MONITORING AND INDICATORS: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES IN BILATERAL ASSISTANCE

TECHNICAL NOTE

2006

MONITORING AND INDICATORS: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES IN BILATERAL ASSISTANCE

Technical Note

Technical Advisory Service
DANIDA

March 2006

Table of Contents

Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AMG	Aid Management Guidelines
ASPR	annual sector programme review
ASPS	agricultural sector programme support
CBNRM	community-based natural-resource management
EIA	environmental impact assessment
EFA	Education For All
ESPS	education sector programme support
EU	European Union
HR	human resources
IASG	Inter Agency Support Group
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IP	indigenous people (also used to denote particular relevance to indigenous peoples, e.g. 'IP indicators' and 'IP issues')
IPs	indigenous peoples
IPO	indigenous peoples' organisation
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
NGO	non-governmental organisation
NR	natural resources
NRM	natural-resources management
PMF	Performance Management Framework
PRA	participatory rural appraisal
PRS	poverty reduction strategy
PRSP	poverty reduction strategy paper
SEA	Special Environmental Assistance
SPS	sector programme support
UN	United Nations
UNPFII	United Nations Permanent Forum For Indigenous Issues
VPA	Annual Business Plan of Danish representations (*Virksomhedsplanlægningsaftale*)
WB	World Bank

1.   Introduction

This Note offers a brief introduction to indicators and monitoring tools for the work with indigenous peoples (IPs) in Danida's countries of cooperation. It is primarily aimed at supporting officers at the Danish representations or at HQ responsible for preparing and managing Danish bilateral development assistance. The Note may also be of assistance to staff in partner organisations responsible for monitoring, their Danida advisers, and consultants who assist in preparing and managing programmes and projects.

The present Note should be read in conjunction with the technical note on "Monitoring at Programme and Project Level – General Issues", which presents definitions of relevant monitoring terms and explains important aspects of the monitoring challenge at the programme and project level, including the links between monitoring and the international agenda on ownership, alignment, harmonisation, and management for results. The definitions, etc. used in the present Note correspond to those presented in the general note.

This Note focuses on activity, output and outcome monitoring. Clearly, the development of IP-related indicators for impact monitoring is a crucial task, but as a first step, in practice, emphasis will need to be placed on the implementation process and its immediate results. In most Danida sector programmes (and in development assistance generally), IP monitoring is a new concept. There are currently no mechanisms and only limited experience of monitoring IP issues. Integration of IP monitoring at activity, output and outcome level is therefore a challenge in its own right, on which initial efforts should be focussed. Monitoring of IP issues cuts across numerous sectors, and addressing IP issues should be seen as an integral part of the sector/component implementation. This Note does not deal with the level of input monitoring. That level will be easy to establish once the other levels of monitoring have been formulated. Moreover, risk and assumption monitoring does not feature in this Note, as its treatment is considered premature at this development stage of IP monitoring, and because it is highly site specific, making it difficult to provide relevant inspiration in a general document of this nature.

The new 'Danish Strategy for Support to Indigenous Peoples' and the toolkit on indigenous peoples in sector programme support (SPS) lay much of the groundwork for this Note, which focuses on four different types of sector programme support, namely: good governance, education, agriculture and environment.

The Note contains a short background chapter on Danida's strategy for support to indigenous peoples and related monitoring and indicator issues (Chapter 2), followed by a presentation of internationally defined goals, indicators and targets (Chapter 3). Chapter 4 then deals with the issue of objectives and indicators at the national level, i.e. in PRSPs. Chapter 5 deals with the monitoring linkage between SPS and PRSPs. Chapter 6 concentrates on practical advice, presenting a number of examples of IP monitoring in relation to each of the four key sectors. Chapter 7 presents more general issues, tools and methods related to IP issues in SPS, while the final Chapter 8 summarises the main conclusions and challenges.

Comments to this note can be sent to the contact person in Technical Advisory Service: Morten Elkjær morelk@um.dk.

2.   Background

Following the rights-based approach of the "Strategy for Danish Support to Indigenous Peoples" (May 2004, henceforth 'the Strategy'), and recognising the fundamental collective right of IPs to set their own agenda, it is crucial to monitor changes in IPs' right to self-determination. However, this is not easily done. Thus, self-determination needs to be fleshed out in terms of more manageable aspects that can be monitored. The Strategy's working definition of IPs suggests the key aspects most relevant to monitor and most suitable for the development of indicators, namely:

• security of IPs' tenure of ancestral land and resources;
• external conditions of IP production systems;
• possibilities of IPs to maintain and express their distinct language, culture and ethnic identity;
• possibilities of IPs to organise their social, economic and cultural affairs by using their own social and legal institutions according to their internal decision-making processes.

The Strategy stresses the importance of an enabling environment for addressing IPs' rights. Consequently, it is important to develop indicators for and to monitor:

• policy and legislative processes that affect IPs;
• development of collaborative and conflict resolution/prevention arrangements that include IPOs;
• awareness of IP issues in the donor and government agencies;
• level of consultation with and involvement of IPs in sector programme formulation and implementation.

It should be noted that IP monitoring will not be required in all SPS or every component. An operational interpretation of the Strategy entails that the abovementioned aspects of IP monitoring are only addressed in countries where such issues are significant, and only implemented in relation to programmes/components with direct impact on IPs' rights.

In addition, the recommendations in "The Tool Kit for Best Practises for Including Indigenous Peoples in Sector Programme Support" (Draft, Danida, August 2004) suggests the following key IP monitoring aspects:

• Monitoring must take account of indigenous peoples' own, and often diverging, concepts of poverty and development, and indicators must be designed according to indigenous peoples' notions of what constitutes poverty and what constitutes desirable development. This calls for diversification of indicators.
• Since IPs' perception of development and poverty reduction is often different from that of mainstream society, it is important that IPs be significantly involved in PRS formulation, indicator development and monitoring.
• Development data disaggregated by ethnic group should be an integral element of the strengthening of national capacities in the area of data collection. Involvement of IPs in collection of disaggregated data is important and should be promoted in relevant sectors.
• Disaggregated data should be aggregated at higher levels (i.e. component indicators relate to how IPs' aspirations are being achieved, programme/sector indicators show IPs' progress towards MDG and PRS goals, and higher-level aggregated indicators signify national achievements in relation to MDGs and PRS goals). However, producing such disaggregated

data is likely to be a long process. In the meantime, it is important to monitor sector/component performance in relation to IP work.

This Note will seek to operationalise Danida's IP Strategy and Toolkit recommendations that specific IP indicators should be developed, with a focus on monitoring compliance with the IP Strategy in sector programmes that do not include specific IP components[1].

3.   Internationally defined goals, indicators and targets

In accordance with Danida policy, performance monitoring in Danida-supported sector programmes will increasingly be harmonised with national poverty reduction strategies (PRS) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

The MDGs are notable for not referring to IPs in any of the 8 goals and 48 indicators[2]. Therefore, the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) has decided to focus on the MDGs in its sessions in 2005-7. Efforts are currently underway by the Inter-Agency Support Group (IASG), related to UNPFII, to propose inclusion of IP-related indicators and processes in the MDGs during the 2005 review process. The IASG proposal recommends the development of rights-based indicators (possibly as sub-indicators of the main MDG indicators), compilation of disaggregated data and local participatory processes for national MDG adjustment and monitoring[3].

For further information on IP-related monitoring in international organisations, please refer to Annex 2.

4.   Objectives and indicators in PRSP

Specific IP indicators are absent in the majority of PRSPs and PRSP monitoring systems. Only a few countries have developed specific PRSP goals and/or indicators concerning the welfare of ethnic groups that are of direct relevance to IPs. However, a number of PRSPs include objectives and indicators for support to "vulnerable groups", "disadvantaged groups" and similar categories. Although these tend to concentrate on women, marginalised children and the poorest in general, they do occasionally serve as umbrella terms and anchoring points for IP support. Chapter 5 below elaborates on the possible linkages between PRSP monitoring and SPS monitoring in the field of IPs.

5.   Objectives and indicators in SPS

Alignment with and integration into national and international monitoring
Danida is committed to the Marrakech Action Plan on Managing for Development Results, which seeks to raise international standards and improve alignment of performance monitoring in

---

[1] For a more in-depth description of Danida's experiences and best practices of support for IPs, see "Review Report: Strategy for Danish Support to Indigenous peoples", Danida September 2001, and "Best Practices for including indigenous peoples in sector programme support: Toolkit", Danida July 2004".
[2] For a brief review of the central IP issues in each of the MDGs, see "Minority and Indigenous Peoples' Rights in the MDGs", MRG International, available at:
http://www.minorityrights.org/admin/Download/pdf/AdvMDGBriefing.pdf
[3] A Draft Position Paper on the MDGs is in preparation by the IASG Support Group. A preliminary statement can be accessed at: http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/links_unsystem/inter_agency_statement.htm

development assistance, as well as to support increased integration into and strengthening of national monitoring systems. Accordingly, Danida's AMG emphasise the need for alignment with national standards generally, and demand specific justification if sector monitoring is to take place outside a national monitoring system. Therefore, it is important that the development of IP indicators starts, to the extent possible, from existing national monitoring systems pertaining to national poverty reduction strategies (PRSs) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). This process is described in more detail below.

It must be noted that the PRS and MDG monitoring process is still evolving, just as Danida's programme approach has yet to be fully implemented in all countries. Moreover, because IP issues can be politically sensitive, or simply not a priority, for national governments, IP indicators are mostly absent from national monitoring systems. Therefore, at present, it is often impossible to rely solely on existing PRS monitoring systems for IP monitoring in Danida-sponsored sector programmes. In such situations, it is suggested that IP indicators be developed for the sector concerned, but that they be: (a) aligned with and fed directly into the PRS and MDG monitoring process, (b) developed in a participatory process with relevant government and civil-society stakeholders, and (c) used as the first step in a process to support and promote full integration of common IP indicators in PRS monitoring frameworks.

Process for alignment of IP indicators with PRS and MDG monitoring
Ideally, PRS indicators address national goals, aligned with and feeding into the globally orientated MDG indicators. In practice, however, the two monitoring processes are not synchronised, and indicators are far from always harmonised. This complicates the process of aligning IP indicators from Danida sector programmes with those of the PRS and MDGs. In practice, and given how Danida sector support is owned and managed by national governments, the first and most practical step is to focus on linking IP indicators in the sector programmes to the PRS, though paying continuous attention to the need for harmonisation with MDG indicators. This is also the best way to move beyond Danida-specific IP indicators towards a nationally-owned monitoring process.

A first principle in the PRS alignment process is to ensure that the formulation of IP indicators takes its starting point in existing PRS objectives and indicators to the extent possible. Ideally, the Danida sector programme in question will have been designed to link up closely with a particular PRS objective. Where this is not the case, the most appropriate PRS objectives and associated indicators should be identified. A next step is to determine the level of alignment. In principle, PRS monitoring should be based on both impact indicators (known as "final indicators" in PRS terminology) and process indicators[4] (known as "intermediate indicators"). In practice, process indicators are either poor or entirely lacking in many PRS papers, which poses problems in day-to-day PRS monitoring and annual reviews[5]. Until better PRS process indicators can be developed, IP indicators will thus need to be aligned directly with the overall impact indicators currently available. However, this brings its own advantages, as indicators from Danida-supported sector programmes can thereby

---

[4] The notion of "process indicator" is not part of the DAC glossary, but is frequently used. A process indicator relates to the implementation process rather than to the results. It therefore primarily concerns the input and the activity levels, sometimes also the output level of the LFA. Often, however, process indicators are formulated in order to monitor processes which are not specified as programme inputs/activities/outputs, but which rather relate to routine activities and processes in an organisation, a sector, etc. (from the general note on monitoring and indicators)
[5] See the ODI review of PRSP Indicators: "Good Practice in the Development of PRSP Indicators and Monitoring Systems", ODI July 2002 available at: http://www.odi.org.uk/pppg/publications/working_papers/172.html

provide much-needed process information, thus helping to substantiate the assessment of overall impacts.

The actual linking of process indicators to PRS impact indicators will need to address one of two situations:

- Where specific PRS indicators do exist for IPs or support for ethnic groups, the links will be fairly apparent. Nevertheless, it is important to ensure that the PRS objectives in question do in fact seek to support IPs' rights, and are not an attempt to dictate the development of IPs.
- Where the PRS does not present explicit IP/ethnic objectives and indicators of its own, or where these are considered insufficient by themselves, Danida's IP indicators will need to link to wider PRS objectives and associated indicators in the sector that are of indirect relevance to IPs.

Depending on their nature, the process of linking IP indicators to PRS will be relatively simple for some sectors, such as education where indicators tend to be standardised and easy to aggregate across levels, and where the problem of too little disaggregated data can be dealt with without major problems. In other sectors, the linking may be less straightforward. For instance, because PRSs do not always contain concise and separate objectives for governance, it can be difficult to find the most appropriate PRS anchoring point for IP indicators of good governance. In such cases, discussions should be held with the responsible PRS monitoring authorities to either establish a new PRS indicator within the sector in question, or develop consensus on the best possible existing indicator. It is important to facilitate that the link between IP indicators and PRS indicators takes root within the specific sector addressed by the SPS, to avoid creating complex indicator linkages that are not operational in practice.

A hypothetical example of how an SPS/component IP indicator could be linked to the Nepalese PRS and the MDGs is provided below.

LFA levels	Indicators
MDG: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger	Proportion of population below $1 per day (selected among several indicators)
PRSP objective: Increase agricultural productivity and income for food security and poverty reduction	Agriculture GDP and per-capita agricultural income growth
Selected PRSP outcome: More diversified production systems and enhanced commercialisation	Co-ordinated needs-based research and extension programmes for severely food deficit areas (specifically remote) in operation
Selected PRSP output: Increased co-operative and contractual farming supported by extension	Cases of cooperative and contractual farming in place after 2004
Sample IP output from SPS/component: Access to research and group-based extension improved among ethnic minorities	Number of producer organisations that significantly address IP production problems

In logistical terms, the process of defining links need not be extensive, but should make sure that all relevant stakeholders are involved. Meetings to define the links should include e.g. IP representatives, relevant government PRS and MDG staff, a Danida representative, and possibly selected members of the Programme Committee. The flow of information would take place along established channels and timeframes for general integration of Danida sector monitoring into PRS monitoring.

The linking between IP indicators in Danida sector programmes and MDGs should take place through the ongoing PRS-MDG alignment process, rather than as a parallel process. This is the best way to support progress towards better alignment between the two monitoring systems, and will also help overcome the potential difficulties of linking directly from individual IP indicators to the highly generalised and aggregate MDG indicators. This process might include collaborative efforts to include IP indicators as subsets in national MDG reports, when the time and means are available. If successful, the current UNPFII efforts to incorporate subsets of relevant IP indicators in MDGs will facilitate this process greatly.

6.   The choice of indicators

This section provides practical guidance regarding IP indicators and IP indicator development for the sectors of governance, education, agriculture and environment. Emphasis is placed on providing a wide array of examples of indicators at various LFA levels and across a range of component types.

After outlining the recommended process for indicator definition and follow-up, a table presents a sample of outcome, output and activity level indicators and means of verification for some typical components in each sector. As for the indicators and means of verification reproduced here, it is important to stress that these are <u>only a sample</u> to serve as guidance and inspiration in the development of indicators. The ones listed here should be adapted or supplemented by other indicators that are more context- and culture-specific, and should be devised in the actual component/sector formulation process. As mentioned earlier, this Note does not address impact indicators, as this is found irrelevant at this incipient stage in the development of IP monitoring. The various levels of the LFA are presented in general terms in order to provide as generic a guideline as possible. It is important to keep this in mind when designing the monitoring set-up and indicators at the level of specific activities.

IP indicators in the sector of good governance

Relevance of the sector to Danida's Strategy for IPs
The emphasis on areas such as human and constitutional rights, access to justice and political representation makes the governance sector particularly relevant to securing IPs' rights. Danida's increasingly holistic approaches to good governance has, in recent years, led to the adoption of relatively broad-based good governance programmes in several of Danida's partner countries. These are typically structured around all or some of the following inter-related areas of intervention: human rights & democratisation; justice; media; decentralisation & local governance, general public-sector reform and anti-corruption. Experience shows that IP issues may prove significant in most of these areas, although least so in the case of public-sector reform and anti-corruption, which will not be addressed separately here. In most sector programmes, civil-society strengthening is built into other components, and will be treated here as such.

Status of IP indicators in governance sector programmes
The programme approach means that Danida's support for the sector tends to emphasise the development of good governance through nationwide reform and capacity development, irrespective of ethnic differences. While this is necessary and fully justified in most respects, it does mean that specific indicators relating to IPs tend to be absent in programme and component documents within the sector. Even where the programme emphasis has been on furthering the civil and political rights

of marginalised groups, indicators have rarely reflected specific IP issues. This has made it difficult to monitor the extent to which the IP Strategy's emphasis on IPs' rights is followed through in sector support for good governance. Inclusion of IP indicators in governance programmes and components is therefore of particular importance.

Process towards indicator definition

Given the thoroughly political nature of the sector and the often sensitive issues addressed within it, it is important that indicators for these aspects are fully understood and agreed upon by the parties involved – including government agencies (e.g. Ministry of the Interior), monitoring and mediation bodies (e.g. national human rights commissions) and relevant advocacy and member organisations (e.g. civil-rights NGOs). Apart from this, whenever present, IPOs should be consulted and participate in the design of indicators, even where the scope of the intervention is too broad to incorporate them as formal partners. In countries where IPs are not formally organised, IP resource persons in NGOs or universities can also be consulted, and may usually provide access to other IP resource persons if necessary. In some settings, certain practices and perceptions of IPs may be considered contrary to Danida's principles on good governance – e.g. Danida's gender-focused human-rights support may clash with certain indigenous patriarchal norms, while traditional indigenous institutions with unelected leaders may collide with Danida's view of democracy. In such cases, indicators may be formulated to measure the extent to which efforts have been made to engage IPs in a dialogue on the issue in question[6].

Actions to be taken on indicators

In some cases, measuring IP indicators will require special efforts. For the type of indicators suggested below, verification may be relatively simple, by means of assessments and consultative processes. Nevertheless, where IP issues are not clear, it may be necessary to back such assessments with more in-depth knowledge held by selected IPO or IP resource persons, who may be asked to inform their perceptions of implementation progress on IP issues. If the monitoring process indicates poor performance regarding IPs' rights, possible causes must be explored. However, when such shortcomings are significant, it is also important to discuss the options for remedial action with all main stakeholders in the intervention. This is necessary, as sector stakeholders tend to have different perceptions of what 'successful' governance is, requiring a wide-ranging dialogue to ensure collective support for mitigating actions. In cases where remedial measures are constrained by aspects beyond the control of component management, an attempt should be made to address this at high-level consultations.

The table below provides, at various LFA levels, samples of IP-relevant indicators and means of verification for typical components in the sector of good governance.

---

[6] See also the IP Toolkit, the section on gender issues, Danida 2004

COMPONENT SUPPORT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND ELECTORAL PROCESS		
LFA levels	**Sample IP indicators**	**Sample means of verification**
Outcome 1. Improved monitoring of human rights and constitutional development	1. Reports from the monitoring organisations address IPs' rights and assess the situation of IPs in view of the Human Rights Convention, the national constitution and ILO Convention 169	1. NHRC/NGO/IPO reporting and studies
2. Improved participation of indigenous voters in electoral processes	2. Voter turnout in IP-dominated areas	2. Reports on voting process
3. Information on IPs' rights is actively used in policies and law-making	3. Number of regulations, laws and policies adjusted/ amended to accommodate IPs' rights	3. Regulations, laws, policies in relevant ministries
Output 1. Stakeholders able to monitor human rights and constitutional development	1.The National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) has IP representation and/or meets regularly with IPOs	1. NHRC/NGO/IPO action plans and staff profiles
2. Improvements in democratic electoral processes	2. No. of IP voters taking part in voter registration process	2. Sample voter rolls IP areas
	2. The electoral monitoring system includes indicators on IP voting	2. Documentation from electoral monitoring system
3. Improved levels of information on civil and political rights	3. The campaign follow-up activities show increased awareness of IPs' rights among target groups	3. Campaign follow-up survey
Activity 1. Build capacity to monitor human rights and constitutional development	1. The organisational assessment of supported organisations has addressed IPs' rights	1. Annual reports from organisations
	1. IPOs have participated actively in development of monitoring guidelines and manuals	1. Monitoring guidelines and manuals
2. Support development of democratic electoral processes	2. The design process for a voter registration scheme has featured documentation and mitigation of obstacles to IP voter registration	2. Guidelines and manuals for electoral process
	2. The process to establish an election commission has explored options for IP representation	2. Annual reports from election commission
3. Promote advocacy and awareness-raising on civil and political rights	3. IPOs have participated actively in designing and implementing the nationwide awareness campaign on civil rights	3. Campaign plan
	3. Advocacy and awareness-raising on civil rights provides qualified information on the specific IPs' rights/ conditions	3. Campaign materials

COMPONENT SUPPORT FOR MEDIA

LFA levels	Sample IP indicators	Sample means of verification
Outcome 1. Media aware of IPs' rights and actively conveying information on IPs' conditions	1. No. of articles and other media products addressing IP issues produced by various media	1. Newspaper clippings, overview of aired media productions
Output 1. Capacity of journalists to address IPs' rights increased	1. No. of IP specialists in supported media resource centres	1. Staff profiles/CVs in media centres
Activity 1. Support training of journalists in various aspects of IPs' rights	1. Sessions on IPs' rights and conditions included in journalist training on human-rights issues	1. Training materials

COMPONENT SUPPORT FOR DECENTRALISATION AND LOCAL GOVERNANCE

LFA levels	Sample IP indicators	Sample means of verification
Outcome 1. Local government structures are accountable and promote the rights of its citizens	1. No. of IP representatives on sample district councils matches local indigenous population	1. Sample documentation on council composition in target areas
2. Local service provision and administration is accessible to IPs and responsive to their needs and rights	2. District budget allocations to indigenous communities are equal to other communities	2. Sample district development plans and budgets
Output 1a. Local governance structures represents its citizenry fairly	1a. Local Governance legislation provides for affirmative action to ensure minority representation in LG structures	1a. Draft & final LG legislation
1b. Traditional IP governance structures allowed to participate in LG structures	1b. Revised legislation and LG set-up endorses role of traditional IP decision-making structures	1b. Draft & final LG legislation
2. Local service provision and administration improved	2. No. of indigenous persons recruited for the new sub-district administration	2. Sample annual reports from districts/sub-districts
Activity 1. Support the democratic strengthening of local governance structures	1. IP-relevant recommendations on local-governance reform have been documented and applied in implementation strategy	1. IPO recommendations to reform process
	1. Technical studies for LG reform have explored special IP needs, including alignment with indigenous territories and traditional institutions	1. Technical studies
2. Support decentralised service provision and administration		2. National guidelines for local service provision
	2. Consultation and information on local budgets conducted in local indigenous language	2. Reports and manuals from training activities
	2. The training programme for district adm. has included sensitisation on IPs' needs and rights	

COMPONENT SUPPORT FOR JUSTICE		
LFA levels	**Sample IP indicators**	**Sample means of verification**
Outcome 1. Improved legal protection of IPs' rights	1. No. of court cases where IPs' rights or equivalent rights of specific importance for IPs are upheld	1. Annual reports from various level of the legal system
2. Processing of IP claims improved in the supported organisations	2. IPOs or similar organisations report improved status of IP claims	2. Interviews with IPO or similar organisations
Output 1. Laws and policies passed that protect rights of IPs on equal terms with other population groups	1. Revised policies and legislation includes specific principles and action plans for equal legal opportunities	1. Draft and final policy documents and laws
	1. Revised legislation and sector set-up endorses role of traditional institutions in local dispute settlement	1. Draft and final policy documents and laws
2. Improved capacity of the Judiciary and other public-sector institutions and NGOs to address IPs' rights	2. Recruitment policies and staff mandates of the relevant organisations feature IPs' rights as subject matter	2. Organisational development plans and policies
Activity 1. Support for reform of policies and legal sector in relation to IPs' rights	1. IP representatives have participated actively in all relevant meetings and hearings	1. Participants list/proceedings from meetings and hearings
	1. IP representatives have provided recommendations and comments on draft versions of laws and policies	1. IPs' statements and comments on draft laws and policies
2. Support for capacity development of the Judiciary and other public sector institutions as well as NGOs	2. IPs or IP specialists have provided information on capacity gaps in legal sector	2. TOR for capacity assessments
	2. IPs' rights form part of training/educational curricula	2. Curricula for training/educational programmes

IP indicators in the education sector

Relevance of the sector to Danida's Strategy for IPs
Education sector programme support (ESPS) is provided in several countries with indigenous populations. Education is a crucial factor in cultural and linguistic diversity. Given the fundamental problems facing IPs in getting access to primary education, this Note focuses on relevant IP indicators in primary education. However, this is not meant to underestimate the role of secondary and higher education in IPs' access to education. Education in one's own language is officially recognised as a basic right in most of the programme countries. It is a fundamental right of IPs, and in countries with sizeable indigenous populations, this right should be considered part and parcel of ESPS. Performance indicators should be developed in this respect. In some countries, specific components are dedicated to supporting bilingual and intercultural education targeting indigenous populations. Unlike indicators for universal primary education, the indicators for bilingual and intercultural education directly target the performance in relation to IPs.

Support for universal primary education

Indicators are, to the extent possible, linked to those of Education for All (EFA), which are considered the most accepted framework for global action on education in developing countries. All the indicators are linked to the MDG no. 2 "Achieve universal primary education" and to target no.3 "Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary school". IPs represent a relatively large proportion of those with no or poor access to primary education. Consequently, bringing education to all calls for focusing on education relevant to IPs. Equal access to and benefit from education for IPs normally require initiatives targeted specifically at IPs within universal primary education programmes or separate components. Below is a presentation of sample monitoring issues and indicators in connection with typical education interventions/components.

Process towards indicator definition

Defining IP-relevant indicators in the education sector would be significantly eased by the existence of education data disaggregated by ethnic group. Such data rarely exists. The process to identify indicators will include studying how to strengthen the gathering of relevant disaggregated data. Given the central importance of education in shaping the future of IPs, and given the complex aspects of providing IP-relevant education, it is essential that IPs – through IPOs, representatives and knowledgeable specialists – be consulted and fully participate in defining indicators for IP-relevant performance in the education sector. One way of approaching this aspect is to support or advocate for continuous consultations between Ministry of Education and IPOs or representatives of IPs.

Actions to be taken on indicators

Most relevant actions will be directed at the various central departments/institutions under the Ministry of Education. If specific initiatives are under decentralised management (autonomous regions, non-government initiatives etc.), actions need target that level. Under-performance in relation to IP-relevant education is likely to stem from negative perceptions of the usefulness of IPs' own knowledge and lifestyles. In this case, indicators might measure actions aimed at supporting, within the education system, awareness and understanding of IPs' rights and the values of indigenous knowledge and lifestyles.

Bilingual and intercultural education

Activities dedicated to bilingual and intercultural education are developed within an education programme in pursuit of the basic right of IPs to receive education in their own language. Indicators for such activities and their outputs would resemble indicators generally used in the sector, functioning as disaggregated sub-indicators of national indicators for progress towards the goal of universal primary education. At the impact level, the indicator of bilingual and intercultural education would be the number of indigenous children successfully receiving bilingual and intercultural education. Disaggregated data would facilitate monitoring this indicator. Of significant relevance at the programme level is how the intended target groups view such specific activities of bilingual and intercultural education, and how the lessons learnt in such activities affect the organisation of the primary education sector.

The table below provides samples of IP-relevant indicators and means of verification at various LFA levels for typical components in ESPS:

EDUCATION SECTOR PROGRAMME SUPPORT		
LFA levels	**Sample IP indicators**	**Sample means of verification**
Outcome 1. Curriculum and teacher-training material provide relevant skills to indigenous communities	1. Curriculum and material approved by IP reps. including educational councils in IP areas (link to EFA 13 and 15)	1. Ministry of Education statistics
	1. Specific activities/interventions in support of bilingual education identified and supported in the national education sector (EFA indicator 13 and 15)	1. Ministry of Education statistics
2. Teachers are able to provide quality education to indigenous children	2. Relative number of teachers active in IP areas with documented skills in using indigenous languages and inter-cultural understanding (link to EFA indicator 9 and 10)	2. Interviews with educational councils in IP areas, IPOs or civil society organisations
	2. Number of qualified teachers with indigenous background active in IP areas	2. Interviews with teachers in IP areas
3. Improved access to quality education in indigenous peoples' areas	3. Relative gross intake rate of indigenous children compared to their percentage of the population (to EFA indicator 3)	3. Ministry of Education statistics (if not disaggregated by ethnicity – specific support for this could be provided)
	3. Number of functional specific arrangements for addressing access to schooling in IP areas	3. School statistics for IP areas
Output 1. Curriculum and teaching material relevant to IPs' rights and inter-cultural understanding	1. Bilingual education can be documented as a key topic in all relevant curricular development	1. Plans and progress reports for bilingual interventions
	1. All relevant teaching material available in indigenous language and tested and discussed with IPs	1. Reports and interviews with IPOs or IP representatives
2. Teacher training improved as regards IP-relevant education	2. Number of teachers passing examination and who have included IP-relevant education in their studies	2. Teacher training college reports and/or Ministry of Education statistics
3. Options for increasing IPs' access to education identified and initiated	3. Number of scholarships for secondary and higher education provided successfully to indigenous persons (link to EFA indicator 17)	3. Ministry of Education statistics/schools statistics
	3. Relative number of specific arrangements for IP schooling (mobile schools, bush schools, scholarships, other adaptations to learning environment in IP areas)	3. School reports/statistics from schools in IP areas

Activity		
1. Support for curricular development and to improve quality of teaching material	1. Number of meetings with IPOs/IP to discuss curriculum	1. Programme progress reports
	1. Process of developing bilingual education can be documented	1. Programme progress reports
2. Support for teacher capacity development	2. Existence of teacher training courses addressing IP-relevant education issues	2. Teacher training college curriculum and annual reports
3. Support for increasing coverage and access to quality education	3. Number of schools in IP areas receiving support from education programme	3. Programme progress reports

COMPONENT SUPPORT FOR BILINGUAL AND INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

LFA levels	Sample IP indicators	Sample means of verification
Outcome 1. Improved access to bilingual and intercultural education	1. Number of students receiving bilingual and intercultural education	1. Ministry of Education statistics
	1. Educational activities supported are in line with aspirations of the IPs	1. Interviews with IPOs or other indigenous groups
Output 1. Improved capacity for provision of bilingual and intercultural education	1. IPOs and IP education councils take active part in and back up decision-making on educational activities	1. Progress reports and interviews with IPs
	1. Strategies and policies of the sector are reflecting the need for bilingual and intercultural education	1. Strategies and policies of Ministry of Education
Activity 1. Support for bilingual and intercultural education	1. Government level and IPs participate in process to incorporate IPs' views and feedback in planning	1. Programme progress reports

IP indicators in the agriculture sector

Relevance of the sector to Danida's Strategy for IPs

Agriculture sector programme support (ASPS) is provided in a range of countries with indigenous populations. Here, the following typical ASPS components contain activities that are potentially relevant to the rights of indigenous peoples: support for agricultural extension/advisory services and farmers' training; institutional and policy support; and, area-based support for agricultural and NRM development. In some settings, private agricultural sector support and support for agricultural micro-finance institutions may also include important aspects of IPs' rights, and although this is not addressed in further detail here, it is important to consider the potential need for IP indicators when designing this type of interventions. Generally, IPs' right to land for production is the main concern that needs to be monitored.

Extension and training programmes in the agricultural sector ought, when active in areas with indigenous inhabitants, to develop specific initiatives aimed at giving indigenous farmers equal opportunities for participating and benefiting from extension and training. The workings of ministries of agriculture and of policy development within the agricultural sector have a potentially significant bearing on the future livelihoods of indigenous peoples. The productive basis of

indigenous peoples is affected by policy-making for agricultural development, typically in such areas as slash-and-burn and highlands agriculture, as well as in livestock/pastoral production. In fishing, hunting and forestry, which may or may not be a domain of the Ministry of Agriculture, policy-making may also make a substantial impact on IPs' production.

In a number of countries, a significant part of agricultural sector support is channelled to specific districts/regions. This kind of intervention typically addresses a host of constraints on agricultural production. If the areas identified are home to IPs, and if the support affects indigenous production systems, the intervention should include activities and outputs that are supportive of such production systems.

Process towards indicator definition

Indigenous and non-indigenous agricultural production often differ in indicators of success. To IPs, increased production volumes may be less important than greater food security and access to traditional land/resources. It is essential that indigenous producers/farmers participate in defining the indicators of success in agricultural production. This should take place in a very direct manner through the use of various PRA tools during programme formulation and implementation. In each area, the point is to understand – and incorporate into the monitoring system – the particularities and rationalities of the indigenous production system. It is especially important to draw upon the rationale of indigenous tenure systems and indigenous traditional technical knowledge to develop the indicators of performance of IP production- and land-management systems.

To the extent producers' associations supportive of IP production systems exist, they should be involved in indicator formulation. Government agencies responsible for production of relevance to the indigenous groups should be substantially involved. Such agencies must often be expected to have limited understanding of the logics of indigenous production system.

Given the fundamental role of strategy and policy development in the agricultural sector, it is important that IPOs or representatives capable of championing the role of indigenous production systems participate in the process of selecting detailed performance indicators for outputs and activities. Furthermore, it is essential that such representatives participate in the process of defining impact and outcome indicators in relation to IP production systems. Frequently, government departments will be unable to properly represent the views of indigenous producers, while relevant IPOs may not exist, thus making it necessary to seek direct contact with indigenous producers in order to develop suitable indicators. This could be initiated by approaching on-going projects/components with close day-to-day presence in areas where IP production systems are implemented, asking them to consult with indigenous producers. Disaggregated data to monitor indicators in relation to ethnic groups or production systems are hard to come by. However a process is advancing in the UN system towards developing disaggregated data for various UN organisations. It may be useful to check the progress of this process and how it relates to the sector and country in question.

Actions to be taken on indicators

An important aspect which directly addresses IPs' rights is the performance of staff in government or non-government extension agencies/service deliverers. This calls for developing appropriate incentives among staff after indicators have been laid down. Some indicators measure how strategy and policy processes perform as regards the protection of indigenous rights in relation to the production system. If actions are needed at the policy/strategy level, these should be pursued at the

highest level in the Ministry of Agriculture. When support is area-based, relevant local decision-making and management structures should be involved in analysing and monitoring information. Failures and successes in meeting indicators on IP-related actions should be highlighted.

The table below provides samples of IP-relevant indicators and means of verification at various LFA levels for typical components in the agriculture sector.

COMPONENT SUPPORT FOR AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION/ADVISORY SERVICES AND FARMERS TRAINING/ORGANISATIONS		
LFA levels	**Sample IP indicators**	**Sample means of verification**
Outcome 1. Agricultural organisations/staff capable of dealing with specific IP extension and organisational needs	1. % of field staff that are able and willing to address specific issues in relation to work with IPs	1. Staff performance assessments, interview with IP producers/ farmers
2. Extension and support provided in a way that allows IPs to participate and benefit according to their share of target group	2. % of IP farmers participating in field days/farmer schools are equivalent to proportion of IPs in the activity area concerned 2. Number of producers'/farmers' organisations that significantly address the production problems faced by IPs	2. Staff reports from field days/farmer schools 2. Survey of topics addressed by organisations
3. Farm model development and trials address the specific production conditions of IPs	3. Relative number of extension messages developed that supports the solution of specific IP production problems	3. Agricultural research institute reports, reports from extension departments, extension messages
Output 1. Staff training effectively addresses IP-relevant service delivery	1. Number of staff training exercises addressing service delivery to IPs	1. Reports from training institution
2. Extension and support improved in relation to areas and topics relevant to indigenous communities	2. Relative representation of indigenous persons among producers/farmers in programme-supported organisations	2. Survey of organisations, progress reports
3. Specific conditions for IP-relevant farming systems are clarified and included in trials and models	3. Relative number of models and farm trials that are dedicated to solving production problems specifically relevant to IPs	3. Agricultural research institute reports
Activity 1. Support capacity-building of service delivery organisations	1. Material for training in IP-relevant service delivery is utilised in staff training	1. Staff training material, progress reports
2. Support service delivery and on-site training	2. Number of field days undertaken where language, topic and site are relevant to IPs	2. Reports from agricultural extension department
3. Conduct farm trials and model development	3. Assessments of farm trials and model development include IP-relevant production issues	3. Reports from agricultural research institutes

COMPONENT SUPPORT FOR INSTITUTIONAL AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT		
LFA levels	**Sample IP indicators**	**Sample means of verification**
Outcome 1. Policies and strategies adequately address and support IP production systems	1. Indigenous farmers/producers view the developed strategies, policies and laws as supportive of their production systems	1. Interviews with IP representatives, producers or IPOs
2. Government agricultural departments adequately include IP production issues in their planning and implementation	2. Implementation records show X% increase in management activities in support of IP productions systems	2. Departmental records and progress reports
3. Management information used to detect specific circumstances related to IPs, including disaggregated data	3. Management information system established that can trace impact and outreach in relation to geographical areas and ethnic groups	3. Management information system
Output 1. Policy and strategy development processes address IP production systems and representation	1. Relative number of IP/producer representatives that actively participate in and influence the relevant policy process meetings	1. Proceedings and IP comments from policy formulation process
2. Institutional development plan that effectively integrates IP-relevant production issues	2. Number of management activities in support of IP productions systems reflected in department plans	2. Institutional development plan
3. Management information system that includes relevant IP production information	3. Development activities in relation to information management actively seek to address information on IP production systems	3. Management information system
Activity 1. Support strategy and policy development in government agricultural organisations	1. The design of strategy and policy development processes considers inclusion of IPOs and IP producer representatives	1. Process documents, progress reports
2. Support institutional strengthening	2. Existence of an agreed process for inclusion of IP-relevant activities in institutional development plan	2. Institutional development plan process document
3. Support information management	3. Existence of an agreed process for inclusion of IP-relevant information into management information system development	3. Management information system development plan
COMPONENT SUPPORT FOR AREA-BASED AGRICULTURAL AND NRM DEVELOPMENT		
LFA levels	**Sample IP indicators**	**Sample means of verification**
Outcome 1. Local support and decision-making structures work in support of IP production systems	1. Number of activities in support of IP production within the implementation of local authorities' development plan	1. Implementation records of local development and activity plans
2. Tenure arrangements increasingly promote IPs' right to land and resources	2. Number of land titles (private or community held) issued to IPs	2. Reports from agencies responsible for land titling
	2. Trend in instances of IPs loosing access to land or resources	2. Interviews with affected IPs

Output		
1. Improved capacity at local authority/organisation level to address development of IP production systems	1. IP producers represented in relevant decision-making processes, or when possible: IP decision-making structures participating on a par with other local structures in the process	1. Annual reports from local government authorities
2. Programme-supported tenure processes improved with regard to IPs' rights	2. Relative number of programme-supported cases or activities involving successful promotion of tenure for indigenous communities	2. Programme progress reports, interviews with IPOs and IP representatives
Activity		
1. Support decentralised capacity-building in relation to management of agricultural/NRM development	1. IP production relevant activities identified in the training needs and human resource development plans	1. Programme progress reports
2. Support land/resource tenure	2. Relative number of tenure activities dedicated to specific circumstances of IPs	2. Programme progress reports

IP indicators in the environment sector

Relevance of the sector to Danida's Strategy for IPs

Two recurring themes in Danida's environmental sector support, whether it be the Special Environmental Assistance (SEA) or general assistance, are of particular relevance to IP issues, namely: (a) overall support for national environmental policy, legislation and government capacity development, and (b) local community-based natural-resource management (CBNRM). Because IPs tend to be entirely dependent on natural resources for their subsistence, components addressing community-based natural-resource management are the most obviously relevant to IP monitoring. However, seemingly more remote national-level interventions may also impinge on IPs' rights, such as the development of biodiversity conservation policies (which may significantly affect IPs' right of use and territorial claims) or EIA capacity-building (which determines how, for instance, dam and road construction is planned and implemented in IP areas)[7].

Status of IP indicators in environmental sector programmes

A few components under the SEA and general assistance do incorporate local-level IP outputs, activities and indicators. In others, IPs are mentioned in the stakeholder analysis, sometimes with a description of special issues to be aware of during implementation. However, most programme and component documents in the sector do not contain specific IP indicators or distinguish between ethnic groups in the component design. As many environment programmes and components operate in multi-ethnic areas, this means that issues such as inter-ethnic natural-resource conflicts and differences in production systems may be overlooked, or that particular rights and use systems are neglected in the development of national policies and approaches.

Process towards indicator definition

Danida-sponsored environment programmes often address thorny issues of who owns and benefits from land and resources, and how spatial boundaries are defined (e.g. in support for protected areas). Moreover, myths and negative perceptions about IPs' resource use remain pervasive in many government agencies. In such a context, IPs' right to self-determination, land and resources (as stipulated in Danida's Strategy and ILO's Convention 169) can be particularly sensitive.

---

[7] See also the IP Tool Kit, section on Environment & Agriculture issues, Danida 2004

Consequently, the approach to developing IP indicators will need to be constructive, yet remain faithful to the IP Strategy. As in the other types of sector programme described here, a simple participatory process is recommended, involving a limited number of meetings between a limited number of stakeholders. Apart from the environmental authorities, these may include one or two relevant agricultural sector representatives, as well as IP representatives and specialists. The process could be based on a brief presentation of Danida's IP Strategy, subsequently building agreement on how to interpret this in the national context and environment sector concerned. It is crucial that the development of IP indicators be integrated into the general component-monitoring framework, to ensure a meaningful and cohesive monitoring process.

Actions to be taken on indicators

Many of the indicators suggested here can be measured through relatively simple reviews of documented outputs, data and process reporting produced within individual components. Whenever a large number of similar activities and outputs have been undertaken and produced, a well-founded selection of documentation may be sufficient (e.g. action plans and member lists produced by village NRM committees). Where doubt occurs, IPOs and IP specialists should be consulted. If time and resources allow, a simple arrangement can be applied in which IP representatives or specialists conduct regular reviews of documented outputs (e.g. once or twice yearly). The twin objectives of many CBNRM interventions may pose dilemmas in IP monitoring: a component may well be successful in meeting its conservation objectives, but be so at the expense of IPs' rights. In such situations, involvement of all relevant stakeholders in discussing and negotiating mitigating actions will be highly important, based on the principles outlined in the Strategy for Danish support to Indigenous Peoples.

The table below provides samples of IP-relevant indicators and means of verification at various LFA levels for typical components in the environment sector.

COMPONENT SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY-BASED NATURAL-RESOURCE MANAGEMENT		
LFA levels	**Sample IP indicators**	**Sample means of verification**
Outcome 1. IPs are able to represent their rights and interests in the local NRM decision-making process	1. No. of village NRM committees in IP areas with broad community representation and active participation of traditional leaders	1. Sample budgets, activity plans and membership lists for village NRM committees
2. Natural-resource conservation measures are implemented in a manner compatible with IPs' rights and livelihood development	2. No. of IP community members engaging in voluntary enforcement of local NR by-laws 2. No. of IP violations of local NR by-laws	2. Reports from local agencies responsible for NRM 2. Agency monitoring reports
3. IP natural-resource livelihood priorities implemented in IP areas	3. Trends in IP benefits from NRM related livelihood activities	3. Interviews with IPOs and IP representatives

Output		
1. Capacities improved for fair representation and participation in local decision-making structures	1. The set-up of village NRM committees has been based on the advice and approval of local IP representatives and specialists	1. Proceedings from IP hearings and Village NRM Committees formation
2. Compatibility between IP natural resource management strategies and conservation measures identified and promoted	2. Local by-laws on resource extraction reflect recommendations of IP representatives and specialists.	2. Progress reporting by staff
	2. No. of joint resource use agreements	2. Sample local by-laws
3. IP livelihood priorities identified and fairly assessed in local-level development/action plans	3. Programme supported local NRM business ventures have been subjected to assessment of social impact and IP safeguards	3. Programme progress reports Social Impact Assessments
Activity		
1. Facilitate development of participatory management structures	1. Process to facilitate local NRM decision-making has included mitigation of constraints to IP representation at all levels	1. Action plan from consultation process
2. Promote natural-resource protection measures	2. The Protected Area (PA) or forest zonation study has incorporated indigenous knowledge to assess sustainable off-take levels	2. Zonation study, programme progress report
3. Support NRM-related livelihoods (micro-project support etc)	3. Information activities regarding access to support on NRM-related livelihood activities are accessible to indigenous communities	3.Programme progress report

COMPONENT SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

LFA levels	Sample IP indicators	Sample means of verification
Outcome		
1. National environmental policy and legislation facilitate IPs' rights to land and natural resources	1. The environmental policy includes a special section on protection of IPs' territorial rights and intellectual property rights	1. Environmental policy document
2. Staff and environmental planning & management processes in government agencies are sensitive towards IPs' rights and needs	2. The National EIA guidelines require assessment of impact on IPs' rights/land	2. National EIA guidelines
	2. Management guidelines for various departments include directions on IP issues	2. Management guidelines from various departments
Output		
1. IP issues included in the process of developing policies and legislation	1. IP consultations and active participation of IPOs included in the consultative process	1. Plan from consultation process, proceedings from IP hearings and studies
2. Staff and institutional capacities to address IP issues improved	2. Relative no. of experts recruited for the EIA and other department with IP knowledge	2. Annual report from Ministry and Departments

Activity		
1. Support formulation of environmental policy and legislation	1. Steps to include IP issues in consultative process identified	1. Planning document for consultative process
2. Build capacity in government environmental planning & management	2. Training needs and HR development plan identify specific training needs on IP issues	2. Training needs assessment and HR development plan

7.   Methods of sector monitoring

Specifically IP-relevant issues are rarely considered as part of routine monitoring undertaken by the various government ministries/departments in the countries and sectors supported by Danida. As pointed out by the relevant UN organisations, data disaggregated by ethnicity is generally not collected. Accordingly, existing statistical systems are not very useful to IP-relevant monitoring. No specific system for or attempt at monitoring IP issues seems to be developed in any of the traditionally government-led sectors in Danida's programme countries. Indeed, in many places this is strongly discouraged for political reasons.

Further complicating the process, Danida is basically the only donor pursuing a specific strategy for indigenous peoples and requiring 'indigenous peoples' to feature as a particular cross-cutting issue. Therefore, unless there is a chance of supporting a process towards the various sector programmes taking IP issues and monitoring of these more seriously, IP monitoring is destined to remain a rather isolated undertaking confined to Danida-funded programmes.

Moreover, in most Danida-supported sector programmes (and in development assistance generally), IP monitoring is a novel concept. There is currently no mechanism and only limited experience of monitoring IP issues. Therefore, integration of IP monitoring at activity and output level, let alone at objective/outcome level, represents a challenge.

The practical advice and examples given in Chapter 6 above clearly set store by identifying indicators that call for participatory monitoring methods. In short, whenever possible, components or programmes should seek to establish participatory monitoring systems through direct and regular contact with representatives of the target group, all in the context of a continuous dialogue to be held between the various government departments and users/target groups. This would not only provide crucial qualitative views on the most significant changes in access to the benefits of interventions (which will include IP issues), but also facilitate essential exchanges between authorities and target groups.

As suggested above, the IP indicators suggested in this Note should be integrated into individual component's logframes as far as possible (rather than as a separate, parallel process) in order to ensure that Danida's IP Strategy is grounded in everyday implementation activities and management decisions. To avoid needless effort, the component design process should assess the need for IP monitoring in each context. The result of the assessment could be indicated in a simple "yes/no" tick-box similar to the system currently used by the WB and ADB. A "yes" would require inclusion of IP indicators in the component's logframe, and inclusion of IP monitoring results in component progress reports.

Regular IP monitoring at the programme level will consist partly of reporting from individual components, and partly of the sector reviews. In programmes addressing IP issues as a significant factor, the reviews should address the status and results of IP monitoring in the sector.

8.   Summary and conclusions

Monitoring and indicators concerning indigenous peoples in Danish bilateral assistance are based on the "Strategy for Danish Support to Indigenous Peoples" (May 2004). This strategy calls, at a general level, for monitoring changes in IPs' rights to self-determination. This is indeed very wide-ranging and not easily done. Thus, self-determination needs to be fleshed out in terms of more manageable aspects that can be monitored. Rights to land, resources, production systems, language, culture and institutions are relevant to look into in connection with self-determination. This is why this Note has discussed monitoring and indicator development related to these aspects in particular.

In the absence of internationally-defined goals, indicators and targets of direct relevance to IP issues, IP monitoring will have to be developed with only limited support from international monitoring processes. The MDGs are notable for not referring to IPs in any of the 8 goals or 48 indicators. However, within the UN system, efforts are being made to include IPs' rights-based indicators as subsets under the MDG indicators. Following this development might help to substantiate guidance on how to link IP monitoring in programmes to national and international processes.

National PRSPs rarely address IP-relevant issues explicitly, thus failing to operate with IP-relevant indicators. Indeed, IP indicators are mostly absent from national monitoring systems. This poses a major challenge. It limits the extent to which IP indicators can be developed in Danida-funded programmes if, at the same time, they must be owned by national institutions. This Note recommends that IP indicators be developed in a participatory manner for relevant Danida-funded sector programmes, while also making serious efforts to align with and feed directly into the PRS monitoring process. Clearly, without serious attempts at influencing national monitoring systems, IP monitoring will remain a rather isolated Danida undertaking. Nonetheless, if the Danish IP Strategy is to be taken seriously, it is essential that IP issues feature more prominently in monitoring across a range of sectors and countries.

This Note addresses such initial development of IP monitoring in a number of key sectors, providing a wide array of examples of indicators for the inspiration of those involved in developing, managing and supervising sector programmes.

Due to the built-in focus on rights in the various components of the good governance sector, incorporating IP indicators in the monitoring of components of good governance programmes is of obvious and particular importance. However, as sector stakeholders tend to have different perceptions of who is entitled to what rights, and of what 'successful' governance implies, a broad dialogue on IPs' rights is often indispensable in this sector. In particular, components concerning human rights, justice, and decentralisation need to explore the potential for IP monitoring. The proposed indicators are closely related to the participation of IPs, and to the recognition, at various levels, of specific issues facing IPs.

Evidently, the education sector is also of key importance to protect IPs' rights. Not least primary education has a crucial impact on the future of IPs. The proposed indicators seek to measure how the education system addresses indigenous children's specific needs for education. It includes indicators to monitor the advance of various aspects of bilingual and intercultural education.

In both the agriculture and the environment sectors, IP issues are crucial. This is often not recognised. However, given the heavy dependence of IPs on land and natural resources, components in these sectors, which deal with management of land and resources, impinge significantly on IPs' rights. Many of the indicators proposed relate to production system, tenure and decision-making bodies concerning land and resource management.

In all sectors, the promotion – at national as well as local levels – of awareness and information on IP issues is considered crucial for the further development of IP-relevant monitoring and for solutions to the serious problems for the future of IPs.

9.   Annexes

ANNEX 1: REFERENCES

ADB (2003) "Policy on Indigenous Peoples" Asian Development Bank, Manila 2003
http://www.adb.org/IndigenousPeoples/

ADB (2004) "Operations Manual Indigenous Peoples" Asian Development Bank, Manila 2004
http://www.adb.org/IndigenousPeoples/

ADB Planning requirements for IP settings. For examples see:
http://www.adb.org/IndigenousPeoples/plans.asp

Danida (2001) "Review Report: Strategy for Danish Support to Indigenous Peoples" Danida, September 2004

Danida (2003) "Partnership on Indigenous Peoples Rights and Sustainable Development: Workshop Report" Danida, March 2003

Danida (2004) "Annual Performance Report 2003", Danida May 2004

Danida (2004) "Draft Strategy for Danish Support to Indigenous Peoples" Danida 2004

Danida (2004) "Draft Tool Kit: Best practices for including indigenous peoples in sector programme support" Danida, August 2004

Danida (2004) "A short introduction to Performance Measurement in Danida Sector Programme Support" Danida, October 2004

Danida (2004) "Danida Support to Good Governance: Some Issues and Challenges Regarding Analysis and Planning" Danida Technical Advisory Services, October 2004

IFAD (2003) "Indigenous People and Sustainable Development" International Fund for Agricultural Development, Rome 2003
http://www.ifad.org/gbdocs/gc/26/e/ip.pdf

ILO (2003) "Convention on Indigenous Peoples and Tribal Peoples, 1989 (No. 169): A Manual" International Labour Organisation, Geneva 2003

http://www.ilo.org/public/english/standards/norm/egalite/itpp/convention/manual.pdf

IWGIA (2002) "Handbook: A Guide to Indigenous Peoples' Rights in the Inter-American Human Rights System" International Work Group on Indigenous Affairs, Copenhagen 2002

IWGIA (2003) "Strategy for IWGIA's Africa Programme: Draft", International Work Group on Indigenous Affairs, Copenhagen, December 2003

IWGIA (2004) "Indigenous People's Rights in Southern Africa" International Work Group on Indigenous Affairs, Copenhagen, 2004-12-17

KIVU (no date) "Worksheet: Checklist of Best Practices: Indigenous Peoples, Proponents, NGOs, and Governments" KIVU Nature Inc.
http://www.kivu.com

MRG (no date) "Minority and Indigenous Peoples' Rights in the MDGs", Minority Rights group International
http://www.minorityrights.org/admin/Download/pdf/AdvMDGBriefing.pdf

MRG (no date) "Indigenous Peoples and Poverty: The Cases of Bolivia, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua" Minority Rights Group International
http://www.minorityrights.org/Dev/mrg_dev_title12_LatinAmerica/mrg_dev_title12_LatinAmerica_index.htm

ODI (2003) Good Practice in the Development of PRSP Indicators and Monitoring Systems" ODI, July 2002 http://www.odi.org.uk/pppg/publications/working_papers/172.html

OECD-DAC (2004) "Action Plan on Managing for Development Results" OECD and others, Ferbruary 2004. This and other documentation on the "Marrakech Principles" can be found at:
http://www.mfdr.org/

UN (2003) "Indicators for Monitoring the Millennium Development Goals: Defintions, Rationale, Concepts and Sources" UN, New York 2003
http://www.developmentgoals.org/UNDG%20document_final.pdf

UN (1998) "How to measure the right to education: Indicators and their potential use by the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights" UN Economic and Social Council, 1998
http://www.bayefsky.com/general/e_c.12_1998_22.pdf

UN (2004) "Documents from the Workshop on Data Collection and Disaggregation for Indigenous Peoples" UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, 2004
http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/news/news_workshop_doc.htm

UN IASG (2004) "Draft Position Paper on the Millennium Development Goals" Inter Agency Support Group, UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, 2004. Preliminary statement at:
http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/links_unsystem/inter_agency_statement.htm

World Bank (2003) "Implementation of Operational Directive 4.20 on Indigenous Peoples: An Evaluation of Results" World Bank, April 2003 http://www.eldis.org/static/DOC11570.htm

World Bank (2004) "Participatory Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation System for Indigenous Peoples Projects: Methodological Guide to Implementing the System" Draft, June 2003

World Bank (2004) "Draft Operational Policy on Indigenous Peoples" Draft: OP 4.10, World Bank, December 2004
http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/ESSD/sdvext.nsf/63ByDocName/IndigenousPeoples

World Bank (2004) "PRSP Sourcebook" World Bank, December 2004
http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTPOVERTY/EXTPRS/0,,menuPK:384207~pagePK:149018~piPK:149093~theSitePK:384201,00.html

ANNEX 2:   IP INDICATORS AND APPROACH TO IP MONITORING IN INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

World Bank (WB). The WB policy on indigenous people is in the final stages of revision, and the new draft policy is available as Revised Draft Operational Policy on Indigenous Peoples (Revised Draft Operational Policy 4.10)[8]. An Indigenous Peoples Policy Guidebook to guide the implementation of the policy is likewise in the final stage of drafting[9]. The guidebook provides input to how monitoring in relation to IP can be arranged and presents samples of relevant indicators. Likewise, the WB is in the process of drafting a methodological guide to implementing "Participatory Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation System for Indigenous Peoples Projects"[10]. This guide will contain a range of information on various processes of IP monitoring and indicator development.

The WB policy for IPs is usually deployed in the context of major investment projects with potentially adverse impact on IP. All projects have to be screened in relation to IP issues, and depending on the level of impact, various instruments are required. In the case of direct impact on IP land, an 'Indigenous People Plan' is required. In the case of sector programme investments, an 'Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework' is needed. In both cases, specific activities in support of indigenous peoples are required. Continuous monitoring within the framework of a free, prior and informed consultation process is obligatory. It is recommended that a specific forum with strong IP representation be defined or established to take on the continuous consultation process. Monitoring of IP issues/rights shall preferably be undertaken by a body independent from the implementing agencies, and results shall be fed into the consultative forum. Various WB Indigenous People Plans provide examples of IP-relevant monitoring and indicators in specific context.

The Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). A revised 'Strategic Framework for Indigenous Development' and an 'Operational Policy on Indigenous People' are now available as drafts (profiles), and will be finalised early 2005[11]. The IDB expects to develop a number of guidelines/sourcebooks to support implementation of the policy. A fundamental aspect of IDB policy is that IPs should participate meaningfully in decision-making throughout the project cycle in any project affecting them. "Development with identity" is a strategic cornerstone of IDB, which means that indigenous definitions of poverty and well-being must be incorporated into project designs, and indicator development and monitoring must, to a large extent, be based on such indigenous definitions. The IDB considers breaking down data on poverty and development (MDG) by ethnic group as crucial in the development of proper monitoring of IP participation in the development process.

Asian Development Bank (ADB). Current ADB Policy on Indigenous People is from 1998, and the Operation Manual related to Indigenous People (OM section 53) dates back to 2000[12]. The procedures in the ADB resemble those of the WB. The ADB also requires consultation processes and 'Indigenous People Plans' when IPs are directly affected. The ADB specifies that independent monitoring capacities are usually needed to monitor implementation of Indigenous Peoples Plans when

---

[8] It can be downloaded from http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/ESSD/sdvext.nsf/63ByDocName/Policies

[9] The guidebook will be made available from the same link.

[10] Likely to become available from Social Development Unit, Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Department, Latin America and Caribbean Region

[11] Both documents can be found at http://www.iadb.org/sds/IND/site_401_e.htm

[12] Policy can be downloaded from http://www.adb.org/Documents/Policies/Indigenous_Peoples/ippp-008.asp and Operations Manual from http://www.adb.org/Documents/Manuals/Operations/om53.asp

institutions responsible for indigenous peoples have weak management records. Furthermore, it states that monitoring by representatives of indigenous peoples' organisations can be an efficient way for the project management to embrace the perspectives of indigenous beneficiaries. Experienced social-science professionals should be members of the monitoring units. Apart from the Policy and the Operations Manual, the ADB produces little material to guide IP monitoring and indicators. A number of IPP are useful for inspiration in terms of IP relevant indicators.

European Union (EU). EU policy on indigenous peoples was first formulated in 1998[13]. Since then, IPs have been a priority within the European Initiative for Human Rights and Democratization. The implementation of the longer-term goal of mainstreaming the concern for IPs at all levels of European development cooperation has been started, and incorporation of indigenous peoples' issues in the country cooperation strategies is ongoing. Not much of the EU's experiences of monitoring and indicators is currently being compiled, but eventually guidelines for implementation, including monitoring, are expected to be developed.

International Labour Organisation (ILO). The ILO Convention 169 is the only international legally binding instrument for the protection of indigenous rights. The Convention is a comprehensive instrument, covering a broad range of issues pertaining to IPs. It underlines the fundamental right of IPs to define their own priorities and to be consulted and fully participate in the development process. The convention has been ratified by Denmark and a number of Latin American countries, where it has been the basis for comprehensive constitutional reforms. A guide to the convention has been published[14]. Under the INDISCO initiative, a number of self-evaluations by IPs may inspire to develop monitoring systems and indicators. Likewise, guidelines for participatory project planning and evaluation provide relevant input on evaluation and development of indicators.[15]

United Nations Permanent Forum for Indigenous Issues (UNPFII). The Forum has identified data collection and dis-aggregation of data on indigenous people as a priority. Without data and indicators, it is difficult to document impacts on IPs, and therefore difficult to direct activities towards support for IPs. A process within the UN system is underway to facilitate the collection of more disaggregated data. UNPFII is developing methodologies for consultation processes. Information on this and the status of data dis-aggregation can be accessed at the UNPFII website[16]. Recommendations from UNFII and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights clearly point to the need for developing indicators that are rights-based (see ECOSOC 2003 and Kempf 2004)

---

[13] It can be downloaded from http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/human_rights/ip/
[14] It can be downloaded from http://www.ilo.org/public/english/indigenous/index.htm
[15] It can be downloaded from http://www.ilo.org/dyn/empent/docs/F111PUB1675_01/PUB1675_01.pdf
[16] http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/panels/freeprior_training.htm