



## WORKSHOP REPORT

**Latin America regional workshop to discuss principles, standards and mechanisms to support indigenous peoples' tenure rights and forest guardianship**

**Presented by:**

**CHARAPA CONSULT AND THE FORO INDÍGENA DE ABYA YALA - FIAY**



**San Salvador, El Salvador  
July 7-8, 2022**

## Content

1. BACKGROUND	1
1.1. What is the Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities' Tenure Rights and Forest Guardianship Pledge?	2
1.2 Approach and scope of the process of evaluation of principles, standards and mechanisms to support the tenure rights and forest guardianship of indigenous peoples	3
2. INTRODUCTION	4
3. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' ASPIRATIONS AND PRIORITIES	5
3.1 Reference framework and participation	5
4. APPROACH AND FOCUS	6
5. FINANCING MODALITIES	6
5.1 Operational requirements related to funding to Indigenous Peoples	7
5.2 Strengthening of institutional capacities	9
5.3 Mechanisms for consultation, participation, and consent	10
6 LEGAL FRAMEWORK	10
7 REFERENCE GROUP – LATIN AMERICA	11
ANNEXES	14
ANNEX 1: Fotografic material	14
ANNEX 2: Reflections and recommendations presented mechanisms	17

# 1. BACKGROUND

Indigenous Peoples constitute distinct cultures, social structures and identities, and are the guardians of traditional knowledge that is received from ancestors and transmitted from elders to subsequent generations. Despite the historical processes of colonization, discrimination and domination that have undermined indigenous peoples' systems of self-determination and governance, their continued existence underscores their strength and resilience as peoples, as well as their aspiration and commitment to pass on their distinct identities, knowledge systems and practices to future generations.

As enshrined in the international human rights legal framework, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and ILO Convention No. 169, Indigenous Peoples are holders of collective rights, with the rights to self-determination and to lands, territories and resources they traditionally possess, occupy or otherwise use. They also have the right to be consulted and to give or refuse their free, prior and informed consent to any initiative that may affect their rights, and to maintain and further develop their own governance systems, customary law authorities and representative institutions.

Throughout history, Indigenous Peoples have developed a wide range of organizational expressions shaped by both the constraints and opportunities found in their local, national, and regional contexts. Different types of organizations coexist in most communities, such as traditional councils, hereditary leadership positions, territorial governments, village councils, municipalities, autonomous regions, associations, networks, alliances, as well as organizations representing, for example, women, youth or other segments of the indigenous population. At the subnational, national and regional levels, Indigenous Peoples are organized into umbrella networks and organizations, some with formal constitution and operational institutional capacity, while others are more informal alliances or provide political leadership without having a project implementation branch. In addition, some indigenous leaders and experts have established civil society organizations that conduct research, facilitate participation, and implement projects, among others.

Indigenous Peoples manage 25 percent of the world's land and protect 80 percent of the Earth's biodiversity, mainly under customary tenure agreements, which in many countries are not legally recognized. Moreover, Indigenous Peoples are the custodians of a significant percentage of the world's forests and are therefore indispensable to achieving internationally agreed goals regarding forest and biodiversity conservation, as well as climate change. The crucial role of Indigenous Peoples in sustainable development, forest and biodiversity conservation, as well as mitigation and adaptation to climate change, has gained increasing recognition. This is also reflected in an increasing number of initiatives and mechanisms, aimed at supporting the legal recognition of Indigenous Peoples' rights to land and resources, to halt deforestation, unsustainable land conversion, biodiversity loss, etc. However, a recent study documents that indigenous communities and organizations receive less than one

percent of global climate funds aimed at reducing deforestation, which is in clear contradiction to the documented role of Indigenous Peoples in protecting the world's forests.<sup>1</sup>

## **1.1. What is the Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities' Tenure Rights and Forest Guardianship Pledge?**

How much? At the 2021 United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP 26), a group of bilateral donors and philanthropic funders pledged to contribute \$1.7 billion to support the advancement of indigenous peoples' and local communities' forest tenure rights and increased recognition and rewards for their role as guardians of forests and nature.<sup>2</sup>

Why? This is the result of a strong advocacy process generated by Indigenous Peoples and their allies, and the political will of donors to change the situation..

What? The main objective has been to mobilize more direct and tangible support for the forest tenure and guardianship of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPCL). The financing under the Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities' Tenure Rights and Forest Guardianship Pledge will be directed at:

- Channeling support to Indigenous Peoples and local communities, including through capacity building and financial support for group activities, collective governance structures and management systems, and sustainable livelihoods;
- Activities to secure, strengthen and protect Indigenous Peoples' and local communities' land and resource rights, including, but not limited to, support to community-level tenure rights mapping and registration work, support to national land and forest tenure reform processes and their implementation, and support to conflict resolution mechanisms.

Who? The Pledge is supported by 5 bilateral donors and 17 philanthropic funders.

Where? Geographically, the Pledge follows the same basic criteria used for the broader Global Forest Finance Commitment.<sup>3</sup> This implies that funding under the Pledge should be channelled to:

1. Forest-related climate action in tropical and subtropical forest countries, which are
2. Eligible for Official Development Assistance (ODA).

---

<sup>1</sup> Rainforest Foundation Norway (2021): *Falling short: Donor funding for Indigenous Peoples and local communities to secure tenure rights and manage forests in tropical countries (2011–2020)*

<sup>2</sup> See: <https://ukcop26.org/cop26-iplc-forest-tenure-joint-donor-statement-spanish/>

<sup>3</sup> See: <https://ukcop26.org/the-global-forest-finance-pledge/>

When? The implementation period is five years, from 2021-2025.

How? Contributions under the Pledge will not result in the establishment of a new fund or a joint donor funding mechanism. Individual donors will decide how they allocate and execute their contributions to the Pledge. Pledge donors recognize that the implementation of commitments will take time, as it is not easy to quickly change donor funding modalities. However, donors are encouraged to work together to increase the effectiveness of their spending and commit to progressively improving the quality of their support.

## **1.2 Approach and scope of the process of evaluation of principles, standards and mechanisms to support the tenure rights and forest guardianship of indigenous peoples**

With the Pledge intending to scale up and improve the quality of climate finance for indigenous peoples in tropical and subtropical forests in countries eligible for Official Development Assistance (ODA), some indigenous experts and funders saw the need to facilitate an inclusive process with indigenous peoples to assess the principles, standards and mechanisms to support indigenous peoples' tenure rights and forest guardianship in accordance with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). Accordingly, the Ford Foundation, the Christensen Fund and the David and Lucile Packard Foundation have hired Charapa Consult to facilitate this process between May and September 2022.

The evaluation process aims to capture the experiences and aspirations of indigenous peoples and will therefore facilitate the participation of indigenous organizations from tropical and subtropical countries eligible for ODA from Africa, Asia and Latin America through a series of outreach events, data collection through an online questionnaire, and the organization of regional workshops.<sup>4</sup>

Approach and scope of the evaluation:<sup>5</sup>

- Scope determined by the Pledge: Indigenous Peoples of Tropical and Subtropical Forest Areas of Countries Eligible for ODA in Africa, Africa and Latin America;
- The existing standards on indigenous peoples, in particular the UNDRIP and ILO Convention No. 169, are starting point, analytical framework and methodological guide in the process;
- Recognition of Indigenous Peoples as collective subjects of rights to lands, territories and resources, self-management, etc.;

---

<sup>4</sup> See more about the evaluation process: <https://charapa.dk/es/evaluando-principios-estandares-y-modalidades-para-apoyar-los-derechos-de-tenencia-y-la-custodia-forestal-de-los-pueblos-indigenas/proceso-independiente-de-evaluacion-de-principios-normas-y-mecanismos-de-apoyo/>

<sup>5</sup> See more about the evaluation process: <https://charapa.dk/es/evaluando-principios-estandares-y-modalidades-para-apoyar-los-derechos-de-tenencia-y-la-custodia-forestal-de-los-pueblos-indigenas/proceso-independiente-de-evaluacion-de-principios-normas-y-mecanismos-de-apoyo/>

- Out of reach of the evaluation: Local communities, countries not eligible for ODA, recommendations to donors on where to put their money;
- Strengthen - and not replace – Indigenous Peoples’ own processes, dialogues and negotiations (caucus, global, regional, national process).

## 2. INTRODUCTION

This document summarizes the contributions that 13 representatives of different organizations and institutions of Indigenous Peoples of Latin America provided during the regional workshop held on July 7 and 8, 2022 in the city of San Salvador, El Salvador, organized by the Indigenous Forum of Abya Yala (FIAY) and Charapa Consult.

The general objective of the workshop was to identify principles, standards and modalities to support the tenure rights and forest guardianship of Indigenous Peoples, based on the experiences and aspirations of indigenous peoples in tropical and subtropical forests in Latin America. It had the following specific objectives:

- Share information on the Pledge to Support the Tenure Rights and Forest Guardianship of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities
- Discuss financing priorities for Indigenous Peoples in tropical and subtropical forests in Latin America
- Exchange experiences with external funding to indigenous organizations and identify challenges and good practices
- Discuss a set of principles and standards for external financing, based on the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
- Discuss preferred modalities for funding under the Pledge to Tenure Rights and Forest Guardianship of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities

The objective of the workshop:

- To identify principles, standards and modalities to support the tenure rights and forest guardianship of indigenous peoples, based on the experiences and aspirations of indigenous peoples in tropical and subtropical forest areas of Latin America.

Methodology:

- Participatory and inclusive, combining presentations and plenary discussions with working groups, surveys and cases
- Trust: Participants are free to use and share workshop information, but the specific identity and affiliation of the speaker or participants is not disclosed, and the workshop report does not attribute specific opinions or recommendations to specific participants.
- Outputs: A workshop report, summarizing the main challenges, lessons learned, good practices and recommendations presented. The Latin America Reference Group approves and will serve as input for the final report to be presented to the donors of the Pledge.

### **3. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' ASPIRATIONS AND PRIORITIES**

---

*"We want to negotiate as partners, not beneficiaries"*

---

After presenting the experiences of Latin America with the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, the following issues emerged in the discusión as priority issues to be addressed within the financing processes:

#### **3.1 Reference framework and participation**

In light of the challenges presented in different experiences such as the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, REDD+ and others, the participating organizations raised the importance of Indigenous Peoples being recognized by donors and other actors as partners and subjects of rights rather than 'beneficiaries'.

The importance of including parameters from the rights of Indigenous Peoples under the requirements of Prior Consultation, and the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), established in both Convention 169 of the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), was emphasized.

These international standards should be the frame of reference for the Pledge and the funders, in conjunction with the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the CEDAW Committee's proposal for general recommendation 39 on the rights of Indigenous women and girls.

Moreover, it was stated that it is crucial to have direct participation of Indigenous Peoples in processes and spaces for dialogue and relations with States and international organizations, and to strengthen administrative technical capacities in Indigenous organizations, recognizing the principles and values of Indigenous Peoples.

A coincidental point related to participation is the profound importance of having equal opportunities in access to financing and incorporating the participation and aspirations of indigenous women and youth who are an important part of Development with Community Identity.

In addition, participating organizations expressed the importance of maintaining political autonomy and leadership vis-à-vis funders, intermediaries and politicians.

## 4. APPROACH AND FOCUS

A key element that was addressed in the debate was the importance of the "commitments made" of the funding institutions. Participants expressed concern that the Pledge follows the same fundamental logic of many funders, focusing on the conservation, protection and care of certain ecosystems. Moreover, participants expressed that the Pledge approach segments the diversity of interconnected ecosystems rather than having a holistic approach, such as the case of the focus on tropical and subtropical forests, without considering other complex and interconnected ecosystems between nations and territories (Amazon, Andean Cordillera, Coast and plain).

On the other hand, this same difference of approach in the financing institutions applies to society or population, where on the one hand the holistic nature and cosmovision of Indigenous Peoples is lost to an atomization by donor interests and that in turn divides the organizations and networks that are practically placed in a scenario of competition with each other.

It was stressed to strengthen the narrative based on the principles of the cosmovisión as a criterion of awareness for funders, as Western conceptual frameworks on conservation, biodiversity, development etc. are oriented to the resource itself, ignoring cultural dynamics, governance and life systems, especially the guarantee of application of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples embodied in the international legal framework on Peoples Indigenous.

On the other hand, indigenous peoples' visions and food sovereignty practices cannot be alien to the holistic approach to the cosmovisions, therefore, food sovereignty must be incorporated into the approaches and frameworks of action of financial institutions.

## 5. FINANCING MODALITIES

---

*"The negotiation on financing should be done in direct agreement avoiding the chain of intermediaries that dilute the budget towards Indigenous Peoples"*

---

Presenting the experiences of the PAWANKA Fund, the debate on challenges, good practices and recommendations related to financing modalities was initiated.

Within the voice of the participants, the need to address financing mechanisms from an approach to the Rights of Indigenous Peoples – recognizing the structural problems of inequality and discrimination – was recurrent, rather than having a victimhood approach, considering that this consideration of victim reproduces the coloniality of power and knowledge prevailing in the current world order, however, there is awareness of the profound challenge that this entails.



The participants raised the importance of the direct reception of funds, since they are hoarded by intermediaries who do not recognize the cosmovisions and organizational structures of Indigenous Peoples, this, in addition to replicating a Western approach, places Indigenous Peoples in a scenario already established by the rules in which they have not participated. To this is added that many of the financing mechanisms generate competition among the Indigenous Peoples themselves, breaking with their holistic vision.

The participants proposed that the funds of the Pledge must be self-sustaining (with temporality that avoids generating dependence); respecting the organization of Indigenous Peoples; a Human Rights approach, especially the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; susceptible to advocate on public policies due to the absence of a culturally appropriate approach from the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

The development approach based on Western indicators should be avoided, rather, the Rights of Indigenous Peoples should be respected, agreeing with the cosmovisions and also emphasizing strengthening capacities in Indigenous Peoples' structures to guarantee the Right to Consultation and Free, Prior and Informed Consent processes.

On the other hand, the importance of financing modalities that allow processes that develop and strengthen the capacities specifically of indigenous youth, emphasizing formal education, was pointed out.

Participants considered it essential to work on financing mechanisms to strengthen the cultural identity of Indigenous Peoples, specifically with indigenous youth and women.

Finally, the participants reflected on the importance of keeping alive the memory of negative lessons learned, considering that despite having existed mechanisms that allowed their recognition and participation, really the processes of exclusion, discrimination and use of Indigenous Peoples with other actors are currently being replicated, preventing the full and effective participation of Indigenous Peoples in these financing mechanisms.

## **5.1 Operational requirements related to funding to Indigenous Peoples**

The discussion among the participants included a series of elements aimed at making operational requirements more flexible, which would involve:

- Need to establish a dynamic of negotiation between the funders and Indigenous Peoples before and during the execution to be able to organize and decide on a process of permanent accompaniment and learning in the understanding that they are interlocutor partners. This means being able to establish flexible requirements that allow the full and effective participation of Indigenous Peoples who do not have legality and/or official recognition, a process of accompaniment towards the legalization of these if they request it, and the recognition and value of the accumulated experience.
- The negotiation must be established as a comprehensive and collective vision of Indigenous Peoples, as well as strengthening the process of capacities that allow the

provision of indigenous ancestral knowledge and knowledge on the conservation of ecosystems, to avoid the development of programs that segment the needs and financing processes.

- Establish an ethical commitment with the financial institutions to dialogue and establish the full and effective participation of Indigenous Women and Youth, respecting their specific rights and preventing abuse of power.
- Establish transparent and parity information mechanisms on the processes of disbursement of funds destined to Indigenous Peoples, enabling the audit and control of Indigenous Peoples themselves.
- Guarantee a permanent dialogue on the establishment and monitoring of indicators for the achievement of the projected objectives, from the recognition of a perspective of results in the short and medium term with a process vision, recognizing and valuing the dimension and meaning of the time of the Indigenous Peoples in relation to the time of the projects.
- Establish budget lines for the technical-administrative strengthening of Indigenous Peoples' organizations to meet the donor criteria and be able to meet the objectives set out in each initiative.
- Establishment of prior agreements with donors on the visibility of projects as there are territories in which it is counterproductive for the security of indigenous leaders.
- Agree on flexibility on the execution of initiatives, taking into account social, political, environmental and personal conditions that may affect project times.
- The negotiation on financing should be direct, avoiding the chain of intermediations that dilute the budget towards Indigenous Peoples.
- Valorization of experience and own resources (premises, personnel, equipment among others) as the counterpart with monetary value in the project.
- Respect the autonomy of Indigenous Peoples from the provisions of the instruments on Indigenous Rights at the international and national levels, to decide on the development of their own agendas to avoid promoting external interference in organizations regarding the forms of governance and systems of life of Indigenous Peoples.

## 5.2 Strengthening of institutional capacities

---

*"The learnings are not capitalized on in the community, but remain in the custody and ownership of donors"*

---

Based on the experiences of the Fund for the Development of Indigenous Peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean (FILAC) and the International Forum of Indigenous Women (FIMI), participants raised the following elements and recommendations regarding institutional capacity building:

The need to integrate the training of technical teams of Indigenous Peoples into the projects and to establish criteria for the transfer of capacities when hiring non-indigenous specialists.

Likewise, the intellectual property of the indigenous knowledge generated in the initiatives to be developed must be recognized, since experience has shown that the learning is not capitalized in the community, but remains in the custody and property of the donors. The same happens with non-indigenous personnel who develop expertise with the work done in the communities, but there is no real commitment to strengthening the identity and struggle of indigenous peoples.

It is also a priority that the organizations return to the principles of "complementarity and balance", which in organizations and projects strengthen the equal and equitable participation of Indigenous Women, who safeguard ancestral knowledge, as well as the guarantee of survival, but their contribution or needs are not necessarily visible in projects with a mixed approach in terms of men and women.

On many occasions Indigenous Women's organizations are at a disadvantage in access to resources, when they do not have legal recognition or do not have the endorsement of indigenous organizational structures at the national level. Therefore, work must be done on actions that allow these gaps to be reduced.

It is necessary to support the internal strengthening of indigenous women's own organizational structures for the recognition of their contributions and the need for their participation, in conditions of equality and equity, as well as to strengthen their participation and leadership for advocacy in advocacy environments with culturally appropriate policies and in negotiation with funders.

Likewise, there is a need to develop and strengthen the capacity for independent monitoring of the Pledge's financial contributions, especially those committed to bilateral agreements with States, as well as to make explicit as a criterion, the specific percentages that reach Indigenous Peoples directly.

Finally, it is necessary to strengthen the functioning of organizations and the recognition of indigenous and non-indigenous leaders who work for the rights of Indigenous Peoples and human rights in conflict territories, and for the tenure and protection of ecosystems

### **5.3 Mechanisms for consultation, participation, and consent**

---

*“Participation in forestry issues is difficult but more so for Indigenous Women, since landowners are summoned”*

---

Presenting the experiences of the Mesoamerican Alliance of Peoples and Forests (AMPB), the debate on challenges, good practices and recommendations related to prior consultation and Free, Prior, and Informed Consent Mechanisms processes was launched.

The participants expressed that in general the Right to Consultation and the processes of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), are not applied.

Indigenous Peoples should be protagonists of their own development, programs and projects, as well as historical owners of the territories and indigenous ancestral knowledge. But rather they are valued as beneficiaries of policies and projects, as well as lacking the capacity to contribute. Consultations are usually to legitimize decisions taken or only with those instances or organizations related to the States, they are not processes where the principle of FREE, PRIOR, AND INFORMED CONSENT is applied. Most consultation processes do not respond to the voice of organizations but to the vision of politicians. This is the case of some countries that have wanted to regulate the Consultation, as well as the ILO's CONVENTION no 169.

The legalization of indigenous organizations is often complicated since there are provisions in some countries that recognize them as civil society organizations, which forces them to immerse themselves in complicated and complex processes. In other contexts, they are recognized as peasants, denying the right to self-recognition as Indigenous Peoples, in this sense, from the existing rules, Prior Consultation and the Principle of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) is not applied according to international standards. In addition, accessible mechanisms for complaints or demands with States are not defined.

The organisations' advocacy action to make visible and put on the social and public agenda sensitive situations for Indigenous Peoples, can lead to State actions such as criminalizing the action or proceeding to withdraw the legal registration.

## **6 LEGAL FRAMEWORK**

---

*“Judicial systems are created to protect the same system from domination, which responds to economic interests”*

---

During the debate on legal frameworks, participants' analysis took point of departure in how judicial systems are created to protect the same system of domination that responds to geopolitically established economic interests, and where the cosmovision, recognition and rights of Indigenous Peoples are poorly respected, although progress has been made in some moments and countries.

One of the great structural problems in Latin America is land tenure and the legal security of these, which have generated deep injustices and violent responses, criminalizing the defenders of indigenous territories. Some laws in Latin America have made clearer progress in their Constitutions and normative and regulatory frameworks regarding the distribution of land and the recognition of the collective rights of Indigenous Peoples. However, in other legislations a racist and exclusionary bias prevails that is making Indigenous Peoples invisible.

It is through a series of legislations that many Indigenous Peoples were stripped of their identity, and their territories were given to large landowners. It is in this context that the figure of the "peasants" was created as individuals contractable for wage labor on the lands that had previously been their own lands. This has in many countries not yet been remedied.

There is a risk of a new wave of setbacks co-financed by donors and international investors that do not allow progressivity in the recognition of the rights of Indigenous Peoples, considering that despite having countries that present a window of opportunity in favor, there are others that have closed their doors to inclusive participatory processes, concentrating the narrative, history and formal power.

A concern was reflected on how international funders – and in some cases the same normative frameworks – give Indigenous Peoples a specific role of guardians and do not recognize the right to tenure of their own territories. A key example is the use of sacred sites and the failure of the State to recognize indigenous land use systems, indicating, in addition, that it is key to work on their reconstruction.

## **7 REFERENCE GROUP – LATIN AMERICA**

To support and guide the process, a Reference Group was established, composed of indigenous representatives from Africa, Asia and Latin America, and donors supporting the Pledge.

The Reference Group is made up of a group of donors (6) and a group of indigenous representatives (12) from the three regions (Africa, Asia and Latin America). Members represent a variety of indigenous organizations (regional and national organizations and networks with experience in bilateral cooperation, reconcession plans, direct grants, etc.).

Both indigenous and donor representatives were appointed on the basis of self-selection between their proper national and regional organizational structures.

## Members of the reference group in Latin America

**Tuntiak Katan**, Deputy Coordinator of the Coordination of Indigenous Organizations of the Amazon Basin (COICA) and General Coordinator of the Global Alliance of Territorial Communities (GATC)



**Benito Calixto Guzmán**, General Coordinator of the Andean Coordinator of Indigenous Organizations (CAOI)



**Dolores de Jesús Cabnal Coc**, Network of Indigenous Women on Biodiversity in Latin America and the Caribbean (RMIB-LAC)



**Jesús Amadeo Martínez Guzmán**, Major Councillor, Indigenous Council of Central America (CICA) and Coordinator of the Indigenous Forum of Abya Yala (FIAY)



## 7.1 Role of the Reference Group

- Oversee the process, and provide input to the consultants regarding methodology and outreach;
- Assist and participate in focus group and regional meetings
- Assist in ensuring broad outreach and dissemination within their regions/constituencies during and after the consultative process;
- Provide comments on draft materials and outputs, and
- Approve final documents



# ANNEXES

## ANNEX 1: Fotografic material











## ANNEX 2: Reflections and recommendations presented mechanisms

MECHANISM	REFLECTIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<b>Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPC)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The selection of the dialogue space created within the framework of this World Bank project did not count on inclusive parameters of the number of Indigenous Peoples and local organizations involved in the process.</li> <li>• Pressure exerted by Indigenous Peoples' organizations allowed to open participation, but insufficient and unrepresentative.</li> <li>• Bilateral mechanism between multilateral organizations and States that included limited indigenous peoples' organizations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collect lessons learned for future phases or other funds.</li> <li>• Inclusion of the indigenous agenda with respect and recognition of their knowledge and holistic approaches.</li> <li>• Always participate as partners, not beneficiaries.</li> <li>• Be direct recipients and executors of funds linked to Indigenous Peoples, avoiding intermediaries.</li> </ul>
<b>PAWANKA Fund</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holistic approach to grantmaking.</li> <li>• Direct support to community-led organizations and networks</li> <li>• Support for the recovery and revitalization of indigenous knowledge and practices.</li> <li>• Collective selection process through cultural due diligence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Socialize these initiatives as successful experiences from and for Indigenous Peoples.</li> <li>• Return to the nature of the holistic approach by replicating these successful experiences.</li> </ul>
<b>Fund for the Development of indigenous Peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean (FILAC)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional indigenous platform against COVID19, in 12 countries, 25 Organizations and 58 Indigenous Peoples.</li> <li>• A first scheme was designed to monitor projects and strengthen capacities (administrative and technical issues) strengthening technical capacities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is necessary to strengthen technical capacities in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In project management and development.</li> <li>○ In administrative execution of projects, but additionally in administrative management of the entity.</li> <li>○ In communication, of the results and financial management</li> <li>○ The levels of strengthening are at all levels (regional, national and local)</li> <li>○ The focus of efforts on women and young people is very important</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>AYNI Fund of the International Forum of Indigenous Women (FIMI)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognizes local indigenous knowledge and practices as a basis for the sustainability of its projects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This approach of full recognition of knowledge and practice should be resumed.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● First and so far only fund for and of indigenous women to achieve the fulfillment of their individual and collective rights.</li> <li>● Holistic approach throughout its cycle.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● This type of initiative should be made more widely known.</li> </ul>
<b>Mesoamerican Territorial Fund (FTM)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There are lessons from a first pilot that has incorporated: decrease in the cost of intermediation, strengthening of rights, strengthening of territorial governance, decision together with the organizations of the priorities of investment, efficiency of investment and transparency.</li> <li>● Debates have been generated on next steps for the legalization of the FTM, thus ensuring that the funds are at least received and executed by 70%.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Move towards the legalization of the FTM to continue strengthening the initiative from a second pilotage.</li> <li>● Strengthen its nature as an alternative territorial financing mechanism that allows most of the funds to be brought to the territories</li> <li>● That the territories are where funding priorities are defined.</li> </ul>

