

**Indigenous Peoples' Global Dialogue
with the World Bank's Forest Carbon
Partnership Facility (FCPF)**

**9 - 11 December 2012
Millennium Hotel, Doha, Qatar**

Final Report Draft

**MESO AND SOUTH AMERICAN AND THE CARIBBEAN
DIALOGUE
BETWEEN INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND THE FOREST CARBON
PARTNERSHIP FACILITY (FCPF)**

**Lima - Peru
August 22, 23, and 24, 2012**

.....
Hosted by:



**Tebtebba
(Indigenous Peoples' International Centre for Policy
Research and Education)**



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

Final Report Draft

**MESO AND SOUTH AMERICAN AND THE CARIBBEAN DIALOGUE
BETWEEN INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND THE FOREST CARBON PARTNERSHIP FACILITY (FCPF)**

Location: Lima - Peru

Dates: August 22, 23, and 24, 2012

1. Introduction

The indigenous peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean are numerous, diverse, and come from the extreme north of the continent to the extreme south. In recent years, the organizational coordination has become stronger, particularly surrounding the issue of climate change and forests, in which resolving the historical demand for land has emerged more and more prominently in the debate. Nonetheless, many of the indigenous peoples in the region know little about the issue and fear REDD+ as much as they fear the extractive industries, energy infrastructure, and continental transport, the constant invasion of the mining industry, and felling of the forests, including the expansion of the industrial and small-scale agricultural frontiers which are destroying their territories and contributing to the destruction of their traditional lifestyles.

The slogan “No rights, no REDD” has reverberated among virtually all of the peoples of the region, where despite significant advances made in the last 10 years, they continue to view with distrust the large majority of the governments of the region. The significant progress made in international law regarding indigenous peoples has been implemented in an inconsistent and incomplete fashion in the majority of countries, and the early-dialogue processes surrounding the drafting of the R-PPs have also been insufficient in the majority of countries. Relatively positive examples – such as the educational and information-dissemination projects shared by the governments of Colombia, Paraguay, Nicaragua, and indigenous organizations there – have not been sufficiently divulged so as to be able to establish regional trust in preparatory REDD+ processes with full and effective participation and a multi-sectoral political negotiation carried out in good faith, so as to establish new public policies regarding the use of the land and natural resources.

Emerging proposals, such as COICA’s Indigenous REDD – representing the nine Amazonian countries and promoting direct coordination between public financing for REDD+ and new investments in titling, demarcation, clearing of land titles (disencumbrance of lands) to collective territories, forest governance, community-based forest management, and “good living” – have been insufficiently analyzed and discussed in Mesoamerica and the Southern Cone to enable there to be unity regarding a long-term regional indigenous agenda. Many indigenous organizations in the region view the World Bank with similar distrust, and do not see the issues of REDD and FCPF in an isolated fashion but rather, linked to continuous investments in the sectors driving regional deforestation and the proliferation of ‘carbon cowboys’ who are anxious for a carbon market.



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

Despite this, the issue of REDD safeguards is at the heart of discussions on historic issues of the region's peoples and has more continuity and greater clarity regarding the objectives and process. Particularly within the context of the implementation of R-PPs in some 15 countries in the region, the review of World Bank safeguard policies, and the design of the methodological framework for the Carbon Fund, a productive dialogue is possible and desired by the majority of the organizations.

2. Acknowledgments

The organization of a dialogue among representatives of indigenous peoples, civil society, multilateral Banks, and the governments of more than 15 countries represents a significant logistical and organizational challenge; in this case, it was shared by COICA, a Steering Committee of leaders, and the Facility Management Team (FMT) of the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF). Despite some gaps in the event's implementation, virtually everyone attended and it was an important space for interaction and dialogue. We are very thankful to the organizers for their continual efforts to carry out a successful event. We also extend our thanks to all of the participants for their active participation, as well as to the representatives of the Participants Committee from the governments of Peru, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, and Suriname. Lastly, a special thanks to the interpreters, our friends at Miramar Tours, the personnel from Hotel Méliá Lima, the team of facilitators, and the volunteers from DAR and WWF Peru for documenting the event.

3. Background

The indigenous peoples of the Latin American and Caribbean region are among the most vulnerable to the effects of climate change, due to their strong dependence on natural resources. Their dependence on the natural environment for their economic, cultural, and spiritual wellbeing puts them at great risk of changes in climatic cycles. This situation is aggravated by the vulnerable and fragile nature of the ecosystems and lands they occupy and utilize. Additionally, indigenous peoples are more prone to be negatively affected by the possible restrictions related to their traditional activities: for example, access to their traditional forests for their personal use of timber, medicinal plants, hunting, fishing, etc. Moreover, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has recognized the importance of indigenous populations by specifically including the issue in its case studies in the Evaluation Report/AR5 (IPCC-XXXI/Doc 20, Rev. 1). Nonetheless, currently indigenous peoples have not played an important role in the dialogue, decision-making, or activities related to climate change.

In order to better understand these changes and administer their forests and lands, indigenous peoples must have access to all relevant information and play an active role in the discussions on climate change and REDD+. Thus, in 2011 several indigenous organizations throughout the world asked the World Bank to initiate a series of dialogues with the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF).



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

FCPF, in response to this request from the indigenous organizations and as part of its efforts to strengthen the latter's capacity and promote their full and effective participation in the REDD+ processes in their respective countries, initiated a series of global and regional dialogues. Starting in Guna Yala in September 2011 and continuing with the African regional dialogue in Arusha, Tanzania in May of this year, the Latin American dialogue is the third of five events authorized by the FCPF Participants Committee in the [PC10/2011/1 resolution](#). A regional dialogue in Asia in September will be followed by a final global dialogue in Doha in December 2012. The dialogues are conceived as the start of a process, not a goal in and of themselves, for laying the foundations for coordination and participation in a more just, transparent, and effective fashion.

4. Agenda and Objectives

The objective of the workshop was to continue building a foundation based on trust and the exchange of information, thereby strengthening the collaboration and coordination between representatives of indigenous peoples together with relevant actors from the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF). This moment of dialogue will also contribute important elements from the regional dialogue to the global process. The final agenda is attached as Annex 1.

5. Sessions

The event was divided into four work sessions, so as to take better advantage of the short timeframe. The first involved an internal meeting of indigenous organizations the entire day on 22nd of August. The second day, the 23rd, was devoted to listening to and posing questions about the informational presentations of the World Bank, most of which dealt with the implementation of social and environmental safeguards, while the third and final day was split between another space for internal debate and deliberation among the organizations in the morning and a final space for dialogue among all the parties in the afternoon.

5.1. Internal meeting of regional indigenous leaders

The goal of the first day's meeting was to share experiences from the various countries and agree on some common points to propose to the World Bank as possibilities for next steps to be taken together in search of solutions to regional problems. As it was a heterogeneous group and not necessarily one that had met previously to discuss issues related to REDD+, we sought to have a broad exchange, with an invitation made to put diverse concerns and positions on the table, without fearing the resulting debate, so as to be able to understand the different experiences and leanings present.

Several leaders in the region made presentations regarding the state of implementation of the R-PPs in their respective countries, and a broad discussion ensued about the steps the governments in the region had taken and not taken vis-à-vis REDD preparation. Despite several actions taken by many governments in the region, no one really saw the efforts made at drafting the R-PPs as being a successful example of full and effective participation as it should be, with the possible exception of



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

Colombia, where the efforts at early dialogue and dissemination of information have been greater than in other countries in the region.

In the majority of the countries, a situation was painted of limited participation in the drafting of the R-PPs, with technical NGOs, oftentimes international ones, playing a key role and little information flowing out of the capital cities, let alone broadly disseminating the information at the national and local levels or creating new spaces for broad participation. In some cases, in which a national government has worked on several draft versions of the R-PP for longer periods of time, such as in the case of Nicaragua, full participation has been achieved by regional, local, and indigenous governance structures, producing good results in terms of the quality of the R-PP document and ideas regarding national REDD strategies. In Guatemala and Panama, which also had greater periods of time, platforms for effective participation were initiated, but the need for monitoring and continuity so as to move ahead was marked by the recent disagreements among CONAPIP, the government, and UN-REDD in the latter country.

Also discussed was the situation in Mexico in particular, as a regional leader in the field of climate change, including the provision of support to community-based forest management and indigenous participation in international negotiations. Despite a good start made in that country, with regional SESA workshops – including the creation of working groups on SESA and the drafting of a consultation protocol – the process has stalled and the government has yet to sign a donation agreement with FCPF, thereby delaying the implementation of SESA and the national process of consultation and participation. At the same time, the government has moved ahead with significant investments in early actions and REDD strategies, including funds from the Forest Investment Program (FIP), World Bank, United States of America, and Norway, without having begun the SESA within the framework of the FCPF process, thereby creating confusion over what the sequence of the process should be and if the safeguards truly apply or not.

In virtually all of the countries, there was a tendency of the governments to invest in new systems to measure the flows of forest carbon, without necessarily committing to a parallel investment in strengthening forest governance so as to truly control the drivers of deforestation. The emphasis on carbon measurement is progressing much more rapidly than the national discussion on how to reduce deforestation, and situations such as that of Guyana, where “payment for results” have already begun to be received, raises concerns that REDD will be utilized to continue implementing current models of development and claim that deforestation is not increasing.

Similarly, the fact that in many countries in the region ill-planned, non-consensus-based investments continue to be made in highways, hydroelectric dams, hydrocarbons, mining, plantations, and industrial agriculture – oftentimes utilizing loans from the same donor banks and countries that promote REDD – leads to profound questions as to whether the discussion surrounding REDD is being carried out in good faith, particularly for organizations representing communities that are suffering the negative socio-environmental impacts of these ‘business-as-usual’ investments, even when there has been progress made in national legislation with regard to consultation, such as in the case of



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

Peru. The issue of insecurity – whether due to drug-trafficking or persistent armed conflicts in the region – and its role in deforestation has yet to be incorporated into the analysis and discussion.

This entire analysis, together with very similar concerns of indigenous organizations from the majority of the countries in the region, set the groundwork for a discussion in greater detail the following day with the World Bank/FCPF team regarding the implementation of the safeguards. While there was a convergence in the critical analysis of the regional situation vis-à-vis REDD, there was not enough time to agree on proposals for solutions in any great detail.

Nonetheless, many proposals came out of the discussion, such as: more investment in strengthening indigenous organizations; a process for transferring information and technology regarding traditional knowledge; a program to map indigenous forests for the purpose of demarcating their territories; creation of a team to modify World Bank regulations, safeguards, ensuring their adaptation to national conditions; more investment of time, resources, and information at the sub-national level to improve the preparatory work for REDD, as we need to be more prepared so as to have a more equitable discussion; more respect for ancestral indigenous authorities/governance; establish the conditions for dialogue with FCPF (generate a protocol, formalize the dialogue, establish a moratorium until the situation of the participation of indigenous peoples is resolved); and regulatory/legal adjustments between international law on indigenous peoples and World Bank regulations.

It was agreed to propose a base document of proposals to be presented to the World Bank, and a small committee of drafters was delegated to work on it some more.

5.2. Dialogue between FCPF and indigenous representatives

After a small indigenous ceremony from the Southern Cone, Edwin Vásquez of COICA introduced the session by saying, “The indigenous heart is large enough to include everyone in the proposal on safeguards, rights, and REDD, so that they may be friendly to the indigenous peoples. In recent days, we have drafted a proposal that does not run counter to the interests of all of the institutions; there will not be conflict but rather, discussions during these work days.”

Similarly, the representative of MINAM-PERU said, “We are working with you, with the indigenous peoples that are our partners in conservation,” and he wished everyone a fruitful day. Benoit Bosquet of FCPF expressed his appreciation for the invitation to the dialogue and said, “We are here in good faith to listen, speak, and better understand how to work together in the future.” He also mentioned that “in certain cases World Bank interventions have negatively impacted indigenous peoples, while others have produced some good impacts. These days are a good learning opportunity for all of us.”

During the second day of the workshop, there were diverse presentations made by FCPF and the indigenous peoples. Following each presentation there was a question-and-answer session in which



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

the indigenous peoples expressed their concerns, proposals, and questions, which were in turn answered by the World Bank team. Afterwards, a summary of these discussions was presented in a question-and-answer format. Due to space constraints, we have not been able to include each of the questions and answers; however, we have selected an illustrative group of them.

The World Bank presentations are available (in Spanish) at: www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/fcp/node/684

5.2.1 Introduction to FCPF

Benoit Bosquet, FCPF-FMT, made the following presentation: [FCPF: General Overview and Participation of Indigenous Peoples](#).

Questions: What is in fact theory has been presented; however, the reality is quite different. The R-PPs are biased in favor of the carbon-credit market, thereby facilitating ‘carbon piracy.’ FCPF cannot wash its hands of this. What measures will FCPF take with regard to this? What measure will FCPF take to ensure respect for alternative indigenous proposals that are situated outside of the carbon and offset market?

Answer: Each country has to decide whether or not they want a carbon market. What we have today is a voluntary market; an official market does not exist. Countries must understand the legal framework of a market. There are things that aren’t negotiable, such as spirituality, rights . . . The market must be composed of voluntary initiatives; they should not be obligatory. Indigenous REDD can be an alternative to practical activities, and shouldn’t be rejected. We have to understand how pilot initiatives function, both in their successes as well as their failures, as the diversity amongst them is better than many similarities.

Question: Within the international framework, there are regulations regarding the rights of indigenous peoples, full participation, and the right to consultation. There must be full and effective participation throughout the entire process. These points are not seen clearly in terms of how they should be contextualized. The territory brings with it a spiritual value and the process brings with it a financial value. These are two different conceptions and we need a debate mechanism.

Answer: Very relevant. We want to work with you to understand what is meant by broad consultation, when there should be delegation, who decides. There is much to learn based on experiences, on practical actions in the field. FPIC is a very nice concept, but what does it mean in the context of REDD? It is important to know if practical elements exist.

Question: In the process of consultation in my country of Guyana, it was more a process of short meetings with the logistics provided in order to attract people. They were not effective consultations. If we are not involving the grassroots, this process won’t be successful. Those of us who monitor these processes would like to see a more transparent process.



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

Answer: We have heard concerns many times from your institutions regarding the consultation process. A two-hour meeting such as you mention is not a consultation; the challenge that you mention is a big challenge that deserves great attention, capacity-building. Your communities are isolated; we have to ensure the way in which the information gets there. There is a need for capacity-building. The IDB is the partner that is responsible for Guyana and this challenge. It is not just money that's needed; it is very important that this process be done right, so as to create a favorable situation in which to progress. Guyana has been a leader in some REDD processes, but this does not mean that everything has been done well.

Question: FCPF exposes us to a situation of vulnerability by allowing the States to make decisions regarding our territories. How does FCPF guarantee compliance with the safeguards? Has FCPF considered supporting initiatives developed by indigenous peoples, such as Indigenous REDD or the Indigenous Environmental Fund in Mexico?

Answer: FCPF, through the government, works with indigenous organizations. Our policy is to involve the indigenous peoples; it is possible that in the process of formulating an R-PP, all groups and peoples do not get a turn, because it is very difficult to do that at the point of formulating a proposal. But afterwards, in the development of a REDD proposal, we must take into consideration the majority. The World Bank teams discuss that. All of that is discussed. The goal is to reach a majority of the groups.

The safeguards must be verified. They are implemented by the governments. The World Bank group monitors the implementation. What we are discussing is that an independent monitoring mechanism can be incorporated into the preparation packet and mid-term report. In the Congo, an independent consultant was hired for the process. In any event, the rest of the mechanisms, such as the inspection panel and United Nations mechanisms, have the right and duty to act. What I am explaining is in addition to existing mechanisms.

The discussion takes place in each country: each proposal must be considered and debated in terms of its benefits, advantages, and disadvantages. There is no exclusive support for Indigenous REDD, nor has it been rejected; we must understand and consider it. In Argentina, it is our responsibility to continue to implement the activities. We do not implement the activities; it is the responsibility of the government to do so. We have a responsibility. There are mechanisms for ensuring the sound implementation of all of the rules, including the safeguards. If there is no preparatory framework, if the rules are not clear, it will be difficult to implement REDD in a given country. It is thus important that all countries progress in the preparation stage.

Question: How can you guarantee that the State will fulfill FCPF's directives? While FCPF does not regulate the market, it does promote it, and should guarantee territorial rights. On a related note, there is a non-negotiable right, which is the pre-existing right to land. How do you foresee ensuring this?



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

Answer: It is our responsibility to follow the implementation of the activities. We do not implement them; the party responsible for implementation is the government, and if we do not fulfill our responsibilities, it is possible to resort to the Inspection Panel, so as to ensure sound implementation, including the safeguards. FCPF does not promote the market as the only solution; we are not against the market; we do not say that countries should have it. The market must have a framework. A market is not something abstract; it must have rules that should be discussed in the preparatory phase.

Question: There are several actors; how is the dialogue between FIP and FCPF? We need to know more about the complaint system you mentioned. Local capacity is not good enough to enable effective participation in Peru.

Answer: In the case of FCPF and FIP, there is a very good opportunity for ensuring coordination. FCPF came first, and FIP later, but our role needs to be better defined. The studies have already begun for the investment plan. We are going to carry out detailed studies of deforestation, so as to have inputs to incorporate into the REDD strategy. In Peru there are many actors contributing and it is up to FCPF to coordinate these activities and initiatives.

Question: In the case of Panama, it began with World Bank support for initiatives prior to discussion and participation in their design. Thirty months after initiating the process, UN-REDD has disappeared from the process and works solely with the actors of its choosing, which generates distrust. The indigenous peoples are not sure if they wish to continue with these discussions; we have been used to endorse a governmental program while not participating effectively. This makes us question if there has, in fact, been compliance with the safeguards. If we stop working with the UN-REDD initiative, what is our alternative? Another element is land tenure: who are the holders and who are the ones with title to the land? Now the State wants to be the owner of territories that have already been titled to indigenous people.

Answer: From the point of view of UNDP/UN-REDD, it appears to me to be a complicated situation. It has been somewhat frustrating and a very slow process: the national roundtable has not yet been established, the government does not have a vision of the potential for REDD+ in the country, there is a lot of information that has not yet been organized. It is important to have communication, capacity-building, to do consultations, but with whom and about what? The government has no such clarity. We understand that it is an activity that takes time. Recently, we began drafting periodic reports every six months so as to contribute information about the progress made in each country, with the opinions of the agencies as well as governments. In the last meeting, it was decided to have a specific section by indigenous peoples. I share your frustration; we are in the same boat.

Question: There are several conflicts in Mexico: the implementation of the R-PP without the participation of the indigenous peoples, in a process carried out by NGOs with conflicts in different indigenous territories. The drivers of deforestation include the illegal felling of trees and drug-



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

trafficking, among others. In terms of the pilot projects, how is it possible that FCPF has authorized these pilot projects to proceed without consultation carried out under the standards of UNDRIP and ILO Convention 169? The safeguards are voluntary, in accordance with Durban and Cancún; we in FCPF cannot simply be observers. Payment for Environmental Services projects are financed through World Bank funds and this has generated debt in several cases among *ejidatarios* [members of the 'ejidos,' a communal land-tenure scheme], natural forests have been replaced by pine and eucalyptus forests for hydrologic services, traditional knowledge has been lost, as well as biodiversity. Will the World Bank continue as a participant in these relationships? Participation mechanisms are non-existent in Mexico – it is mostly NGOs with one or two indigenous persons.

CONAFOR: FPIC is already in our legislation and we are already discussing how to implement it. There are complaint mechanisms and platforms where these issues can be discussed. The platform for participation is the CTC (REDD's Technical Consultative Committee). With regard to the pilot projects, it must be understood that there is an overlap among the implementation phases of REDD; there is no way to stop all of the processes in the country; what we want is to try to organize everything in the best possible fashion. The way the R-PP was done in Mexico wasn't ideal but is what's being done. There is an overlap of phases. The phases of Cancún are not consecutive. There is a recognition that in reality, there is an overlap not only between FCPF and FIP. Millions of dollars come in – we are not able to pause. We want things to be better organized in the future. It is a very complex reality in which REDD+ is introduced. It is too chaotic.

5.2.2 Social and Environmental Safeguards

Two presentations were made during this session: [The Application of Safeguards in FCPF, the Cancún and Durban Decisions regarding REDD+ Safeguards and Indigenous Peoples](#), by Kenn Rapp, FCPF-FMT, and Marie Brown, World Bank; and [A Strategic Socio-Environmental Evaluation and Its Application to REDD+ Processes in Latin America](#), by Alonso Zarzar, World Bank.

Question: The SESA process in Mexico involved workshops with five indigenous participants; the majority were NGOs and the government. The selection of guidelines for implementing actions left significant gaps with respect to indigenous rights. SESA has a good methodology; nonetheless, the inputs have not been managed. The monitoring group does not have a clearly defined role and we do not know what direction this process will take.

Answer: We know that the SESA process has generated problems and disagreement. We have taken the concerns with great seriousness, in order to seek sustainable solutions. It is a building process. There is much to learn and one workshop does not represent the entire process.

Question: One concern regarding SESA: Costa Rica already signed a donation agreement but has not carried out the consultation and there is no agreement with the indigenous populations. Several organizations participated and we see that the contributions do not figure in the minutes. The States



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

have an obligation to collect the guides. There is a contradiction. What happens when there are no agreements with the national organizations?

Answer: In Costa Rica, as well as in all of the countries where FCPF works, World Bank loans and donations cannot promote something that is in opposition to the country's legislative framework. The safeguard policies can ask the States to go beyond their national legislation, but not against it.

Question: The IDB and World Bank have a presence in Guatemala, and the concern is: How will their policies work? How will we define which one to utilize? At the regional level, there is no clear safeguard implementation policy.

Answer: It was for that reason that the Common Approach was promoted, wherein the standards can be stronger. Now we understand that the Common Approach is approved so that it can be fully applied and so as to work closely with the IDB to recognize if there exist differences in the safeguards which must be resolved. We are currently waiting for the IDB to approve the Common Approach so that it may be fully implemented. We will work to fill in the gaps in order to ensure stronger protection.

Question: There is a degree of incoherence in the construction of safeguards based on future scenarios, but the current mess has been recognized, and so the safeguards should be current and not only future ones, where there will be unmanageable conflicts. COICA proposes early safeguards: clearing of land titles ['disencumbrance' of lands]; registration of early initiatives; funds to ensure that indigenous proposals are respected by the States; we the indigenous people have a registry of the private companies that promote the drivers of deforestation. The World Bank should not pass the buck to the government or vice versa. FCPF must take charge of its immediate actions.

Answer: We are working ever harder on the issue, exploring ways to provide information to the governments. It is not true that they are only applied in the future, that is not so. The old World Bank safeguards apply. In terms of the regulations for a social and environmental framework, that is in the future; there are governments that have expressed a desire to apply them soon.

Question: We are concerned about the World Bank's support to those countries that are justifying the presence of safeguards for indigenous peoples. In reality it is not like that, the reports aren't even always truthful. The example of Mexico demonstrates this. We have managed to get a consultation protocol drafted in the CTC, but it is still in its draft form and they have pressured us because the deadline to submit a report to FCPF is approaching. It makes us think that they want to substitute the protocol for a consultation. How does the World Bank ensure that the reports are realistic?

Answer: Basically, through analysis and supervision, sending teams to verify, including to the field to resolve some deficiencies where actions need to be taken.



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

Question: In Suriname, there is little space and few opportunities for informing our people. What can be done to help us in this?

Answer: Suriname cannot make use of the resources of the R-PP until the Participants Committee approves the R-PP and the government and implementing partner sign a donation agreement. We are working on making some resources available for supporting the drafting of the R-PP, and the country can also apply for funds from the Capacity-Building Program.

Question: The governments must prepare safeguard-monitoring reports and the society can present parallel reports. With regard to the issue of indigenous peoples, diverse standards are also applied. How does this work with IDB projects? What standards are applied?

Answer: We have spoken about the involvement of indigenous peoples in the processes managed by FCPF: there has been a four-fold increase in the funds for capacity-building for indigenous peoples. The Observers representing the indigenous peoples and civil society who accompany Participants Committee meetings also inform us about the R-PP governance processes and disseminate them in the meetings so that the participants can be apprised of them. There are examples where the standards of a partner are weaker than those of the World Bank and the stronger ones are the ones that are applied.

Question: Regarding the direct relationship between the World Bank and the States, the indigenous peoples are at a significant disadvantage. There are ways, methodologies, strategies for establishing this relationship . . . The indigenous peoples are an appendage of the States. Throughout this entire process, the States have had economic resources for their policies, while the indigenous peoples have not. How much of the sum that goes to the States gets to the [indigenous] peoples? In addition, the States have political power.

Answer: We recognize that this is a problem and that it manifests itself in various ways. In Africa, some governments do not recognize that indigenous peoples exist in certain places. There can be instances where indigenous organizations can receive funds directly, such as for example for capacity-building actions and also from the Carbon Fund. Other non-State entities can receive resources from an indigenous federation. One example is the Suruí people in Brazil, who have received resources directly from REDD+. That is, mechanisms exist through which the indigenous peoples can receive funding directly.

Question: We have received a lot of information this morning and there are many misunderstandings. Our country of Guyana has received resources to promote participation, for MRV, among other things. Capacity-building for indigenous peoples is not a part of these initiatives.

Answer: There is a complex situation in Guyana, with the World Bank, UNDP, IDB, and the government of Norway all channeling REDD resources at the same time – and each one still has



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

different safeguard policies and the government has little capacity to consult and support the development of the communities.

5.2.3 FCPF: Current Processes

While there was no presentation made during this session, a space was created for discussing the multiple Implementing Partners with Benoit Bosquet, FCPF-FMT, María da Cunha, IDB, and Pierre-Yves Guedez, UNDP.

Questions: There is concern in Honduras because the dialogue with the government has been very inconsistent.

Answer: UNDP in Honduras has been working with local actors in an attempt to improve it. The draft document is valid and it is important to emphasize that it is a working document that continues to be improved upon.

Question: In the case of Panama, it seems to me that UNDP is left with its hands tied when the government doesn't progress. We wait for an answer and there is no formal answer forthcoming from the government, and it shouldn't be an opinion. It is hard for us to understand how there can exist safeguards, and yet we do not receive a competent response on the part of the program. Does UN-REDD have the capacity to carry out such a program? The indigenous peoples were used and that is the source of the distrust. How can a degree of trust be created and regained with a program to promote conservation?

Answer: UNDP: we are not the only ones at fault. It is difficult to understand how we should go and how we should proceed; it is all new, REDD tackles very sensitive issues and the thing gets even more complicated. The way to proceed so as to manage expectations has been to promote the safeguards, participation, and capacity-building. When we speak about REDD, we speak with institutions that are not accustomed to working together. To be able to provide funds, we must work with institutions having legal status, and it has been a problem with the administrative rules, legal administrative rules. How to progress in Panama is a challenge, but the most appropriate thing to do is to once again bring together the actors, so as to guarantee the representativeness of everyone in the process, and analyze alternative options to the legal regulations. We are in a good moment for this. We may have created false expectations that the money would flow in the first year.

Question: In Guyana, our government is pushing to adopt other agricultural methods which are a far cry from our traditional practices. Other funds were approved that ended up coopting community leaders. We presented comments to UNDP that they should be reviewed again. The UNDP continues – it does not listen to us because it says we are extremists. In Guyana, it doesn't work. There is no compliance with State obligations. The government is only searching for dollars, and that's it. The executing partners say that the entire consultation has been done, but that's not true. There are objections raised to the indigenous call for recognition of their lands, for example by miners.



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

Answer: What was approved regarding the bridge funding was the concept. The next step is to prepare the complete document, where the various requests from the communities should be present. UNDP is not the actor that will do the FCPF work in the country; that is, the IDB will be the implementing partner for FCPF, but UNDP is in fact channeling other funds, for example GRIF. We are aware of this problem in Guyana. In the initial phase, there was minimal consultation. They did not receive funds from FCPF. The focus was on MVR and not on consultation.

Question: The UN is now a partner in Suriname. We have seen that there is an agreement between FCPF and UNDP – how will this work in Suriname? We are an ethnic group and our rights are not recognized in the country. What will be UNDP’s role in this process, particularly with respect to our rights?

Answer: Upholding indigenous peoples’ rights is a challenge . . . if we want to place everything within the REDD framework, it will not work. In Paraguay, for example, the process began with a consultation protocol, as no such thing existed in the national legal framework. We had to begin somewhere, and this could serve as an alternative for Suriname. The World Bank safeguards are the initial point for the protocols to be applied in Suriname. If FCPF’s implementing partner has stronger ones, those should be used.

Question: International agreements do not just include ILO 169 . . . To apply the REDD process in a situation in which there are sentences from the international court, they must be above the World Bank agreements. What holds more weight, the international sentences or the Common Approach among the banks?

Answer: The articles of incorporation make reference to international instances. These types of international decisions should be taken into consideration and managed by the country.

5.2.4 The “R-Package” and Preparatory Process for REDD+ - Kenn Rapp, FCPF-FMT

Question: With regard to the voluntariness of compliance with the requirements of the various phases, up to what point are these overlaps acceptable? How can rights violations be prevented in the next phases?

Answer: The R-Package should not be understood as a mid-term implementation report, but rather, a tool virtually at the end of the preparatory process. Countries are also required to provide mid-term reports.

Question: A concern: at the end of the first stage, the self-evaluation can include documents with a very pretty chart, with good indicators, reflecting the situation in the country from the point of view of the government – but how do the banks know if it’s the truth? The promise of dollars is overriding.



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

Guyana's R-PP has been approved by the Participants Committee under these circumstances. One phase should be finalized so as to begin another one in the REDD process.

Answer: FCPF and the Participants Committee are always open to receiving and taking into consideration other sources of information and analysis of the facts, including from indigenous organizations and civil society.

Question: Why not include stronger elements in this package regarding territorial security, and that funds should be allocated for that? In the case of Peru, the project is already being prepared for FIP. Why does FCPF not insist on prioritizing funds for the territorial issue as well as the carbon baseline? Why not include that these early initiatives are of an obligatory nature and must comply with the obligations of the package?

Answer: It is true that some defects can be identified in this stage of self-evaluation which will lead to the presentation of an R-Package. It is feasible for a recommendation on clearing or disencumbrance of land titles [*saneamiento territorial*] to appear, but the R-Package is not like a new donation; it is simply an evaluation in which the country determines that it is ready to continue on to the next stage of REDD+ implementation. With regard to contracts that have already been signed outside of a legal framework, I am not sure what might happen in the case of Peru. In the Congo, a contract was canceled due to the lack of a legal framework. I agree that an existing contract should be adjusted when there is a framework. They are exposing themselves to a certain degree of risk, as we do not know what will happen.

5.2.4.1- Peter Saile, FCPF-FMT, Capacity-Building Program for Forest-Dependent Indigenous Peoples

Question: How, within this process, can resources be assured for the promotion of legal territorial security?

Answer: It is not enough money to promote land titling to scale, since we are talking about small donations of between US\$50,000 and US\$75,000, but it can be utilized to document, study, and map the territorial problems around the national REDD preparatory process.

Question: In Honduras, we are in diapers in the REDD process, presenting a draft R-PP for the moment. With regard to building capacity, we believe that first it is important to strengthen those who direct the processes. The R-PP draft has been developed without our participation and only at the end did they consult with us, nothing more.

Answer: Donations from the fund can be utilized for activities of training and strengthening within the organizations, such as capacity-building workshops, studies, technical support on proposals, work meetings, trips to attend national and international meetings, etc.



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

Question: Who is strengthened with this whole process? How to strengthen oneself without having one's territory assured? If you help us to secure the territory, then yes, that strengthens us.

Answer: Well, a fund of this size will not resolve the territorial situation; it is designed to support indigenous organizations to dialogue and work with their governments in this national REDD preparatory process. In order to receive financing from the fund, usually the organization must have legal status and a bank account, but projects can be presented by several organizations and channeled through one of them.

Question: It was said that part of this program considers fundamental actors, such as indigenous peoples, and that the sums are for capacity-building. It is worthy of mention that the Mexican State has a convening announcement for projects that join with REDD, but the statement does not mention indigenous peoples. I would like to know if the World Bank has criteria for guaranteeing that the States are strengthening this capacity?

General Answer: A capacity-building program will not resolve the land problem and will not buy titles; but through studies, it can collaborate by systematizing information about the location of the problems and where the communities are located that need to disencumber the title to their territories. It will not be the World Bank that defines the contents and modalities and procedures, nor selects the proposals, but rather, the Committee.

5.2.5 Second internal meeting of the indigenous representatives

The morning of the third day began with the continuation of the indigenous representatives' of internal work. It began with the reading of the document that was prepared by the indigenous participants for the final dialogue with the World Bank. This document was developed during the workshop. A first version was drafted at the end of the meeting of the indigenous representatives on the 23rd, followed by contributions based on the presentations and discussions which took place on the 24th. In the declaration, the organizations identified two general lines which they wished to pursue with the World Bank. On one hand, the idea of the protocol emerged as a way to formalize and provide continuity to a deeper and more systematic discussion between the World Bank and indigenous peoples, and in that way provide a foundation for reaching binding and lasting agreements. On the other hand, many of the participants felt that the continuation of the implementation of the REDD+ processes without guarantees of respect for the rights of indigenous peoples and processes based on free, prior, and informed consent would be a violation of their rights. Thus, they felt it was necessary to institute a pause in the implementation of REDD+ until the indigenous peoples and States can reach agreement regarding the rules of the game. The situation in each country varies, and so it will be necessary to discuss each point anew in the national discussions. On a related note, a mention is made of the need to reform the indigenous policy of the World Bank and ensure that there is no dilution of the substantive and procedural rights achieved in policy thus far.



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

Several additional concrete proposals came out of this discussion, although they were not included in the final declaration, such as: strengthen the country frameworks for monitoring and evaluation; support the independent evaluation processes of the mid-term and R-Package reports; utilize the funds from the Capacity-Building Program to support the participation of indigenous organizations in the SESA processes; there should be space for parallel reports from indigenous peoples to the World Bank; utilize funds from the Capacity-Building Program to support independent monitoring and reporting on the part of indigenous peoples; the UNDRIP guidelines should be included in World Bank policies; ask the Participants Committee to come out against 'carbon cowboys' and ask that the countries take urgent measures to prevent the rights violations that this type of contract imposes on communities; create a political-technical-legal team to review the World Bank's safeguard policies; and create a working group of indigenous peoples and the World Bank to identify practical methodologies for implementing FPIC. The final document can be found in Annex 3 below.

The principal points in the final discussion are presented below.

5.2.6 Presentation of the declaration

The session began with a reading of the consensus document of the participating indigenous organization. Following the reading, Benoit Bosquet of FMT was given a chance to respond. He expressed his appreciation for the work and recognized that the discussions were strong and long. First, he clarified that FMT represents the institution but does not make the decisions. FCPF is an alliance and the Participants Committee is the decision-making body. Thus, it is necessary to present and share the declarations with them. He asked the group for a few needed clarifications:

- 1) We need a clarification with respect to this International Protocol – what is it, and who should participate in this process? We suggest that you send us a first draft of the Protocol and we can continue to discuss it.
- 2) Paragraph 2: this first phrase can be interpreted the wrong way; please clarify it.
- 3) Paragraph 3: **dilute indigenous peoples and local communities.**
- 4) Creation of a team of suitable persons in the area of capacity-building: based on the proposals of those who should be the intermediaries, the World Bank will ensure that said institution complies with the capacity for financial management and safeguards. It is an external evaluation of this institution. We clarify that conflicts of interest must be avoided; avoid institutions that already participate in the Participants Committee.
- 5) Last paragraph: what is the meaning of the reference to a dialogue in October and a World Summit? We are willing to engage in dialogue, but this will depend on what the Participants Committee says as a result of budgetary issues.

Ramiro Batzin then spoke and responded in the name of the indigenous organizations, providing some clarifications:



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

- 1) International Protocol: we understand that FCPF is an alliance. The idea of this large guide is for us to express common-sense issues. We need a clear, permanent, and institutional relationship with the World Bank. There is a long learning process for both parties. We need an institutional relationship. There are gaps that make us vulnerable. The absence of institutional mechanisms opens the way for controversy. The Protocol is a guide, a set of principles, drafted jointly so as to order our dialogue, a guide that defines the character of the meetings (consultation, official, informal . . .).
- 2) Deep analysis: not only in the studies; it is because each of the countries has developed a dialogue process wherein a document of analysis has been produced. We had a Central American workshop in which we analyzed this process.
- 3) Policies: there is a concern regarding compliance with the policies.
- 4) Representative of the Protocol dialogue: it is important to define who will be invited, a guide with principles.
- 5) Institution for the issue of capacity-building: a guide with the requirements for defining this institution.

5.2.7 Closing Session

Edwin Vásquez, COICA's Coordinator General, took the floor to declare: "We have shared many opinions these days. The REDD processes have presented many challenges . . . We thank the event's committee and congratulate them for their great work. And our thanks to the World Bank for the financial assistance and trust in the organization of this event."

In the name of the Executive Committee, it was expressed that "it has been very constructive; we have spoken in a clear fashion, a constructive dialogue. It is not just about expressing one's point of view; it's a process, we have a very favorable scenario as compared to two decades ago. Good faith is an act of will among the interested parties. We have had an act of good faith here, which seems very good to me. We took maximum advantage of this moment. This step should continue to be built upon, as we have done during this meeting. First thing tomorrow, we will work on the Protocol's draft!"

Benoit Bosquet, FCPF Coordinator, also thanked Juan Reátegui of COICA and all members of COICA, the FCPF team, UNDP, IDB, and the participants. He said that "the issue is difficult, but it is a historic opportunity for the planet. We are on a path which we will continue because the route is marvelous. We await the final version of the declaration. We will see one another again in the global dialogue in Doha and we await your ideas in the Protocol. Thank you."

6. Anexos

6.1. Agenda

22 de Agosto, 2012: Reunión interna de dirigentes regionales



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

HORA	ACTIVIDAD	RESPONSABLES
08:30 – 09:00 am	Registro de Participantes indígenas	Secretaria del evento
09:00 - 09:20 am	Inauguración del taller: Palabras de apertura.	Comité de Dirección <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amadeo Martinez - CICA • Miguel Palacin - CAOI • Aucan Ulcaman – Consejo de todos los indios • Onel Masardule – Fundación para la Promoción del Conocimiento Tradicional Organizador: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edwin Vasquez - COICA
09:20 – 09:45 am	Presentación de los participantes	
09:45– 10:00 am	Presentación de la agenda 22-24agosto Explicación de la metodología y objetivos del Dialogo Regional y de la reunión interna.	Equipo de Facilitadores
10:00 – 10:30 am	Presentación del Estudio de Caso de Centro América.	Consultor de Estudio de Caso Centro América.
10:30 – 11:00 am	Presentación del Estudio de Caso de Sudamérica.	Consultor de Estudio de Caso Sudamérica.
11:00 – 11:15 am	Refrigerios	
11:15 – 12:00 pm	Preguntas y respuestas	Todos los participantes
12:00 – 13:30 pm	Presentación de la situación de implementación de R-PP de Sudamérica, Mesoamérica y el Caribe. Discusión sobre Preocupaciones y propuestas de los Pueblos Indígenas en el proceso de preparación para REDD+ y la implementación del R-PP. (a presentarse el 23 y 24 agosto). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identificación de 3 aspectos positivos y negativos por país (15min) • Discusión por región (2 grupos): agrupamiento, priorización, consenso de 10 aspectos positivos y 10 negativos. (45min) 	Representante de CICA Equipo de Facilitadores
13:30 – 14:30 pm	Almuerzo	
14:30 – 16:30	... continuación Plenaria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentación de cada grupo (1 hora) • Priorización en plenaria: 5 aspectos positivos y 5 aspectos negativos. (1.5 hora) 	
16:30 – 16:45 pm	Refrigerios	
16:45 – 18:30 pm	Acuerdos Generales / Definir posicionamiento (Condiciones para REDD+, Financiamiento para Pueblos Indígenas;...)	
18:30 – 19:00 pm	Palabras de cierre	
19:30 – 20:30 pm	Cena	

23 de Agosto, 2012



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

HORA	ACTIVIDAD	RESPONSABLES
08:30 – 09:00 am	Registro de participantes indígenas, otros participantes y observadores	Secretaria del evento
09:00 – 09:20 am	Palabras de bienvenida	Comité de Dirección Edwin Vasquez - COICA Benoit Bosquet – FCPF/FMT Representante del MINAM
	Ceremonia de apertura	
09:20 – 09:40 am	Presentación de los participantes	
09:40 – 10:00 am	Explicación de la metodología y objetivos del Dialogo Regional y de la reunión interna.	Facilitadores
10:00 – 10:40 am	Panel 1: Marco de acción del FCPF • Panorama General del FCPF y la participación de los Pueblos indígenas.	• Benoit Bosquet, FCPF-FMT
10:40 – 11:15 am	Preguntas y respuestas	Todos los participantes
11:15 – 11:30 am	Refrigerios	
11:30 – 12:30 pm	Panel 2: Salvaguardas ambientales y sociales • Aplicación por el FCPF y los Países REDD Participantes de las decisiones de Cancún y Durban sobre Pueblos Indígenas y la DNUDPI • Como se están aplicando las políticas de salvaguardas en el ámbito ambiental y social en los procesos de implementación de R-PP y REDD+ en Latinoamérica.	• Kenn Rapp, FCPF-FMT / Marie Brown, BM • Alonso Zarzar, BM
12:30 – 13:30 pm	Preguntas y respuestas	
13:30 – 14:30 am	Almuerzo	
14:30 – 16:00 pm	Panel 3: FCPF y los procesos actuales • FCPF y los Múltiples Socios para la Ejecución • Actualización sobre el Paquete de Preparación para REDD+ del FCPF • Modalidades del Programa de Desarrollo de Capacidades para Pueblos Indígenas	• Benoit Bosquet, FCPF-FMT /María da Cunha, BID / Pierre-Yves Guedez, PNUD • Kenn Rapp, FCPF-FMT • Peter Saile, FCPF-FMT



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

HORA	ACTIVIDAD	RESPONSABLES
16:00 – 16:45 pm	Preguntas y respuestas	
16:40 – 17:00 pm	Refrigerios	
17:00 – 19:00 pm	<p>Panel 4: Preocupaciones y propuestas desde los PPII</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentación del Estudio de Caso de Centro América y sus recomendaciones principales. • Presentación del Estudio de Caso de Sur América y sus recomendaciones principales • Preocupaciones y propuestas de los Pueblos Indígenas, frente al proceso de preparación para REDD+ y la implementación del R-PP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultor de Estudio de Caso Centro América. • Consultor de Estudio de Caso Sur América. • Representante de los Pueblos Indígenas
19:30 – 20:30 pm	Cena	

24 de Agosto, 2012

HORA	ACTIVIDAD	RESPONSABLES
09:00 – 13:00 am	Reunión interna de Pueblos Indígenas	• Dirigentes Indígenas
13:00 – 14:00 pm	Almuerzo	
	Sigue Reunión interna de Pueblos Indígenas	Dirigentes Indígenas
16:00 – 18:00 hrs	<p>Diálogos Pueblos Indígenas y FCPC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentación en Plenaria • Discusión y Acuerdos 	• Facilitadores
18:00 – 19:00 pm	Lectura de acuerdos	Facilitadores y Comité de Dirección
19:00 – 19:30 pm	Clausura	
20:00 – 21:00 pm	Cena	



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

6.2 Listado de Participantes

PAISES Y ORGANIZACIONES	NOMBRES Y APELLIDOS
PAISES DE MESOAMERICA	
MEXICO / RITA	Jose Antonio Medina
MEXICO / RITA	Gisela Flores Quiroz
MEXICO/RMIBLAC	Berenice Sanchez
GUATEMALA/CICA	Ramiro Batzin
GUATEMALA/CICA	Marvin Chirix
EL SALVADOR/CICA	Alfredo Ernesto Rivera Melgar
EL SALVADOR/RMIBLAC	Nestor Wladimir Perez Valiente
HONDURAS/CICA	Jose Bayardo Aleman
HONDURAS/	Maria Esperanza Meza Pineda
HONDURAS/CIMA	Jairo Wood
NICARAGUA/CICA	Doris Borst
NICARAGUA/REMIBLAC	Galvis Nicho Nihimaya
NICARAGUA/CIMA	Jorge Fedrick
COSTA RICA/CICA	Donald Rojas
COSTA RICA/RMIBLAC	Ana Iris Elizondo Maroto
COSTA RICA/CIMA	Alancay Morales
PANAMA/COONAPIP	Candido Mezua Salazar
PANAMA/RMIBLAC	Florina Lopez Miro
PANAMA/CIMA	Nelson De León Kantule
MEXICO / RITA	Jose Antonio Medina
MEXICO / RITA	Gisela Flores Quiroz
PAISES DE SUDAMERICA	
COLOMBIA/OPIAC	Henry Cabria Medina
COLOMBIA/OPIAC	Diana Alexandra Gonzales Aguilar
COLOMBIA/ONIC	Carmen Pimienta Cote
ARGENTINA/Confederacion Mapuche	David Sarapura
ARGENTINA/	Carol Alejandra Soae
ARGENTINA/Org. del Pueblo Warpe-San Juan	Paz Argentina Quiroga



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

CHILE / REMIB-LAC	Hortencia Hidalgo Caceres
CHILE	Maria Teresa Huentequeo Toledo
BOLIVIA	Maria Eugenia Choque
BOLIVIA	Jaime Retamozo
BOLIVIA	Celin Quenevo
PARAGUAY	Faustina Sosima Alvarenga Peres
PERU	Nadesca Pachao Ayala
PERU	Benito Calixto Guzmán
PERU	Alberto Pizango Chota
GUYANA	Jeanne Sharon Atkinson
GUYANA	Laura George
GUYANA	Lawrence Anselmo
SURINAME	Sirito-Yana, Aloema
SURINAME	Carlo Lewis
SURINAME	Helouise, Agnes Stuger
COLOMBIA/OPIAC	Henry Cabria Medina
COLOMBIA/OPIAC	Diana Alexandra Gonzales Aguilar
COLOMBIA/ONIC	Carmen Pimienta Cote
PC OBSERVADORES - PUNTOS FOCALES DE FCPF-BM	
MEXICO	Ana Karla Perea Blázquez
PARAGUAY	Sandra Aranda
SURINAME	Jerrel Pinas
NICARAGUA	Javier Gutierrez
PARTICIPANTES DE COICA	
ECUADOR	Edwin Vasquez
ECUADOR	Diego Escobar
ECUADOR	Arlen Ribiera
PUNTOS FOCALES INDIGENAS DE FCPF-BM	
AFRICA	Nanta Mpaayei
ASIA	Kittisak Rattanakrajangri
PANAMA	Onel Masardule
FACILITADORES INTERNACIONAL	
PERU	Hugo Che Piu
PERU	Liliana Lozano



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

BRASIL	Andre Silva Dias
EEUU	Joshua Lichtenstein
Belgica/Universidad de Lobaina	Deborah Delgado
Perú/CARE	Rodrigo Arce

ORGANISMOS INTERNACIONALES

BANCO MUNDIAL	BENOIT BOSQUET
BANCO MUNDIAL	KENN RAPP
BANCO MUNDIAL	PETER SAILE
BANCO MUNDIAL	MARIE BROWN
BANCO MUNDIAL	CAROLINA HOYOS
BANCO MUNDIAL	JULIUS THAYER
BID	MARIA DA CUNHA
BID	HANA USIMA
BID	DEANNE BARROW
BID	CARLOS PERAFAN
BID	JAIME FERNANDEZ-BACA
PNUD	Mr. PIERRE-YVES GUEDEZ
FAO	Mr. ALBERTO SANDOVAL

**PARTICIPANTES DE ORGANIZACIONES INDIGENAS
AUTOFINANCIADAS - OBSERVADORES**

SURINAME/Pueblos Saramaka	Hugo Jabini
SURINAME/Pueblos Saramaka	Zaria Eenig
SURINAME/VIDS	Loreen Jubitana
SURINAME/VIDS	Marie-Josée Artist
INGLATERRA/Forest People Programme	Conrad Feather
Estados Unidos/EDF	Christopher W. Meyer
PNUD/Surinam	Anuscka Levant
PNUD/Surinam	Nicolaas Stiefen Petrusi
PERU/Gobierno Regional - Loreto	Marco Antonio Celis Salinas
PERU/Gobierno Regional - Loreto	Maritza Ramirez Tamani
BOLIVIA/IBIS	Elisa Canqui



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

6.2. Declaración de Lima

Declaración de los Pueblos Indígenas de Abya Yala

Lima, Perú, 24 de agosto de 2012

Los representantes de los pueblos indígenas de Abya Yala, articulados en la Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica- COICA, la Coordinadora Andina de Organizaciones Indígenas CAOI, el Consejo Indígena de Centro América CICA, el Consejo Indígena de Meso América CIMA, la Red de Mujeres Indígenas por la Biodiversidad RMIB, el Consejo de Todas las Tierras, Enlace Continental de Mujeres Indígenas de las Américas, los representantes del Pueblo Saramaka y otros delegados de Pueblos Indígenas que suscriben esta Declaración, en el marco del desarrollo del “Diálogo Regional de Pueblos Indígenas y el Fondo Cooperativo para el Carbono Forestal (FCPF) del Banco Mundial”, efectuado en Lima, Perú del 22 al 24 de agosto del 2012, luego de haber desarrollado un profundo análisis sobre la política de los gobiernos en relación a la elaboración, implementación y aplicación de la política de REDD+, en la región.

Considerando que la implementación de los procesos REDD+ en Abya Yala ha significado la violación de los derechos fundamentales de los Pueblos Indígenas; reiteramos al Banco Mundial, al FCPF y a su Comité de Participantes, nuestras propuestas generales siguientes.

Hemos revisado la Política Operativa 4.10 del Banco Mundial sobre Pueblos Indígenas. A este respecto las experiencias nos reportan que tales políticas no cubren las diversas situaciones en materia de Derechos Colectivos que afectan a los Pueblos Indígenas en los países de la región y que debe ser armonizada con la Declaración de Naciones Unidas sobre los Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas (DNUDPI).

Los Pueblos Indígenas reiteramos que dicha Declaración (DNUDPI), es el instrumento que estipula derechos mínimos y al mismo tiempo constituye una herramienta elemental para el diálogo nacional y multilateral basado en la buena fe. Sin embargo, este instrumento no ha sido respetado ni aplicado por los gobiernos en muchas partes de la región. De la misma forma y a pesar de las limitantes del Convenio 169 sobre Pueblos Indígenas y Tribales en Países Independientes de la OIT, sigue siendo un instrumento válido que se debe respetar, promover y aplicar. Así mismo, los Estados y la Banca Multilateral, deben respetar la jurisprudencia (Casos Saramaka, Awas Tigni, Sarayaku, entre otros) sobre Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas que va estableciendo la Corte Interamericana de Derechos Humanos (CIDH) y que hace parte de los “acuerdos internacionales” que comprometen a los Estados Latinoamericanos. En relación a la armonización de la normativa interna de cada país con sus obligaciones internacionales de Derechos Humanos de los Pueblos Indígenas, exigimos que todo esto sea un requisito previo a la aprobación de los proyectos de REDD+ en nuestros países.



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

Los Pueblos Indígenas ratificamos el derecho inherente e imprescriptible sobre nuestras tierras, territorios y sus recursos, basados en el artículo 28º de la DNUDPI.

Los Pueblos Indígenas reiteramos el Derecho a la Libre determinación que nos asiste y que ha sido reconocido recientemente por la resolución de la Asamblea General de Naciones Unidas para la implementación Universal de dicho derecho y del mismo modo reconocido en el artículo 3º de la DNUDPI, así como en la “Declaración del Derecho al Desarrollo” y como lo estipula inequívocamente el artículo 1º del Pacto de Derechos Civiles y Políticos y el artículo 1º del Pacto de Derechos Económicos, Sociales y Culturales.

Así mismo, señalamos las propuestas siguientes:

1. A raíz de la experiencia de preparación, implementación y aplicación de los R- PP sobre políticas de REDD, en América Latina y el Caribe, los Pueblos Indígenas consideramos un imperativo establecer un *Protocolo Internacional (Principios, reglas y procesos)* para la relación institucional y permanente entre el Banco Mundial, FCPF y los Pueblos Indígenas sobre la implementación de los mecanismos y procesos REDD+ en todas sus etapas; que estén basados en la Declaración de Naciones Unidas sobre Derechos de los Pueblos Indígenas (DNUDPI).

Consideramos que dicho Protocolo Internacional debe elaborarse mediante un diálogo directo, transparente, equitativo y de fiel cumplimiento, entre el Banco Mundial y los Pueblos Indígenas del Abya Yala, a través de las organizaciones presentes en este Diálogo y ampliable a otras más, mediante un proceso, que deben ser apoyado por el FCPF y construido conjuntamente con nuestras organizaciones.

2. Los procesos REDD+ no deben ser continuados o implementados en aquellos países donde no se hayan respetado los Derechos Colectivos y territoriales de nuestros Pueblos; ni efectuado las debidas consultas, con la participación efectiva de los Pueblos, o donde se carecen de mecanismos institucionales para la preparación y ejecución de REDD+; hasta que dichos Derechos fundamentales sean respetados y garantizados, con evaluaciones independientes al respecto. Lo que empieza o se prepara mal, no se podrá mejorar en las etapas siguientes.

3. Sobre la revisión de la *Directiva Operacional 04.10 del Banco Mundial sobre Pueblos Indígenas*, rechazamos el enfoque de diluirla o desaparecerla en una norma sobre “Comunidades Locales”. Nuestra solidaridad con ellas implica, no reducir derechos, sino al contrario ampliar lo ya conseguido por nuestros pueblos a dichas comunidades locales.

4. En cuanto a la *capacitación y relación directa e institucional* entre los Pueblos Indígenas, el FCPF y el Banco Mundial, las organizaciones de los Pueblos Indígenas articuladas en la Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica COICA, la Coordinadora Andina de Organizaciones Indígenas CAOI, el Consejo Indígena de Centro América CICA, Consejo Indígena de Meso América CIMA, la Red de Mujeres Indígenas por la Biodiversidad RMIB, el Consejo de Todas las Tierras, Enlace Continental de Mujeres Indígenas



Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica

de las Américas, los representantes del Pueblo Saramaka y otros delegados de Pueblos Indígenas que suscriben esta Declaración, conformaremos un equipo con organizaciones idóneas para establecer y efectuar las actividades denominadas de “Intermediarios Regionales”. Esta se formalizará ante el Banco Mundial y FCPF en un plazo que no exceda los 30 días y se solicita a dichas entidades, el apoyo para el proceso indígena que permita viabilizar lo.

Finalmente reiteramos nuestra firme disposición al dialogo tanto con el Banco Mundial y con el FCPF, con el objeto de definir el alcance y contenido del Protocolo Internacional, lo cual debe constituir la base para la relación firme y duradera en el futuro; para lo cual proponemos la continuidad de este Diálogo mediante un nuevo cronograma posterior al Diálogo global de Diciembre del 2012 en Doha.

Lima, 24 de agosto del 2012

Coordinadora de Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica COICA

Coordinadora Andina de Organizaciones Indígenas CAOI

Consejo Indígena de Centro América CICA

Consejo Indígena de Meso América CIMA

Red de Mujeres Indígenas por la Biodiversidad RMIB

Consejo de Todas las Tierras

Enlace Continental de Mujeres Indígenas de las Américas