICIES IN RELATION TO OTHER DONORS AND ORGANIZATIONS	<u>Stream 2</u> : Sample of other international organizations’ and donors’ policies and programs	
USAID POLICIES IN RELATION TO INDIGINEOUS PEOPLES ORGANIZATIONS	<u>Stream 3</u> : Sample of Indigenous Peoples’ organizations’ policies and programs	

II. METHODS AND APPROACH

DESK REVIEW

To conduct a structured review of relevant documents, the research team developed a search strategy and descriptive framework to guide the three streams of desk review.

The central source to retrieve information for Stream 1A was USAID’s Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC). To retrieve the most relevant and informative documents for our purpose, we collaborated closely with our Indigenous Peoples subject-matter expert, Carolyn Stephens, to develop a list of key search terms, which included variations and context-specific terms used to refer to Indigenous Peoples (see Appendix A). Additionally, documents in the DEC search were restricted to a publication date between October 2019 and December 2020. The search terms and time frame were shared with USAID as part of NORC’s Landscape Analysis Outline, which was approved by USAID in March 2021. The search terms in the DEC within the timeframe yielded an initial result of 529 documents. In order to narrow our documents to those related to specific USAID projects or programs, we excluded documents that did not have a contract or agreement number associated to its metadata. We then underwent an initial review of the documents to screen for relevance. To do so, we evaluated the frequency of and content surrounding the search term to determine relevance to our analytical points of interest. This stage of review also included another round of consultation with our subject-matter expert to clarify any ambiguous or unclear applications of the search terms as they appeared in the DEC documents. A full description of search terms can be found in Annex A. Our list of search terms does

not exhaustively cover the multiple ways that Indigenous Peoples groups are described, both across OUs and generally.

To analyze documents from the DEC, we developed a codeframe based on the Landscape Analysis Outline submitted previously. The codeframe is structured around the PRO-IP objectives, under which particular points of interest, including operating principles and use of tools and resources mentioned in the Policy, are integrated as sub-codes. The final codeframe, found in Appendix B, was then uploaded into Dedoose qualitative analysis software. To review the breadth of relevant DEC documents, we adapted a variation on summative content analysis,¹ only coding content surrounding our search terms of interests within documents. For our analysis, 162 documents from the DEC were reviewed and coded in full.

The research team also searched past solicitations on sam.gov and grants.gov to ascertain whether USAID's solicitations issued in FY2020 after the release of the PRO-IP include the PRO-IP's suggestions for strengthening USAID programming for Indigenous Peoples. These suggestions, as they relate to solicitations, include requiring a plan for developing mitigation measures in consultation with Indigenous Peoples themselves and requiring applicants to submit their Indigenous Peoples Policy, among others.

The searches of these two online solicitation repositories resulted in an initial gathering of 356 records, 159 from sam.gov and 197 from grants.gov. The research excluded documents outside of the date range of 10/1/2019 - 12/31/2020, and removed duplicates within the result of each repository, resulting in 47 eligible documents from sam.gov and 31 from grants.gov. After de-duplication of documents between the two repositories, and further screening to exclude solicitations with no files attached or with files attached that fell outside of the date range, 44 total solicitations met eligibility requirements. Of the 44 coded solicitations, NORC categorized solicitations into three groups depending on the activity's relevance to Indigenous Peoples:

1. Directly relevant: If it was clear after reviewing the solicitation that the activity explicitly identified Indigenous Peoples populations as direct activity beneficiaries (i.e., there are objectives and results that are related to Indigenous Peoples and their welfare)
2. Possibly relevant: If, after reviewing the solicitation, the activity either explicitly identified Indigenous Peoples populations but did not specify them as direct beneficiaries, or identified a population that might be Indigenous given the description in combination with the geographical/sector focus (e.g. "youth who are living in communities bordering protected areas and conservancies")
3. Not relevant: If, after reviewing the solicitation, the activity does not identify any Indigenous Peoples population.

The directly or possibly relevant solicitations were then thematically coded and analyzed to assess the extent that they included PRO-IP's suggestions for strengthening USAID programming for Indigenous Peoples.

In addition to reviewing USAID's activities with Indigenous Peoples, the research team also conducted a scan of international donors' work on integrating these issues into their own programs as part of Stream 2. This review included multilateral donors such as the World Bank and United Nations, and bilateral

¹ Hsieh H-F, Shannon SE. Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*. 2005;15(9):1277-1288. doi:10.1177/1049732305276687 <https://journals-sagepub-com.proxy.uchicago.edu/doi/pdf/10.1177/1049732305276687>

donors such as DFAT, Canada’s Department of Foreign Affairs, and the Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office. Finally, the Stream 3 review included publicly available documentation from Indigenous Peoples’ organizations and organizations focused on Indigenous Peoples’ development, such as IWGIA, AIPP, DOCIP, and Sotz’il. As with Stream I, the team analyzed documents in Streams 2 and 3 based points of interest in the Landscape Analysis Outline (see Appendix A).

OPERATING UNIT OUTREACH

Since NORC’s searches of publicly available documents could not be fully comprehensive and include all relevant project activities, particularly due to differences in terminologies used to refer to Indigenous Peoples between OUs and the incomplete nature of the DEC, NORC also conducted direct outreach to a subset of USAID OUs. Operating Units for outreach were selected based on the findings of our initial document review as well as consultations with USAID and with our subject matter expert. This subset was chosen to include OUs from a diverse selection of regions to help us understand geographic trends. NORC focused on OUs that have active Indigenous Peoples portfolios, as well as those where there are substantial activities that are likely to include Indigenous Peoples as part of the target beneficiary population or that have considered or included Indigenous Peoples as partners.

In collaboration with USAID, NORC worked with primary points of contacts at these OUs to schedule and conduct semi-structured interviews (SSIs) lasting approximately 45 minutes. See Annex C for the full SSI Guide. The purpose of these interviews was to complement and validate the information gathered from the review of publicly available documents, as well as highlight considerations that would have been outside the scope of NORC searches due to differences in terminologies used to refer to Indigenous Peoples. As such, the questions asked examined how OUs were identifying, interacting with and partnering with Indigenous Peoples, organized by PRO-IP objective, and then how much they had been exposed to and able to integrate PRO-IP guidance into their activities.

Interviews were conducted remotely in English and recorded. Detailed notes were then taken on the recordings, and NORC followed up with the points of contact for additional information about specific projects, data, or indicators mentioned during the interviews.

The following 16 OUs were selected for SSIs:

Table 2: Operating Units selected for semi-structured interviews

Washington (Senior Policy Specialist who worked on PRO-IP)	Democratic Republic of the Congo
Paraguay	South Africa
Peru	Kenya
Ecuador	Zambia
Guatemala	Mali
Brazil	Nepal
Colombia	India
Cambodia (2 SSIs: Environmental Sector and Democracy, Human Rights and Governance Sector)	The Philippines

The analysis of these interviews is integrated into NORC’s analysis of publicly available documents from the Development Experience Clearinghouse.

LIMITATIONS

Our review, while including all relevant documents from the DEC for the period of interest, is limited by the documentation available for review. As such, projects or reports that were not included in the DEC, and were not captured through our SSIs, are not considered in our findings.

The review was also limited by the level of detail available in the documents on topics related to the integration of Indigenous Peoples. This is expected as the documents reviewed were not prepared specifically to speak to USAID’s PRO-IP. To fill in these gaps, the research team collected additional details through SSIs. However, conducting SSIs with all OUs was outside the scope of this review and so some gaps may still remain. The lack of details in reports, however, should not be considered as conclusive evidence that the recommendations of the PRO-IP were not followed by these projects. We have analyzed the data available with this in mind and have framed our conclusions accordingly.

III. FINDINGS

STREAM IA: REVIEW OF PUBLICLY AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS ON PROJECT ACTIVITIES

OBJECTIVE 1: STRENGTHEN ENGAGEMENT WITH INDIGENOUS PEOPLES TO SAFEGUARD AGAINST HARM AND SUPPORT THEIR DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES AND SELF-RELIANCE.

Objective 1 of the PRO-IP is to “strengthen engagement with Indigenous Peoples to safeguard against harm and support their development priorities and self-reliance.” In order to achieve this objective, Operating Principle 3 emphasizes that OUs should “engage with Indigenous Peoples to understand their aspirations, priorities, capacities, and preferred approaches...not only to enable us to identify potential risks, but also to ensure that our design of projects and activities more directly targets their needs.”

ACROSS PROGRAM TYPES AND LIFECYCLE

Our review of USAID activities suggests that programs and activities do tend to distinctly fall into the two categories of programs as described in the PRO-IP: “Stand-alone” programs that aim to directly address the concerns of Indigenous Peoples, and “integrated” interventions, incorporating consideration of Indigenous Peoples across all programs. Table 2 displays a sample of activities identified as stand-alone programs by the review team, for which related documents explicitly identified Indigenous Peoples as target partners or that centered on Indigenous Peoples’ rights and concerns. Consequently, we observed deep and direct engagement often among such programs and OUs, where it was common to see multiple instances and detailed descriptions of engagement specifically with Indigenous Peoples.

A variety of direct engagement activities and communications with Indigenous Peoples and organizations were mentioned across a range of programs and activities through avenues such as KIs, focus groups, direct observations, meetings, forums:

US Ambassador W. Patrick Murphy **met with about 30 Indigenous activists** in Peak Village, Ya Tung Commune, Ou Ya Dav District in Ratanak Kiri province to discuss their efforts to hold a gold mining company accountable for mitigating damage inflicted by the company. (PA-00X-5BX Cambodia)

During this activity, the ECS collected baseline information pertaining to environmental and social aspects through personal observations and **collecting indigenous knowledge** by consulting/meeting local community. (PA-00W-KMC Pakistan)

To better understand existing value chains and exploring potential collaborations, the Enterprise Development Specialist consulted Kerala State Federation of SC/ST Development Co-operatives Ltd. – **an Apex Cooperative Federation of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes** primary co-operative societies in the State of Kerala and gathered information on existing value chains.” (PA-00X-59Z India)

Conversely, we observed a majority of “integrated” interventions for which consultation with Indigenous Peoples or consideration of the impact to Indigenous Peoples was largely mentioned within the same context as several vulnerable or special populations of interest rather than directly focusing on this group.

Table 3: Sample of “Stand Alone” Programs

PROGRAM/ACTIVITY	USAID OU	DESCRIPTION
The Amazon Indigenous Rights and Resources Activity (AIRR)	USAID/Colombia	AIRR encourages Indigenous Peoples’ participation in the sustainable economic development of the Amazon to preserve biodiversity and reduce CO2 emissions caused by forest loss
The Forest Alliance	USAID/Peru	The Forest Alliance works in seven Indigenous communities to provide technical assistance to Indigenous communities by fostering a Community Forest Management (CFM) approach

PROGRAM/ACTIVITY	USAID OU	DESCRIPTION
Green Annamites	USAID/Vietnam	Green Annamites supports the provinces of Thua Thien Hue and Quang Nam to protect the region's globally significant biodiversity and help local and ethnic minority communities to diversify and improve their livelihoods
Green Future	USAID/Cambodia	The Green Future Activity aims to mobilize communities to conserve biodiversity and protect natural resources by collaborating with a wide range of partners, including women, youth, and Indigenous groups, and civil society organizations (CSOs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and government bodies with environment-related mandates.

While there are various examples of direct engagement with Indigenous Peoples or organizations in the DEC documents, it was unclear whether programs were engaging Indigenous Peoples at all stages of the program cycle as guided by the Pro-IP, and whether engagements were designed to be one-time or ongoing through the project lifecycle. However, in an SSI, **DRC OU respondents** indicated their observation that newer programs in their OU have generally been starting consultation processes earlier in the program cycle, a reflection of lessons learned from shortcomings of prior engagements. Particularly, it is more common now for consultations with Indigenous Peoples to begin as soon as a program or idea is pitched, as opposed to older projects where a consultation may not have occurred until after a proposal was already released. A similar trend was observed by **Colombia OU respondents**, who indicated that starting in 2018, there was a significant shift in the way of doing business towards having direct relationships with ethnic communities.

Indigenous Preferences in Engagement Processes Our review of documents revealed differences in the specific processes to set up engagements with Indigenous Peoples, including whether Indigenous Peoples or organizations were able to express their preferences and rules of engagement. Our SSIs revealed that it was common for the first line of communication to start with Indigenous leadership. For example, our key informant at the **South Africa OU** noted that the mission learned from their Indigenous Peoples advisors to ensure that discussions followed the way Indigenous Peoples organize themselves. In their example, it was specifically important that discussions were led by Indigenous leadership, and next steps respected hierarchal processes and preferences. Moreover, the experience of **OU respondents in Cambodia** demonstrated that it is not always effective to immediately engage at the community and village-level because of concerns with trust and safety; instead, engaging directly with community leaders allowed for them, in turn, to work and communicate directly with their communities in a trusted environment.

LANGUAGE

Our review of DEC documents indicate that OUs are largely addressing and mitigating language barriers when directly engaging with Indigenous Peoples, whether during consultation processes or during dissemination of materials, as demonstrated below:

...to this end, the Justice Project held a virtual meeting with the director of the Institute, agreeing to ... **publish a legal glossary in indigenous languages for legal interpreters.** (PA-00X-3GR Guatemala)

...develop gender sensitive learning materials, including those appropriate for **those with low literacy and those who speak indigenous languages.** (PA-00W-JCQ Cambodia)

PMA also adapts its technical information and training materials for clients with varying reading proficiencies and **in indigenous languages to ensure no one is unable to access our methodology.** (PA-00X-3PR Colombia).

However, it was not always clear in instances of translation how languages were identified and whether they were comprehensive to equitably meet the needs of all groups of Indigenous Peoples within the project geography. Notably, the example below of rationale of language choices demonstrates the importance and impact of thoughtful consideration of the linguistic makeup of partners:

This followed the water messages produced in Year 2, in **eight indigenous languages.** The increase in languages included in the radio spot production corresponds to the project municipality expansion (15 additional municipalities, totaling 44 under project coverage) ... By recognizing the **unique linguistic makeup of each municipality, the project is ensuring proper and culturally sensitive messaging to achieve wider impact.** (PA-00W-C84 Guatemala)

Our SSIs were also informative on the process of addressing language barriers, as most of our informants mentioned the general availability of translators, though needs and considerations vary across contexts. For example, **OU respondents in Paraguay** noted that most communication can usually be done in the Indigenous language, Guarani, as it is commonly spoken by a majority of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations in the country. On the other hand, **OU respondents in South Africa** noted that language and translation could highly depend on the context: in one locale, meetings held in a singular local language may be appropriate, while in another in which there are multiple local languages, a combination of languages spoken in common such as Zulu, Afrikaans and English are more often used.

MULTIPLE APPROACHES TO ENGAGEMENT

The DEC review showed that a several programs recognized that different approaches to engagement were pertinent to address populations that face multiple barriers, especially to address barriers that affect Indigenous women and youth:

Discussions with local women have shown that they have more confidence when they are in **settings where they are able to speak in their indigenous languages and where there are only women.** (PA-00W-JCQ Cambodia)

Another common theme we observed through our DEC review was using a variety of modes of communication to reach and communicate with wider audiences of Indigenous Peoples, which included audio, radio, video, and other forms of media:

Other tools mentioned included storytelling, demonstrations, the Pink Book, pictorial counseling cards, and videos that were praised for ease of use, comprehensiveness, and utility in breaking down language barriers for indigenous populations and illiterate individuals... Video was also noted as the most effective tool for ensuring that training quality does not get diluted through the cascade training approach. (PA-00W-7VW Laos)

The radio drama series is a good opportunity to incorporate local and indigenous knowledge regarding coastal issues, challenges, and solutions. (PA-00W-F5R West Africa)

In response, the youth produced a weekly video to generate recommendations on anxiety management, protective measures, promoting self-employment or businesses and coping strategies related to the COVID-19 pandemic. (PA-00X-616 Nicaragua)

OU respondents in the DRC noted that key aspects to their engagement with Indigenous Peoples were to offer repeated exposure, multiple opportunities, and a variety of environments to foster comfort, safety, and trust for Indigenous Peoples to meaningfully participate in and inform program design. For example, the range of engagements for an activity in Salonga National Park included the following: a first meeting with Indigenous Peoples with only Congolese USAID staff; another with all USAID staff and Indigenous leaders within their “home base;” and finally an offer for anybody from the Indigenous community who was interested, within protected space in the park with park rangers and authorities present so members felt protected and safe.

OU respondents in India also mentioned multi-sectoral and intersectional approaches, noting an example where a member of a tribal village once lamented the assumption that “all tribal communities are poor.” In this case, it was important to consider disparate dimensions of marginalization within tribal communities: that even in wealthy tribal communities, women may express not having their health needs met.

While it is encouraging to see many OUs address intersectionality in their engagement as well as the need to address the compounding of multiple barriers, there were many documents for which details on what these barriers are, and how they would be addressed, were not observed. Instead, they mentioned general statements on recognizing the need to keep “vulnerable groups” in mind. For example, from our review it was especially difficult to observe detailed programs or targeted actions to address barriers to engage Indigenous Peoples who have disabilities.

OBJECTIVE 2: INTEGRATING IP CONCERNS ACROSS USAID PORTFOLIOS AND SECTORS

Objective two aims to increase the integration of Indigenous Peoples’ concerns across all sectors of USAID’s portfolio of investments and promote cross-sectoral development approaches. From the DEC documents, we can see how projects across geographic regions and sectors are starting to integrate the guidance of the PRO-IP in their activities, in particular through the use of USAID tools, risk identification strategies, and methods of identifying Indigenous Peoples.

USE OF PRO-IP TOOLS

While few projects in the DEC explicitly mentioned using the tools from PRO-IP (Social Impact Assessments or SIAs, Inclusive Development Analyses or IDAs, and the USAID Consultation Handbook), many still conducted analyses of social inclusion for their projects that were similar in scope and focus to these tools. In particular, requirements on gender analyses often encompassed the inclusion of marginalized populations generally. Towards this end, the category of Indigenous was often included alongside other vectors of marginalization such as youth, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex (LGBTQI+) people, or peoples affected by conflict. This is reflective of the general approach to “integrated projects” described above; in which Indigenous Peoples are mentioned as part of a wider group of vulnerable populations but whose specific and unique concerns are not focused on or addressed. The most common tool used to assess impacts on Indigenous Peoples across geographic regions was the Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) tool. Another tool used that was similar in scope and focus to those of the PRO-IP was the Applied Political Economy Analysis used for the project, “Strengthening the Capacity of Indigenous Organizations in the Amazon –SCIOA” (PA-00X-B6H Suriname; Peru; Guyana; Colombia; Brazil). **OU respondents in the Philippines** also mentioned using political economy analysis; they were familiar with the tools in the PRO-IP and explained that if Applied Political Economy Analysis is done robustly and with enough time and funding to go in-depth, this tool can fulfill exactly the same purposes as the SIAs and IDAs in the PRO-IP.

An example of GESI tools being used to consider the needs of IP’s is the Laos Microenterprise project (PA-00X-78V Laos), which used the term ‘ethnic minority groups’ to refer to Indigenous Peoples: “The GESI used both qualitative and quantitative information to identify gender and social inclusion gaps that would limit participation and benefits for men, women, PWDs [persons with disabilities] and ethnic minority groups in the Activity.” The GESI assessment involved key informant interviews, focus group discussions, desk research, and observations with “relevant stakeholders in agriculture and livestock.”

While these kinds of GESI analyses are important, the category of “Indigenous” is markedly different from other categories of marginalization. Moreover, there are benefits to considering it separately when projects conduct analyses for inclusive development or social impacts. In some contexts, Indigenous Peoples are unique rights holders with legally recognized tenure rights over land, territories, natural resources, sovereignty and self-determination. Thus, especially in these cases, they should be considered separately from other “marginalized populations.” USAID has stated that OUs will seek compliance with local laws on free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) where applicable, and where none exist, will pursue consultation and cocreation processes that rise to FPIC standards. Indigenous Peoples are also given protections under international law, though these protections are not binding on nations. For the Washington/Indigenous Peoples office’s most recent toolkits around FPIC, please contact the Indigenous Peoples Advisor.² This is where intersectionality is an important consideration: Indigenous concerns intersect in complex and impactful ways with other categories of marginalization, and projects that are truly inclusive must consider these different vectors of marginalization and how they can compound on each other and affect project outcomes. In particular, projects must consider intersections of Indigeneity and gender and how they can impact types and prevalence of Gender Based Violence (GBV) in Indigenous communities. The USAID GBV strategy defines GBV as: “violence that is directed at an individual based on his or her biological sex, gender identity, or perceived adherence to socially defined norms of masculinity and femininity. It includes physical, sexual, and psychological abuse; threats; coercion; arbitrary deprivation of liberty; and economic deprivation, whether occurring in public or

² Luis-Felipe Duchicela, Senior Advisor for Indigenous Peoples’ Issues: lduchicela@usaid.gov

private life.”³ Socially defined norms of masculinity and femininity are inextricably linked to the cultures of Indigenous communities and understanding these norms can help projects to assess risks of GBV that might arise from their programming.

There is a balance to be struck between rightfully considering Indigenous People as separate from other “vulnerable populations” while still recognizing Indigeneity as a factor that is deeply embedded in gendered experiences, experiences of poverty, and other forms of marginalization.

An evaluation of the Niti Sambad project in Nepal (PA-00W-PD5 Nepal) spoke to the difficulties of finding this balance:

Some interviewees, including experts not directly affiliated with Niti Sambad, noted that the activity has not paid adequate attention to the issues of marginalization within such categories, especially those in a status of multiple marginalizations. Niti Sambad generally has treated the constitutionally recognized marginalized groups (such as women and Dalits, Adhibasi, Janajati, Madhesi) as respective homogeneous groups, with a blanket approach rather than recognizing varying interests and needs of people within and across these groups. For instance, the activity has reached out to the Dalit community; however, there is little or no evidence that it has paid substantial attention to the needs and policy priorities of those Dalits who have been facing multiple forms of exclusion due to sex, age, disability, sexual identity, and so forth. The same applies to women with disabilities and other groups, such as Janjatis, Muslims, and Madhesis. Blue Diamond Society is the only organization that focuses on the LGBTI community, whereas other organizations have not moved beyond the binary concept of gender.

In the SSI with the **OU respondents in India**, they described some of the complexities that necessitate an intersectional approach. One respondent shared their experience working in tribal village, where a member made the point that “everyone assumes all tribal communities are poor.” However, in areas such as tea plantations, while both informal and formal workers classified themselves as tribal individuals, formal workers were more comfortable in their employment, which has strong implications for employment related programming that affects Indigenous People.

OU respondents in India also cautioned against the rigidity of some of the tools promoted in the PRO-IP. Though USAID/India’s recent Social Inclusion Assessment helped identify scheduled tribes as marginal communities and understand their realities, they also stated that:

We have to recognize that we work within a government system that has its own agenda as well. PRO-IP needs to include more diversity in its approaches – the policy gives clear guidance on ‘what’s right and what’s wrong’ but rather should recognize the grey and how to move forward [...] USAID tools sometimes make program staff feel like there are more things they are “not doing” versus doing their best to fit specific needs of communities.

Like the India OU using SIAs, and especially in Central and South America, OUs are clearly taking steps to incorporate the PRO-IP policy into their analyses. Certain OUs like Peru explained in during our interviews that they are incorporating all three tools into their projects, including creating their own

³ USAID Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally, https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2155/GBV_Factsheet.pdf

tools. In Guatemala, the Community Roots project ending in December 2021 (PA-00X-9RD Guatemala) reported that:

In order to ensure that Project and implementing partner’s reporting and planning activities use a gender, inclusion, and cultural relevance approach (especially in accordance with USAID’s new Indigenous Peoples Policy), in FY 2020 Q4, the gender and inclusion specialist prepared a new tool containing criteria for planning and reporting (monthly, quarterly, or final). After this new tool was discussed and approved by the Project staff, the implementation protocol was also prepared to make sure all staff and implementing partners are aware of the reasons, objectives, content, and implementation procedure to be used in Fiscal Year 2021.

In this case, the existing gender and social inclusion specialist was able to adapt the PRO-IP guidance to this specific project. This lines up with the information shared with NORC during SSIs, where respondents in several OUs explained that having a dedicated staff member or technical expert who could help adapt and implement the tools of the PRO-IP would be effective in ensuring their use. **OU respondents from Ecuador** also noted that having a regional facilitator as a direct point of contact would make it easier to utilize these tools.

Other OUs utilize SIAs and IDAs in their projects. One example of a project that used a Social Impact Assessments was the LESTARI project (PA-00X-IBG Indonesia), which also placed great emphasis on free, prior, and informed consent: “In 2017, LESTARI supported the FPIC for the construction of canal blocking in five villages covering 55,733 hectares. Both the USAID Social Impact Assessment Framework and BRG’s [Berkeley Research Group] Social Safeguards were used to formulate and implement the LESTARI-supported FPIC process.” **OU respondents in Cambodia** stated that, “...the IDA guidance in PRO-IP was wholly adopted in the gender and inclusive development analysis that we commissioned as part of our strategy—so we adopted these tools as part of our inclusive development .”

Some projects used tools from implementing partners that covered the same range of concerns as the tools in the PRO-IP policy. For example, the Central Africa Regional Program for the Environment (CARPE) (PA-00W-PV7 Democratic Republic of the Congo), worked with Wildlife Conservation Society to create a guidebook for “Participatory Approaches to Natural Resource Management Planning” which is similar in scope to the USAID consultation handbook recommended in the PRO-IP. This implementing partner also developed protocols for activities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo that “require Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) from communities in and around protected areas, as well as finalizing a tender for the creation of an OWR grievance mechanism”. Similarly, **OU respondents in Peru** explained that their partners, namely WWF and PACT, also know about PRO-IP, and they might not use these specific tools [SIA, IDA, and the Consultation Handbook] but they use participatory methods and their own safeguards in their work with Indigenous Peoples.

RISK IDENTIFICATION STRATEGIES AND CONFLICT ASSESSMENTS

The PRO-IP guidance as well as USAID’s sector guidance on Indigenous Peoples calls for specific risk identification around land. While many projects also highlighted the importance of this analysis, few reports in the DEC outlined clear processes for doing so. There were also no standard strategies for conflict mitigation—while there should not be a one-size fits all approach promoted, there could still be more standard guidance towards this end. Most projects that did rigorous risk identification for land were biodiversity or forest projects. However, even for projects in these sectors, there were challenges

with navigating the differences between customary or traditional systems of land tenure and legal land tenure systems from national governments.

Difficulties with land tenure systems were a significant barrier to project activities for many projects. A Gender and Social Inclusion Analysis for USAID/Mexico published in 2020 (PA-00W-HFX Mexico) explained that:

For indigenous groups, especially indigenous women, who are less likely to speak Spanish than men, the land registration system can be difficult to use and access, thereby compromising their ability to claim and hold onto land. The failure to include women and indigenous groups in decision-making processes is likely to exacerbate inequalities and undermine the effectiveness of activities.

Multiple projects highlighted the intersection of woman and Indigenous as particularly challenging for land tenure issues. The idea that land rights issues disproportionately affect women is paralleled in USAID's sector guidance on agriculture and biodiversity. It is also important to note that programming that focuses on changing gendered patterns of land ownership can incur risks of gender-based violence. For example, the guidance on biodiversity states that “[w]omen's economic activities are more commonly based in subsistence activities from the land and they are not as likely as men to be employed in the labor force.” Similarly, a gender analysis report from Indonesia published in 2020 (PA-00X-2C5 Indonesia) noted that,

Land use and ownership present challenges for women and indigenous groups living in forest areas. Due to the limitations on women's participation in community discussions about land ownership and use, especially in conservation areas, their livelihoods are at risk of marginalization [...] Land issues are often complex for Indigenous groups, especially when they do not recognize the government's ownership of their ancestral lands.

In situations of conflict or dispute, for example over land ownership or boundaries, USAID's sector guidance documents recommend utilizing a conflict-sensitive approach. Conflict sensitivity implies inclusivity and the assumption that claims from different groups are valid unless otherwise demonstrated. This technique is reflected in the fact that projects that facilitated conflict resolution processes for land tenure emphasized participatory approaches. In one such project (PA-00W-JFT Indonesia), the OU focused on the following strategy for conflicts around land:

Prioritize the ongoing collection of accurate and comprehensive data on conflict prevalence and key conflict dynamics to enable USAID/Indonesia and its partners to engage in conflict sensitive development planning and to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions designed to address conflict drivers [...] including regulations protecting the rights of indigenous people, promoting inclusive participation in conflict resolution efforts, and ensuring transparency in spatial planning, land use, and permitting.

The Nexos Locales project (PA-00X-285 Guatemala) used inter-generational dialogues as a conflict mitigation strategy: “As a means of applying a conflict mitigation lens to the remainder of the program, Nexos Locales will continue to promote inter-generational dialogue within formal and informal deliberative spaces under project activities.” The Forest Alliance in Peru (PA-00X-2WWM Peru) used georeferencing to facilitate a process of border negotiation to deal with conflicts around land:

Georeferencing the boundary markers of the initial title of the Roya community by DRAU: Overcoming conflicts between neighboring native communities: Roya and Puerto Belén. After 10 years of differences with the neighboring community Puerto Belén, the Roya community reached an agreement on the location of their respective territorial boundaries with the support of the Forest Alliance. [...] Both communities promised to respect these adjacent border definitions and signed an agreement to that effect.

OU respondents in Brazil discussed using an initial environmental examination (IEE) to determine risks for all activities prior to procurement stage. Once awarded, projects then have environmental mitigation plans and environmental reports to evaluate compliance.

The diversity of strategies used to identify risks to Indigenous Peoples and resolve conflicts around land suggests that there could be more standardization, or more mechanisms (such as meetings with technical advisors on Indigenous concerns) to ensure that projects across OUs and sectors account for risks and resolve land disputes in equitable ways.

METHODS AND TERMS OF IDENTIFICATION

The process through which OUs label populations as Indigenous as well as its complexity varied significantly by geography. It is important to note here that the PRO-IP does not rigidly enforce the nomenclature of “Indigenous Peoples” and does not demand that OUs comply with the language of labelling populations as Indigenous. Projects in the Africa region faced enormous challenges and political sensitivities for determining if a population was Indigenous. In Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) and some countries in Asia, governments established lists of Indigenous Peoples; however, these lists were sometimes contested, leading SSI respondents to triangulate information between governments and Indigenous organizations or federations. Overall, OUs do not seem to be using the guidance of the PRO-IP policy to identify Indigenous Peoples in their countries, either because the policy is too new and staff are not aware of its guidance, or because the political history behind the label of indigenous precludes them from using external guidance.

Terminology used to refer to Indigenous Peoples varied by region. In the LAC region, OUs trended toward the use of “ethnic communities” or “ethnic minorities”, while in Africa projects were more likely to describe peoples and their governance systems as “native”, “traditional”, or “customary”. In Asia, there was a mix of terminology used, which included some specific terms like “Hill peoples” or “castes”; at least one project, the Indonesia Sustainable Ecosystems Project, also used the word “customary” (PA-00X-9RX Indonesia). Some projects across regions used “tribes” but this was specific to certain countries like India and the DRC.

LAC Region

Countries in the LAC region were able to categorize populations as Indigenous with the most clarity. However, they did not seem to be using PRO-IP guidance; it did not seem to be necessary given the high level of organization among Indigenous Peoples that predates the PRO-IP, which allows for easy identification. Countries with strong legal frameworks for Indigenous Peoples, such as Colombia, were able to identify them with exact numbers and clearly defined parameters. This was reflected in both the SSI with the OU in Colombia and the review of publicly available documents. The clarity of Indigenous categorization from the government is apparent in project documents in the DEC:

Between the 2005 General Census and the 2018 National Population and Housing Census the Indigenous population increased to 36.8% in Colombia. There are currently 1,905,617 people who self-identify as Indigenous, and the Census determined there are 115 native Indigenous tribes. (PA-00W-RKN Colombia)

OU respondents in Colombia explained that they don't have challenges in identifying Indigenous Peoples because the distinctions are so clearly defined in the legal framework of the country, and communities' own self-identification through regional second tier organizations and Indigenous Peoples' organizations. It has been institutionalized and is a central part of Colombia's constitutional framework. However, in general they use the term "ethnic communities" when categorizing populations for project activities to be more inclusive, especially in terms of including Afro-descendants. In the Americas and the LAC region, Afro-descendants are almost always included alongside Indigenous Peoples in a category of beneficiaries. Similarly, **OU respondents in Brazil** described using official census data to identify indigenous groups and where they live.

OU respondents in Paraguay also described a straightforward process of identifying Indigenous Peoples for project activities, pointing to clear government recognition as well as very small Indigenous population size:

What we call Indigenous, and not mixed: The IP population is 2% and they live in specific indigenous communities mostly and they are easily identifiable. The government already has them identified, mostly where they live. It's very easy to identify where they live and who are the populations.

The respondents went on to say that they develop separate indicators for IP populations amongst project beneficiaries to take into account communal systems of ownership, revealing the usefulness of clear categorization:

In the case of IP communities, they have a community culture where some of the people are producers and produce and sell for the entire community. The income is not per capita and it goes to the entire community. So how do we determine per capita income? Sometimes we cannot mix the way we count among IP and non-IP beneficiaries.

It is important to stress the need to clearly identify the population of interest, using the term "Indigenous" as opposed to other categories, labels, or terms has implications for how data is disaggregated and how information can be synchronized across projects and geographic contexts. There is value to disaggregating not just by Indigenous versus non-Indigenous but by specific peoples, as mentioned by **OU respondents in Guatemala** who discussed disaggregating by Pueblo—there are four distinct Pueblos in Guatemala that have differing realities, needs, and considerations that would be useful to distinguish between when monitoring and evaluating. However, having more standardized and consistent usage of the broader category of Indigenous would allow USAID to assess how it is integrating IP concerns across geographic contexts and portfolios much more easily, therefore facilitating the measurement of progress against Objective 2 of PRO-IP.

African Contexts

Especially in Africa, OUs struggle to identify Indigenous Peoples based on the criteria in the PRO-IP and label them as such, either because of the content of the criteria itself or because of political sensitivities.

Throughout this research the challenge of identifying Indigenous populations in Africa surfaced repeatedly. In some countries, Indigenous Peoples are highly politically sensitive and recognizing them runs counter to government principles of unification. In other countries, nomadic, pastoralist, and otherwise transhumant communities are difficult to label as Indigenous, similarly those who have been displaced by conflict, and these types of communities are prevalent in Africa.

To the latter point, the Niger Mini-Grid Feasibility Project (PA-00W-RS9 Niger) described some of the challenges with identifying Indigenous peoples in African, particularly West African contexts; it seems that they referred to the World Bank's Policy, "Indigenous Peoples/ Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities" from 2018:

This Performance Standard applies to communities or groups of Indigenous Peoples who maintain a collective attachment (or whose identity as a group or community is linked) to distinct habitats or ancestral territories and their natural resources. It may also apply to communities or groups that have lost their collective attachment to distinct ancestral habitats or territories in the project area during the lifetime of the members of the groups concerned as a result of forced separation, conflict, government resettlement programs, dispossession of their land, natural disasters or the integration of such territories into urban areas. The preliminary ESIA (CLIN II) discusses the need to apply this standard or not in subsequent studies (ESIA and PAR) given the presence of nomadic/pastoral populations in certain villages.

In some African countries, it is politically sensitive to label a group or population as Indigenous. The SSI respondent in Zambia, for example, explained that terms which distinguish one group are avoided because it threatens the unity of the country. "The term Indigenous is highly political because our national motto is 'One nation, one Zambia'", the respondent said, "Indigenous labeling creates divisions in terms of identity". Instead, the OU refers to "local communities" and "traditional community groups" rather than Indigenous Peoples. Communities are identified by the geography in which they live (e.g. protected areas) instead of their ethnicity, a convention also followed by the government of Zambia.

OU respondents from Mali explained that they are not able to label populations as Indigenous because of histories of terrorist organizations in Mali that co-opt tensions between nomadic and sedentary or agriculturalist groups, tensions that center on who has the right to claim Indigeneity or rights to land. For that reason, the OU does not focus on any one ethnic group to avoid becoming an actor in the conflict. Respondents called for guidelines based on countries that have similar challenges, or meetings with technical advisors from Washington to evaluate the applicability of the PRO-IP in their context. "Because of Mali's conflict setting," a respondent explained, "PRO-IP would be difficult to apply here."

OU respondents from South Africa described how Indigenous status was contested among different populations. "It's a very contentious issue," a respondent explained, "except for the white people, pretty much everyone is seen as Indigenous populations and if you talk about who you need to support you need to identify the marginalized Indigenous populations." In South Africa specifically, they described contention between Zulu and Khoe peoples over which group could claim they were Indigenous. Additionally, in countries with government principles of unification like Botswana, it is considered counterproductive to focus on Indigenous Peoples as sub-groups within the nation state. The respondents explained:

For example, in Botswana, in a conversation with government representatives [...] they really explained even in front of the IP's that we had meetings with that 'we are all Batswana, so we cannot have a separate development initiatives or policies.' Host governments in most cases just don't make the differentiation between citizens of that country and the Indigenous Peoples – policy may say that, but in reality, no.

Especially in places like South Africa which have a history of settler colonialism, respondents mentioned extreme sensitivity for any projects that deal with land tenure. **OU respondents in Kenya** described such intense political sensitivity around this issue that it prevented them from using the descriptive of Indigenous at all in their programming. Their last 2 strategic plans (for the past 10 years) used only the terminology of marginalized people rather than Indigenous people. They were very hesitant to categorize certain groups/communities as Indigenous, because: 1) communities are linked to constituencies and elections for members of parliament as well as resource distribution, and relatedly, 2) current and past governments have refused to recognize IP for fear of the implications for land titling and distribution. Despite also mentioning these tensions around land titling, **OU respondents in Zambia** described project activities to promote the customary land certificate system in which land titles are signed by the traditional leadership who controls the land. In Kenya, the political sensitivities were simply too much for these kinds of activities; respondents said that they have not focused on land tenure issues directly because “historically it has been a very emotive issue”, and in the last few elections, these issues have resulted in violent conflict.

Even when populations are fixed and have not been displaced by conflict, in many African contexts, OUs depend on local knowledge to determine Indigenous status more than established lists from any one source such as the government or IP organizations. **OU respondents in the DRC**, for example, stated that there this isn't much to distinguish between Indigenous and majority community in areas, and these distinctions are often based on “healing” or occasionally mythical stories: “Indigenous communities would live more [in] forests and have more mythical stories, and rely more on land than other communities who live in cities or urban areas.” This echoed trends across geographic contexts in which Indigenous Peoples who lived in or near forests were more clearly labelled as Indigenous than those who lived in other kinds of landscapes. Reflecting the ambiguity of especially non-forest peoples, respondents in the DRC described that often, when they walked into a room with a mix of Indigenous and majority community people, they didn't know who belonged to which group without having to ask them to self-identify as the line is “blurry”. They also referenced “common knowledge” about which ethnic groups are considered Indigenous and which are not.

Asian Contexts

While many countries in Asia have established lists of Indigenous Peoples, these lists can be highly contested and labelling a population as Indigenous is politically sensitive. In general, OUs in Asia in NORC's SSIs described going off of government lists or Indigenous Peoples organizations and not the criteria in the PRO-IP to identify Indigenous Peoples. For example, **OU respondents in Nepal** described that the government of Nepal has produced a list of approved Indigenous Peoples and that is their first reference for project activities, however there are many known Indigenous Peoples that are excluded from that list. Therefore, the Nepal Federation of Indigenous Groups (NEFIN) is the to-go institution for identifying, listing, and recommending Indigenous Peoples. The people who are not recognized by the government are participating in advocacy [with NEFIN] and are recognized by other Indigenous Peoples as Indigenous groups but not by the government. The government has also made

mistakes with listing Indigenous Peoples as other groups, for example as Dalit instead of ‘Hill’ people. The respondent explained, “The government needs to do some corrections so there is continued advocacy but for USAID, we are in consultation with the associations and networks so we recognize the contestations and contentions around identify. But to put a group into the category of indigenous takes both the government and the federation/associations.”

Sometimes issues with established government lists of indigenous peoples were factors in conflict that posed challenges for projects. For example, the USAID Sea Project (PA-00X-9RX Indonesia) wrote in a report:

Dispute over the spatial allocations and areas under customary (adat) authority — requiring more local level discussions and engagement compared to other regions. This involved disputes over the representation of formally recognized customary tribes and those as yet to be formally recognized, as well as issues regarding the demarcation of areas to enable a buffer around adat-managed waters. These issues were eventually resolved through agreement to only incorporate recognized tribes at this time, but with a provision added for further recognition of tribes and incorporation of their territorial waters in the coming five years.

Even in uncontested situations, the terminology used to refer to Indigenous Peoples varied widely across Asia, especially in documents in the DEC. Some projects use broader and more inclusive acronyms to categorize affected groups and disaggregate their data. For example, a Gender and Inclusive Development action plan from Burma (PA-00X-4VW Burma) calls the focus population that includes Indigenous peoples ‘EMCA’s’, or “economically marginalized and conflict affected” instead of “indigenous”. They identified an Indigenous women’s organization as a key partner, but did not use the word Indigenous to describe target populations. Another project in Burma (PA-00W-GSR Burma), a health project focused on tuberculosis treatment, had no mention of the word Indigenous but used ‘ethnic’ instead as in, “implementing in remote and ethnic areas”. A report on a governance project in Nepal (PA-00W-P73 Nepal) refers to populations as “marginalized ethnic groups”. The Human Resources for Health program (PA-00W-JVQ The Philippines) disaggregated data with one category labelled as “poor, marginalized, or indigenous”.

Like in many African contexts, in some countries in Asia the recognition of Indigenous Peoples was considered to go against principles of unification from governments. Specifically, **OU respondents in India** stated that they feel that the OU understands the policy clearly, but they have trouble communicating with their Partners. For example, language around self-determination in PRO-IP is very sensitive to the point of being almost dangerous in the context of the Government of India.

This is echoed across several SSI’s in Asia, including Cambodia, India and Nepal, that call for more guidance on how to manage political sensitivities around IP concerns and maintain productive relationships with both government partners and IP organizations. **OU respondents in Cambodia** explained that it’s difficult to do advocacy work because it’s very sensitive with the government: “When we try to get communal land titles for indigenous groups it can take 5-10 years, or even in 20 years we might not get it. There are always obstacles to working with local authorities.”

OU respondents in Nepal went into detail about the potential usefulness of more guidance on managing government relationships for IP issues:

Engaging with the government should be a priority [...] not just engagement, but support and capacity building that includes the government and not just indigenous peoples. They have very poor understanding of the diverse population of Nepal and they think that IP's are behind because they haven't done well in studies, or education. [...] They don't understand the normative factors behind the exclusion of IP's. How can the government be more empathetic and more understanding? There are very few policy planners who have that understanding, and all of them are in dominant caste groups and they are men. They hardly care. What kind of approaches would be good to create entry points within the bureaucracy? The bureaucracy is very powerful and it's the biggest bottleneck. How can we support the bureaucracy to be more inclusive?

OBJECTIVE 3: EMPOWER INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVE ORGANIZATIONS TO ADVOCATE FOR, AND EXERCISE, THEIR RIGHTS AND PRACTICE SELF-DETERMINED DEVELOPMENT

The third objective of PRO-IP focuses on empowering Indigenous Peoples and their representative organizations to advocate for, and exercise, their rights and practice self-determined development. This objective was an area in which the projects examined from the DEC and described in the SSIs seemed to be successfully integrating the PRO-IP guidance, by identifying, partnering with, and supporting the work of Indigenous Peoples' organizations. This is reflected in the fact that projects that did not explicitly or consistently label their beneficiary communities as Indigenous still partnered with Indigenous Peoples' organizations. **OU respondents in Cambodia** explained that it is “helpful to engage with them for projects so that they can be the “bridge” to disseminate information and knowledge to community members.” It was clearly a benefit for all parties to have close partnerships between OUs and Indigenous Peoples organizations, despite some capacity challenges including administrative and financial reporting requirements and language barriers.

PRO-IP recommends supporting capacity-building activities for Indigenous Peoples' organizations, specifically through providing direct funding opportunities and strengthening participation in decision-making. Organizational capacity building for Indigenous organizations was especially strong for projects in the Amazon and in the LAC region, particularly for environmental or conservation projects. For example, the Forest Alliance in Peru (PA-00X-2WV Peru) provided “modular training in business management for native communities as well as a proposal for strengthening the operations and strategy of the indigenous company.” Other forms of capacity building seen across projects and sectors were support for coordinating with regional or national bodies, support with financial or administrative management, and support in creating life plans or other organizational visions and strategies to guide their work.

In LAC-region OUs like Guatemala, we find strong progress under Objective 3, especially with the creation of the Indigenous Peoples' Alliance for Rights and Development (IPARD), which builds capacities for Indigenous Peoples' organizations, strengthens their participation in decision making processes, and creates an enabling environment in public and private dialogues. Often times, projects targeted women's Indigenous organizations specifically with capacity building trainings to encourage their participation and voice in government decision making. For example, the Colombia OU works closely with the Union of Indigenous Women of the Amazon alongside other Indigenous Peoples' organizations at different levels. Some projects doing these sorts of activities with Indigenous women's organizations were very attuned to the intersectional vectors of marginalization that such women face, and specifically

focused on gender-based violence perpetrated against Indigenous women. For example, the Regional Human Rights and Democracy activity report from El Salvador stated:

With the support of the Project, the indigenous women's movement Tzununijá succeeded in positioning racism as a form of violence against indigenous women, in addition to the sexist violence they endure in their communities. They conducted a study on the current forms of racism, which found a significant relationship between past and present forms of racism, leading to significant inequalities in the country and concentrating privileges within a small group (Annex D). They also trained women, youth, and indigenous leaders to analyze structural causes of violence against indigenous women and to learn about the international protection mechanisms. (PA-00W-C2N El Salvador)

It is crucially important that projects consider Indigenous Peoples' organizations not just as beneficiaries or stakeholders, but as true partners in development. One project that successfully navigated this issue was the West Africa Biodiversity and Climate Change Program:

WA BiCC came with a kind of commitment that we have not seen before and they engaged the communities with respect. Respect for indigenous knowledge, respect for community leaders, made sure women were included in decision-making. They didn't take us as beneficiaries – when you take communities as beneficiaries, they will just sit there for the benefits. They saw us as partners. [...] We [community leaders] are here to be involved. Our involvement is crucial. We have become more and more important in issues of conservation in Sierra Leone...sometimes it is not only about the message, it is also about who delivers the message.' -Paramount Chief of Gola Rainforest National Park in Sierra Leone. (PA-00X-9WX West Africa)

While trainings to support the capacity of Indigenous leaders and organization staff were frequently included in project activities, many respondents in SSIs noted that they had to be very cautious when navigating relationships with governments. Thus, activities that helped foster good working relationships between Indigenous Peoples organizations and government structures were challenging but also useful and effective. This was illustrated in a report from the project, "Cambodian Civil Society Strengthening Project" which listed the following lessons learned about involving government officials in their activities with Indigenous organizations:

Introducing the project and objectives to government officials helps to allay government concerns and to strengthen relationships [...] Involving government officers in training and capacity building can build government capacity (CCSP, ODC) and provide a platform for strengthening relationships (NAS, PKH, YCC). HA invites officials from all levels to attend national campaigns or meetings such as international women's day, environment day, international indigenous rights day and other events. (PA-00W-7FD Cambodia)

One area of capacity building that was rarer amongst the project files in the DEC but seemed to be effective and important was supporting Indigenous Peoples and organizations to collect data for development projects. For example, a 2020 Gender Analysis report on USAID/DRC explained:

Changing discriminatory cultural beliefs and norms will require qualitative research that is inclusive. This means investing in building research capacities of rural/Indigenous individuals. Reducing social/emotional distance can be important in some contexts in obtaining quality

research findings. [...] Women and young people may be good candidates for local interviewers/researchers both to help design, plan, and undertake the research. (PA-00X-B7H Democratic Republic of the Congo)

The SCIOA project also highlighted training in data collection, monitoring and evaluation as a key need for Indigenous organizations:

Learning is also another weak capacity subdomain, as five of the six IPOs do not surpass level 2. This means IPOs are not being systematically aware of the learnings and successes they have throughout the activities they develop. As SCIOA has observed throughout the project, indigenous organizations tend to focus only on their ultimate OUs/purposes. (PA-00X-B6H Suriname; Peru; Guyana; Colombia; Brazil)

This kind of qualitative data collection from people who understand local Indigenous experiences is extremely important for monitoring and evaluation, as evidenced by this quote from an evaluation of the Hamro Samman project:

The HS leadership and staff respondents generally identified GESI integration as quantitative data disaggregation of participants in activities by sex, age, and caste/ethnicity. This stands as a major barrier to realizing transformation. Without understanding and undergoing a critical thinking process to influence and restructure changes in power relations, the HS team cannot lead stakeholders in achieving the impact envisaged through GESI integration within interventions and actors. (PA-00X-2HB Nepal)

Building the monitoring and evaluation skills of Indigenous Peoples organizations is also crucially important for the FPIC process. A report from the LESTARI project (PA-00X-1BG Indonesia) focused on FPIC explained, “FPIC is a continual process that extends beyond consent and requires monitoring and evaluation of agreements made and the fulfillment of those agreements (both of parties seeking consent and rights-holders).”

One of the largest challenges faced by OUs working with Indigenous Peoples organizations was their lack of experience with USAID’s specific monitoring and evaluation standards. Even if organizations have strong monitoring, evaluation and learning or communications processes, these might not line up specifically with USAID requirements. This underscores the importance of co-creation and continued engagement to help organizations learn about USAID standards. This was cited in numerous SSIs; **OU respondents in Colombia** said that while organizations do understand the need to meet these standards, first-time partners don’t initially have training on USAID-specific regulations like how to report financial management or follow USAID branding requirements. **OU respondents in Peru** noted difficulties especially for accounting requirements: “they have very good leadership, but it can be challenging to find accountants and to move things forward on specific timelines. The OU has learned that they have to be patient and match the speed of the IP organizations, especially for in person workshops and trainings that require traveling long distances.” **OU respondents in Brazil** echoed these concerns; they stated that most Indigenous Peoples organizations are not legally registered, and face challenges with legal documentation and organizational structure that make it difficult for USAID to be able to meet requirements to fund them. This is an endemic problem in the international development community. It has been NORC’s experience that local NGOs often do not have the technical capacity to closely adhere to donor M&E reporting requirements.

The COVID-19 pandemic also posed a significant challenge for projects working to build the capacity of Indigenous Peoples' organizations, but there were numerous examples in the DEC and SSIs of OUs pivoting their strategies effectively to address these challenges. During the pandemic, many projects were able to take action to help Indigenous organizations build their capacity for digital engagement—which will benefit them far beyond the pandemic itself. For example, the Strengthening the Capacity of Indigenous Organizations in the Amazon SCIOA project described its activities to maintain partnerships with IP organizations digitally:

During the past fiscal year, the CDO, APA, trained members of the IPO MDC in communications tools (e.g., Skype, Zoom, Google Meet), created a WhatsApp group for the organization, set up personal e-mail addresses where members did not have these, and set up an MDC organizational e-mail address. All of these efforts were aimed at ensuring that the IPO is able to virtually engage during the pandemic and beyond. (PA-00X-8KG Suriname; Peru; Guyana; Colombia; Brazil)

Respondents in the SSIs described providing digital tools to IP organizations, such as **OU respondents in Peru** who explained that they bought cell phones, laptops, and internet antennas for even remote and isolated communities in the Amazon to facilitate the continuation of project activities.

Another major challenge that came up in both the SSIs and the publicly available documentation in the DEC was that Indigenous Peoples groups did not have full understanding of the laws relevant to their concerns. The gender and social inclusion report for Laos explained that often populations are not aware of the policies and laws in place to protect them, which is a major barrier to them using these legal protections for their empowerment.

FGD [focused group discussion] and KII [key informant interview] findings indicate that in general, a majority of study participants in Xiengkhouang province do not know the rights of women, ethnic minorities, or PWD, [persons with disabilities] neither informally nor in specific terms. Even if they know that there are laws or policies, they don't know of any government agency responsible for administering them. The lack of knowledge among the respondents about protections for women and PWD under family and labor laws could possibly be contributing to a lack equality at the family and village level, which women and PWD may not feel empowered to question. As discussed in the section on control of assets and resources, in some villages Hmong women are not aware that they may own land. (PA-00X-78V Laos)

This was echoed by **OU respondents in the DRC**, who explained that a large majority of Indigenous Peoples are not educated on the law, and it is not easy to reach these populations as you need translators and to visit remote areas. Even with laws in place, it is difficult to get feedback at the grassroots level. "It will not be easy to sensitize the majority of communities," the respondent stated; "If you do not know the law, the law cannot know you."

Despite political sensitivities and challenges, some OUs were able to implement activities to empower Indigenous Peoples' organizations to work with state governments more effectively. **OU respondents in Cambodia** described activities to improve Indigenous Peoples organizations' awareness of their rights and the legal frameworks relevant to their issues, as well as provide guidance on how to engage government officials on sub-national levels to resolve their issues, how to organize and advocate.

DIRECT FUNDING

In DEC searches and SSIs, NORC found that OUs engaging with Indigenous Peoples and their organizations frequently provide them with micro-grants, but it was very rare to see larger scale projects being funded, primarily because of the financial reporting and administrative limitations to their capacity described above. Capacity building for Indigenous Peoples' organizations was inextricably linked with Operating Units' ability to provide them with direct funding. For example, a road building project (PA-00W-F5T Colombia) reported that, "Through RGA capacity-building, the Corinto-Toribío MRMF was able to design and submit this project to the OXI mechanism, which subsequently approved this proposal for USD \$1.7 million to improve 6.3 kilometers of regional road between the two municipalities."

The Strengthening the Capacity of Indigenous Organizations in the Amazon -SCIOA project also identified administrative and accounting capacity as a barrier to providing direct funding to IP organizations. The capacity building activities of the project allowed these organizations to receive funds:

Across these countries, a critical need that was identified through the Subawardee Risk and Responsibility Assessment and the ITOCA diagnostic tool was the lapsed or incomplete registrations of individual IPOs. This included missing documentation, lack of organizational bank accounts, and legal registrations that had not been updated or had never been completed. For that reason, during this fiscal year, one IPO in Peru and two in Brazil obtained registration numbers which allowed them to formally develop and implement activities through direct receipt of funds (rather than through in-kind grants), such as those focused on the defense of their territories, its natural resources, biodiversity, and indigenous people's rights to self-determination. (PA-00X-8KG Suriname; Peru; Guyana; Colombia; Brazil)

In the DEC documents as well as SSIs, most OUs described micro-grants for Indigenous organizations, with very few large scale grants being awarded. For example, the direct funding mentioned by **OU respondents in Ecuador** under the Amazon Regional Environmental Program consisted of micro-enterprise grants for Indigenous ventures. This trend of smaller scales is in large part due to limitations on the capacity of IP organizations to manage the accounting and reporting requirements of large-scale grants. However, part of this trend could also be related to the need to see results within a certain window of time. **OU respondents from South Africa** explained,

To think a five-year program is going to make a difference in IP's life – it's unrealistic. If you're American [working for USAID], you're four years in the country and you need to show you've made a difference. So, you're chasing numbers in a project (i.e. 30 IP organizations in a training), but it doesn't mean the training has had any impact. When maybe what you should have been looking at is in the long run, can that IP organization provide the same kind of information down the road?

In general, OUs are moving towards more direct funding for Indigenous Peoples' organizations. **OU respondents in Colombia** explained,

In 2018, we started moving towards having a direct relationship with ethnic communities responding to requests by these organizations, and as a result of a long process of capacity building as part of standalone programs. The OU launched an annual program statement to work directly with ethnic organizations. This includes a series of objectives and a broad framework for organizations to submit their ideas based on their own priorities for self-

determined development in their territories. We've received a tremendous response from hundreds of organizations, and after a long process of co-creation and site visits, the OU signed direct awards [...] These initiatives represent a shift in our way of doing business with these organizations and permit a relationship where they directly receive funding and directly respond to self-determined priorities.

OU respondents in Cambodia also discussed a growing trend of direct funding to civil society organizations including Indigenous Peoples' organizations: "We are thinking about providing direct funding/sub-grants to the CBOs (community-based organizations), and we have 60 CBOs, so I'm sure that some of them will be Indigenous CBOs."

OBJECTIVE 4: FOSTER AN ENABLING ENVIRONMENT FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLES TO ADVOCATE FOR, AND EXERCISE, THEIR RIGHTS.

LEGAL ANALYSIS AND LOCAL LEGISLATION

The PRO-IP guides that "[i]n countries that have ratified conventions or treaties relating to Indigenous Peoples' rights, the domestic legal framework should be analyzed to determine the mechanisms for the exercise and enforcement of such rights." Our review found that many projects included analysis of domestic legal frameworks surrounding Indigenous Peoples as either background research or part of the USAID Gender Equity and Social Inclusion analysis:

The **Local Self Governance Act** institutionalizes the process of development by enhancing the participation of all the people including the ethnic communities, **Indigenous people** and down-trodden as well as socially and economically backward groups..." (PA-00X-BZD Nepal)

Only **Indigenous Papuans are entitled to hold top positions** at provincial (governor and vice governor) and district levels (district heads and vice district heads). However, the central government retains authority to approve Special Bylaws issued by local government. (PA-00W-JFT Indonesia)

Further, some projects show a deeper level of legal analysis by identifying gaps, challenges and opportunities in the domestic legal framework that affect Indigenous Peoples:

There is also insufficient protection in the National Plan from violence in particular sectors or violence as a result of or part of social conflict. These **gaps mean that indigenous women protecting their communities' land may not be protected by this regulation.** (PA-00W-RM3 Peru)

Vulnerable persons are taken into account in the context of expropriation, but not specifically for so-called **indigenous persons who are not officially recognized in Niger.** (PA-00W-RS9 Niger)

Lastly, **institutional and systemic policy reforms have to be made** along with initiatives to educate collectors on indigenous and different forms of processing and storing technologies. (PA-00X-IMQ Nepal)

While we may see a wider variety of projects represented that consider the domestic legal framework, it narrows to more “stand alone” projects that have activities specifically aimed at enacting policy change or increasing knowledge on legal rights:

Most recently, **community members were recognized as a legal indigenous entity by the Ministry of Interior (Moi)**, as a result of cooperation and joint efforts from Mvi, HA, and 3SPN. Now the community will move forward with its efforts to **obtain a communal land title**, in order to secure their land and natural resources for their next generation. (PA-00W-7FD Cambodia)

The Forest Alliance continues to support the seven communities in formalizing their communal territorial limits and property titles. (PA-00X-2WWM Peru)

Throughout **the life-of-project**, Nexos Locales, through the Association of Guatemala Indigenous Mayors and Authorities (AGAAI), has **strengthened indigenous participation in decision-making processes at both the local and national levels**. (PA-00X-285 Guatemala)

By nature, these projects included deeper legal framework analysis as well as engagement with Indigenous organizations in order to mobilize and/or recommend policy change. This is congruent with findings from the SSIs, that some projects have a very explicit focus on democracy and governance, while others do not. **OU respondents in the DRC** noted that a major component of newer programs are human rights and legal advocacy, where they are training Indigenous communities on international human rights law and DRC law on what protections they have under each of these systems. On the other hand, **OU respondents in India** noted that while there are not currently these types of programs, they regularly work with the Ministry of Tribal affairs, who work with tribal rights.

GOVERNMENT CAPACITY

Several USAID programs are engaging in “capacity building” work as it relates to enabling Indigenous Peoples rights, and consequently we see a large number of projects with activities aimed at improving government systems and processes. We especially see high representation of projects in Latin America directly engaging with public sector actors. These projects include improving the capacity of central government and local authorities to engage with, respond to and/or uphold Indigenous Peoples’ rights:

These **trainings** include the development of new, edited versions of the curriculum and pamphlets for the **Political Advocacy School with a focus on the rights of indigenous groups and Afro-Hondurans**. The effects of these trainings were felt beyond the target populations, as the leaders who participated in the trainings passed on their experiences and knowledge to others through trainings they held for other vulnerable groups. (PA-00W-C2N Latin America)

Linked to the work with indigenous peoples was the Activity's support for the tripartite dialogue in Colombia between the government, the private sector, and the Organization for Indigenous Peoples of the Colombian Amazon (OPIAC). (PA-00W-Q3S Peru)

The Alliance for Social and Economic Recovery in the Peruvian Amazon Activity mitigates the adverse social and economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on vulnerable populations in Peru, particularly **within indigenous communities** in the Peruvian Amazon. To this end, **the activity will support the Government of Peru’s capacity to respond to the COVID-19 crisis, particularly in under-resourced Amazon regions of Peru**, where risk communication and social and economic services are insufficient. (PA-00X-828 Peru)

...the project worked to **improve collaboration between ethnic authorities and mayors, government secretariats and authorities** in charge of protecting the rights of CHA&Y, such as Family Ombudspersons and Commissioners (PA-00W-ZWH Colombia)

There were also several projects that focused on the capacity of Indigenous entities and authorities to support accessing and promoting their rights:

The **communal authorities of five indigenous communities** (Callería, Flor de Ucajali, Roya, Curiaca and Pueblo Nuevo) **received technical support** as they prepared their annual work plans for 2020 on communal governance. (PA-00X-2WM Peru)

Through these agreements, the **indigenous authorities have achieved greater justice-administration capacities** and a better understanding of, and coordination with, ordinary justice system operators, **enhancing their ability to prevent and resolve conflicts in indigenous communities**. **Indigenous women have strengthened access to traditional and formal justice** by promoting their socio-cultural rights within indigenous communities. (PA-00W-RZ6 Colombia)

The Project also committed to providing the following **support to improve access to justice for Indigenous peoples**... Provide training and carry out other activities for MP staff and

Indigenous leadership to promote knowledge and understanding of both justice systems. (PA-00X-3GR Guatemala)

In addition, **OU respondents in the Philippines** described the Access to Justice and Support for the Rule of Law (ACCESS) activity. This activity works to enhance access to justice for the most vulnerable communities in the Philippines, including a focus on Indigenous Peoples whose rights are least protected and whose ability to access a fair and predictable legal system is extremely limited. The activity is implemented by supporting the work of local civil society organizations and bolstering locally led interventions that increase public awareness of Indigenous People’s legal rights, improve access to legal aid, promote alternative dispute resolution, and build upon previous USAID-supported initiatives to advance the efficient and fair administration of justice.

Several projects also targeted improving government infrastructure to facilitate the granting of Indigenous land title and rights:

...follows extensive research by community members, who documented problems with the land that was initially offered (such as rocks and sand, making it impossible to plant crops). Expert officials were assigned to check the lands. **As a result, sufficient farm lands were given to 32 families** in Q4. (PA-00X-5BX Cambodia)

In FY20, an area of 66,921 ha was allocated for protection in Bintuni Bay in the West Papua, with the aim to develop a Traditional Community-Based Fisheries Management Area (TCBFMA) at the site. This is outside of the regular jurisdiction of MPA’s, and **instead provides a mechanism by which indigenous people in the area will secure marine tenure and privileged access rights** to key traditional user zones in the bay. (PA-00X-9RW Indonesia)

FEEDBACK MECHANISMS

The PRO-IP states that “feedback mechanisms can help strengthen the impact and outcomes of USAID-financed projects and activities, and are an effective tool for the early identification, assessment, and resolution of complaints.” Across DEC reports, it was common to see feedback mechanism such as establishing committees, working groups, or facilitated forums to provide feedback on project activities. Respondents in Colombia noted that they held large “pause and reflect” spaces throughout implementation, which proved to be very helpful and allow for learning throughout all phases of implementation.

While there was documentation of convening of multi-sectoral groups, the specific composition of Indigenous representation is not always clear, or how often in the program cycle these groups were meant to convene:

Amazon BMP Activity established **Country Advisory Groups (CAGs)** in Colombia and Peru to **provide overall guidance for the Activity’s priority interventions**. These advisory groups include well-known representatives of the private sector, public sector, and civil society organizations, including **Indigenous groups**. (PA-00W-6SR Latin America)

GC hosted a **strategic development planning session** with youth, **Indigenous people**, women and other community members in Battambang. (PA-00W-S4S Cambodia)

By contrast, several examples demonstrate establishing feedback mechanisms specifically from Indigenous organizations on project design and activities and specifying throughout which stage in the program cycle, or how these feedback mechanisms were to be implemented as well as some results of the feedback received:

In Year 5, Nexos Locales developed a **life-of-project cultural pertinence committee...** whose actions are led and monitored by an internal cultural pertinence committee. This committee is tasked with **ensuring that program and administration activities are culturally relevant.** (PA-00W-C84 Guatemala)

The right process **invites constructive stakeholder feedback from local interests** to achieve a greater sense of stakeholder ownership in canal blocking which provides useful ideas for appropriate modifications to project design and location. In the present case, **traditional knowledge about water flows resulted in designers accepting the need for wider compacted peat dams to reduce the risk of failure...** Finally, a **grievance mechanism was established** to handle subsequent objections to actions on the ground. (PA-00X-IBG Indonesia)

MONITORING AND LEARNING

The PRO-IP states that monitoring, evaluating and learning is particularly important to “verify whether the intervention as carried out is consistent with Indigenous Peoples’ development priorities, needs, challenges, aspirations, and opportunities.” Many projects include Indigenous Peoples within their monitoring and learning frameworks. Successful project examples have shown the value of monitoring impacts of activities in order to pivot or course-correct activities:

...Noteworthy observation of the study was that only one deployed HRH was a recipient of a national scholarship sponsored by DOH and only one represented the Indigenous people sector. **According to the AO, government scholars and members of Indigenous cultural communities should be granted priority in the program.** (PA-00W-NQ9 Philippines)

Where appropriate, **affected Indigenous peoples shall participate in determining the level and form of mitigation and compensation measures** affecting them. Such measures should aim to meet their objectives and preferences, including by improving their living standards. (PA-00W-RS9 Niger)

The Amazon BMP activity also shows a clear example on the value of continuing to monitor impacts and engagement with Indigenous peoples throughout the lifecycle of the program. This approach to mitigate negative impacts is also clearly guided by the PRO-IP, demonstrating its usefulness to OUs:

Indigenous groups and Indigenous rights advocacy groups mistakenly perceived that the Amazon BMP Activity’s purpose is to promote extractive and infrastructure megaprojects in the Amazon region. **In reviewing their concerns,** it was clear that while the Activity had put in place a social inclusion strategy and planned to undertake a series of social assessments and site-level stakeholder consultations, **it should have implemented a more robust stakeholder engagement** process with indigenous groups during its first year of implementation...In undertaking these FY20 activities across its three Strategic Approaches, the **Activity will apply**

the USAID Policy on Indigenous Peoples' Issues and cooperate closely with the USAID AIRR Activity. (PA-00W-6SR Amazon)

Another example from the Nexos Locales projects in Guatemala demonstrates how assessments and analyses are not only relevant for the start-up of a project, but can continue to be used throughout the project lifecycle in order to continue to monitor negative impacts and possible conflicts:

...in Year 2, Nexos Locales contracted an international conflict mitigation expert to design and develop a conflict vulnerability matrix, which builds off the USAID Guatemala Conflict Vulnerability Assessment completed by Democracy International. The matrix recommends **life-of-project activity considerations and captures cross-cutting considerations in youth, indigenous communities, and gender to anticipate and prevent possible tensions arising from change catalyst activities.** (PA-00W-C84 Guatemala)

While some projects have detailed plans on monitoring data relevant to program outputs and outcomes themselves, the level of detail seems to become broader as it comes to monitoring impacts to Indigenous groups specifically, as several projects mentioned monitoring impacts on Indigenous groups as part of same category as other marginalized groups:

The team will jointly design data collection instruments to capture pertinent data across all Green Future interventions. The instruments will provide a significant basis for reliable performance data entered into the Performance Indicator Summary and Data Tracking table (see Appendix C). The team will be **vigilant to identify opportunities for useful interactions with cross-cutting and priority focus areas, including women, youth, and indigenous and other marginalized groups.** (PA-00W-NQ9 Cambodia)

However, this example potentially continues the discussion on gaps or areas of further clarification in the PRO-IP policy. The program continues to reference engagement with Indigenous peoples in this context as *stakeholder* engagement, whereas the groups' concerns about potential negative impacts from extractive megaprojects within their regions may qualify their engagement as those of *rights holders*, with which the depth and level of engagement must match. This issue of language is discussed extensively in Stream 3.

MEASUREMENT AND INDICATORS

Our review of documents suggest that indicators related to Indigenous Peoples generally try to measure disaggregated program outputs, such as the number of Indigenous peoples or groups reached by the program; the number of relevant program activities events centering Indigenous interests, such as trainings to non- Indigenous peoples on culture or heritage; as number of related legislation passed; or number of trainings of government authorities. A large majority of indicators in "integrated" programs also disaggregate activity-level indicators by populations of interest:

How many men, women and other under-represented groups **invited to this event?** – Are at least 30% of under-represented groups such as women, **indigenous**, extremely poor people invited to this event? (PA-00W-JCQ Cambodia)

Number of citizens participating in project activities 55% are identified as belonging to vulnerable groups (women, young people, **Indigenous people** and persons with disabilities; no LGBTBI members were identified as participants)... (PA-00W-NXG Honduras)

...% **recipient communities** that were poor, marginalized, or **indigenous**. (PA-00W-JVQ Philippines)

Indicators Disaggregated by... Ethnicity Age **Indigenous Not Indigenous**. (PA-00W-NWN Guatemala)

One challenge with disaggregating data by category of Indigenous is the presence of political or historical barriers in some contexts that make using the word Indigenous highly sensitive. For example, **OU respondents in Mali** discussed that due to conflicts related to Indigeneity, particularly conflicts between nomadic groups and agriculturalists, they do not label populations as Indigenous. When measuring impacts, staff at this OU collect data on composition of ethnicity at the village level and use village level studies to classify communities as facing 1) external threat 2) internal threat (people leaving to join extremist groups) or 3) interethnic coopting.

Additionally, the below is a positive example of the type of engagement needed in order to ensure that indicators and measurements of success are decided on and defined by Indigenous peoples themselves:

During this year, IPOs representatives from Guyana and Suriname held a first contextualization and capacity assessment workshop to narrow the capacity areas to be assessed and **customize their own indicators, or statements of excellence**, to more appropriately respond to their contexts. They also **finalized their Organizational Performance Indices (OPI)**. These baselines scores will be used to continue to inform capacity development activities to address prioritized organizational functions and capacity areas. (PA-00X-8KG Suriname; Peru; Guyana; Colombia; Brazil)

Other indicators demonstrate measurement not just of Indigenous Peoples reached by a program, but the results as they speak to advancement of Indigenous leadership and representation, and the achievement of Indigenous rights:

Performance Indicator: GESI 2.1 Percent of **leadership positions** in USG-supported community management entities that are **filled by a woman or member of a vulnerable group** (USAID PMP 1.3.2-1) Performance Plan and Report (PPR) (PA-00X-BNV Nepal)

Forest Alliance expects three results and six intermediate results: Result 1: Enabling conditions for CFM in Ucayali strengthened Intermediate **Results: 1.1. Indigenous' lands controlled and monitored by the seven indigenous communities...CFM 1.3. Public budget available to support CFM** in Ucayali. (PA-00X-2WWM Peru)

SHARING RESULTS

While there were several details on how progress and results are reported and documented to donors and others involved in the programming, there were fewer examples of results shared to Indigenous communities themselves. Results shared outside of the donor community often included the sharing of media, especially video:

The video was produced by a LESTARI female media champion, who received mentoring on video documentary via a LESTARI fellowship...Video will be **shared with the local media organization** Aceh Documentary, to be screened in awareness-raising activities for high school and college students in Aceh. (PA-00W-7RH Indonesia)

Other examples of sharing results often come in the form of the bringing together of committees or groups to discuss ongoing activities:

Since April, Community Roots' gender and inclusion specialist has been participating in **weekly meetings of both groups to learn about activities implemented** by the authorities, establish alliances with other key actors, and **share information on measure to prevent COVID-19** and violence against vulnerable groups. (PA-00X-9RD Guatemala)

Additionally, the below are especially good example of sharing technical information from the activity and ensuring it is accessible to Indigenous Peoples:

PMA also **adapts its technical information and training materials for clients** with varying reading proficiencies and **in indigenous languages** to ensure no one is unable to access our methodology. (PA-00X-3PR Colombia)

Likewise, the Indigenous People's Specialist contextualized training documents to ensure all indigenous participants truly understood methodologies, ideas and guides being shared throughout intervention activities. (PA-00W-NWN Guatemala)

Support the communities in the preparation of deforestation reports to be **officially delivered to these indigenous organizations** and facilitate the agreement of a procedure for the delivery of reports. (PA-00X-2WX Peru)

STREAM IB: REVIEW OF PUBLICLY AVAILABLE USAID SOLICITATIONS

This stream of the landscape analysis analyzed publicly available solicitations around the guiding question: "to what extent are solicitations issued after the release of PRO-IP include the PRO-IP's suggestions for strengthening USAID programming for Indigenous Peoples?"

Overall, NORC found that most OUs are not fully incorporating PRO-IP guidance in their solicitation process. However, this general trend masks high levels of variability between OUs and regions. After identifying 226 solicitations that are related to IP's from grants.gov and sam.gov, 44 were determined to be relevant to PRO-IP and falling within the date range of 10/1/2019 - 12/31/2020 (for more detail, please see our methodology section in Annex B.

Of these 44, 12 solicitations were Directly Relevant, meaning that it was clear after reviewing the solicitation that the activity explicitly identifies Indigenous Peoples populations as direct activity beneficiaries (i.e. there are objectives, results, etc. that are related to Indigenous Peoples and their welfare). These were specifically in the following sectors: Biodiversity/Conservation/Pollution Reduction, Health, and Economic Growth; and in the following countries: Vietnam (2), Cambodia, Tanzania, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Republic of the Congo, Zambia, Lesotho, Libya, and Colombia.

It is important to note that several respondents in SSIs mentioned plans to include PRO-IP in solicitations moving forward even if they haven't been able to incorporate it fully yet. For example, **OU respondents in the Philippines** explained that going forward, there will be a mandatory reference to the PRO-IP in environment programming when making solicitations, since many of areas of conservation are occupied by Indigenous Peoples.

Statement of managers required for FY 2020-21 budget – IP partners in protected area must meet certain conditions, such as setting up redress mechanisms.

Please note: References to solicitations by number in this section refer to the full table of solicitations relevant to PRO-IP in Annex B, “Methods and Limitations”.

TERMS OF IDENTIFICATION IN SOLICITATIONS

Typically, terms of identification are quite broad in solicitations, referencing “traditional leaders”, “indigenous people”, “ethnic minority communities,” etc. but do not reference specific Indigenous Peoples population(s) or group(s). However, many of the Directly Relevant solicitations target very specific geographical zones where the activity will be taking place which may identify specific Indigenous Peoples population(s) even if they are not explicitly named, such as reference to “Indigenous Peoples” in the forest and peatlands in Republic of the Congo (#40).

In terms of how beneficiary populations are determined to be Indigenous, one solicitation vaguely references the process of identifying Indigenous Peoples (#37) but none of the solicitations reviewed indicate how the OU made the determination that “any ethnic group or other marginalized population in a country would qualify as Indigenous Peoples” in line with the criteria in Section II of PRO-IP. Only three solicitations identify specific populations of Indigenous Peoples and/or reference the process of identifying Indigenous Peoples. These include: 1) “forest dependent communities living near protected areas of the provinces of Quang Tri, Thua Thien Hue, Quang Nam, Quang Binh and Lam Dong” (#6); 2) “Pygmies” (#11); and 3) “Indigenous populations, such as Tuaregs and Tebus” (#12).

From these solicitations, the process by which OUs determine whether a group is Indigenous or not still remains unclear and not standardized. This is in line with findings from searches of the DEC and the SSIs in which many OUs, especially in Africa and Asia, faced challenges with determining which populations are Indigenous within their geographic zones, and even in countries that have official lists of Indigenous Peoples, these lists are often contested and incomplete. Thus, OUs either triangulate information from Indigenous Peoples’ organizations and the government, or as mentioned in the SSI with USAID/DRC, they use more loose information gathering (“common knowledge”). Alternatively, it is possible that some OUs simply avoid labelling populations as Indigenous altogether, due to difficulties with making the determination and/or political sensitivities.

Six solicitations out of the 12 that were Directly Relevant explicitly referenced the PRO-IP policy; two reference PRO-IP only as a footnote; two reference the PRO-IP in the main text as a hyperlink; and two explicitly specify that the activity must be carried out in accordance with the PRO-IP (#7 - Colombia, and #37 - Cambodia). This was corroborated by the SSI interviews where respondents in Colombia and Cambodia said that they deliberately incorporated directives around using the PRO-IP into their solicitation process. Despite the relatively small number of solicitations that call for using the PRO-IP policy, many of the solicitations reference other USAID policies (e.g. Gender and Climate policies) and

require offerors to align their activity to such policies. This offers an encouraging sign that OUs will reference the PRO-IP more explicitly in the future if USAID continues to encourage them to do so.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The guidance from the PRO-IP calls for evaluation criteria for proposals that promote meaningful engagement with Indigenous Peoples. The general trend in the solicitations that NORC assessed is that very few OUs are including the recommended elements in evaluation criteria. It is important to note that NORC examined all types of solicitations, and such evaluation criteria are only present in Requests for Proposals; this explains somewhat why the proportion of solicitations that were found to include these criteria were small in comparison to the total. None of the solicitations request that the offeror include their Indigenous Peoples Policy or Inclusive Development Policy. This may be something that future dissemination efforts can emphasize in order to clearly communicate to offerors the importance of engaging with Indigenous Peoples.

Five solicitations include language that *states expectations* of offerors to engage with Indigenous Peoples (#6, 11, 23, 37, 40). For example, solicitation six in Vietnam states that the success and sustainability of the activity is dependent on:

Engagement with local communities and local organizations - Local communities living in and around special use and protection forests can be partners in conservation if they are engaged effectively and seen as partners in implementation. Local NGOs are also considered important stakeholders for the implementation of this activity through collective action approaches. (#6)

Solicitation 37 in Cambodia included the following language:

Effective implementation requires intentional approaches... [such as] Ensuring that collective impact initiatives are community-driven and involve community members with lived experience of the environmental pollution challenge; Bringing an equity lens to collective impact, which involves understanding how environmental pollution challenges affect demographic groups differently and identifying interventions that increase gender and social equity... (#37)

Only three solicitations *specifically cite these expectations as evaluation criteria* with which applications are evaluated (#6, #11, #40). Language on the content of the technical application for solicitation 6 in Vietnam included: "The Applicant must demonstrate experience in...Engagement with stakeholders, including protected area management authorities, NGOs and local communities, to develop biodiversity plans and support the implementation of those plans..." (#6). In the Democratic Republic of the Congo, solicitation 11 stated that, "The concept paper will be evaluated on the extent to which the organization will be leveraging school staff and community members while reaching the main direct beneficiaries" (#11). In the Republic of the Congo, solicitation 40 requested that the technical approach in proposals "Describe how approaches address gender equality and empowerment of women and other vulnerable populations including indigenous people where applicable" (#40).

CAPACITY BUILDING AND DIRECT FUNDING

While many of the solicitations had language around general capacity building activities (objective 3 of the PRO-IP), only two included language on offering capacity building assistance to help Indigenous

Peoples compete for and manage direct funding from USAID. In the Republic of the Congo (RoC), solicitation 40 called for “the development of a small grants program that targets local enterprises and civil society organizations from RoC involved in or with the potential to be involved in sustainable natural resource management, forest management and conservation”. In Colombia, solicitation 7 stated:

The Activity will also prioritize developing the capacity of such organizations so that they would be capable of and well-positioned to receive and effectively manage a direct award from USAID or other donors in the future. The Activity is also expected to include a large sub-grants fund. (#7)

This is in line with the SSI with USAID/Colombia in which respondents discussed a general trend towards prioritizing direct funds for Indigenous Peoples’ organizations. Solicitation 7 in Colombia was the only solicitation that discussed such direct funding. Respondents in the SSI with Colombia also noted that they have been including PRO-IP as a resource in procurement solicitations, “which is important so that offerors know that this is a framework to reference and keep in mind and learn about.” It is important to note as well that SSI respondents in Cambodia point offerors to the PRO-IP in solicitations:

We consider this, we made a provision for example in the early design phase. Sometimes we don’t know exactly what the target location is for a project or who are the exact beneficiaries, whether indigenous or non-indigenous, but we have a provision or clause that if the proposed target site and beneficiaries are indigenous people, you have to follow PRO-IP and obtain FPIC.

CASE STUDIES

Case studies from 3 OUs that have followed PRO-IP guidance in their solicitations since October of 2019 are presented here to illustrate how this guidance has translated into practice.

Tanzania (#1) - Although the solicitation does not clarify if IPs are the targeted group, it does state that “The activity will engage parents and community members, including faith and traditional leaders, in protecting adolescents from violence...” & ““The foundational assumption of the OVC Activity is that the empowerment of indigenous stakeholders by supporting locally generated and driven interventions with a framework of accountability will result in sustainable achievements that will far outlast the period and level of USAID/Tanzania investment.” (Objective #1 / Operating Principle #3)

Vietnam (#6, #23) - In USAID Biodiversity Conservation (#6), the OU engages with IP/PRO-IP in the following ways: 1) Clearly identifies IP populations (and their geographical location); 2) Explicitly references IP populations in two “Strategic Approaches” and a “Custom Indicator” (Strategic Approach 1: "Promote Conservation Friendly Enterprises in Forest Dependent Communities") and (Strategic approach 4: "Reduce Local Demand [for hunting wildlife] through Behavior Change Methodologies"); 3) Includes engagement with IPs under criteria for evaluation (see Technical Approach) and specifies that success of activity is dependent on:

Engagement with local communities and local organizations - Local communities living in and around special use and protection forests can be partners in conservation if they are engaged effectively and seen as partners in implementation. Local NGOs are also considered important stakeholders for the implementation of this activity through collective action approaches.

And:

Thinking and working politically (TWP) and political economy analysis (PEA) - Conservation involves a diverse group of stakeholders with diverse motivations and requires a TWP approach. The core principles of TWP are: ... 2) nuanced appreciation of, and responses to, the local context, working through and empowering domestic networks of stakeholders and coalitions...

This solicitation also includes language about the intersections of gender and Indigenous status. USAID conducted a gender analysis and findings include:

It is recognized that the Activity will work in locations with high cultural and social diversity. Thus, the recipient must conduct a more detailed gender analysis prior to or an early stage of the Activity implementation. There is a clear labor division in forest dwelling communities. In general, men are perceived as the ones responsible for representing families in events and meetings and/or dealing with other stakeholders, for instance government agencies... There is clear evidence about the roles and responsibilities between men and women in the mountainous ethnic minority communities in the conduct of livelihood activities...

Colombia (#7, #17) - In both solicitations, the OU engages with IP/PRO-IP in the following ways:

1. Clearly identifies “Indigenous Peoples” and “Afro-Colombians” as targets of Activities:

The goal of this Activity is to contribute to Indigenous Peoples' and Afro-Colombians' self-determined development by strengthening organizations' capacity, increasing communities' access to socio-economic opportunities and participation in peace implementation, and increasing society's respect for ethnic heritage and cultural diversity. Recognizing the need for differential, tailored actions for ethnic communities, USAID/Colombia strives to implement comprehensive, standalone activities for Indigenous Peoples and Afro-Colombians. (#7)

Target population: The OU expects the resulting Award(s) to target and include one or more of the following populations: conflict survivors, youth, women, LGBTI, Afro-Colombians, indigenous, and Venezuelan migrants. (#17);

2. This is the only clear, explicit case from the review of solicitations of an OU reaching out to IPs in activity design phase:

Given the nature of Indigenous Peoples and Afro-Colombian Activity, USAID is reaching out to Indigenous Peoples and Afro-Colombian organizations, current partners, and a broader audience to solicit comments/suggestions... (#7)

3. The solicitation is clear about cross-sectoral nature of activities:

The activity will respond to the changing context for ethnic communities, including ongoing violence, poverty, illicit crop growth in their territories, and the appearance of unforeseen health and food security issues such as those related to COVID-19 (#7)

and,

COVID-19's impact on economy but also biodiversity, technology; economic recovery being more challenging for vulnerable populations including women, LGBTI, Afro-Colombians, indigenous, and Venezuelan migrants. (#17)

4. The solicitation includes plans to offer capacity building assistance:

The Activity will also prioritize developing the capacity of such organizations so that they would be capable of and well-positioned to receive and effectively manage a direct award from USAID or other donors in the future. The activity is also expected to include a large sub-grants fund. (#17)

REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

Several of the SSI respondents mentioned using Requests for Information (RFI) to integrate PRO-IP guidance into the solicitation and procurement process. While this was the case for OUs that were already familiar with the PRO-IP policy or had a history of working closely with Indigenous Peoples, in general, most OUs could improve on using this tool to help their solicitation process better incorporate Indigenous Peoples concerns. **OU respondents in Peru** explained that they first use requests for information, then participate in meetings with Indigenous Peoples' organizations to listen to their concerns about projects, then develop solicitations and concepts and send them as RFIs to solicit opinions on project design. Then they refine project designs based on Objective 2 about Indigenous economic activities. **OU respondents in South Africa** also mentioned using requests for information to kick off co-design processes related to Indigenous Peoples.

STREAM 2: SAMPLE OF OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS' AND DONORS' POLICIES

In this section, we compare the PRO-IP policy to other policies from bilateral and multilateral donors, presented in Table 3:

Table 4: International Organizations' and Donors' Policies

POLICY	YEAR	ORGANIZATION
United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples	2007	United Nations
World Bank ESS7: Indigenous Peoples/ Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities	2018	World Bank
DFAT Indigenous Peoples Strategy 2015-2019: A framework for action	2015	Australia Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
IFC Performance Standard 7: Indigenous Peoples	2012	International Finance Corporation
Joint Staff Working Document : Implementing EU External Policy on Indigenous Peoples	2016	European Commission
Operational Policy on Indigenous Peoples and Strategy for Indigenous Development	2006	Inter-American Development Bank
Indigenous Peoples Safeguards: A Planning and Implementation Good Practice Sourcebook	2013	Asian Development Bank

Since the African Development Bank has not published a specific policy to promote the rights of Indigenous Peoples, we chose a World Bank policy that focuses on Indigenous Peoples in Africa. Indigeneity is a particularly contested subject in Africa, and we have included language from policies that discuss this in the section on criteria to identify Indigenous Peoples below under Objective 2.

Overall, PRO-IP is very much aligned with other donor policies on Indigenous peoples. All policies focus on collaboration with Indigenous communities, participatory or co-design approaches to development, and the right of IP's to determine their own development processes.

OBJECTIVE 1: STRENGTHEN ENGAGEMENT WITH INDIGENOUS PEOPLES TO SAFEGUARD AGAINST HARM AND SUPPORT THEIR DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES AND SELF-RELIANCE.

Objective 1 of PRO-IP deals with meaningful engagement, especially in terms of free, prior, and informed consent. Similar language to this objective was at the center of all donor policies including PRO-IP. All policies emphasize free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) as being of utmost importance. However, the guidance provided on obtaining FPIC, as well as what to do if it cannot be obtained, differs between policies as outlined below. It is important to emphasize that USAID takes the approach of seeking compliance with local laws on FPIC, and if they do not exist in a country, using meaningful engagement, consultation and co-creation to ensure that FPIC values and standards are met. In addition, the PRO-IP takes the approach of promoting a continuum of engagement rather than a onetime FPIC exercise, to facilitate co-creation and engagement throughout the program cycle. For the Washington/Indigenous Peoples office's most recent toolkits around FPIC, please contact the Indigenous Peoples Advisor.⁴

One example of an OU that successfully integrates FPIC into their programming is Paraguay. **OU respondents from Paraguay** described how they follow the requirements from the government of Paraguay around FPIC and educate all of their implementing partners on them. They receive regular (weekly and trimester) reporting from partners and stay in close contact with them to ensure compliance with legal FPIC requirements as well as meaningful engagement, consultation, and co-creation with Indigenous Peoples generally.

ALLOWING TIME FOR COLLECTIVE DECISION MAKING

While PRO-IP and USAID's Consultation Handbook lay out guidelines for meaningful consultation with IP's to get free, prior, and informed consent, other policies such as the World Bank's additionally and specifically emphasize allowing sufficient time for collective decision making processes. In Operating Principle 3 of PRO-IP policy, it is written that:

USAID's staff and implementing partners must work with representatives of Indigenous Peoples to understand cultural differences, such as different ways of conceiving of timelines, spaces, communication, etc. Establishing mutually agreed upon procedures or "rules of engagement" will provide a framework for conversation and interaction that is culturally appropriate for both sides.

While this is strong guidance, it is not quite as explicit as the other policies that state that time must be given for collective decision making as part of good faith negotiations. This is because the PRO-IP supports a continuum of engagement approach. So, instead of a linear process in which Indigenous

⁴ Luis-Felipe Duchicela, Senior Advisor for Indigenous Peoples' Issues: lduchicela@usaid.gov

Peoples are allotted specific windows of time for decision making, the guidance in the PRO-IP calls for engagement throughout the program cycle, thus allowing for Indigenous decision making across the entire timeline of projects. USAID provides guidance on how to implement this approach to engagement in its Consultation Handbook which can be found alongside other guidance documents for FPIC on the Implementation Toolkits page of the USAID/Indigenous Peoples website.⁵

In contrast, The World Bank policy states:

Internal decision-making processes are generally but not always collective in nature. There may be internal dissent, and decisions may be challenged by some in the community. The consultation process should be sensitive to such dynamics and allow sufficient time for internal decision-making processes to reach conclusions that are considered legitimate by the majority of the concerned participants.

The policy from the International Finance Corporation also specifies as part of their guidelines for meaningful consultation to “provide sufficient time for Indigenous Peoples’ decision-making processes.”

COMPENSATION

The PRO-IP policy does not lay out guidance for compensating Indigenous Peoples whose land or access to natural resources are impacted by project activities and free, prior, and informed consent cannot be obtained. Instead, it encourages projects to avoid these impacts from the beginning by identifying such risks using tools like Inclusive Development Analysis (IDAs) and Social Impact Assessments (SIAs), and taking steps to mitigate them. Or, if FPIC cannot be obtained, the guidance from PRO-IP is to not move forward with the activities. In this way, PRO-IP is most aligned with the policy of the World Bank, which states:

If FPIC cannot be ascertained by the Bank, the project design will be adjusted to eliminate the aspects of the project relevant to the affected IP/SSAHUTLC. For example, if FPIC is not obtained from the affected communities of IP/SSAHUTLC for the proposed construction of a new road through their land, the project should reroute the road to avoid acquisition of the land or physical displacement of the communities. In such cases, measures included in the IP/SSAHUTLC Plan help avoid any adverse impacts on the communities.

In contrast, the policy from the International Finance Corporation lays out specific situations in which Indigenous peoples should be compensated. While most policies make a strong point of avoiding asking Indigenous peoples to relocate, especially without their free and prior informed consent, this one lays out guidelines for compensation in the event that FPIC is not obtained and the project involves commercial development of traditionally Indigenous held lands and resources:

[Projects should be] providing land-based compensation or compensation-in-kind in lieu of cash compensation where feasible. Ensuring continued access to natural resources, identifying the equivalent replacement resources, or, as a last option, providing compensation and identifying alternative livelihoods if project development results in the loss of access to and the loss of natural resources independent of project land acquisition.

⁵ <https://www.usaid.gov/indigenous-peoples/social-impact-assessment-toolkit>

The Asian Development Bank is the most flexible of the policies in terms of allowing for resettlement instead of strongly encouraging projects to avoid this outcome. Their policy calls for compensation in the event that Indigenous Peoples do not have formal land titles:

Since IP may not have legal title of ownership to their land, the borrower/client should offer at least the same level of compensation and due process that it offers to those with full legal title...Land-based resettlement is not easy, and the displaced communities must agree on the replacement land offered to them. When lands are owned collectively, regardless of their tenure system, the replacement land must be equally vested in the community rather than in individuals.

Both the Inter-American Development Bank and the European Commission also mention compensation in their policy, albeit without providing clear guidance on how to go about setting it. For example, in the European Commission policy it is written: “indigenous peoples' right to their "self-development", including the right to object to projects, in particular in their traditional areas, and the right to obtain compensation where projects negatively affect their livelihoods.”

OBJECTIVE 2: INCREASE THE INTEGRATION OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' CONCERNS ACROSS ALL SECTORS OF USAID'S PORTFOLIO OF INVESTMENTS AND PROMOTE CROSS-SECTORAL DEVELOPMENT APPROACHES.

Objective two in PRO-IP overlaps heavily with Operating Principle 2 (Analyze Indigenous peoples' Opportunities and Challenges), focusing on systematic ways of integrating Indigenous Peoples' concerns across projects and portfolios, especially in terms of using standardized tools and written analysis. It also calls for the identification of IP's as stakeholders in every project that could impact them, which is an area of divergence between policies which have differing criteria for identifying Indigenous Peoples.

SIMILARITIES

The tools that PRO-IP outlines, particularly the Inclusive Development Analysis (IDA) and Social Impact Assessment (SIA), are quite similar to the tools promoted in other donor policies. There is also consensus between policies that cross-cutting considerations such as gender and youth should be incorporated into any tools or procedures that assess social impacts of projects on IP's.

Additionally, the policies from the European Commission and the Inter-American Development Bank aim to 'mainstream' the rights of Indigenous peoples into broader country and regional programs, which parallels USAID's cross-sectoral approach.

DIFFERENCES IN CRITERIA TO IDENTIFY INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

Where the policies differ is with the criteria that they provide to identify Indigenous Peoples. The criteria to identify Indigenous Peoples in PRO-IP is highly aligned with other policies, but it has a few more components than the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank or the criteria from the International Finance Corporation. The two components of the PRO-IP guidance that are not present in these three others are: 1) the recognition of Indigenous identity from others (as opposed to self-identification) and 2) “resolve to maintain and reproduce their ancestral environments and systems as distinctive peoples and communities.” All four policies' criteria are in line with international standards.

In these ways, PRO-IP is in the middle of a spectrum of inclusivity among donor policies. They are less broad and inclusive than the three policies mentioned in the paragraph above, but are also broader than some policies that are more explicit about including histories of marginalization in their criteria, as described in the section below. In addition, the criteria of “collective attachment to territories and their natural resources” for the definition of Indigenous Peoples in PRO-IP could exclude some societies in Africa who would otherwise be identified as Indigenous. There is a section below that goes into more detail on this point and showcases guidance from other donor policies for identifying African Indigenous Peoples.

CRITERIA THAT INCLUDE COLONIALISM

The only mention of colonialism in the criteria in PRO-IP is “historical continuity with pre-colonial and/or pre-settler societies.” This criteria is a bit vaguer than that of some other donor policies, which include more explicit language about histories of colonialism. While the PRO-IP criteria are not as specific about historical marginalization as those of other donors, their lack of specificity allows them to be more inclusive across the many geographic contexts of USAID’s work.

On the other end of the spectrum, the Australian Government’s Indigenous Strategy cites 3 criteria to identify Indigenous Peoples, all of which include acknowledgment of colonialism and historical marginalization. The relevant excerpts are as follows:

- 1) “[Indigenous peoples must have] experience of subjugation, marginalization, dispossession, exclusion or discrimination because they have different cultures, ways of life or modes of production than the national hegemonic and dominant model.”
- 2) "Peoples in independent countries (who) are regarded as indigenous on account of their descent from the populations which inhabited the country, or a geographical region to which the country belongs, at the time of conquest or colonization or the establishment of present state boundaries."
- 3) “[Indigenous communities, peoples and nations are those which, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing on those territories, or parts of them.”

The Inter-American Development Bank also includes histories of colonization in its criteria for identifying Indigenous peoples; one of their criteria is: “(i) they are descendants from populations inhabiting Latin America and the Caribbean at the time of the conquest or colonization”

IDENTIFYING INDIGENOUS PEOPLES IN AFRICA

There is much less consensus on Indigeneity in African contexts than there is in other regions of the world. This is a major reason why the African Development Bank has not published its own policy promoting or safeguarding the rights of Indigenous Peoples. The European Commission policy included language that spoke to this point:

In Africa, the term "indigenous peoples" is often particularly challenged. According to the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR), the concept of indigenous peoples is

relevant on the continent. However, it is mainly applied to pastoralists and hunter gatherer communities sharing specific characteristics.

This challenge of identifying Indigenous Peoples in Africa is also reflected in the title of the World Bank's Policy on Indigenous Peoples/Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities. In the policy, they explain that the criteria of "collective attachment to territories and their natural resources", used in PRO-IP and other donor policies, should be made more flexible in African contexts:

This ESS also applies to communities or groups of Indigenous Peoples/Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities who, during the lifetime of members of the community or group, have lost collective attachment to distinct habitats or ancestral territories in the project area because of forced severance, conflict, government resettlement programs, dispossession of their land, natural disasters, or incorporation of such territories into an urban area. This ESS also applies to forest dwellers, hunter-gatherers, pastoralists, or other nomadic groups.

Under these criteria, Indigenous Peoples can include those whose attachment to land is periodic or seasonal in nature because they are nomadic or they practice transhumance.

The criteria outlined in PRO-IP work best for Indigenous Peoples in the Americas, which makes sense given the strong history of Indigenous rights movements in these regions. In other regions such as Asia or Europe, criteria for Indigeneity are less clear cut than in the Americas but still more straightforward than defining Indigeneity in Africa. However, the same factors that muddy the waters in Africa such as the nomadic or transhumance nature of some peoples, or histories of land dispossession that break the continuity of their presence on a specific land, are also present in these regions. USAID may benefit by providing additional region-specific guidance for identifying Indigenous Peoples for such cases.

OBJECTIVE 3: EMPOWER INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVE ORGANIZATIONS TO ADVOCATE FOR, AND EXERCISE, THEIR RIGHTS AND PRACTICE SELF-DETERMINED DEVELOPMENT

Objective 3 of PRO-IP encourages projects to work closely with Indigenous organizations, establish feedback mechanisms for project activities, and identify adverse impacts. A key priority for USAID under this objective is also to consolidate lessons learned between Operating Units that are working on rights and empowerment.

Many components of this objective were shared between all of the donor policies. For example, the International Finance Corporation's policy calls for projects to "Involve Indigenous Peoples' representative bodies and organizations" and the Asian Development Bank policy emphasizes the "the need for the borrower/client to have good interaction with local leaders and Indigenous-specific organizations early in the project process". Related is that between donor policies, there was clear consensus about respecting the right of Indigenous Peoples in voluntary isolation to remain uncontacted. Where policies differ from PRO-IP is their guidance for sharing lessons learned and data between Operating Units.

SHARING LEARNINGS AND DATA

Several of the other donor policies have specific strategies for sharing learnings and data from projects that work with Indigenous peoples. While data disaggregation is encouraged, the PRO-IP policy does not specify that data must be disaggregated between Indigenous and non-Indigenous categories, nor does it establish specific platforms to share lessons learned and data between operating units or organizations. There is of course the Indigenous Peoples Blog and the Global Development Alliance mechanism, but there is no specific community of practice established by PRO-IP.

This is in contrast to the Australian DFAT Indigenous Peoples Strategy 2015-2019, which calls for data disaggregation and establishes a Community of Practice on Indigenous Issues to facilitate collaboration and share evidence-based lessons between organizations working on domestic or international issues affecting Indigenous peoples.

The European Commission policy highlights Indigenous Navigator as a repository of learnings and data about IP's: "As part of EU's support for 2030 Agenda, the Indigenous Navigator project remains relevant in order to generate consolidated data, making Indigenous issues visible and measurable for all relevant sustainable development targets."

OBJECTIVE 4: FOSTER AN ENABLING ENVIRONMENT FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLES TO ADVOCATE FOR, AND EXERCISE, THEIR RIGHTS.

This objective from PRO-IP is focused on making political, economic, and social institutions more equitable, inclusive, and accessible. It specifically promotes activities that work to reform the domestic legal environment in their country or countries of focus to reflect the rights of Indigenous Peoples. This can be very difficult when there are multiple layers of law; laws from the national government alongside Indigenous or customary codes of law. Operating Principle 1 highlights the existence of various legal frameworks that apply to Indigenous Peoples, including international and domestic sets of laws. Under sometimes conflicting sets of laws, redress mechanisms for grievances can be difficult to establish or enforce.

SIMILARITIES

All policies highlight the important risk of land or natural resource dispossession for Indigenous peoples, and include language about capacity building for Indigenous communities and organizations to know their rights around land. For example, the Inter-American Development Bank asks that projects include in their activities, "informing indigenous organizations and individuals of their rights under labor, social, financial, and business legislation and of the recourse mechanisms available". Across policies, suggested capacity building for Indigenous organizations is most often in the form of helping to establish formal land titles under nation-state law.

EMPHASIS ON MECHANISMS OF REDRESS FOR GRIEVANCES

While PRO-IP clearly calls for feedback mechanisms between project staff and their focus communities, it does not use the same language as many of the other policies about redress for grievances or complaints. In a section on project documents or work plans for implementation, PRO-IP states: "Specifically, the plan should include a mechanism by which partners and communities can provide feedback or alert USAID's Operating Units about concerns regarding the implementation of the project or activity." However, they do not go into great detail about what these feedback mechanisms should

look like. This also deviates from some of the wording used in other policies; The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in particular places great emphasis on redress.

The primary reason for PRO-IP's lack of emphasis and guidance in this area is that the scope of the policy does not allow it to mandate such mechanisms on an agency-wide level. Under USG regulations, such redress processes must be separately addressed and specific to the level and sector for which they are designed.

Very recently, initiatives have been gaining momentum to standardize the establishment of accountability mechanisms across the agency. In December 2020, when the United States Congress passed its appropriations legislation to fund the government, it issued an accompanying explanatory statement that requires USAID to establish an accountability mechanism. The process of implementing this directive for programming that impacts Indigenous Peoples is being guided by the USAID/Washington Indigenous Peoples office. The full text of the Congressional mandate is as follows:

USAID Accountability Mechanism.—Not later than 90 days after enactment of the Act and following consultation with the Committees on Appropriations, the USAID Administrator shall submit to such Committees a plan to establish an accountability mechanism, or strengthen any existing mechanisms, to which individuals, communities, civil society organizations, and other stakeholders can communicate concerns about existent or potential adverse impacts, including social, environmental, and economic impacts, resulting from USAID-funded programs, projects, and activities, and through which USAID can respond. The plan shall include procedures, to be posted on the USAID website, for communicating and responding to such concerns.

For more information on this ongoing process, please see the [2020 Joint Explanatory Statement](#), or the description from [Accountability Counsel](#).

The Congressional Appropriations Bill of 2021 also underscores the necessity of grievance and redress mechanisms, with the existence of such mechanisms a requirement for any funding being made available for national parks and protected areas.

Other policies, such as that from the Asian Development Bank, provide more explicit guidelines within the policy itself. For example, their policy dictates to projects that there must be descriptions of procedures to redress grievances provided to communities, and that information on these procedures must be accessible to Indigenous peoples, culturally appropriate, and gender sensitive. This policy has very specific guidance on how to go about designing and implementing grievance mechanisms, including who should be responsible for receiving grievances from the community, how they can be dealt with, and in what timeframe. Importantly, the policy stresses that project staff should allow Indigenous peoples to express their grievances orally as opposed to in writing, as per their cultural preferences.

The World Bank's policy also calls for specific grievance mechanisms:

The Borrower will ensure that a grievance mechanism is established for the project, as described in ESS10, which is culturally appropriate and accessible to affected Indigenous Peoples/Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities, and takes into account the availability of judicial recourse and customary dispute settlement mechanisms

among Indigenous Peoples/ Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities.

STREAM 3: PUBLICATIONS FROM INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' ORGANIZATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS FOCUSED ON INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' DEVELOPMENT

This section reviews policies, reports, and briefs produced by organizations of Indigenous Peoples as well as organizations focused on Indigenous Peoples' development. We identify gaps and overlaps between PRO-IP policy and these organizations' needs and expectations. Generally, the PRO-IP identifies many of the same points as Indigenous Peoples' organizations regarding their desired engagement with development donors; both share a strong emphasis on the processes of consultation and consent. However, Indigenous Peoples' organizations often prefer greater participation in activities than what is mandated by USAID. They also raise several concerns, areas for improvement, and opportunities that are not addressed by the PRO-IP, including permission to consult, discrepancy among government sectors, difficulty in meeting donor requirements, and recognizing historical failures.

One set of documents surveyed relates to the implementation of free, prior, informed consent (FPIC), in response to a solicitation by the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, a subsidiary body of the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHCR). Organizations responding to this solicitation include the [Amazon Cooperation Network](#), [Assembly of First Nations](#) in Canada, [Association Nationale de Promotion et de Protection des droits de l'homme](#) (Cameroun), [Indian Law Resource Center](#), [Maya Leaders Alliance of Toledo Belize](#), and the [NSW Aboriginal Land Council](#). These documents focus on different challenges and considerations faced regarding FPIC in different contexts.

Other documents analyzed include reports on communicating and engaging with Indigenous Peoples released by the [International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs \(IWGIA\)](#), [IWGIA](#) and the [Asian Indigenous People's Pact \(AIPP\)](#), [Forest Peoples Program](#), [Center for World Indigenous Studies \(CWIS\)](#), [CWIS and Rainforest Foundation Norway](#), [Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee \(IPACC\)](#), as well as a [manual on gender and Indigenous Peoples](#) and a [handbook on FPIC and extractive industries](#) by AIPP.

OBJECTIVE 1: STRENGTHEN ENGAGEMENT WITH INDIGENOUS PEOPLES TO SAFEGUARD AGAINST HARM AND SUPPORT THEIR DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES AND SELF-RELIANCE.

PRO-IP's first objective fills many of the gaps identified by Indigenous Peoples' organizations in engagement with Indigenous Peoples. In particular, the third Operating Principle (Engage Indigenous Peoples) explains how USAID's priorities can be applied in various contexts during the engagement process. These priorities include elevating the development priorities of Indigenous Peoples, leveraging Indigenous and traditional knowledge, engaging in frequent consultations and communication throughout the lifecycle of a project, and mitigating adverse consequences resulting from development initiatives.

The Maya Leaders Alliance highlights that USAID's priorities should be reflected in project budgets, and collaborators should account for the costs of regular consultation and engagement in their budget estimates. PRO-IP also acknowledges this need:

OUTS are also encouraged to have implementing partners set aside financial resources to engage with Indigenous Peoples and monitor social impacts over the life of the activity. The

Independent Government Cost Estimates should include funds for engagement with Indigenous Peoples as warranted and based on the findings of any analyses.

The goal of these consultations and structured engagement is to ensure agreement and cooperation between IP communities and donor organizations, which is formally obtained through free, prior, informed consent (FPIC). These groups PRO-IP and IP organizations differ in some ways over FPIC; in particular, they differ in their understanding of the following questions:

- Who should give consent?
- Is FPIC always necessary?

PERMISSION TO CONSULT

Before commencing the process of obtaining FPIC, PRO-IP policy acknowledges that “[i]n cases in which Indigenous Peoples have developed their own protocols and policies in relation to consultation and FPIC, these should form the basis for engagement with them.” Some organizations including Forest Peoples stipulate seeking permission to consult as a precondition for obtaining FPIC. Seeking permission to consult entails contacting the Indigenous community in a culturally appropriate way to ask whether the community is open to discussion about a development project. It also includes recognizing that some communities live in voluntary self-isolation or initial stages of contact and may refuse to communicate. Operating Principle 3 (Engage Indigenous Peoples) and Operating Principle 4 (Safeguard Indigenous Peoples Rights and Well-Being) in the PRO-IP discusses respect for these communities, including “establishing mutually agreed upon procedures or ‘rules of engagement’” and that USAID “should not fund or support projects that could lead to undesired contact,” respectively. However, PRO-IP does not explicitly mention permission to consult as a first step in engaging with IPs.

DEFINITION OF FREE, PRIOR, INFORMED CONSENT (FPIC)

Both PRO-IP and documents released by IP organizations differentiate between the processes of consultation and consent, recognizing that both consultation and FPIC are necessary components before taking action that directly or indirectly affects Indigenous communities. IP organizations draw additional attention to the actors involved in decision making. For example, AIPP states that:

FPIC is more than just an act of consultation, consent or non-consent. Rather, it entails an internal process of consensus building among the people in order to arrive at a decision... Consensus means that the decision is not simply a majority vote or a decision made by the leaders in the community. Rather, a decision is reached through a democratic process of discussion with the participation of the community collectively.

This statement recognizes that FPIC is a decision not limited to the leaders of the community, but involves the entire community in a participatory process. Language used by PRO-IP also notes that Indigenous Peoples’ decision-making processes may include recognized leaders as well as community-based decision-making mechanisms. However, PRO-IP is not explicit in its guidance about determining whose consent should be sought. This is because PRO-IP supports a continuum of engagement framework rather than a one-time exercise to obtain consent. Instead of ‘checking a box’, USAID guidance promotes co-creation and engagement that is flexible and nuanced. So, OU staff are encouraged to learn from communities about the best ways to engage with them and take a more holistic and adaptive approach to consultation throughout the program cycle.

In addition, some Indigenous definitions of FPIC include additional steps of the consulting process beyond collective decision-making. For example, definitions designated by AIPP and Forest Peoples include the following steps to achieving FPIC: establishment of a grievance mechanism, participation in monitoring and evaluation, proof of binding agreement, securing advisors and legal counsel, and agreements on benefit sharing and the inclusion of third party entities to audit and oversee the project. Some of these steps are mentioned in the PRO-IP and in USAID's sector guidance; for example, the guidance on energy and infrastructure suggests enhancing the sharing of project benefits, particularly in energy and infrastructure projects, as a best practice for donors. Yet there exist no clear standards for determining the requirements or entailments for FPIC.

WHEN FPIC IS DEEMED NECESSARY

Regarding the necessity of FPIC, Operating Principle 4 states that obtaining FPIC is a “best practice” for development organizations, rather than a requirement. Under this Operating Principle, FPIC is most emphasized in the case of potential adverse impact. Furthermore, PRO-IP highlights the fact that FPIC does not imply explicit agreement by Indigenous Peoples leaders:

The United States, in its Announcement of Support for the UNDRIP, states that, “the Declaration’s provisions on free, prior, and informed consent are understood to call for a process of meaningful consultation with [traditional] leaders, but **not necessarily the agreement of** those leaders, before the actions addressed in those consultations are taken.”

PRO-IP, in its guidance on FPIC, must balance several different factors in its approach. FPIC and its associated rights-based approach is conceived in the international community as a legal framework that is mandated to national governments. USAID cannot take this position on behalf of a sovereign state, so it can't mandate FPIC. Thus, the USG interprets FPIC as Free, Prior, and Informed Consultation, not Consent.

In light of these considerations, PRO-IP guidance is to pursue consultation that meets FPIC standards without legally mandating it. There's no universal framework or definition for FPIC, so it is not possible USAID to endorse it blankly.

In contrast, Indigenous Peoples concur that an FPIC analysis must always be conducted in situations involving IPs, whether the anticipated effects of the engagement are positive or negative. They agree that FPIC requires the full agreement of the communities affected, and without it, the initiative should not proceed. According to AIPP,

Indigenous peoples view FPIC as an inherent right that is derived from their right to self-determination. Thus it is not an option to forego the process of FPIC, because to do so would mean from the very start that the rights of Indigenous peoples are violated.

This discussion stems from a deeper issue of Indigenous sovereignty, as shown through the Maya Leaders Alliance's support of a consent-veto approach:

The consent-veto approach to the state duty to consult, and the related objective of obtaining free, prior, and informed consent, is one grounded in the historical recognition of indigenous sovereignty. This approach invokes an indigenous community's complete right to give or

withhold consent before a state takes action that may directly affect that community's fundamental rights, particularly rights to land.

ENABLING INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE SHARING

A significant aspect of this objective is to elevate development-related knowledge possessed by Indigenous Peoples. According to IPACC, “indigenous and traditional knowledge [ITK] involves a complex matrix of knowledge, most of it undocumented, most of it held in cultural systems, which allows humans and nature to interact.” The value of this knowledge in promoting health and sustainability is recognized through PRO-IP's goal of establishing partnerships with Indigenous Peoples to leverage their communal knowledge. Operating Principle 5 (Establish Partnerships with Indigenous Peoples) states the following:

Indigenous Peoples are often the best source of expertise in identifying effective development approaches to address the challenges they and broader society face...One clear example has been leveraging Indigenous Peoples' knowledge to identify, address, and manage adaptively climate risks. Doing so not only provides a good opportunity for partnering, but also results in better risk mitigation.

However, IPACC points out that Indigenous Peoples' communities will be reluctant to share this knowledge without an environment of trust:

Community control, a rights-based approach & an ethical framework will build trust and cooperation: ITK is both a community resource and a national resource. The ability of the community to control, value, transmit and benefit from its knowledge will influence both the sustainability of the local resources and the willingness to share and explore its applications. If communities fear that their knowledge will be extracted or misused they will not trust the process.

Operating Principle 3 of PRO-IP underscores two-way communication through ongoing and culturally appropriate consultations in order to reach consensus on goals and how to achieve them. PRO-IP more broadly stresses the importance of preserving and unlocking Indigenous knowledge, but does not contain specific guidance on protecting Indigenous Peoples' wishes for the use of this knowledge. The process of consultation, particularly regarding initiatives involving sustainability and health that are ingrained in Indigenous Peoples' livelihoods, should therefore assure Indigenous Peoples' communities that their Indigenous and traditional knowledge will be used in good faith.

RECOGNIZING RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

As inhabitants of affected areas and beneficiaries of development-related activities, Indigenous Peoples are often grouped with involved parties under the term “stakeholders.” This term, though reflective of the fact that different groups may be invested in the same activity, can discount the unique rights and concerns of Indigenous Peoples.

Out of the 15 documents in this stream that were authored by IP organizations, three of them (Maya Leaders Alliance, AIPP, and IWGIA) use the word “stakeholder” freely to refer to Indigenous Peoples themselves, but more commonly to refer to non- Indigenous Peoples entities like government agencies,

corporations, and civil society. Two organizations explicitly distinguish between IPs as rights holders and other stakeholders:

Throughout the policy development process, NSWALC seeks to...set a standard of engagement that recognises the status of Aboriginal **peoples as rights holders and not merely 'stakeholders'**. (NSWALC)

While Project Proponents should seek consent from all local populations affected by the Proposed Project, only the Affected Peoples have the right to withhold or grant their consent to the project. Other stakeholders, such as local non-governmental organizations do not have this power when it comes to projects that affect the lands, territories and resources of indigenous peoples...This does not discount the role of NGOs or local government bodies, for instance, but acknowledges that **indigenous and tribal peoples are rights-holders rather than stakeholders or interested parties**. (Forest Peoples)

PRO-IP explains its usage of the term as the following:

USAID considers 'stakeholders' to consist of 'those who are affected positively or negatively by a development outcome or have an interest in or can influence a development outcome' (as defined in ADS Chapter 201). USAID further suggests that an initial identification of stakeholders should encompass as broad a range of groups as possible, which an Operating Unit can then refine to identify which of these groups are Indigenous Peoples through further analysis, assessments, and consultations with stakeholders and Indigenous Peoples' communities themselves.

While the term "stakeholders" is well within the common language used by USAID and some Indigenous organizations, other Indigenous groups contend that including Indigenous Peoples with other bodies under the banner of the word "stakeholders" equates the investment of Indigenous Peoples with that of interested parties, when these are not always equal. Recognizing that projects often pose a greater risk to Indigenous livelihoods than to other groups, particularly when vital territories and resources are affected, is a key outcome of distinguishing between Indigenous Peoples and third parties. Moreover, differentiating Indigenous Peoples acknowledges that Indigenous Peoples often carry legal rights unique to their group.

OBJECTIVE 2: INCREASE THE INTEGRATION OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' CONCERNS ACROSS ALL SECTORS OF USAID'S PORTFOLIO OF INVESTMENTS AND PROMOTE CROSS-SECTORAL DEVELOPMENT APPROACHES.

The second PRO-IP objective focuses structurally on USAID on involving Indigenous Peoples throughout all dimensions of USAID's workstream. This includes consulting with Indigenous Peoples on initiatives that may indirectly affect them, as well as incorporating their interests in all sectors. This theme aligns strongly with Indigenous Peoples organizations' expectations. The IPACC report draws attention to the need for integration between different levels and sectors of government:

Communities are sometimes puzzled about how one part of government seems to hear them and want to work together, while another part of government does something that may break up the landscape plans necessary for climate resilience. Both the national and the local policy

intervention should involve different levels of government as well as different sectors and ministries.

Regarding stand-alone projects geared toward a specific aspect of Indigenous Peoples' development, this objective emphasizes utilizing cross-sectoral solutions to cater better to interrelated issues and identify the root causes of these issues. This relates closely to the commonly shared concern of Indigenous land tenure and its diverse effects. Additionally, an intersectoral approach will be particularly beneficial in uplifting Indigenous/traditional knowledge, highlighted further under Objective 1. While the PRO-IP suggests that potential impacts be incorporated into the development of a Regional or Country Development Cooperation Strategy (RDCCS/CDCS), it provides little in the form of actionable steps to address the complex effects of engaging in sector-specific work and measuring the consequences of such efforts.

LAND TENURE

Indigenous organizations recognize that concerns over land tenure have wide-ranging and cross-sectoral implications. Regarding the importance of land, the New South Wales Aboriginal Land Council states that “[t]he land claim process (supporting the return of land to Aboriginal Land Councils generally in freehold title) is the cornerstone and primary mechanism through which Aboriginal peoples can realise economic and social justice outcomes in [the Australian state of New South Wales].” This sentiment is shared by several organizations including the Assembly of First Nations in Canada and the Maya Leaders Alliance.

Similarly, Rainforest Foundation Norway recommends that donor organizations scale up and prioritize funding for IP and local community (IPLC) land tenure and forest management, particularly in tropical rainforests. Strong tenure rights are critical to successful IP and local community forest management: “Where IPLC rights to manage forestlands are legally recognized, they demonstrate lower deforestation rates compared to lands not under IPLC management.” Moreover, land rights have strong synergistic effects, allowing better IP-led protection of biodiversity and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. In light of COVID-19, IPLC tenure and forest management may bolster pandemic prevention strategies as well as the economic resilience of these communities.

PRO-IP recognizes the intersections between land tenure rights and other sectors:

Insecure tenure rights have contributed to high levels of conflict between Indigenous Peoples and other communities, including incidents of displacement which has contributed to further impoverishment, of poverty, joblessness, homelessness, hunger and food-insecurity, and increased morbidity, and community disarticulation.

While PRO-IP briefly mentions this issue and USAID's sector guidance on agriculture suggests programs improve their understanding of “national legal frameworks, including both formal and customary law, related to land and resource ownership, transactions and investment, as well as frameworks governing indigenous peoples and women's rights to land,” neither document provides concrete measures on how to institutionalize solutions to this issue.

OBJECTIVE 3: EMPOWER INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVE ORGANIZATIONS TO ADVOCATE FOR, AND EXERCISE, THEIR RIGHTS AND PRACTICE SELF-DETERMINED DEVELOPMENT

This objective focuses on supporting capacity building of Indigenous Peoples through support in planning, financing, and implementing self-determined solutions to local development challenges. This notion is discussed extensively by PRO-IP and less commonly by Indigenous Peoples' organizations. Operating Principle 5 recommends that USAID Operating Units provide support to Indigenous Peoples' organizations in the form of grants and sub-awards to implement activities benefitting the communities in the areas in which they operate.

PRO-IP policy and Indigenous Peoples' organizations such as AIPP concur on the importance of fully involving Indigenous communities, particularly women and youth, in decision-making. They agree that stronger representation of women and youth allows for a wider range of perspectives in creating solutions.

EDUCATIONAL INITIATIVES

Indigenous Peoples communities emphasize that education about rights is needed and that a lack of education and awareness about formal rights enables exploitation. The Safeguards Information System report states that,

Many indigenous people are not aware of their collective rights to land, territories and resources. In this case, communities cannot assert their rights, including in their engagements in any plans relating to REDD+ and programmes of government and others that affect them.

Thus, support in the form of providing rights-based education may contribute to empowering Indigenous Peoples communities, an avenue of empowerment notably absent in the PRO-IP. IPACC further recommends that advocacy coaching is provided to these communities, specifically in integrating their needs with existing state policies.

FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

PRO-IP encourages OUs to strengthen capacity by providing direct funding and indirect support to empower Indigenous Peoples, for example by advocating for reform to domestic legal frameworks around land rights. Regarding direct support, Objective 3 of PRO-IP states that “it is critical that USAID’s Operating Units increase their direct funding to local Indigenous Peoples’ organizations.” Moreover, Operating Principle 5 touches on the nature of these awards, including that they should “address priorities identified by the organizations themselves.”

Given the potentially cross-sectoral benefits of securing these rights, particularly if they relate to land, donor organizations can reduce barriers to funding, including intermediary organizations and donor regulations, as recommended by Rainforest Foundation Norway. Donors can also help protect from extractive industries who operate within “the territories of Indigenous peoples who face risks of losing their lands, livelihoods and identity when development plans are implemented without their meaningful participation” (AIPP). The matter of simplifying donor regulations to reduce barriers to funding is not emphasized by PRO-IP.

OBJECTIVE 4: FOSTER AN ENABLING ENVIRONMENT FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLES TO ADVOCATE FOR, AND EXERCISE, THEIR RIGHTS.

The final objective involves mitigating political, economic, and social obstacles to Indigenous Peoples' development and self-reliance, including ensuring that public and private institutions are equitable, inclusive, and accessible. One prevalent concern for Indigenous Peoples organizations in working with government bodies and private entities is historical and ongoing violations of human rights. As discussed under Objective 1, Indigenous Peoples and the PRO-IP affirm that a key step in assuring mutual agreement between two parties is obtaining free, prior, informed consent (FPIC). However, present-day and historical failures to uphold commitments to FPIC undermine the credibility of FPIC policies. By failing to acknowledge ongoing human rights issues, donor organizations may hinder their own efficacy at engaging with IPs. PRO-IP only briefly recognizes this concern, stating that “[i]t is also important to recognize the psycho-social impact of ongoing conflict and the lack of redress for past atrocities or violence that many communities confront.” Though the PRO-IP’s language is similar to Indigenous Peoples’ guidelines in an emphasis on FPIC, PRO-IP does not go as far as many Indigenous Peoples’ organizations in recognizing historical failures and how these affect working with Indigenous Peoples.

IMPLEMENTATION GAPS

Many Indigenous Peoples organizations recognize the discrepancy between formal commitments to FPIC and practice of governments, organizations, and individuals. On the national and local levels, treaties have been broken and human rights violated. According to the Assembly of First Nations, “Canada continues to authorize or issue permits to large-scale resource development projects over the objections of First Nations concerned about the potential for severe harm to the enjoyment of our human rights.” The Maya people observe similar tendencies in third party organizations:

Although the Maya people have successfully affirmed their rights in the domestic courts of Belize, outside entities (in part due to the actions and policies of the government of Belize) continue to operate on Maya lands and territories without their consent. These entities include individuals, as well as corporations.

Such implementation gaps, particularly relating to FPIC, may hurt the enabling environment for Indigenous Peoples to exercise their rights.

COMMUNITIES IN VOLUNTARY ISOLATION/INITIAL STAGES OF CONTACT

PRO-IP and Indigenous Peoples organizations agree that Indigenous Peoples living in voluntary isolation and in the initial stages of contact should be respected and their resources protected. For example, Operating Principle 4 states the following:

In host countries where Indigenous Peoples in voluntary isolation and in the initial stages of contact live, USAID should support efforts to recognize, respect, and protect their lands and territories, health, and cultures. The Agency should not fund or support projects that could lead to undesired contact or that could potentially have negative impacts on the lands and resources of Indigenous Peoples.

Extending this point, IWGIA mentions the possibility that Indigenous Peoples in isolation may desire to engage with others, and retain the right to return to isolation if they choose. In this case, risks of harm that could come to these communities must be taken into account, a consideration not brought up by the PRO-IP.

The right to self-determination also implies that, if Indigenous Peoples decide to increase their interactions with the surrounding society, this course of action should be respected, ensuring that their physical, sociocultural and territorial security is guaranteed, as well as the time and space necessary for them to develop immunological defense mechanisms and sociocultural means of adaptation for the plethora of new situations that arise as result of increased interaction.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Our review has found that there are several USAID programs, activities, and OUs that are accomplishing specific objectives and operating principles as outlined in the PRO-IP. We see several instances where Indigenous Peoples' concerns are integrated in both "stand alone" and "integrated" programming. These include explicit mention of Indigenous Peoples' concerns in written analyses of social inclusion or analyses of domestic legal frameworks, as well as empowerment of Indigenous Peoples by identifying, partnering with, and supporting the work of their representative organizations. While few projects seemed to be specifically using the tools outlined in the PRO-IP (Social Impact Assessments or SIAs, Inclusive Development Analyses or IDAs, and the USAID Consultation Handbook), all OUs recognized the importance of assessing equity concerns and identifying risks, and many used other tools that were similar in scope and focus, such as Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) analyses, or Political Economy Analyses. However, the tools being used tended to consider Indigeneity as a category of 'vulnerable populations' alongside other vectors of marginalization such as gender or persons with disabilities. This can be detrimental as Indigenous Peoples are uniquely rights holders who can refuse project activities in some contexts, and should also be considered separately from other marginalized groups.

We also see a divergence in the achievement of the PRO-IP objectives across program type, with more targeted "stand alone" programs demonstrating more substantial engagement and consideration of approaches to engagement with Indigenous Peoples throughout the program cycle, as well as stronger initiatives to create an enabling environment through policy change and education related to Indigenous Peoples' rights. Across all types of programs, there was a significant gap in the documentation of processes taken to engage with Indigenous Peoples, ranging from FPIC, consideration of first lines of contact, determination of translated or interpreted languages, and evidence of continued engagement across all stages of the program cycle.

Additionally, we observed significant variations across all programs and OUs in the ability to concretely "identify" Indigenous Peoples, and in relation, challenges in being able to monitor and evaluate program impact and integration of Indigenous Peoples in a manner distinct from other vulnerable or marginalized populations. This is related to numerous external factors that OUs must take into account such as political sensitivities stemming from conflict, displacement, or histories of extremist movements. While certain geographies can refer to formalized lists to recognize who is considered Indigenous, other OUs, such as those in the African region, have more ambiguous lists, terms of identification, and significant political sensitivities surrounding the process of identifying Indigenous Peoples.

We observed across "integrated" programs that Indigenous Peoples were often grouped together with vulnerable or marginalized populations in general, instead of as a distinct consideration. This is evident in trends in monitoring and learning, as well as in measurement of indicators, which are key to fostering an enabling environment as guided by Objective 4 of the PRO-IP. A majority of program indicators and frameworks observed in the DEC documents disaggregate program outcomes by Indigenous Peoples in the same way as other social groups. However, we observed that these monitoring and learning frameworks often lack presentation of the criteria of who is considered Indigenous in order to accurately measure these outcomes, documentation of Indigenous Peoples' own definition or determination of outcome "achievement", or measurement of the quality of engagement with Indigenous Peoples. Part of this gap is also a lack of clear recognition in the documentation of the unique legal status and rights to Indigenous Peoples that are different to other marginalized populations,

especially as it comes to the obligations in obtaining FPIC or contexts in which Indigenous Peoples must be engaged as rights holders instead of mere “stakeholders.”

NORC found that most OUs are not fully incorporating PRO-IP guidance in their solicitation process or evaluation criteria. However, this general trend masks high levels of variability between OUs and regions. The process by which OUs determine whether a group is Indigenous or not still remains unclear and not standardized. NORC found that direct funding opportunities are increasing, but these are general for small grants. While many of the solicitations had language around general capacity building activities (Objective 3 of the PRO-IP), only two included language on offering capacity building assistance to help Indigenous Peoples compete for and manage direct funding from USAID.

Findings from review of other organizations’ policies for engaging with Indigenous Peoples reveal that the PRO-IP was largely congruent with other organizations’ guidance. However, differences included specific guidance in relation to obtaining free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), compensation to Indigenous Peoples when land or access to resources are impacted, sharing learnings and data, and mechanisms of redress for grievances, the last of which is outside the purview of the PRO-IP. NORC also reviewed publications from Indigenous Peoples organizations and found that they often call for more participatory approaches than what is mandated by USAID. While these publications generally line up with the objectives and priorities of PRO-IP, they also raise several concerns about permission to consult, discrepancy among government sectors, difficulty in meeting donor requirements, and recognizing historical failures.

There are several directions for future guidance that this landscape analysis suggests to better operationalize the PRO-IP and contribute to larger learning goals around the integration of Indigenous Peoples concerns into USAID programming. One theme across this analysis is that ease of identifying Indigenous Peoples and using tools for meaningful engagement varies significantly across regions. Therefore, especially for African contexts, it would be highly useful to have region-specific guidance, or guidance specific to certain types of contexts like conflict settings (such as Mali) or settings with highly sensitive political histories around Indigeneity (such as Nepal). In addition, an overarching trend from respondents in semi-structured interviews is that tools cannot be too rigid, as OU staff need to be responsive to the nuances of their particular context. Therefore, it could be helpful to have a larger basket of options of tools that can be used, or guidance on how to adapt existing tools like Political Economy Analyses or Gender and Social Inclusion Analyses. In a similar vein, many respondents noted that OU staff are spread thin across many obligations, and struggle to find time to fully understand and operationalize PRO-IP. Therefore, many respondents called for meetings with staff from USAID/Washington’s Indigenous Peoples office to discuss exactly how the PRO-IP can be used in their specific context. Further, as the landscape analysis highlights several Missions which have successfully implemented various elements of the PRO-IP, these activities can serve as learning opportunities for USAID and as the start of a process to compile best practices.

This landscape analysis also serves as a comparison point in USAID’s work in integrating Indigenous Peoples. Subsequent data collection on USAID’s efforts to integrate Indigenous Peoples can be broadly compared to the findings in this report, to help illustrate changes compared to the period immediately before and after the publication of the PRO-IP (the period covered by this report). The next stage in NORC’s work will focus on developing the tools for subsequent data collection, including learning questions and indicators related to the integration of Indigenous Peoples.

ANNEX A. LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS OUTLINE

DRG LEARNING, EVALUATION, AND RESEARCH (DRG-LER) II ACTIVITY

LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS OUTLINE: USAID POLICY ON PROMOTING THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES: KNOWLEDGE BASE AND ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

March 2021

Contract No.: GS-10F-0033M / Order No. 7200AA18M00016

Submitted to:

Brandy Witthoft, COR

Contractor:

NORC at the University of Chicago
4350 East West Highway, 8th Floor
Bethesda, MD 20814
Attention: Matthew Parry
Tel: 301- 634-5444; E-mail: Parry-Matthew@norc.org

DISCLAIMER

The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

ACRONYMS

AIPP	Asian Indigenous People's Pact
CDCS	Country Development Cooperation Strategy
DEC	Development Experience Clearinghouse
DOCIP	Center for Documentation, Research and Information
DRG	Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance
DRG-LER	Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance Learning, Evaluation, and Research
FPIC	Free, Prior, and Informed Consent
GSA	General Services Administration
IDA	Inclusive Development Analysis
IDIQ	Indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity
IP	Indigenous Peoples
IWGIA	International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs
MOBIS	Mission-Oriented Business Integrated Service
NORC	National Opinion Research Center (NORC at the University of Chicago)
OU	Operating Unit
PRO-IP	Policy on Promoting the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
PSS	Professional Serviced Schedule
SIA	Social Inclusion Analysis
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government

LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS GUIDELINES

The research team's landscape analysis will include (1) a review of USAID Operating Units' documented activities with Indigenous Peoples, (2) a review of a limited number of international donors' Indigenous Peoples policies related to the integration of Indigenous Peoples into their programs, and (3) a review of publicly available documentation from selected Indigenous Peoples' organizations and organizations focused on Indigenous People's development. The approach for each of these three streams are outlined below.

NORC will use the attached list of key terms to guide its search of US government documents and to identify those that are relevant to this activity. The key terms are broken out into Level 1 and Level 2, where Level 1 terms are likely to return documents that directly reference Indigenous Peoples, while Level 2 terms may include Indigenous Peoples but will also return results that are not relevant to this work. NORC may truncate the phrases included in these key terms, searching for separate words, or use combinations of these search terms, depending on early results. NORC will also add to these lists through an iterative process based on additional terms identified in the documents reviewed.

In addition, NORC will develop Level 3 terms, to identify projects that do not mention working with Indigenous Peoples, but which operate in sectors or geographies where Indigenous Peoples are stakeholders. NORC will develop this list based on its initial reviews of Level 1 and 2 documents.

Following the landscape analysis, the research team will conduct outreach and semi-structured interviews to collect additional details on their work related to IPs. NORC will use these details, and those collected through the landscape analysis to prepare the report for Stage 1 of this work. At the same time, NORC will also note details relevant to the subsequent stages of its work (e.g. indicators and learning questions).

STREAM IA: REVIEW OF USAID OU'S DOCUMENTED ACTIVITIES WITH INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

<p style="text-align: center;">Data Source:</p> <p>USAID Development Experience Clearing House (DEC), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country Development Cooperation Strategies • Program Reports • Environmental Compliance Factsheets • Inclusive-Development Analyses (IDA) • Social Impact Assessments (SIA) 	<p style="text-align: center;">Period of Interest for Search:</p> <p>Activities started or active in FY2020 and the first quarter of FY 2021 (i.e. October 1, 2019-December 31, 2020))</p>
---	---

General	
Points of Interest ⁶	Notes
Document Type (e.g. CDCS, Program Report, etc.)	
Region(s) of Activity/Program	
Country/Countries	
Operating Unit(s) and/or Missions	
Project/Activity Name	
Sector(s)	
Sector(s) which engaged IP, if different than above	
Year activity began	
Month activity began, for those that started in 2020	
Year activity ended/is expected to end	
Programming phase at time document was produced	
Activity budget	
Relation to Indigenous Peoples (e.g., directly targeting Indigenous Peoples; involved in sector issues relevant to Indigenous Peoples and with Indigenous Peoples as beneficiaries, though Indigenous Peoples were not directly targeted; and involved in sector issues relevant to Indigenous Peoples and with no/few Indigenous Peoples as beneficiaries)	
Terms used for referencing Indigenous Peoples.	The research team will add any new terms to the list of search terms.
Methods for identifying Indigenous Peoples	
Indicators/Measurement Approaches Used	The research team will make note of measurement approaches/indicators, especially as it relates to approaches used by Indigenous Peoples for learning/capturing and communicating progress, to inform Stage 2 of the research

⁶ The points listed below will be captured in NORC's descriptive framework, an Excel file, which NORC will attach as an appendix to its report in Stage 1.

Objective 1: Strengthen engagement with Indigenous Peoples to safeguard against harm and support their development priorities and self-reliance	
Points of Interest	Notes
Was engagement meaningful?	“Meaningful”, as defined by the PRO-IP
Did engagement begin with informal conversations with IP?	
Did USAID engage directly with IP?	Engagement is considered “direct” if communication is between USAID or its partners and Indigenous Peoples, rather than through an intermediary such as a government ministry.
Did Indigenous Peoples have a say in how engagement would be done?	
Did engagement mostly follow IP’s suggestions (i.e. was engagement culturally appropriate)?	
Was engagement ongoing?	“Ongoing” is not explicitly defined in the PRO-IP. For the sake of the landscape analysis, we will consider any engagement as “ongoing” if it is explicitly stated as such or if the document demonstrates two or more engagements.
Were different approaches for engagement used for different groups (e.g. women, youth, and disabled individuals)?	
If not, what justification is given?	
Were languages, interpreters, and/or accommodations considered for communication with IP?	

Objective 2: Increase the integration of Indigenous Peoples’ concerns across all sectors of USAID’s portfolio of investments and promote cross-sectoral development approaches	
Points of Interest	Notes
Is this a standalone program/activity to address Indigenous Peoples concerns? If yes:	Standalone/integrated program/activity as described in PRO-IP (p.12-13)
Were multiple barriers to empowerment and well-being identified/analyzed?	
Was disaggregated data, including by Indigenous Peoples identities, collected? Are safety concerns for recording data identified/mitigated?	
Were systemic, cross-sectoral approaches identified/implemented to address Indigenous Peoples challenges and opportunities?	The research team will identify if/how an IDA was used to conduct analyses
Is the program/activity an integrated intervention? If yes:	Standalone/integrated program/activity as described in PRO-IP (p.12-13)
Was there due diligence to identify potential risks to IPs related to the “possession or title of land, implementing partners, and private-sector partners/affiliates?”	

Objective 2: Increase the integration of Indigenous Peoples' concerns across all sectors of USAID's portfolio of investments and promote cross-sectoral development approaches	
Points of Interest	Notes
Are IPs identified as stakeholders?	
At which stage(s) of the program cycle(s) were IPs engaged?	Points of interest from Objective 1 (above) will provide further information on the nature engagements
If Indigenous Peoples organizations are absent, did OU work with allied organizations that have a track record of working with Indigenous Peoples in the country or region?	
Was a preliminary desk review conducted to collect basic demographic data for Indigenous Peoples in the country/region? If so, what sources/tools were used?	The research team will note use of Self-Reliance roadmap, Social Group Equality metrics, IDAs, and other tools used
Was a written analysis produced of the potential impact the investment could have on IP, including review of adverse impacts of prior development interventions?	The research team will note if/how the analysis complements the mandatory gender analysis, use of annotated IDA and/or development of more robust IDA, and other frameworks/tools used for analyses and assessments
If conflicts with nearby communities were identified, was a conflict-assessment conducted?	
How did the results of the assessments/analyses inform program/activity design, and/or RDCS/CDCS	

Objective 3: Empower Indigenous Peoples and their representative organizations to advocate for, and exercise, their rights and practice self-determined development	
Points of Interest	Notes
Does document reference lessons learned related to empowerment and rights?	The research team will note any knowledge management tools or resources referenced, to assist USAID in consolidating these lessons learned.
Was there consideration/identification of undesired contact with USAID?	
Did OU provide funding or in-kind capacity-building for Indigenous Peoples organizations? If yes:	
How much direct funding was given to Indigenous Peoples' organizations?	
Does program reflect Indigenous Peoples' development priorities?	The research team will consider "meaningful" engagement of Indigenous Peoples in the design phase or changes to the implementation due to Indigenous Peoples' feedback as evidence the program reflects Indigenous Peoples' development priorities.
If Indigenous Peoples organizations are engaged under a sub-award mechanism, are plans	

Objective 3: Empower Indigenous Peoples and their representative organizations to advocate for, and exercise, their rights and practice self-determined development	
Points of Interest	Notes
identified for them to become direct recipients of USAID funding as soon as possible?	

Objective 4: Foster an enabling environment for Indigenous Peoples to advocate for, and exercise, their rights	
Points of Interest	Notes
Use of SIA, IDA and/or USAID’s Consultation Handbook	The research team will indicate which of the resources were referenced.
If an SIA was conducted: Did this involve collaboration with Indigenous Peoples who are project stakeholders to identify potential impacts of USAID programs (both positive and negative), establish a baseline for the social elements that may be impacted and, when impacts may be adverse, to collaboratively define mitigation measures for such impacts?	The research team will detail adherence of any SIA conducted on each of these points.
Are feedback mechanisms by Indigenous Peoples established?	Points of Interest from Objective 1 will provide further information on mutually agreed-upon procedures or “rules of engagement”
Was there engagement and co-creation with Indigenous Peoples at all stages of the program cycle?	
Production of a written analysis of potential impacts on Indigenous Peoples	The research team will indicate what types of additional analyses were conducted and document the results of the analyses and gaps for potential future analysis.
Were results from analyses or decision-making processes shared with Indigenous Peoples stakeholders?	
Were Indigenous Peoples consulted when identifying potential adverse impacts?	
If potential adverse impacts were found, did USAID consult with Indigenous Peoples to develop measures to understand these impacts and develop mitigation measures?	
Were potential negative impacts monitored over the life of the project?	
Were stakeholders consulted located only inside the specific geographic location where implementation was expected, or were stakeholders outside this geography also consulted?	
Did the stakeholders outside the geography include IP?	
If not, why not?	

Objective 4: Foster an enabling environment for Indigenous Peoples to advocate for, and exercise, their rights	
Points of Interest	Notes
Documentation of free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) (if applicable)	The research team will document what steps were taken to secure FPIC, if any, and whether Indigenous Peoples responded to the FPIC.
Was anyone beyond USAID and the Indigenous Peoples present for FPIC?	
If yes, who else was present?	
What measures, if any, were used to mitigate the influence of those beyond USAID and Indigenous Peoples who were present for FPIC?	
Did OUs assess the capacity of government agencies that are responsible for engaging with, and providing services to, Indigenous Peoples? If yes:	
What capacity development, if any, did USAID provide to these agencies?	
Did OUs analyze the domestic legal framework to determine the mechanisms for the exercise and enforcement of Indigenous Rights? If yes:	
What steps, if any, were made to support the enforcement of these rights?	
Did OUs support the drafting of local and national legislation and regulations to assist governments in complying with their obligations under international and/or domestic law to recognize the rights of Indigenous Peoples? If yes:	
What assistance was given (e.g. strengthening of regulatory frameworks for environmental and social impact assessments that include the participation of Indigenous Peoples through consultations and FPIC)?	

Stream IB: Review of USAID Solicitations for programming related to Indigenous Peoples

Data Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beta.SAM.gov and Grants.gov⁷ 	Period of Interest for Search: Solicitations issued in FY2020 and the first quarter of FY 2021 (i.e. October 1, 2019-December 31, 2020)
---	---

General	
Points of Interest	Notes
Document type	
Region(s) of Activity/Program	
Country/Countries	
Operating Unit(s) and/or Mission(s)	
Proposed Project/Activity Name	
Sector(s)	
Sector(s) which engaged IP, if different than above	
Year Solicitation Issued	
Month Solicitation Issued, for those that started in 2020	
Relation to Indigenous Peoples (e.g., directly targeting Indigenous Peoples; involved in sector issues relevant to Indigenous Peoples and with Indigenous Peoples as beneficiaries, though Indigenous Peoples were not directly targeted; and involved in sector issues relevant to Indigenous Peoples and with no/few Indigenous Peoples as beneficiaries)	
Terms used for referencing Indigenous Peoples.	The research team will add any new terms to the list of search terms.
Methods for Identifying Indigenous Peoples	

Objective I: Strengthen engagement with Indigenous Peoples to safeguard against harm and support their development priorities and self-reliance	
Points of Interest	Notes
Were there opportunities for IPs to voice concerns and engage in dialogue for proposed activities, such as through an RFI process?	
Were IPs consulted during design of Scope of Work or Program Description?	
Does the OU evaluate defined approaches for consultation with Indigenous Peoples throughout the USAID Program Cycle as part of evaluation criteria?	

⁷ Solicitations for IDIQ task orders and GSA (MOBIS/PSS/OASIS) task orders are not included in these databases and so will not be part of NORC's review.

Objective 2: Increase the integration of Indigenous Peoples' concerns across all sectors of USAID's portfolio of investments and promote cross-sectoral development approaches	
Points of Interest	Notes
Does the solicitation include specific components, expected results, and/or illustrative interventions related to Indigenous Peoples and their welfare?	
Does OU evaluate the systemic, cross-sectoral approaches to address Indigenous Peoples challenges and opportunities as part of evaluation criteria?	The research team will identify if/how IDA was used to conduct analyses
In the event the SIA identified risks to IP: Were Offerors required to develop a plan for mitigation measures? Was it explicitly stated that such measures must be developed in consultation with IP, if the OU has not already done so?	The research team should note whether Indigenous Peoples were included, or plan to be included, in the development of mitigation measures.
Does OU evaluate the effective integration of Indigenous Peoples and their challenges and opportunities throughout the application as part of evaluation criteria?	

Objective 3: Empower Indigenous Peoples and their representative organizations to advocate for, and exercise, their rights and practice self-determined development	
Points of Interest	Notes
Does solicitation seek to provide funding directly with Indigenous Peoples organization (as opposed to as subgrantees)?	
Does OU offer appropriate capacity-building assistance to help IPs compete for, and manage, direct funding from USAID?	
Does OU evaluate the transition of the management of activities and funding to local Indigenous Peoples organizations over the life of the award as part of evaluation criteria?	
Does OU evaluate the capacity to build and maintain partnerships with Indigenous Peoples as part of evaluation criteria?	

Objective 4: Foster an enabling environment for Indigenous Peoples to advocate for, and exercise, their rights	
Does the solicitation request a copy of the applicant's Indigenous Peoples Policy or Inclusive-Development Policy/approach?	
Did/will OUs carry out due diligence to identify potential risks to Indigenous Peoples related to public and non-profit implementing partners, private-sector firms, or other USAID affiliates?	

**Objective 4:
Foster an enabling environment for Indigenous Peoples to advocate for, and exercise,
their rights**

Were SIA, IDA and/or USAID's Consultation Handbook used during the design of Scope of Work or Program Descriptions?	The research will indicate which of the resources were referenced, and outline benefits and challenges of each of the resources.
---	--

STREAM 2: REVIEW OF OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND DONORS' POLICIES AND PROGRAMS RELATED TO INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

<p style="text-align: center;">Data Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Publicly available documents of donor organizations' progress on integrating Indigenous Peoples in their work ● Policies related to Indigenous Peoples of multilateral organizations (such as the World Bank and United Nations) and bilateral donors (such as DFAT, Canada's Department of Foreign Affairs, the EU Commission, and the Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office). 	<p style="text-align: center;">Period of Interest for Search:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Current documented policy; Progress reports published in calendar year 2020</p>
--	---

General	
Points of Interest	Notes
Organization Name(s)	
Document Type	
Year of policy/progress report	
Region(s) of Activity/Program	
Country/Countries	
Policy/Project/Activity Name	
Sector(s)	
Sector(s) which engaged IP, if different than above	
Date Activity Began/Policy Published	
Year activity ended/is expected to end	
Programming phase at time document was produced	
Activity budget	
Relation to Indigenous Peoples (e.g., directly targeting Indigenous Peoples; involved in sector issues relevant to Indigenous Peoples and with Indigenous Peoples as beneficiaries, though Indigenous Peoples were not directly targeted; and involved in sector issues relevant to Indigenous Peoples and with no/few Indigenous Peoples as beneficiaries)	The research team will note on how the document references Indigenous Peoples to continue growing the Landscape Analysis Key Terms list.
Terms used for referencing Indigenous Peoples.	The research team will add any new terms to the list of search terms.
Methods for identifying Indigenous Peoples	The research team will make note of how the criteria overlaps/differs from USAID's criteria
Indicators/Measurement Approaches Used	The research team will make note of measurement approaches/indicators, especially as it relates to approaches used by Indigenous Peoples for learning/capturing and communicating progress, to inform Stage 2 of the research

Objective 1: Strengthen engagement with Indigenous Peoples to safeguard against harm and support their development priorities and self-reliance	
Points of Interest	Notes
In what ways does the policy/activity overlap with PRO-IP to achieve Objective 1?	
In what ways does the policy/activity fall behind PRO-IP to achieve Objective 1?	
In what ways does the policy/activity extend beyond PRO-IP to achieve Objective 1?	

Objective 2: Increase the integration of Indigenous Peoples' concerns across all sectors of USAID's portfolio of investments and promote cross-sectoral development approaches	
Points of Interest	Notes
In what ways does the policy/activity overlap with PRO-IP to achieve Objective 2?	
In what ways does the policy/activity fall behind PRO-IP to achieve Objective 2?	
In what ways does the policy/activity extend beyond PRO-IP to achieve Objective 2?	

Objective 3: Empower Indigenous Peoples and their representative organizations to advocate for, and exercise, their rights and practice self-determined development	
Points of Interest	Notes
In what ways does the policy/activity overlap with PRO-IP to achieve Objective 3?	
In what ways does the policy/activity fall behind PRO-IP to achieve Objective 3?	
In what ways does policy/activity extend beyond PRO-IP to achieve Objective 3?	

Objective 4: Foster an enabling environment for Indigenous Peoples to advocate for, and exercise, their rights	
Points of Interest	Notes
In what ways the policy/activity overlap with PRO-IP to achieve Objective 4?	
In what ways does the policy/activity fall behind PRO-IP to achieve Objective 4?	
In what ways does the policy/activity extend beyond PRO-IP to achieve Objective 4?	

Stream 3: Review of Indigenous Peoples' organizations and organizations focused on Indigenous People's development

<p>Data Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publicly available documentation from Indigenous Peoples organizations (such as IWGIA, AIPP, DOCIP, and Sotz'il) and Indigenous Peoples organizations who submitted FPIC protocols to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights⁸ 	<p>Period of Interest for Search:</p> <p>Most recent documentation on development strategies and FPIC protocols from data sources listed</p>
--	---

General	
Points of Interest	Notes
Organization Name(s)	
Region(s) of Activity/Program	
Country/Countries	
Policy/Project/Activity Name	
Sector(s)	
Sector(s) which engaged IP, if different than above	
Date Activity Began/Policy Published	
Year activity ended/is expected to end	
Programming phase at time document was produced	
Activity budget	
Relation to Indigenous Peoples (e.g., directly targeting Indigenous Peoples; involved in sector issues relevant to Indigenous Peoples and with Indigenous Peoples as beneficiaries, though Indigenous Peoples were not directly targeted; and involved in sector issues relevant to Indigenous Peoples and with no/few Indigenous Peoples as beneficiaries)	
Terms used for referencing Indigenous Peoples.	The research team will add any new terms to the list of search terms.
Methods for identifying Indigenous Peoples	The research team will make note of how the criteria overlaps/differs from USAID's criteria
Indicators/Measurement Approaches Used	The research team will make note of measurement approaches/indicators, especially as it relates to approaches used by Indigenous Peoples for learning/capturing and communicating progress, to inform Stage 2 of the research

⁸ As seen on the OHCHR website here: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/issues/ipeoples/emrip/pages/studyfpic.aspx>

Objective 1: Strengthen engagement with Indigenous Peoples to safeguard against harm and support their development priorities and self-reliance	
Points of Interest	Notes
In what ways does the policy/activity overlap with PRO-IP to achieve Objective 1?	
In what ways does the policy/activity diverge with PRO-IP to achieve Objective 1?	
In what ways does the policy/activity extend beyond PRO-IP to achieve Objective 1?	

Objective 2: Increase the integration of Indigenous Peoples' concerns across all sectors of USAID's portfolio of investments and promote cross-sectoral development approaches	
Points of Interest	Notes
In what ways does the policy/activity overlap with PRO-IP to achieve Objective 2?	
In what ways does the policy/activity diverge with PRO-IP to achieve Objective 2?	
In what ways does the policy/activity extend beyond PRO-IP to achieve Objective 2?	

Objective 3: Empower Indigenous Peoples and their representative organizations to advocate for, and exercise, their rights and practice self-determined development	
Points of Interest	Notes
In what ways does the policy/activity overlap with PRO-IP to achieve Objective 3?	
In what ways does the policy/activity diverge with PRO-IP to achieve Objective 3?	
In what ways does the policy/activity extend beyond PRO-IP to achieve Objective 3?	

Objective 4: Foster an enabling environment for Indigenous Peoples to advocate for, and exercise, their rights	
Points of Interest	Notes
In what ways does the policy/activity overlap with PRO-IP to achieve Objective 4?	
In what ways does the policy/activity diverge with PRO-IP to achieve Objective 4?	
In what ways does the policy/activity extend beyond PRO-IP to achieve Objective 4?	

KEY SEARCH TERMS

Key Term	Search Level	Notes
Aboriginal	1	This is a term USAID notes has been used to describe Indigenous Peoples, and may still be used by Operating Units in some countries. This would mostly apply to US/Canada, though may be used by other countries as well.
Ethnic Minorities	1	This is a term USAID notes has been used to describe Indigenous Peoples, and may still be used by Operating Units in some countries. Especially applicable for most of Asia, though the Research Team notes that the term is also used internationally for immigrants of all nations in a host nation.
First Nations	1	This is a term USAID notes has been used to describe Indigenous Peoples, and may still be used by Operating Units in some countries. Specific for North America and Poles.
Indigenous Peoples	1	
Natives	1	This is a term USAID notes has been used to describe Indigenous Peoples, and may still be used by Operating Units in some countries. The Research Team acknowledges this term can be complex and have been replaced by other more common terms.
Pastoralists	1	This is a term USAID notes has been used to describe Indigenous Peoples, and may still be used by Operating Units in some countries. The Research Team acknowledges it important to consider that this term can encompass communities who do not self-identify as Indigenous, so search results will be screened for relevance.
Policy on Promoting the Rights of Indigenous Peoples	1	Truncations and mixes of the terms within the phrase will be searched as well.
Indigenous Rights	1	“Rights” will also be searched in conjunction with the other key terms.
Indigenous Policy	1	“Policy” will also be searched in conjunction with the other key terms.
Scheduled Tribes/Scheduled Castes	1	This is a term USAID notes has been used to describe Indigenous Peoples, and may still be used by Operating Units in some countries. This is specific to India.
Agro Pastoralists	2	This is a term USAID notes has been used to describe Indigenous Peoples, and may still be used by Operating Units in some countries. The Research Team acknowledges it important to consider that this term can encompass communities who do not self-identify as Indigenous (such as some African communities), so search results will be screened for relevance.
Ancestral Environments	2	Will be searched alone and in conjunction with other Level 2 words.

Key Term	Search Level	Notes
Ancestral Lands	2	Will be searched alone and in conjunction with other Level 2 words.
Cultural Assimilation	2	Will be searched alone and in conjunction with other Level 2 words. Can especially be a good proxy to find urban indigenous projects/programs.
Customary Institutions	2	Part of the criteria for being classified as Indigenous Peoples by USAID.
Customary Land	2	Will be searched alone and in conjunction with other Level 2 words.
Customary Resources	2	Will be searched alone and in conjunction with other Level 2 words.
Environmental Defenders	2	Will be searched alone and in conjunction with other Level 2 words.
Hill People	2	This is a term USAID notes has been used to describe Indigenous Peoples, and may still be used by Operating Units in some countries. It is important to consider that this term also encompasses people in Asia who would not self-identify as indigenous, so search results will be screened for relevance.
Pre-Colonial Societies	2	Part of the criteria for being classified as Indigenous Peoples by USAID.
Pre-Settler Societies	2	Part of the criteria for being classified as Indigenous Peoples by USAID.
Social and Cultural Groups	2	Part of the criteria for being classified as Indigenous Peoples by USAID.
Traditional Knowledge	2	Will be searched alone and in conjunction with other Level 2 words.
Traditional Languages	2	Will be searched alone and in conjunction with other Level 2 words.
Traditional resource-management	2	Will be searched alone and in conjunction with other Level 2 words.
Traditional Territory	2	Part of the criteria for being classified as Indigenous Peoples by USAID.
Urban	2	Term to be combined with “Indigenous” an/or other definitions/terms to acknowledge Indigenous Peoples, as it may be particularly relevant for Latin America, Asia and some parts of Africa.

ANNEX B. METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

The search terms finalized in the landscape analysis (Appendix A) were used to search the USAID DEC, sam.gov, and grants.gov using the below search process:

Stream IA. DEC

DEFAULT Search String Description:

Advanced Search: Documents

- Input “Key Word” into “**Text of Document**”
- Input 2019 OR 2020 as “Publication Date”
- N/A for “Authoring Organization,” “Primary Subjects,” “USAID Geographic Term(s)”
- Select “English” for “Language(s)”
- Select ALL (except: Bibliography/Literature Review, Conference Proceedings/Paper, Journal Article, Periodical, USAID Contract/Grant Agreement, and USAID MOU) for “Document Type”

-----Can try entering this in Filter after Search: *Documents.Bibtype_Name=(“USAID Strategic Planning Document” OR “USAID Report to Congress” OR “USAID Project/Program Overview” OR “USAID Program Planning Document” OR “USAID Policy Document” OR “USAID Operational Assessment” OR “USAID OIG Audit Report” OR “USAID General Program Document” OR “Trip/End of Tour Report” OR “Special Evaluation” OR “Significant Evaluation (PPL Use Only – For Evidence Act Deliverables)” OR “Reference Document” OR “Project/Program/Activity Design Document” OR “Program/Project Evaluation Guide” OR “Preliminary Design” OR “Periodic Report” OR “Other USAID Supported Study/Document” OR “Other USAID Evaluation” OR “Other Authorized Design Document” OR “Non-USAID Technical” OR “Non-USAID Operational Review” OR “Miscellaneous Document” OR “Loan/Grant Agreement” OR “Handbook/Manual” OR “Final Evaluation Report” OR “Final Contractor/Grantee Report” OR “Evaluation Summary” OR “Evaluation Plan (PPL Use Only – For Evidence Act Deliverables)” OR “Assessment” OR “Annual Report” OR “Design/Implementation Workplan”)*

We did NOT include “indigenous populations” as one of the “USAID Thesaurus Terms” because we did a basic search using that term for year 2020 and there were 0 results.

N = 1515

Stream IB. beta.SAM.gov

Search String Description:

- Input “Key Word” into main search bar (“Assistance Listings” & “Contract Opportunities”)
- Select “Status” as “Active only”
- Select “072 – Agency for International Development” as “Federal Organization”
- Sort by “Date Modified/Updated”

- Manually count results between October 1, 2019 to December 31, 2020

N = 159

Stream 1B. Grants.gov

Search String Description:

Search Grants

- Input “Key Word” into “Keyword(s)”
- Select “Forecasted” and “Posted” under “Opportunity Status”
- Select “All” for “Funding Instrument Type”
- Select “All” for “Eligibility”
- Select “All” for “Category”
- Select “USAID” as “Agency”
- Sort by “Posted Date (Descending)”
- Manually count results between October 1, 2019 to December 31, 2020

N = 197

The results of the searches are presented in the below tables:

Stream I-A: Search Results for DEC Documents (after removing duplicates, N=529)

Document ID	Bibtype Name	Contract_Grant_Nu mber	Date of Publication Freeform	Descriptors Geographic
PA-00X-2CB	Handbook/Manual	72052719P00035	7/1/2020	Peru
PA-00W-RS9	Evaluation Summary	720-674-19-D-00007	2/1/2020	Niger
PA-00W-QHG	Other USAID Supported Study/Document	72052718C00001	5/1/2020	Peru Colombia Brazil
PA-00W-7FD	Annual Report	AID-442-C-16-00002	11/30/2019	Cambodia
PA-00W-7VW	Special Evaluation	AID-486-I-14-00001	12/1/2019	Laos
PA-00W-DWG	Periodic Report	AID-440-TO-16-00001	10/15/2019	Vietnam
PA-00W-F5X	Periodic Report	AID-440-TO-16-00001	1/15/2020	Vietnam
PA-00W-GSR	Final Evaluation Report	AID-486-I-14-0001	2/1/2020	Burma
PA-00W-JFS	Assessment	72049720F00001	2/1/2020	Indonesia
PA-00W-JFT	Assessment	72049720F00001	2/1/2020	Indonesia
PA-00W-JNQ	Annual Report	72048618CA00001	11/15/2019	Laos
PA-00W-M6W	Periodic Report	AID-440-TO-16-00001	5/18/2020	Vietnam
PA-00W-P73	Special Evaluation	AID-367-C-15-00001	5/1/2020	Nepal
PA-00W-PD5	Special Evaluation	AID-367-C-15-00001	5/1/2020	Nepal
PA-00W-Q9M	Assessment	72048619F00001	12/21/2019	Cambodia
PA-00W-RD7	Assessment	7200AA18A00010	6/1/2020	Africa south of Sahara East Africa Bangladesh
PA-00W-RQV	Periodic Report	AID-440-TO-16-00001	8/17/2020	Vietnam
PA-00X-237	Other USAID Supported Study/Document	72044219C00005	9/1/2020	Cambodia
PA-00X-2HB	Special Evaluation	AID-367-C-15-00001	9/1/2020	Nepal
PA-00X-2W4	Assessment	AID-OAA-A-17-00033	9/1/2020	Vietnam
PA-00X-3R6	Periodic Report	AID-440-TO-16-00001	10/1/2020	Vietnam
PA-00X-4VW	Design/Implementation Workplan	72048220C00001	9/1/2020	Burma
PA-00X-5X7	Annual Report	AID-440-TO-16-00001	10/1/2020	Vietnam
PA-00X-629	Other USAID Evaluation	72048220C00001	10/21/2020	Burma
PA-00X-78V	Assessment	72048618CA00007	6/1/2020	Asia Southeast Asia Laos
PA-00W-CZJ	Reference Document	AID-OAA-TO-15- 00020	12/1/2019	Indonesia Southeast Asia Cambodia
PA-00W-C84	Annual Report	AID-520-C-14-00002	10/22/2019	Guatemala
PA-00W-C2N	Annual Report	AID-596-A-16-000001	10/31/2019	El Salvador Latin America Central America
PA-00W-7RH	Annual Report	AID-OAA-I-13-00058	10/1/2019	Indonesia
PA-00W-6SR	Periodic Report	72052718C00001	11/1/2019	Peru Colombia Brazil
PA-00X-149	Final Contractor/Grantee Report	AID-520-C-12-00004	8/14/2020	Guatemala Central America Latin America
PA-00X-148	Final Contractor/Grantee Report	AID-520-C-12-00004	8/14/2020	Guatemala Central America Latin America
PA-00W-Q3S	Final Contractor/Grantee Report	72052718C00001	5/1/2020	Brazil Peru Colombia
PA-00W-QB8	Assessment	7200AA19M00008	4/1/2020	Ecuador
PA-00X-BZF	Final Contractor/Grantee Report	AID-367-IO-16-00002	11/1/2019	Nepal
PA-00X-B6H	Periodic Report	72052718LA00001	12/31/2020	Suriname Peru Guyana C olombia Brazil
PA-00X-8KG	Annual Report	72052718LA00001	9/30/2020	Suriname Peru Guyana C olombia Brazil
PA-00X-77X	Periodic Report	72052718LA00001	6/30/2020	Suriname Peru Guyana C olombia Brazil
PA-00X-3HN	Periodic Report	Cooperative Agreement No. 72052719CA00004	7/1/2020	Brazil Peru Ecuador Colo mbia
PA-00X-3GR	Annual Report	72052020C00001	10/29/2020	Guatemala Central America Latin America

Document ID	Bibtype Name	Contract Grant Number	Date of Publication Freeform	Descriptors Geographic
PA-00X-2VWX	Design/Implementation Workplan	72052719CA00002	10/1/2020	Peru
PA-00X-2WK	Periodic Report	72052719CA00002	7/1/2020	Peru
PA-00X-2KH	Periodic Report	72052719CA00004	4/1/2020	Peru Ecuador Colombia Brazil
PA-00X-1M5	Periodic Report	72052718LA00001	3/31/2020	Guyana Suriname Peru Colombia Brazil
PA-00X-1M3	Periodic Report	72052718LA00001	12/31/2019	Guyana Suriname Peru Colombia Brazil
PA-00W-S7Q	Annual Report	AID-OAA-TO-15-00020	7/1/2020	
PA-00W-RM3	Design/Implementation Workplan	7200AA18D00020	12/26/2019	Peru
PA-00W-K23	Periodic Report	AID-520-C-14-00002	1/21/2020	Guatemala
PA-00W-JF2	Other USAID Supported Study/Document	AID-497-TO-15-00005	3/1/2020	Indonesia
PA-00W-JDT	Periodic Report	72044219C00005	1/31/2020	Cambodia
PA-00W-JCQ	USAID Strategic Planning Document	72044219C00005	12/31/2019	Cambodia
PA-00W-GZC	Periodic Report	72052719CA00004	1/1/2020	Peru Ecuador Colombia Brazil
PA-00T-R4R	Miscellaneous Document	AID-OAA-A-14-00069	8/1/2020	Brazil
PA-00X-2WWM	Periodic Report	72052719CA00002	4/1/2020	Peru
PA-00X-9FI	Final Evaluation Report	72051419C00001	12/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-5Q3	Final Contractor/Grantee Report	AID-OAA-A-10-00046	11/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-8KD	Final Evaluation Report	72DFFP19GR00066	10/1/2020	Venezuela
PA-00X-3QP	Assessment	7200AA19M00008	10/1/2020	Windward Islands Trinidad and Tobago Saint Lucia Lesser Antilles Leeward Islands Guyana Grenada Eastern Caribbean Dominica Caribbean Barbados Antigua and Barbuda
PA-00X-6FC	Assessment	72051419C00001	9/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-4VW8	Final Evaluation Report	72051419C00001	9/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-2KG	Assessment	AID-497-C-16-00006	9/1/2020	Indonesia
PA-00X-363	Assessment	GS-10F-0048L	7/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-3T8	Other USAID Supported Study/Document	AID-512-T-15-00001	6/1/2020	Brazil
PA-00W-PV7	Final Contractor/Grantee Report	AID-660-A-13-00004	3/1/2020	Congo DR
PA-00W-JJV	Special Evaluation	72DFFP19GR00066	2/1/2020	Brazil
PA-00W-K98	Final Evaluation Report	AID-522-TO-16-00002	1/10/2020	Honduras
PA-00W-JVQ	Other USAID Supported Study/Document	AID-OAA-A-15-00046	1/30/2020	Philippines
PA-00W-HFX	Assessment	72052318M00001	1/17/2020	Mexico
PA-00W-FP1	Assessment	72052318M00001	12/5/2019	Mexico
PA-00W-F5R	Special Evaluation	AID-624-TO-15-00002	10/1/2019	West Africa
PA-00X-BSM	Reference Document	AID-497-C-16-00008	2/1/2020	Indonesia
PA-00X-BRT	Periodic Report	AID-497-C-16-00008	4/15/2020	Indonesia
PA-00X-BR7	Reference Document	AID-497-C-16-00008	10/1/2020	Indonesia
PA-00X-BNS	Periodic Report	AID-367-A-16-00008	2/1/2020	Nepal
PA-00X-BF9	Annual Report	72044218C00001	11/1/2020	Cambodia
PA-00X-BCJ	Annual Report	Cooperative Agreement No: AID-367-A-16-00008	7/28/2020	Nepal
PA-00X-BBS	Annual Report	AID-OAA-I-14-00014	8/1/2020	Philippines
PA-00X-B7H	Assessment	AID-660-TO-16-00002	8/25/2020	Congo DR
PA-00X-9RX	Periodic Report	AID-497-C-16-00008	10/15/2019	Indonesia
PA-00X-9RVV	Periodic Report	AID-497-C-16-00008	10/15/2020	Indonesia

Document ID	Bibtype Name	Contract Grant Number	Date of Publication Freeform	Descriptors Geographic
PA-00X-9RD	Evaluation Summary	AID-520-A-17-00001	10/30/2020	Guatemala Latin America
PA-00X-9JN	Annual Report	AID-526-A-13-00003	9/30/2020	Paraguay
PA-00X-9FK	Periodic Report	AID- OAA-I-13-00032	4/1/2020	Latin America Colombia
PA-00X-9FG	Periodic Report	AID- OAA-I-13-00032	1/1/2020	Latin America Colombia
PA-00X-97R	Annual Report	AID-520-C-14-00002	10/20/2020	Guatemala
PA-00X-8TK	Assessment	AID-OAA-I-15-00025	12/31/2020	Dominican Republic Caribbean
PA-00X-76D	Periodic Report	AID-OAA-I-14-00014	10/1/2020	Philippines
PA-00X-6SB	Design/Implementation Workplan	72044219C00005	9/1/2020	Cambodia
PA-00X-6I6	Periodic Report	AID-524-TO-15-00001	7/30/2020	Nicaragua
PA-00X-5X2	Annual Report	AID-TO-16-00002	10/30/2019	Indonesia
PA-00X-5BX	Annual Report	AID-442-C-16-00002	11/28/2020	Cambodia
PA-00X-4ZW	Periodic Report	Award No: 72514181O00005	1/31/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-4ZV	Annual Report	Award No: 72514181O00005	10/31/2019	Colombia
PA-00X-4ZS	Periodic Report	Award No: 72514181O00005	4/30/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-4VR	Periodic Report	7200AA18F00015	1/1/2020	Zambia Mozambique Ghana India
PA-00X-4VJ	Periodic Report	7200AA18F00015	4/1/2020	Mozambique Zambia India Ghana
PA-00X-4NR	Annual Report	AID-OAA-I-14-00014	8/1/2020	Philippines
PA-00X-4JW	Miscellaneous Document	AID-624-TO-15-00002	7/1/2020	Ivory Coast
PA-00X-4JV	Miscellaneous Document	AID-624-TO-15-00002	7/1/2020	Ivory Coast
PA-00X-4DD	Annual Report	AID-514-C-17-00002	10/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-3Z9	Design/Implementation Workplan	72051419CA00006	8/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-3T7	Periodic Report	AID-514-C-17-00002	7/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-3T6	Periodic Report	AID-514-C-17-00002	4/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-3T5	Periodic Report	AID-514-C-17-00002	1/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-3PR	Project/Program/Activity Design Document	AID-514-C-17-00002	8/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-3PJ	Annual Report	AID-514-C-17-00002	10/1/2019	Colombia
PA-00X-3MR	Periodic Report	USAID IDIQ Contract No. 72052218D00001	8/20/2020	Central America Honduras
PA-00X-3FS	Evaluation Summary	AID-OAA-I-15-00011	2/1/2020	Guyana
PA-00X-3FN	Evaluation Summary	AID-OAA-I-15-00011	2/1/2020	Guyana
PA-00X-2XF	Periodic Report	AID-514-A-16-00009	1/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-2XD	Miscellaneous Document	72052719CA00002	6/24/2020	Peru
PA-00X-2WT	Periodic Report	AID-514-A-16-00009	1/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-2WVN	Periodic Report	72052719CA00002	1/1/2020	Peru
PA-00X-2VK	Periodic Report	AID-514-A-16-00009	1/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-2TK	Periodic Report	AID-514-A-16-00009	1/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-2JD	Special Evaluation	72052018CA00003	10/1/2020	Guatemala
PA-00X-2C5	USAID Program Planning Document	AID-497-C-16-00006	6/1/2020	Indonesia
PA-00X-289	Design/Implementation Workplan	AID-520-C-14-00002	8/28/2020	Guatemala
PA-00X-285	Annual Report	AID-520-C-14-00002	9/28/2020	Guatemala
PA-00X-283	Annual Report	AID-514-A-16-00009	1/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00X-25J	USAID Strategic Planning Document	AID-OAA-A-15-00046	12/1/2019	Philippines
PA-00X-25H	Miscellaneous Document	AID-OAA-A-15-00046	12/1/2019	Philippines
PA-00X-25D	USAID Strategic Planning Document	AID-OAA-A-15-00046	6/30/2020	Philippines
PA-00X-1ZR	Periodic Report	72044219C00005	8/24/2020	Cambodia
PA-00X-1HI	Periodic Report	AID-520-C-14-00002	7/20/2020	Guatemala
PA-00X-18Z	Periodic Report	AID-524-TO-15-00001	1/31/2020	Nicaragua
PA-00X-18W	Annual Report	AID-524-TO-15-00001	10/30/2019	Nicaragua
PA-00W-ZZB	USAID Policy Document	AID-OAA-TO-15-00020	1/1/2020	
PA-00W-ZWH	Periodic Report	AID-514-A-15-00005	8/28/2020	Colombia Latin America
PA-00W-S6T	Handbook/Manual	AID-OAA-TO-15-00020	7/1/2020	Indonesia

Document ID	Bibtype Name	Contract Grant Number	Date of Publication Freeform	Descriptors Geographic
PA-00W-S4S	Periodic Report	AID-442-C-16-00002	4/30/2020	Cambodia
PA-00W-RZ6	Annual Report	AID- OAA-I-13-00032	10/1/2019	Colombia
PA-00W-RKN	Design/Implementation Workplan	72051419CA00006	10/30/2019	Colombia
PA-00W-RGC	Special Evaluation	720520CA1800003	7/31/2020	Guatemala
PA-00W-R6W	Evaluation Summary	AID-520-A-17-00001	7/31/2020	Guatemala
PA-00W-QN6	Periodic Report	AID-OAA-I-14-00014	4/1/2020	Philippines
PA-00W-Q9J	Miscellaneous Document	AID-497-C-16-00008	2/14/2020	Indonesia
PA-00W-PV4	Periodic Report	AID-520-C-14-00002	4/20/2020	Guatemala
PA-00W-NXW	Final Contractor/Grantee Report	AID-524-C-13-00001	6/1/2020	Nicaragua
PA-00W-NXG	Periodic Report	72052218LA00001	1/16/2020	Honduras Latin America
PA-00W-NWN	USAID Program Planning Document	AID-520-A-17-00004	10/31/2019	Guatemala Nicaragua
PA-00W-NTB	Miscellaneous Document	AID-OAA-TO-16-00017	4/1/2020	Philippines
PA-00W-NQ9	USAID Program Planning Document	72044219C00005	5/7/2020	Cambodia
PA-00W-MHV	Periodic Report	AID-523-TO-16-00003	4/29/2020	Mexico Latin America
PA-00W-MFH	Periodic Report	AID-523-TO-16-00003	1/30/2020	Mexico Latin America
PA-00W-KRR	Miscellaneous Document	AID-497-TO-15-00005	4/1/2020	Indonesia
PA-00W-KGZ	Miscellaneous Document	AID-OAA-TO-16-00017	4/1/2020	Philippines
PA-00W-KGW	Miscellaneous Document	AID-OAA-TO-16-00017	4/1/2020	Philippines
PA-00W-JWI	Miscellaneous Document	AID-OAA-A-15-00046	2/1/2020	Philippines
PA-00W-JQ5	Other USAID Supported Study/Document	72044218C00001	12/19/2020	Cambodia
PA-00W-JQ4	Periodic Report	72044218C00001	3/9/2020	Cambodia
PA-00W-JQ3	Annual Report	72044218C00001	1/10/2020	Cambodia
PA-00W-JDN	Periodic Report	AID-520-LA-15-00001	10/30/2019	Guatemala
PA-00W-JDG	Annual Report	AID-520-LA-15-00001	11/6/2019	Guatemala
PA-00W-HZK	Reference Document	AID-497-C-16-00008	2/14/2020	Indonesia
PA-00W-HV3	Periodic Report	AID-OAA-I-14-00014	1/1/2020	Philippines
PA-00W-HFS	Periodic Report	AID-514-A-15-00005	10/1/2019	Colombia
PA-00W-H7M	Assessment	GS-10F-0033M	2/1/2020	Ecuador
PA-00W-GM8	Annual Report	AID-514-H-17-00002	10/1/2019	Colombia
PA-00W-GJS	Assessment	AID-OAA-TO-14-00007	8/20/2020	Indonesia
PA-00W-GC8	Assessment	AID-660-A-13-0006	2/24/2020	Central Africa
PA-00W-F6P	USAID Program Planning Document	7200AA18N00001	1/1/2020	Nigeria
PA-00W-F5T	Annual Report	AID-OAA-I-13-00042	10/30/2019	South America Colombia
PA-00W-CR4	Annual Report	AID-OAA-15-00019	11/15/2019	Central America Honduras
PA-00W-C2W	Reference Document	7200AA18R00023	12/1/2019	Mali
PA-00W-B4F	Design/Implementation Workplan	7200AA18C00087	10/1/2019	Central African Republic
PA-00W-9WH	Non-USAID Technical	No. AID-OAA-M-14-00001	11/1/2019	
PA-00W-KKV	Assessment	AID-OAA-A-12-00095	4/1/2020	Guatemala
PA-00X-7CI	Miscellaneous Document	AID-OAA-A-15-00046	9/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00W-PZH	Handbook/Manual	AID-OAA-L-15-00003	1/1/2020	Uganda Rwanda Niger Nepal Kenya Ethiopia Cambodia Burkina Faso
PA-00W-PK6	Periodic Report	AID-514-TO-15-00015	1/31/2020	Latin America Colombia
PA-00W-GBJ	Annual Report	AID-514-C-15-00002	10/31/2019	Colombia
PA-00X-73B	Assessment	7200AA19M00008	12/1/2020	Trinidad and Tobago Saint Lucia Guyana Grenada English speaking Caribbean Eastern Caribbean Barbados Antigua and Barbuda
PA-00X-5V2	Assessment	AID-621-T0-15-00004	9/1/2020	Tanzania
PA-00X-2VR	Assessment	720FDA20GR00020	8/1/2020	Zimbabwe
PA-00X-1MQ	Assessment	AID-367-C-15-00001	5/1/2020	Nepal
PA-00X-2KM	Final Evaluation Report	AID-OAA-I-15-00028	2/27/2020	East Africa Kenya Africa

Document ID	Bibtype Name	Contract Grant Number	Date of Publication Freeform	Descriptors Geographic
PA-00W-KMC	Final Contractor/Grantee Report	AID-391-TO-15-00005	12/1/2019	Pakistan
PA-00X-BZD	Final Contractor/Grantee Report	AID-367-10-16-00002	11/1/2019	Nepal
PA-00X-BNV	USAID Program Planning Document	AID-367-A-16-00008	11/14/2020	Nepal India
PA-00X-B8T	Miscellaneous Document	AID-624-TO-15-00002	6/1/2020	Liberia Ivory Coast
PA-00X-9WX	Miscellaneous Document	AID-624-TO-15-00002	11/1/2020	West Africa
PA-00X-9TG	Annual Report	AID-624-TO-15-00002	12/1/2020	West Africa
PA-00X-71R	USAID Policy Document	GS-10F-0245M	8/1/2020	
PA-00W-DRW	USAID Strategic Planning Document	GS00Q14OADU119, Order No.	11/1/2019	Ghana Africa south of Sahara West Africa
PA-00W-9KD	Annual Report	7200-AA-18-CA-00009	10/30/2019	USA
PA-00W-9CC	Periodic Report	AID-615-H-15-00001	10/30/2019	Kenya
PA-00W-893	Periodic Report	AID-615-A-16-00009	10/1/2019	
PA-00W-KKN	Miscellaneous Document	AID-OAA-A-14-00028	4/1/2020	
PA-00X-9B8	Design/Implementation Workplan	AID-615-A-17-00004	5/1/2020	
PA-00X-9BB	Design/Implementation Workplan	AID-615-A-17-00004	8/1/2020	
PA-00X-1KM	Miscellaneous Document	AID-OAA-I-15-00011	9/14/2020	
PA-00X-2X7	Evaluation Summary	TO No. 72062478F00001	9/22/2020	
PA-00X-1BG	Miscellaneous Document	AID-497-TO-15-00005	8/1/2020	Indonesia
PA-00X-81W	Assessment	7200AA19M00013	8/13/2020	Dominican Republic
PA-00X-828	Assessment	7200AA19M00013	9/23/2020	Peru
PA-00X-822	Assessment	7200AA19M00013	9/28/2020	Senegal Gambia Sahel
PA-00X-97W	Assessment	7200AA19M00013	10/7/2020	Congo DR Congo PR Africa south of Sahara
PA-00X-826	Assessment	7200AA19M00013	10/13/2020	Niger
PA-00X-81N	Assessment	7200AA19M00013	10/14/2020	Niger Burkina Faso Sahel
PA-00X-823	Assessment	7200AA19M00013	10/21/2020	India
PA-00X-81H	Assessment	7200AA19M00013	11/30/2020	Haiti
PA-00X-68F	Miscellaneous Document	AID-720-674-18-D-00004	12/11/2020	Congo DR Djibouti Burundi Uganda Somalia Eritrea Tanzania Rwanda Kenya Ethiopia East Africa
PA-00W-JWB	Annual Report	AID-OAA-L-15-00003	10/1/2019	USA Uganda Nepal Rwanda Niger Kenya French speaking Africa Ethiopia East Africa Asia Cambodia Burkina Faso Africa
PA-00W-B4D	Annual Report	7200AA18C00087	10/1/2019	Central African Republic
PA-00X-5TF	Assessment	AID-621-TO-15-00004	11/1/2019	Tanzania
PA-00W-B57	Final Contractor/Grantee Report	AID-615-H-15-00001	11/1/2019	Kenya
PA-00W-M52	Miscellaneous Document	AID-OAA-A-14-00028	12/1/2019	Africa south of Sahara East Africa West Africa
PA-00W-C2Z	Reference Document	7200AA18R00023	12/1/2019	Mali
PA-00W-G98	Other USAID Supported Study/Document	GS-10F-0033M	1/1/2020	Africa
PA-00W-GW6	Periodic Report	7200AA18C00087	1/1/2020	Central African Republic
PA-00W-G8D	Other USAID Supported Study/Document	72062318LA00002	1/1/2020	Somalia
PA-00W-BJT	Assessment	AID-OAA-I-13-00058	1/15/2020	Vietnam
PA-00W-H82	Periodic Report	72062019CA00005	1/31/2020	Nigeria
PA-00X-9QV	Annual Report	AID-OAA-L-15-00003	2/1/2020	Uganda Rwanda Niger Nepal Kenya Ethiopia Asia

Document ID	Bibtype Name	Contract Grant Number	Date of Publication Freeform	Descriptors Geographic
				Cambodia Burkina Faso Africa
PA-00W-RG4	Periodic Report	7200AA18C00087	3/1/2020	Central Africa Central African Republic
PA-00W-NRI	Other USAID Supported Study/Document	7200AA18C00087	3/1/2020	Central African Republic
PA-00W-PRW	Project/Program/Activity Design Document	AID-OAA-L-15-00003	5/1/2020	Ethiopia
PA-00X-4FT	Assessment	AID-OAA-LA-11-00008	7/1/2020	Zambia Africa south of Sahara
PA-00X-3BZ	Assessment	7200AA18N00001	8/1/2020	Mali
PA-00X-2WF	Periodic Report	7200AA18C00087	9/1/2020	Central Africa Central African Republic
PA-00X-2WD	Design/Implementation Workplan	7200AA18C00087	9/1/2020	Central Africa Central African Republic
PA-00X-1KT	USAID Policy Document	AID-OAA-TO-14-00007	9/21/2020	Ethiopia
PA-00X-5TP	Other USAID Supported Study/Document	AID-621-T0-15-00004	10/1/2020	Tanzania Africa south of Sahara East Africa
PA-00X-5TN	Other USAID Supported Study/Document	AID-621-T0-15-00004	10/1/2020	Tanzania
PA-00X-5CC	Periodic Report	AID-621-T0-16-00005	10/15/2020	Tanzania
PA-00X-4N3	Periodic Report	AID-621-T0-15-00004	10/30/2020	Tanzania
PA-00X-59Z	Annual Report	72038619C00001	10/1/2019	India
PA-00X-1BK	Final Contractor/Grantee Report	AID-497-TO-15-00005	8/1/2020	Indonesia
PA-00W-PBX	Miscellaneous Document	AID-497-TO-15-00005	5/1/2020	Indonesia
PA-00W-PB8	Annual Report	AID-514-H-17-00001	10/15/2019	Colombia
PA-00W-P9M	Annual Report	AID-514-H-17-00001	10/15/2019	Colombia
PA-00W-HFV	Periodic Report	AID-514-A-15-00005	12/1/2019	Colombia
PA-00W-75Q	Assessment	AID-615-A-17-00004	12/31/2019	Kenya
PA-00X-77J	Assessment	AID-669-C-16-00002	6/15/2020	Liberia
PA-00W-KHD	Final Evaluation Report	AID-OAA-I-15-00022	4/1/2020	Malawi
PA-00W-K3K	Assessment	AID-669-C-16-00002	1/1/2020	Liberia
PA-00W-B55	Assessment	AID-OAA-TO-14-00007	12/1/2019	Latin America Southeast Asia Brazil
PA-00X-CKZ	Annual Report	7200AA18C00087	10/1/2020	Central African Republic
PA-00X-9WR	Miscellaneous Document	AID-624-TO-15-00002	11/1/2020	West Africa
PA-00X-8S4	Reference Document	AID-497-C-16-00008	12/21/2020	Indonesia
PA-00X-4VT	Other USAID Supported Study Document	7200AA18F00015	1/1/2020	Zambia
PA-00X-4VG	Design/Implementation Workplan	7200AA18F00015	11/1/2019	Mozambique India Zambia Ghana
PA-00W-RG5	Project/Program/Activity Design Document	7200AA18C00087	6/1/2020	Central Africa Central African Republic
PA-00W-C2X	Reference Document	7200AA18R00023	12/1/2019	Mali
PA-00W-9QJ	Periodic Report	AID-OAA-I-12-00032	10/1/2019	Liberia
PA-00W-QGH	Miscellaneous Document	7200AA18D00020	2/10/2020	Peru
PA-00X-3VV5	Bibliography/Literature Review	7200-AA-18-CA-00009	9/1/2020	Uganda East Asia
PA-00X-8S2	Reference Document	AID-497-C-16-00008	11/26/2020	Indonesia
PA-00X-34I	Design/Implementation Workplan	7200AA18F00015	6/1/2020	India
PA-00X-1J4	Periodic Report	AID-514-H-17-00001	4/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00W-Q9C	Miscellaneous Document	AID-497-C-16-00008	6/21/2020	Indonesia
PA-00W-PT8	Periodic Report	AID-514-H-17-00001	4/1/2020	Colombia
PA-00W-PCI	Miscellaneous Document	AID-497-TO-15-00005	5/1/2020	Indonesia
PA-00W-GWF	Miscellaneous Document	AID-624-TO-15-00002	1/1/2020	West Africa
PA-00X-654	Final Evaluation Report	GS-10F-0048L	7/1/2020	Colombia

Stream I-B: Search Results for Solicitations

NO.	SOURCE	KEY WORD	OPPOR-TUNITY NUMBER	OPPORTUNIT Y TITLE	AGENCY NAME	COUNTRY/IES
1	grants.gov	“indigenous”	720-621-21-RFI-00001	RFI – Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC) Next Generation, Tanzania	Tanzania USAID-Dar es Salaam	Tanzania
2	grants.gov	“urban”	7200AA21RFA00005	Discovery & Exploration of Emerging Pathogens “Viral Zoonoses (DEEP VZN)	Agency for International Development	Up to 12 hot-spot countries in Asia, Latin America, and Africa
3	grants.gov	“indigenous”	7200AA21RFA00011	Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Current and Emerging Threats to Crops	Agency for International Development	One or more countries in Latin American and the Caribbean, West Africa, East/Southern Africa, and South Asia
4	grants.gov	“indigenous”	7200AA21RFA00012	Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Horticulture	Agency for International Development	
5	grants.gov	“ethnic minorities”	72038820APS00001	USAID/Bangladesh and the Private Sector: Partnering to Fight COVID-19	Bangladesh USAID-Dhaka	Bangladesh
6	grants.gov	“ethnic minorities”	72044020RFA00004	USAID Biodiversity Conservation	USAID-VIETNAM	Vietnam
7	grants.gov	“indigenous”	72051420RFI00017	USAID/Colombia IPAC	Colombia USAID-Bogota	Colombia
8	grants.gov	“natives”	72060820-ISED-MS-RFI-0003	Inclusive Socio-Economic Development Program in the Marrakech-Safi Region (ISED-MS)	Morocco USAID-Rabat	Morocco
9	grants.gov	“ethnic minorities”	72060820-REMA-RFI-0002	Religious and Ethnic Minorities Activity (REMA)	Morocco USAID-Rabat	Morocco
10	grants.gov	“ethnic minorities”	72065620APS00002	Supporting Greater Socio-Economic Development and Recovery in Cabo Delgado APS	Mozambique USAID-Maputo	Mozambique
11	grants.gov	“ethnic minorities”	72066020APS00002	Foundational Literacy for Improved Educational Resilience (FLIER)	Democratic Republic of the Congo USAID-Kinshasa	

NO.	SOURCE	KEY WORD	OPPOR-TUNITY NUMBER	OPPORTUNIT Y TITLE	AGENCY NAME	COUNTRY/IES
12	grants.gov	“indigenous”	72067020RFISS0001	Request for Information (RFI) and Sources Sought: Libyan Economic Acceleration Project	Germany USAID – Frankfurt	Libya
13	grants.gov	“natives”	72068521APS0001	Improving Health Status and Human Capital in Senegal	Senegal USAID-Dakar	Senegal
14	grants.gov	“indigenous”	720FDA20APS0001	Localization of Disaster Risk Reduction in the Pacific	Agency for International Development	Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, Palau, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Samoa, Tokelau, Tonga, and/or Tuvalu
15	grants.gov	“indigenous”	720FDA20RFA0004	Local Capacity Strengthening for Response (LCS4R)	Agency for International Development	Unclear
16	grants.gov	“indigenous”	72ASHA21RFA0001	American Schools and Hospitals Abroad Program Worldwide	Agency for International Development	
17	grants.gov	“indigenous”	APS-OAA-21-00001-514	APS-OAA-21-00001 Addendum Colombia	Colombia USAID-Bogota	Colombia
18	grants.gov	“indigenous”	BAA-AFR-SD-2020	The USAID BAA for Sustainable Development in Sub-Saharan Africa	Agency for International Development	Countries in Sub-Saharan Africa
19	grants.gov	“indigenous”	BAA-E3-SUSTAINABLELANDSCAPES-2020	Sustainable Landscapes Broad Agency Announcement	Agency for International Development	Global
20	grants.gov	“urban”	BAA-OAA-E3-ENERGY-2020	Energy Sector Self-Reliance BAA	Agency for International Development	
21	grants.gov	“indigenous”	BAA-OAA-E3-POLLUTION-2020	Pollution Prevention & Mitigation BAA	Agency for International Development	
22	grants.gov	“ethnic minorities”	DRAFTPD-CWT	Combating Illegal Wildlife Trafficking	USAID-VIETNAM	Vietnam
23	grants.gov	“ethnic minorities”	DRAFTPD-REDUCINGPOLLUTION	USAID Reducing Pollution	USAID-VIETNAM	Vietnam

NO.	SOURCE	KEY WORD	OPPOR-TUNITY NUMBER	OPPORTUNIT Y TITLE	AGENCY NAME	COUNTRY/IES
24	grants.gov	“urban”	RFI-621-20-WASH01	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene – Tanzania	Tanzania USAID-Dar es Salaam	Tanzania
25	grants.gov	“urban”	RFI-278-20-HSQA	Health Service Quality Accelerator	Jordan USAID-Amman	Jordan
26	grants.gov	“urban”	RFI-613-20-000001	Input into USAID/Zimbabwe’s Building Locally Owned, Self-Reliant, and Effective Private Sector Associations	Zimbabwe USAID-Harare	Zimbabwe
27	grants.gov	“urban”	RFI-685-20-IHSHCS-01	Improving Health Status and Human Capital in Senegal Activity	Senegal USAID-Dakar	Senegal
27	grants.gov	“urban”	RFI-720656-20IFPI	Request for Information - Improved Family planning Initiative in Mozambique	Mozambique USAID-Maputo	Mozambique
28	grants.gov	“ethnic minorities”	RFI-GH-21-002	PROPEL Health Project (Promoting Results and Outcomes through Policy and Economic Levers)	Agency for International Development	Global scope
29	grants.gov	“urban”	RFI263-20-00002	Business Egypt	Egypt USAID-Cairo	
29	grants.gov	“urban”	RFI72066020R00012	Request for Information – New Sanitation Activity	Democratic Republic of the Congo USAID-Kinshasa	DRC
30	SAM	“traditional resource management”	720-114-20-R00010	Industry Led Skills Development Program	USAID-Georgia	Georgia
31	SAM	“pre colonial societies”	72011220RFI00001-MEL	USAID/Azerbaijan Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Mechanism	USAID-Azerbaijan	Azerbaijan
32	SAM	“environmental defenders”	72011519R00011	USAID/Central Asia Regional Water and Environmental Program	USAID-Central Asia	
32	SAM	“environmental defenders”	72027819R00004	Recycling in Jordan Activity	USAID-Jordan	Jordan

NO.	SOURCE	KEY WORD	OPPOR-TUNITY NUMBER	OPPORTUNIT Y TITLE	AGENCY NAME	COUNTRY/IES
33	SAM	“traditional resource management”	72027819R00012	Request for Qualifications – Water Engineering Services (WES)	USAID-Jordan	Jordan
34	SAM	“policy on promoting the rights of indigenous peoples”	72027820R00002	Business Growth Activity – USAID Jordan	USAID-Jordan	Jordan
35	SAM	“customary resolutions”	72038819RFI00017	USAID Bangladesh Protibesh Activity	USAID-Bangladesh	Bangladesh
36	SAM	“environmental defenders”	72039120Q000011	Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Activity	USAID-Pakistan	Pakistan
37	SAM	“pre colonial societies”	72044221R00001	Cambodia Malaria Elimination Project 2	USAID-Cambodia	Cambodia
38	SAM	“traditional resource management”	72049220C00002	Logistics Services in Mindanao	USAID-Philippines	Philippines
39	SAM	“customary institutions”	72049719RFI00002	USAID/Indonesia – New Energy Activity	USAID-Indonesia	Indonesia
40	SAM	“indigenous”	72060520R00001	Notice of Amendment No. 4 to comply with FAR Part 4.2105	USAID-DRC	ROC
41	SAM	“customary resolutions”	720611200001A2C	USAID Alternatives to Charcoal PRESOL for Information Only	USAID-Zambia	
42	SAM	“customary institutions”	72067419R00022	Voluntary Medical Male Circumcision and Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis Services in Lesotho (Khanya Project)	USAID-South Africa	Lesotho
43	SAM	“policy on promoting the rights of indigenous peoples”	BAA-OAA-E3-ENERGY-2020	Energy Sector Self-Reliance BAA		
43	SAM	“ancestral environments”	BAA-OAA-E3-Pollution-2020	Pollution Prevention & Mitigation BAA	USAID M/OAA	

NO.	SOURCE	KEY WORD	OPPOR- TUNITY NUMBER	OPPORTUNIT Y TITLE	AGENCY NAME	COUNTRY/IES
43	SAM	"customary institutions"	BAA-OAA-LLDI-2019	Broad Agency Announcement - Locally Led Development Innovation	USAID M/OAA	Uganda (& others but documents not reviewed)
44	SAM	"policy on promoting the rights of indigenous peoples"	PresolicitationPATI	Prosper Africa Trade and Investment (PATI)	USAID M/OAA	Multiple in Africa

After screening for relevance, documents were coded using the below codeframe in Dedoose:

ID	PARENT ID	DEPTH	TITLE	DESCRIPTION
1		1	Miscellaneous	Code if related to review purpose but does not fit under any other code. Use sparingly.
2		1	Terms of Identification	Code terms used and descriptions of referenced Indigenous Peoples.
3		1	Methods of Identification	Code any methods used and descriptions of how Indigenous Peoples were identified.
4		0	Objective 1: Strengthen Engagement	Objective 1: Strengthen engagement with Indigenous Peoples to safeguard against harm and support their development priorities and self-reliance
5	4	1	1.1 Direct Communication with IP	Code if USAID engages directly with IPs. Engagement is considered “direct” if communication is between USAID or its partners and Indigenous Peoples, rather than through an intermediary such as a government ministry.
6	4	1	1.2 Directly Targeting IPs	Code if program directly targets IPs as a beneficiary project activities.
7	4	1	1.3 Say in Engagement	Code if Indigenous Peoples have a say in how engagement would be done. Did engagement mostly follow IP’s suggestions (i.e. was engagement culturally appropriate)?
8	4	1	1.4 Different Approaches to Engagement	Code if different approaches for engagement were used for different groups (e.g. women, youth, and disabled individuals)?
9	4	1	1.5 Culturally Appropriate Communication	Code if languages, interpreters, and/or accommodations were considered and/or used for communication with IP?
10		0	Objective 2: Increase the integration of Indigenous	Objective 2: Increase the integration of Indigenous Peoples’ concerns across all sectors of USAID’s portfolio of investments and promote cross-sectoral development approaches
11	10	1	2.1 Identify Challenges	Code if a written analysis was produced of the challenges Indigenous Peoples face.
12	10	1	2.2 Identify Opportunities	Code if a written analysis was produced of the potential opportunities traditional or indigenous knowledge may have on project area.

ID	PARENT ID	DEPTH	TITLE	DESCRIPTION
13	10	1	2.3 Identify Impacts	Code if a written analysis was produced of the potential impact the investment could have on IP, including the review of adverse impacts of prior development interventions.
14	10	1	2.4 Cross-Sectoral	Code if systemic, cross-sectoral approaches were identified/implemented to address Indigenous Peoples challenges and opportunities and potential impacts? May double code with Identify Challenges, Identify Opportunities, Identify Impacts.
15	10	1	2.5 Risk Identification - Land	Code any mention of due diligence to identify potential risks to IPs related to the “possession or title of land, implementing partners, and private-sector partners/affiliates”
16	10	1	2.6 Data Collection	Code if data (either primary or secondary) was collected on Indigenous Peoples as part of initial desk review.
17	16	2	2.6 Disaggregated Data	Code if disaggregated data , including by Indigenous Peoples identities, was collected.
18	10	1	2.7 Safety/Ethical Considerations	Code any reference to IP's safety being identified/considered during the data collection process, and any steps to mitigate harm (e.g. FPIC)/
19	10	1	2.8 IP Organizations	Code if OU worked with allied organizations that have a track record of working with Indigenous Peoples in the country or region.
20	10	1	2.9 Use of USAID tools	Code USAID sources/tools that were used in desk review/ data collection process (e.g., Self-Reliance roadmap, Social Group Equality metrics, IDAs, consultation handbook, SIA)
21	10	1	2.10 Conflict Assessment	Code if conflicts with nearby communities were identified and/or if a conflict-assessment was conducted.
22		0	Objective 3: Empower Indigenous Peoples	Objective 3: Empower Indigenous Peoples and their representative organizations to advocate for, and exercise, their rights and practice self-determined development
23	22	1	3.1 Lessons Learned	Code any mention of utilizing past project evaluations/lessons from past projects (to inform program).

ID	PARENT ID	DEPTH	TITLE	DESCRIPTION
24	22	1	3.2 Undesired Contact	Code if there was consideration/identification of undesired contact with USAID.
25	22	1	3.3 Funding	Code if operating unit (project) provided funding or in-kind capacity-building for Indigenous Peoples/IP organizations.
26	25	2	3.3 Unclear	
27	25	2	3.3 Yes	
28		0	Objective 4: Foster an enabling environment	Objective 4: Foster an enabling environment for Indigenous Peoples to advocate for, and exercise, their rights
29	28	1	4.1 Domestic Legal Framework	Code if OUs (projects) analyzed the domestic legal framework to determine the mechanisms for the exercise and enforcement of Indigenous Rights.
30	28	1	4.2 Local Legislation	Code if OUs supported the drafting of local and national legislation and regulations to assist governments in complying with their obligations under international and/or domestic law to recognize the rights of Indigenous Peoples.
31	28	1	4.3 Government Capacity	Code any reference of Ous assessing the capacity of government agencies that are responsible for engaging with, and providing services to, Indigenous Peoples. May double code with Local Legislation.
32	28	1	4.4 Feedback Mechanisms	Code if feedback mechanisms with Indigenous Peoples were established.
33	32	2	4.4 IP Approaches	Code if feedback mechanisms include those used by Indigenous Peoples
34	32	2	4.4 Unclear	
35	28	1	4.5 Evaluation Indicators/Measurement	Code reference to evaluation measurement approaches and/or indicators
36	35	2	4.5 IP Approaches	Code if measurement approaches include those used by Indigenous Peoples
37	28	1	4.6 Monitoring Negative Impact	Code if and how potential negative impacts are monitored over the life of the project.
38	37	2	4.6 Unclear	
39	28	1	4.7 Sharing Learning/Results	Code if results from analyses, decision-making processes, project results and/or lessons learned were shared with Indigenous Peoples stakeholders.

ID	PARENT ID	DEPTH	TITLE	DESCRIPTION
40	39	2	4.7 IP Approaches	Code if dissemination/communication include strategies used by Indigenous Peoples
41	39	2	4.7 Unclear	

ANNEX C. SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE



POLICY ON PROMOTING THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES: LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE

NORC at the University of Chicago

INTRODUCTION AND CONSENT:

Hello and thank you for agreeing to speak with us. My name is _____ (interviewer name) and this is my colleague _____. We work with NORC at the University of Chicago, which has been contracted by USAID to build an internal knowledge base and analysis framework on how USAID's operating units are integrating Indigenous Peoples into development activities. Although the USAID Policy on Promoting the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (PRO-IP) was just approved in March 2020, the objectives and operating principles of this policy will be used as a proxy to organize the information collected from the field.

As part of this work, we would like to ask you some questions about any projects that you have worked on with Indigenous Peoples, your experiences with USAID's Policy on Promoting the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and any thoughts you have on how the policy can be better implemented moving forward.

This interview will last approximately 45 minutes. Your participation is entirely voluntary, and you can choose not to answer a question or terminate the interview at any moment without providing a reason. Your perspective is very important to us. Your name and job title will not be included with any responses in our reports. Please note, however, that our report may include references to specific projects. We would like to record this interview, but the recording will not include your name and will not be shared with anyone outside of the NORC team.

If you have any questions you may ask them now or later, even after the interview has started. If you wish to ask questions later, you may contact Ron Wendt, e-mail: wendt-ron@norc.org, phone: +1 301/634-9518.

Do you agree to participate in this discussion today? Yes No

GENERAL PROGRAM QUESTIONS

First, we are going to discuss your Operating Unit's work with the Indigenous Peoples that live in your geographic zone.

1. [Operating Principle 1: Identifying Indigenous Peoples] How do you make the determination that a population in your zone is Indigenous?

a. Have you encountered any challenges with identifying Indigenous Peoples in your zone?

2. [Objective 1/Operating Principle 3: Engagement]

a. Do you have any programs for which Indigenous Peoples are the primary beneficiaries? Could you briefly tell me about these programs?

i. [Objective 2: Integration] Probe: Are these projects focused on a single issue or are they attempting to address multiple barriers to well-being at once?

b. How do you go about identifying potential risks for Indigenous Populations that are not direct beneficiaries when designing programs?

i. [Probes:] Risks related to public and non-profit implementing partners, private-sector firms, or other USAID affiliates?

ii. [Additional probes:] Risks related to land? Natural resource management? Culture? Governance?

3. [Objective 1/Operating Principle 3: Engagement] In past or ongoing development programming that could potentially affect identified Indigenous Peoples, how has this Operating Unit typically engaged or communicated with these Indigenous Peoples?

a. Are there established protocols or principles?

b. Were there discussions with the Indigenous Peoples to determine how they would like to be engaged before formal conversations began? If so, how did this affect how the Indigenous Peoples were engaged?

c. At what stages of the program cycle are IP's typically engaged?

d. What does this engagement look like? (e.g. is there translation, does it work through communities' own decision-making mechanisms, is a special effort made to engage women, youth, persons with disabilities, is engagement done throughout the Project Cycle.)

4. [Operating Principle 4: Safeguarding Rights and Well-Being] What does the process of obtaining free, prior and informed consent from Indigenous Peoples for project activities that might impact them look like for your Operating Unit?

a. Who is typically present when Operating Units are obtaining FPIC from Indigenous Peoples? Are government or private sector stakeholders also present? If yes: Is it required for government or private sector stakeholders to be present?

5. [Objective 3: Empowerment] Has this Operating Unit done any work related to empowerment and rights for Indigenous Peoples, such as advocating for indigenous rights or supporting advocacy for Indigenous Peoples' development priorities?

a. If yes: Has your Operating Unit captured any lessons learned related to this work that you would be able to share? (Note: this can be shared with us after the call as well, though we would prefer to capture it during the interview.)

b. If no: What are the main barriers to conducting work on these topics?

i. Probe: Are there specific tools you can think of that would encourage more work on these topics or to make the work more impactful? (e.g. compilations of lessons learned, processes for conducting empowerment and rights projects, etc.)

6. Does your Operating Unit collect any data related to the integration of Indigenous Peoples in your projects? For example, data on how often Indigenous Peoples are engaged at the program design phase or data related to any advocacy your Operating Unit has done related to Indigenous Peoples' rights and well-being?

a. If yes: Would you be able to share a list of the points your Operating Unit is collecting data on? We will not need the data itself.

SPECIFIC GEOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

7. Are there any additional challenges to working with Indigenous Peoples that are specific to this Operating Unit's geographic context?

a. [Probe:] Political issues that are difficult to navigate? Conflicts between Indigenous Peoples? Problems with affiliates or partners in the public or private sector related to your work with Indigenous Peoples?

8. Are there any factors specific to this Operating Unit's geographic context that support or enable your work with Indigenous Peoples? [Probe: Legal frameworks?]

a. Do any of these factors facilitate meaningful and successful engagement?

USE OF PRO-IP

Next, we are going to discuss your exposure to the Policy on Promoting the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, AKA PRO-IP, and if it has been useful to your Operating Unit.

9. Since its launch in March of 2020, how much have you learned about the PRO-IP policy, and how have you learned it?

a. *Probe: Have you attended webinars or dialogues about it? Have there been meetings for your Operating Unit's staff about it?*

10. ***If necessary skip this question for time:*** In the past year, have you used the PRO-IP policy to guide the development of solicitations? For example: (1) consulting with Indigenous Peoples during the design phase, (2) requiring proposals include a plan for developing mitigation measures for any risks identified, (3) including specific criteria when evaluating proposals, such as plans for working with Indigenous Peoples throughout the implementation or plans to transition the program's management to Indigenous Peoples' organizations.

a. *[If yes:] Can you think of any ways in which PRO-IP could be improved to be more helpful for solicitations?*

b. *[If no:] What is this Operating Unit's current protocol for developing solicitations for programs that affect Indigenous Peoples?*

11. [Objective 3: Empowerment] Has the Operating Unit provided any direct funding to Indigenous Peoples in the last year? If so, can you estimate how much this was?

12. *[If this did not come up in previous responses:]* Have you used USAID’s Consultation Handbook, the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) or the Inclusive Development Analysis (IDA) tool in your projects?
 - a. *[If no:]* Do you know about these tools?
 - b. *[If yes:]* Did you find them useful? Did you face any challenges using them?
13. *[If it is clear that the operating unit has not been using PRO-IP:]* We’d like to understand why Operating Units have or have not been engaging with the PRO-IP policy. What are some reasons this Operating Unit hasn’t used the PRO-IP up until now?
 - a. *[Probe:]* Has it not been relevant for recent program work? Is this because it is not necessary for your work, or because you are not informed about its uses?

CLOSING QUESTIONS

9. What do you think are the best ways that the PRO-IP policy can continue to be disseminated in the Operating Units? What kind of dissemination activities would you find most useful?
 - a. *[Probe: Webinars? Dialogues? Smaller scale discussions with experts?]*
10. Is there anything else that you would like to tell us about your work with Indigenous Peoples and the PRO-IP policy?

Thank you very much for your participation today. If you have any additional comments, questions, or concerns, please feel free to contact Ron Wendt, e-mail: wendt-ron@norc.org, phone: +1 301/634-9518.

If there is time, or in a follow up email:

Are there any projects that we should look into specifically to help us understand how your Operating Unit works with Indigenous Peoples?

1. Are there any projects that have worked with Indigenous Peoples since early 2020 that you can draw our attention to?
2. Are there any projects that faced many challenges that you think could help inform our landscape analysis?
3. Are there any specific documents that you think we should look at, in particular solicitations that might not have come up in our searches of sam.gov or grants.gov? Likewise, are there any documents that might not have come up in our search of USAID’s DEC?

ANNEX D. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE CLEARINGHOUSE DOCUMENTS CITED IN REPORT:

ANNUAL REPORT USAID LESTARI YEAR 4: OCTOBER 2018—SEPTEMBER 2019 (PA-00W-7RH). (2019). Tetra Tech ARD.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTU0MTA2>

Bharati, Luna, Pandey, Vishnu P., Dhaubanjari, Sanita, Suhardiman, Diana, Bastakoti, Ram C., Karki, Emma S., Shrestha, Gitta, Clement, Floriane, Thapa, Bhes R., Okwany, Romulus, Tachamo, Ram D., Eriyagama, Nishadi, Sharma, Akriti, Sharma, Subodh, Jeuland, Marc, & Pakhtigian, Emily. (2019). *SUSTAINABLE, JUST AND PRODUCTIVE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT IN WESTERN NEPAL UNDER CURRENT AND FUTURE CONDITIONS USAID's Digo Jal Bikas Project MAIN REPORT* (PA-00X-BZD). International Water Management Institute (IWMI) Kathmandu University (KU) Duke University.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTc4NTc1>

BITTER CASSAVA FOR A SWEET MILK ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN Year 2 (PA-00W-RKN). (2019). Cooperativa Colanta.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTY1NzMw>

BURMA RESPONSIBLE INVESTMENT AND TRADE ACTIVITY Gender and Inclusive Development Analysis and Action Plan (PA-00X-4VW). (2020). DAI Global, LLC.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTczODAx>

Cambodia Green Future Activity MEL Plan (PA-00W-NQ9). (2020). ECODIT LLC.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTYzNDgw>

Cambodia Green Future Gender Analysis, Strategy and Action Plan (PA-00W-JCQ). (2019). ECODIT, Inc.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTYwODYw>

Cambodian Civil Society Strengthening Project Annual FY20 Report (PA-00X-5BX). (2020). United States Agency for International Development.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTc0MTY2>

Cambodian Civil Society Strengthening Project Annual Report FY19 (PA-00W-7FD). (2019). United States Agency for International Development.

https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail_Presto.aspx?vID=47&ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTUzODUx

Cambodian Civil Society Strengthening Project Q2 FY20 Quarterly Report (PA-00W-S4S). (2020). United States Agency for International Development.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTY2MTU0>

Community Roots Annual Performance Report FY20 (PA-00X-9RD). (2020). World Vision.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTc3Njlz>

Corro, Rita, Kerley, Janet, Clark, Kim, Munevar, Santiago Salazar, & Revilla, Tatiana. (2020). *Gender and inclusive development analysis: Final report (USAID/Mexico) (PA-00W-HFX)*. International Business and Technical Consultants, Inc. (IBTCI).

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTYwMTM4>

Duthie, Mike, Anzoategui, Lissette, Hess, Anna-Karin, Higgins, Julia, & Smith, Madeleine. (2019). *Impact evaluation of USAID nurture in Laos: Midline report (PA-00W-7VW)*. Social Impact, Inc.

https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00W7VW.pdf

Environmental and Social Safeguards (Niger Mini-Grid Feasibility Study) (PA-00W-RS9). (2020). ECODIT, LLC.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTYlODg4>

Final report: Department of Health deployment program study (PA-00W-JVQ). (2020). Chemonics International, Inc.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTYxMjUy>

Forest Alliance Annual Work Plan FY2021 (PA-00X-2WX). (2020). AIDER.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTcyMjYy>

Forest Alliance quarterly performance report Jan-Mar 2020 (Q2 2020) (PA-00X-2WM). (2020). AIDER.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTcyMjUz>

Fremming, James, Tuladhar, Indu, & Khanal, Ajaya Bhadra. (2020a). *Niiti sambad (“policy dialogue”): Mid-term performance evaluation (PA-00W-PD5)*. CAMRIS International.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTY0MDA4>

Fremming, James, Tuladhar, Indu, & Khanal, Ajaya Bhadra. (2020b). *Niti sambad “policy dialogue”: Mid-term performance evaluation final report (PA-00W-P73)*. CAMRIS International.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTYzODY2>

GENDER AND SOCIAL INCLUSION PLAN Combating Environmental Crimes Activity (PA-00W-RM3). (2019). DAI Global, LLC.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTYlNzQy>

GUATEMALA LOCAL GOVERNANCE/NEXOS LOCALES PROJECT YEAR 7 WORK PLAN (PA-00X-285). (2020). DAI Global, LLC.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTcxNzM2>

Honduras Civil Society & Media Activity—Quarterly Report 4/Annual Report—Fiscal Year 2019 (PA-00W-NXG). (2020). FHI 360.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTYzNjUz>

Indonesia Strategic Assessment (PA-00W-JFT). (2020). Democracy International, Inc.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTYwOTE5>

Industry and the Amazon: Laying the foundation for adopting best management practices: Final report, 2019-2020 (PA-00W-Q3S). (2020). DT Global.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTY0NTU4>

Justice & Transparency Project—Annual Technical Report FY2020 (PA-00X-3GR). (2020). Checchi and Co. Consulting, Inc. (CCCI).

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTcyNzAl>

Laos Microenterprise supported by USAID - Gender, Equality, and Social Inclusion Report (PA-00X-78V). (2020). ACDI/VOCA.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTcINjc2>

LEARNING FROM CHALLENGES TO EFFECTIVELY TARGET AND INVOLVE STAKEHOLDERS IN SUSTAINABLE LANDSCAPE PROJECTS (PA-00X-9WX). (2020). Tetra Tech ARD.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTc3NzUw>

LOCAL GOVERNANCE/NEXOS LOCALES PROJECT ANNUAL REPORT FY2019 (PA-00W-C84). (2019). DAI Global, LLC.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTU2ODM5>

MEL Plan Revised Hariyo Ban Program II (PA-00X-BNV). (2020). WWF Nepal.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTc4MzM2>

Monitoring, Evaluation and Coordination Contract (MECC): USAID/DRC 2020 Gender Analysis Report (PA-00X-B7H). (2020). International Business and Technical Consultants, Inc. (IBTCI).

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTc3OTkw>

Producers to Market Alliance Gender and Vulnerable Population Strategy FY2021 (PA-00X-3PR). (2020). Fintrac, Inc.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTcyODcz>

Puentes Project Guatemala FY19 Annual Report (PA-00W-NWN). (2019). World Vision.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTYzNjMw>

Quarterly Progress Report – July to September 2019 | USAID Amazon BMP Activity (PA-00W-6SR). (2019). DT Global (formerly known as AECOM International Development).

https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail_Presto.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTUzMzU3

Radford, Nick. (2020). *Central Africa regional program for the environment (CARPE): Final report, reporting period—30 September 2013 to 27 December 2019 (PA-00W-PV7)*. Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) (New York, NY).

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTY0Mzc0>

Recruitment Prevention and Integration Program (RPR) Final Report 2016 -2020 (PA-00W-ZWH). (2020). IOM -RPR.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTcwNjgy>

REGIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEMOCRACY ACTIVITY ANNUAL REPORT OCTOBER 1, 2018—SEPTEMBER 30, 2019 (PA-00W-C2N). (2019). Pan American Development Foundation (PADF).

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTU2Njg2>

Shakya, Sujeev, Bhaju, Sudip, Pant, Samridhi, KC, Niraj, Shapiro, Marc, & Devkota, Ananda Raj. (2020). *Nepal private sector engagement assessment, 2020 (PA-00X-1MQ)*. CAMRIS International.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTcxMjQ4>

Stephens, Sarah, Tuladhar, Shareen, Rana, Pinky Singh, Shrestha, Kshitiz, Bharati, Puja, Sharma, Ganesh, Shrestha, Ram, & Shapiro, Marc. (2020). *USAID/Nepal hamro samman activity: Mid-term performance evaluation report (PA-00X-2HB)*. CAMRIS International.

<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTcxOTM3>

- Strengthening the Capacity of Indigenous Organizations in the Amazon -SCIOA (FY20 Report with Executive Summary Translated)* (PA-00X-8KG). (2020). Pact, Inc.
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTc2NzAx>
- Strengthening the Capacity of Indigenous Organizations in the Amazon -SCIOA (FY21 Q1)* (PA-00X-B6H). (2020). Pact, Inc.
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTc3OTYy>
- Support Provided to GOC to Build and Maintain a Network for Secondary and Tertiary Roads* (PA-00W-F5T). (2019). Management Systems International, Inc. (MSI).
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTU4MzQz>
- Technical Vocational Education and Training Strengthening for At-Risk Youth, Proyecto Aprendo y Emprendo, FY 2020 Quarter 3 Report* (PA-00X-616). (2020). Creative Associates International, Inc. (CAII).
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTc0Njc3>
- Ujjwal Pradhan, Vaneska Litz, Aatish Khan, & Ashish Raj. (2019). *FOREST-PLUS 2.0: FOREST FOR WATER AND PROSPERITY Annual Performance Report: December 2018 – September 2019* (PA-00X-59Z). Tetra Tech ARD.
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTc0MTM5>
- USAID Justice for a Sustainable Peace Activity annual report* (PA-00W-RZ6). (2019). Chemonics International, Inc.
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTY2MDI1>
- USAID LESTARI FREE, PRIOR AND INFORMED CONSENT: A TOOL FOR IMPROVED LAND USE MANAGEMENT* (PA-00X-1BG). (2020). Tetra Tech ARD.
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTcxMDE3>
- USAID/Peru COVID-specific gender analysis* (PA-00X-828). (2020). Banyan Global.
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTc2Mjcl>
- Volk, Richard, Diame, Abdoulaye, & Armah, Frederick Ato. (2019). *Midterm performance evaluation: West Africa biodiversity and climate change program: Sierra Leone coastal landscape complex* (PA-00W-F5R). Tetra Tech DPK, Inc.
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctlID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&rID=NTU4MzQx>

White, Alan, Gunawan, Tiene, Yuni, Christiana, Rudyanto, Sari, Irna, Wen, Wen, Purwanto, Siahaan, Dame, & Carter, Eleanor. (2019). *USAID SEA Project Annual Report (October 2018—September 2019)* (PA-00X-9RX). Tetra Tech ARD.
<https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/content/Detail.aspx?vID=47&ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDNmY2Uy&rID=NTc3NjM4>

SOLICITATIONS CITED IN REPORT:

APS-OAA-21-00001 Addendum Colombia. (2020). grants.gov. <https://www.grants.gov/view-opportunity.html?oppld=330448>

Cambodia Malaria Elimination Project 2. (2020). SAM.gov.
https://sam.gov/opp/6d5f60bd24a54cb3839f8ba76302ab79/view?keywords=%22pre%20colonial%20societies%22&sort=-modifiedDate&index=&is_active=true&page=2&organization_id=100148640&date_filter_index=0&in_active_filter_values=false

Foundational Literacy for Improved Educational Resilience (FLIER). (2020). grants.gov.
<https://www.grants.gov/view-opportunity.html?oppld=327042>

Input into USAID/Zimbabwe's Building Locally Owned, Self-Reliant, and Effective Private Sector Associations. (2019). grants.gov. <https://www.grants.gov/view-opportunity.html?oppld=323022>

Notice of Amendment No. 4 to comply with FAR Part 4.2105. (2020). SAM.gov.
https://sam.gov/opp/aa1185986a714eb89fe93bd13966db50/view?keywords=indigenous&sort=-modifiedDate&index=&is_active=true&page=1&organization_id=100148640&date_filter_index=0&in_active_filter_values=false

Request for Information (RFI) and Sources Sought: Libyan Economic Acceleration Project. (2020). grants.gov.
<https://www.grants.gov/view-opportunity.html?oppld=329255>

Request for Information—Indigenous Peoples and Afro-Colombian Activity. (2020). grants.gov.
<https://www.grants.gov/view-opportunity.html?oppld=328565>

RFI - Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC) Next Generation, Tanzania. (2020). grants.gov.
<https://www.grants.gov/view-opportunity.html?oppld=330535>

USAID Biodiversity Conservation Agency for International Development USAID-VIETNAM. (2020). grants.gov.
<https://www.grants.gov/view-opportunity.html?oppld=324942>

USAID Reducing Pollution. (2020). grants.gov. <https://www.grants.gov/view-opportunity.html?oppld=330377>

DOCUMENTS CITED IN STREAM 2:

DFAT Indigenous Peoples Strategy 2015-2019: A framework for action. (2015). Australia Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. <https://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/dfat-indigenous-peoples-strategy-2015-2019.pdf>

Indigenous Peoples Safeguards: A Planning and Implementation Good Practice Sourcebook. (2013). Asian Development Bank. <https://www.adb.org/documents/indigenous-peoples-safeguards-planning-and-implementation-good-practice-sourcebook>

Joint Staff Working Document: Implementing EU External Policy on Indigenous Peoples. (2016). European Commission. https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/default/files/swd_2016_340_fl_joint_staff_working_paper_en_v2_pl_8_65982.pdf

Operational Policy on Indigenous Peoples and Strategy for Indigenous Development. (2006). Inter-American Development Bank. <https://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getdocument.aspx?docnum=2032081>

Performance Standard 7: Indigenous Peoples. (2012). International Finance Corporation. https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/3274df05-7597-4cd3-83d9-2aca293e69ab/PS7_English_2012.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=jiVQI.D

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 61/295 (2007). https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2018/11/UNDRIP_E_web.pdf

World Bank: *Indigenous Peoples/ Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities, ESS7* (2018). <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/972151530217132480/ESF-Guidance-Note-7-Indigenous-Peoples-English.pdf>

DOCUMENTS CITED IN STREAM 3:

A guide to acknowledging First Peoples and traditional land: Land acknowledgements for staff and volunteers. (2021). Center for World Indigenous Studies (CWIS). <https://www.cwis.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/landacknowledgementguide.pdf>

An Introduction to integrating African Indigenous & Traditional Knowledge in National Adaptation Plans, Programmes of Action, Platforms and Policies. (2016). The Indigenous Peoples of Africa Co-ordinating Committee. https://ipacc.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/indigenous_knowledge.pdf

Appel à contribution du mécanisme d'experts sur les droits des peuples autochtones. (2018). Association Nationale de Promotion et de Protection des droits de l'homme. https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/IPeoples/EMRIP/FPIC/AssociationNationalePromotionProtectionDH_Cameroun.pdf

ASIA INDIGENOUS PEOPLES PACT (AIPP)'S HANDBOOK: EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES AND FREE, PRIOR AND INFORMED CONSENT OF INDIGENOUS. (2019). Asian Indigenous People's Pact (AIPP). <https://aippnet.org/asia-indigenous-peoples-pact-aipps-handbook-extractive-industries-free-prior-informed-consent-indigenous/>

Beatriz Huertas Castillo. (2021). *Respect for the Self-determination and Protection of Indigenous Peoples in Isolation*. International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA).

<https://iwgia.org/en/resources/publications/3994-respect-for-the-self-determination-and-protection-of-indigenous-peoples-in-isolation.html>

Contributions of the RCA on the right to Free, Prior and Informed Consultation and Consent to the thematic study of the UN Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. (2018). Amazonian Cooperation Network (Rede de Cooperação Amazônica: RCA).

https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/IPeoples/EMRIP/FPIC/AmazonCooperationNetwork_EN.pdf

Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Free, Prior and Informed Consent. (2018). The New South Wales Aboriginal Land Council (NSWALC).

<https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/IPeoples/EMRIP/FPIC/NSWAboriginalLandCouncil.pdf>

Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: Study on the theme of free, prior and informed consent. (2018). Maya Leaders Alliance.

<https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/IPeoples/EMRIP/FPIC/MayaLeadersAllianceBelize.pdf>

Falling short: Donor funding for Indigenous Peoples and local communities to secure tenure rights and manage forests in tropical countries (2011–2020). (2021). Center for World Indigenous Studies/Rainforest Foundation Norway.

<https://www.cwis.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/rainforestmanagement.pdf>

GENDER MANUAL: GOOD PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNT BY AN INDIGENOUS PEOPLES ORGANIZATION. (2015). Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact. <https://aippnet.org/gender-manual-good-practices-and-lessons-learnt-by-an-indigenous-peoples-organization/>

Key Elements to the Initiation, Performance and Maintenance of Good Faith Consultations and Negotiations with Indigenous and Tribal Peoples and Communities. (2008). Forest Peoples Program.

<https://www.forestpeoples.org/sites/default/files/publication/2010/10/fppkeyelementsgoodfaithdec08eng.pdf>

SAFEGUARDS INFORMATION SYSTEM (SIS) IN REDD+ AIPP Submission to the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) on Safeguards Information System. (2014). IWGIA and the Asian Indigenous People's Pact (AIPP).

https://www.iwgia.org/images/publications/0699_Briefing_Paper_SIS_for_eb.pdf

Submission of the Assembly of First Nations (AFN) on Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) for the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. (2018). The Assembly of First Nations (AFN).

https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/IPeoples/EMRIP/FPIC/AssemblyFirstNations_Canada.pdf

Submission to the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. (2018). The Indian Law Resource Center.

<https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/IPeoples/EMRIP/FPIC/IndianLawResourceCenter.pdf>

MISCELLANEOUS DOCUMENTS CITED:

[Appropriations.senate.gov](https://www.congress.gov/appropriations). "Division K-Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2021." March 18, 2022.

<https://www.appropriations.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Division%20K%20-%20SFOPS%20Statement%20FY21.pdf#page=94>

Congress.gov. "H. Rept. 116-444 - STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2021." March 18, 2022. <https://www.congress.gov/congressional-report/116th-congress/house-report/444>.

Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687>

U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20523