

WWF Contribution to the Thematic Report of the UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

Introduction

Background and Content of this report

This report is WWF's contribution to the thematic report of the UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples on conservation and the promotion of the rights of Indigenous Peoples.¹ It draws on experiences and practice from offices and programmes across WWF's Network and identifies ongoing efforts and outstanding challenges for promoting the rights of Indigenous Peoples in conservation. The report briefly introduces WWF and then responds to the nine questions posed by the Special Rapporteur in her letter of 11 March 2016. A brief joint contribution will also be submitted by the Conservation Initiative on Human Rights of which WWF is a founding partner.

WWF in general

From its origins as a small group of committed wildlife enthusiasts, WWF has grown into one of the world's largest independent conservation organizations – supported by 6 million people and active in over 100 countries on five continents. Over the last fifty years, WWF's focus has evolved from localized efforts in favour of single species and individual habitats to an ambitious strategy to preserve biodiversity, share equitably the resources of our planet, and achieve sustainable development across the globe.

WWF is a network of independent and managed offices which share a mission, global objectives and the WWF brand. Our Mission is inherently intertwined with human wellbeing: *“To stop the degradation of the planet's natural environment and to build a future in which humans live in harmony with nature”*. The Network is not hierarchical; each independent office has its own Board and offices develop their own strategic plans. WWF International, the global Secretariat of the Network, unites and supports all offices to collectively drive conservation impact at scale in line with our Mission – this includes developing network policies, fostering global partnerships, coordinating international campaigns, and maintaining consistent standards. The WWF International Board (composed of internal and external members) and the Network Executive Team (composed of CEOs representing the WWF Network) represent the two key governance bodies for the WWF Network. The Network Executive Team engages with CEOs across the Network before taking decisions or making recommendations to the WWF International Board.

A new work programme, designed to achieve greater impact by concentrating resources on a limited set of large-scale challenges, will launch in July 2016. This will include a focus area on Governance of natural resources, including community rights and natural resource stewardship.

¹ This report has been developed by a special working group of the Social Development for Conservation (SD4C) Steering Group.

WWF and Indigenous Peoples

Indigenous Peoples (IP) are among the earth's most important stewards, as evidenced by the high degree of correspondence between the lands, waters and territories of indigenous peoples and the remaining high-biodiversity regions of the world. Many areas where WWF works are thus also home to Indigenous Peoples, tribal, rural and coastal communities whose livelihoods and cultures are intertwined with the natural environment.

WWF endeavours to work closely with multiple stakeholders to help ensure that development is inclusive and does not undermine the natural environment underpinning human well-being. During over five decades of conservation work, WWF has collaborated with many indigenous peoples and their organizations on activities such as conservation area management, sustainable use of natural resources and policy advocacy on issues of shared concern.

In many places, the conservation community and indigenous peoples are natural allies fighting for the common objective of strong and equitable stewardship of natural resources. WWF has seen that success often depends on building effective partnerships with civil society, IP organization and other actors to advocate for the rights of Indigenous Peoples in conservation and the implementation of the UNDRIP as well as on the natural resource governance frameworks in place, including the legal frameworks and the access and rights they confer.

The movement to address human rights, including indigenous rights, within conservation has gained strength since the 2003 World Parks Congress (WPC 2003), where the Conservation community acknowledged that the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities were still not adequately promoted and respected in conservation work. The conservation community has since adopted a number of resolutions through the World Conservation Congress.² Another important step was the creation in 2005 of the **Conservation Initiative on Human Rights (CIHR)**, a framework of principles by which the major international conservation organisations committed to improve their human rights practices, and to establish and promote best practices for the conservation community as a whole.³

The discussion below highlights examples where WWF has made progress towards these commitments and also some of the challenges that we have met or continue to face.

² Inter alia; WCC Resolution 1053, WCC res. 3055, WCC resolution 2056, WCC Resolution 4048, WCC Resolution 4052, WCC Resolution 2056.

³ CIHR partners include : Birdlife International, Conservation International, Fauna and Flora International, IUCN, The Nature Conservancy, Wetlands International, the Wildlife Conservation Society, and WWF.

Responses to the Special Rapporteur's questions on conservation and the rights of indigenous peoples

Q1: Has your organization adopted specific policies, guidelines and/or standards regarding the respect of indigenous peoples' rights? If so, could you please specify their contents? What steps have you taken internally to disseminate such policies, guidelines and/or standards among your staff, particularly those working on the ground on conservation projects at all levels?

Policies: WWF was the first major conservation organisation to formally recognize, in 1996, the rights of Indigenous Peoples to their traditional lands, territories and resources. Reviewed and revised in 2007 in consultation with Civil Society Organisations and Indigenous Peoples representatives, [WWF's Indigenous Peoples](#) policy includes principles around *inter alia* due diligence, respect of voluntary isolation, consultation, Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC), use of traditional knowledge and dispute resolution. Guidelines on '[Mainstreaming WWF Principles on Indigenous Peoples and Conservation in project and programme management](#)' were issued in 2008 outlining practical steps to mainstream these commitments.

As a founding member and partner in the CIHR, **WWF has committed more broadly to respect and promote internationally proclaimed human rights** as contained in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and other applicable instruments, and to support and promote human rights within conservation programs (See [CIHR](#)). Specifically WWF endorsed the two key instruments on Indigenous Peoples rights: the ILO Convention No 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries, and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).

WWF's Indigenous Peoples and Human rights policies are part of a **wider suite of social policies** also covering poverty and conservation (promoting pro-poor approaches) and gender. New guidelines on the Prevention of Restrictions of Rights and Involuntary Relocation & Resettlement of Indigenous Peoples, Tribal and Local Communities (RRR guidelines) are in the final stages of development. WWF also applies safeguard requirements as a GEF agency.

Policy Dissemination: WWF's broad and diverse Network -- with over 6000 staff across 100 countries and many working in remote locations and in a variety of languages -- creates a challenge for ensuring thorough dissemination and uptake of Network policies. Some of the steps taken to strengthen staff knowledge and learning, internal capacity, and external engagement to move these policies off the paper are listed below.

- **Expanding an internal community of practice to build awareness and capacity on social policy and Human Rights Based Approaches (HRBA).** WWF's Social Development for Conservation (SD4C) is a **self-organised community of practice**, established in 2009 and growing organically ever since. Working through regional hubs in Africa, Asia Pacific, LAC and Europe/North America covering over 50 offices and the International Secretariat, the SD4C works to build WWF's capacity and effective integration of social policies. SD4C focal points come from a variety of backgrounds, including the social sciences, and bring skills in **program design, implementation and monitoring, issue and policy analysis, policy advocacy, knowledge sharing and capacity**

building. The SD4C Steering Group helps ensure connectivity across regions and between local to global levels, builds a global vision for the WWF Network, and conducts joint pieces of work for the Network. It also maintains an **Intranet site and external pages** on panda.org/people where the social policies can be downloaded and where colleagues can share project information, academic articles, external reports, guidance, etc. SD4C has also worked with conservation strategy and performance colleagues to **embed WWF's social policies in WWF's voluntary programme and project standards**. In June 2014 the SD4C Steering Group drafted a **Social Development Action Plan to accelerate mainstreaming and integration of the social policies and enhance accountability and monitoring** of social dimensions of WWF work in all offices and programmes. The plan was agreed by WWF's Conservation Committee.

- **Translating policies into national and regional contexts.** All WWF social policies are available on WWF's internal and external sites in English, French and Spanish. In addition a number of offices have taken further steps to embed the policies in their national or regional context. In **Asia-Pacific** different offices have endorsed the Network social policies and some have translated them into national and local languages (e.g. **WWF Thailand**). Some offices have also developed specific, country-based guidance on the respect, engagement and partnership with IP that reflect legal conditions in the country and the degree of recognition IP enjoy. **WWF Indonesia**, for example, has developed **positions grounded in the legal and field reality** of IP in Indonesia such as upholding the rights of IP to continue to access resources for their wellbeing and cultural purposes including inside protected areas.⁴ WWF Indonesia also developed guidelines and principles of "*Community Empowerment*" where the respect of IP rights and advocacy work are key principles. **WWF India**, in collaboration with other Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), has developed a **field guide on implementation of the Forest Rights Act** that sets out the recognition and vesting rights of Tribal and forest dependent communities in forest areas. **WWF Chile** has translated and adapted WWF's *Mainstreaming Guidelines* to its regional context and **funds a staff position** to support colleagues with challenges around social issues. In **Africa**, SD4C is gaining momentum with **focal points in each country** to support mainstreaming across all country projects. The SD4C Africa hub includes a session on Social Policies in all its **training to raise staff awareness and knowledge**. While not all WWF offices are working or have worked with indigenous people as per the ILO definition, **all apply the same principles when working with marginalised communities** around conservation areas in priority landscapes who face the same challenges as Indigenous Peoples. **WWF Nordic offices** (Sweden, Norway, Finland) have begun drafting a document on the application of the Indigenous People's policy in the Sampi region.
- **Adopting relevant national, indigenous or third party policies and guidelines.** **WWF Paraguay** is using Paraguay's national guidelines for Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), the Indigenous People National Institute regulations, the Minister of Environment's environmental assessment and environmental services guidelines and the Indigenous People's Federation FPIC guidelines. **WWF Peru** has specific guidelines on engaging with IP (updated in 2013) which are part of the **introduction process for new employees and used by teams in the field**. In addition

⁴ See *Masyarakat Hukum Adat dan Konservasi* (2012) and on traditional use in protected areas *Pemanfaatan Tradisional Sumber Daya Alam untuk Kehidupan Masyarakat dan Konservasi* at http://www.wwf.or.id/program/inisiatif/social_development/.

to upholding WWF internal policies, **WWF Colombia works in accordance with the national legal and policy frameworks** regarding IPLC collective rights, and the policies and guidelines defined by IPLC organizations when establishing partnerships. In 2002, WWF Colombia defined an *“Ethical guide for action: set of principles to work with ethnic organizations”* in collaboration with indigenous and afro-Colombian organizations. **In Africa**, many WWF programmes promote the **Forest Stewardship Council principles**, criteria and generic indicators for Principle 3 on Indigenous Rights and Principle 4 on Community Relations and Workers’ Rights. In addition, **Kenya, South Africa, Tanzania and Uganda** are developing National Forest Stewardship Standards (NFSS) to domesticate the international FSC generic indicators, a process that treats IP as a special interest group. **WWF Canada** adheres to a WWF position which does not oppose indigenous hunting in the Arctic, unless best available knowledge shows that it threatens the local population of a species.

Q2: Has your organization put in place any mechanism to monitor the implementation of these policies, guidelines and/or standards? If so, could you please explain its functioning?

An SD4C survey in 2014 demonstrated that **many WWF offices monitor a suite of indicators at project and programme level to measure the social dimensions of their work**. Part of those comprise **specific indicators on indigenous peoples** such as strengthening Indigenous Community Based Forest Enterprises (CBFEs) in Priority Ecoregions in Latin America and Caribbean, Asia-Pacific and Africa; IP consultation processes; the ability of IP to negotiate collectively with companies; the number of hectares mapped and registered as IP territories; Number of community forests recognized; Number of coalitions and partnerships with IP; proper FPIC process conducted; Civil Society tools (capacity, level of engagement); and number of benefit-sharing schemes benefitting IP communities.

Developing practical **indicators to provide a global overview** across the WWF Network has been more challenging. An earlier attempt to include an indices on engagement with Indigenous Peoples in project reporting at global level did not provide meaningful and consistent information. WWF is now trialling a different approach developed over 18 months of discussion and pilot tests by a joint working group of SD4C and Results Based Management colleagues and currently in proof of concept stage in 8 countries. Part of WWF’s global monitoring of conservation outcomes and impact, this approach will use **three indicators of community natural resource governance -- Institutional Capacity, Resource Conflict, and Resource Access** -- to provide insight into the social aspects of WWF conservation work. The indicators will be assessed by WWF office presences, at the national scale, with respect to a set of approximately 20 local user groups selected to represent the community partners with which WWF works most closely. The guidelines encourage that indigenous peoples be represented as important user groups. It is envisaged that the indicators will enable WWF programmes to **adaptively manage how they engage and empower user groups and address their specific needs, inform higher-level policy and sectoral interventions, and highlight emerging global issues related to resource governance, partnerships, and drivers**.

SD4C regional hubs have also conducted **self-assessment surveys** on the mainstreaming of social policies and principles at programme level which have helped highlight gaps and inform capacity

building needs. In **Africa**, a **social policies compliance review tool**, endorsed by SD4C focal points in 2015, is being promoted across all offices to support internal evaluations of the progress each office is making in implementing the provisions of each WWF social policy. The WWF Coastal East Africa global initiative developed a **screening tool on gender, livelihoods and communities**. **WWF Indonesia** conducted a complete assessment of its work with Indigenous People.

Monitoring implementation at office project/programme level includes both quantitative and qualitative mechanisms. **WWF Paraguay** projects are designed to include social indicators that are then monitored regularly by field staff and monitoring team. WWF Paraguay is also an active **member of a key national commission** that monitors policies, guidelines, mechanisms and conflict management of indigenous communities related to issues in the Bi-Chamber National Congress Commission of Defense of Natural Resources (CONADERNA) and the National Commission on Climate Change (CNCC). The “Ethical guide for action” is a keystone to every collaborative agreement or Memorandum of understanding that **WWF Colombia** signs with Indigenous Peoples, afro-Colombian and peasant organizations: each of these agreements include a **follow-up mechanism and a monitoring committee**. The **WWF Forest and Climate** team have been supporting countries involved in Reducing Emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+) in the **development of safeguards information systems, benefit sharing systems and grievance mechanisms**. In addition, monitoring plans have been put in place to **ensure effective implementation of training and capacity building with Indigenous Peoples and to measure policy influence**. Examples of indicators used include: Number of provisions to address tenure/resource rights and FPIC and biodiversity values included in REDD+ initiatives in focal countries; Hectares under the management of indigenous and local communities in REDD initiatives; Number of civil society organizations and local communities trained in, and using, rigorous but practical tools for measuring; and Number of innovative revenue streams from benefit sharing mechanisms with potential to increase income for rural communities.

Q3. How does your organization promote your policies, guidelines and standards on the rights of indigenous peoples vis-à-vis governments and other civil society organizations with whom you work?

WWF’s engagement with government agencies, the private sector and civil society organizations to promote the rights of Indigenous Peoples **varies across the Network and is influenced by the political and legal context of Indigenous Peoples in each country**. In some countries, IP rights are challenged or not recognized or respected, while in others customary land and fishing rights and communal ownership are protected. In a small number of places, Indigenous Peoples have a very strong voice and conservation management decisions are made in consultation with them.

WWF’s work with government and other CSOs is also influenced by wider issues around the respect of civil and political rights and civil society action, for our own offices but also the wider CSO community. While WWF generally works frequently and well with government at all levels, the degree to which civil society enjoys an enabling space varies significantly across the Network. Civil society space and citizen participation are under threat in many countries where WWF works and

environmental rights defenders are among the most at risk as pressures around land use and natural resources increase, including indigenous environmental rights defenders.

These differences in civil society space and in the degree to which national and local context recognize IP rights and enable inclusive and equitable decision-making on natural resource use means no one approach fits all. Each WWF office needs to determine the most effective way to apply Network principles in its work with government and other CSOs. This diversity creates challenges for ensuring even implementation of our social policies and for aggregating results across different offices but also provides an ample variety of strategies and potential for learning. Some examples of WWF's work to promote the principles of our Indigenous policies with government, the private sector and CSO partners are provided below.

- **Building awareness and implementation of national laws.** In collaboration with CSO partners, **WWF India** developed a **field guide on how to implement the Forest Rights Act**. The Act is about recognising and vesting rights of Tribal and forest dependent communities in forest land. The guide has been translated into Hindi and shared with all field offices, CSO partners and relevant government offices. In the field, government officials are often not aware of the policies and guidelines related to IP therefore **awareness raising** is key. WWF has used the enabling provisions of the national Act to secure community tenure and access to forest resource use areas in Western Ghats-Nilgiri including for a particularly vulnerable tribe. Possibilities of using the enabling provisions in Satpura Maikal landscape are being explored.
- **Making Indigenous Rights a specific focus in conservation work:** Over the last five years **WWF Indonesia** has moved from including work with IP under conservation targets to making it a specific target itself **through the documentation, recognition and integration of Indigenous peoples and community territories and areas (ICCAs) in conservation landscapes and seascapes**. This is part of building stronger recognition of IP rights and more effective and equitable governance. In this work, WWF Indonesia is working directly with IP communities to provide technical support for **mapping of Indigenous territories, development of management plans and integration of important places for IP in existing government spatial plans** to safeguard their resources and rights. At national level, WWF Indonesia is a founding and active member of an advocacy coalition on ICCAs and IP rights in Protected Areas established in 2011 with other rights and environmental organizations, including the largest IP network (AMAN). As part of this coalition, specific **policy advocacy work is underway for the recognition of ICCAs** including advocating for stronger role and voice of IP in protected areas and influencing a new law on biodiversity and genetic resources.
- **Influencing policies in support of community tenure rights for land and access to resources and respect of IP rights.** In **Cambodia**, WWF works to support the **legalization** of community forestry, community protected areas and community fisheries which benefit the communities as a whole, including ethnic Khmers. In **Malaysia**, **WWF Malaysia's** conservation work pays attention to the rights of the local IP communities and specific efforts are directed towards securing the rights of IP in forestry concessions in Sarawak. In

Nepal, interventions on the ground advocate for local policies and practices to secure the rights over and access to natural resources with the leading examples of ecotourism and water management. **WWF Colombia** works to ensure that the government entities with whom they cooperate respect the IP's national legal framework. WWF Colombia also verifies that IP organisations that could be impacted by a project are aware of the process and that they are provided with the consultation process required. In **Mozambique**, Mozambican law does not give local communities exclusive access to their traditional fishing ground. Since 2008, WWF and partner organization CARE have been collaborating with communities and authorities to develop marine sanctuaries and design a fisheries management plan that works for people and nature.

- **Supporting the participation of indigenous leaders in key international events and high level political fora.** **WWF Paraguay** actively supported the participation of indigenous leaders from the *Federación por la Autodeterminación de los Pueblos Indígenas* (FAPI) at the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) 20th Conference of the Parties (COP 20) in Lima (2014). In addition, high authorities of FAPI and of the Ache People of the Indigenous Community, the *Koe Tuwy*, were part of the main speakers at the **WWF Paraguay** International Seminar on Forest and Climate Change. **WWF Indonesia** has also mobilized resources for IP representatives and leaders to attend COP10 to the Convention on Biological Diversity, in Nagoya (2010), the World Park Congress in Sydney (2014), COP UNFCCC in Paris (2015) and Indigenous Terra Madre in India (2015), while also supporting their membership in regional ICCAs events and networks. **WWF Colombia** also promotes and supports participation by Indigenous People and Local Community organisations in key processes at the subnational, national and international levels.
- **Bringing Indigenous Rights into collaborative work with other partners:** WWF has been working with national focal points, private sector companies, CSOs and academia to raise awareness on forest certification and support the development of national stewardship standards as beacons of best practices and reference points, including treatment of IP as special interest groups. **Uganda, Tanzania, DRC, Ghana** among others, are working on national standards. **WWF Thailand** provides financial support to a local NGO, *Seub Foundation*, to promote an ecological corridor in IP territory. *Seub Foundation* works on community-based forest management including participation of IP in conservation work.
- **Building rights into commodity standards: WWF's Market Transformation Initiative (MTI)** has been **lobbying to include Free, Prior and Informed consent (FPIC) in a range of voluntary standards for short commodities** (forestry, agriculture and seafood related commodities). The Forest Stewardship Council's (FSC), Aquaculture Stewardship Council (ASC), the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO), the Roundtable on Responsible Soy and genetically modified soy (RTRS). The latter has put three new criteria on respecting the rights, customs and culture of indigenous peoples forward for adoption at the next RTRS Assembly. These measures are complementary to legal protection, but also **engage the private sector on this issue which strengthens implementation on the ground**. The increase in FSC certification, doubling in the past 7 years to about 16% of production forests, documents progress for indigenous rights. Further, **WWF includes rights of local**

indigenous communities in due diligence research before signing agreements with companies. If question arise, WWF checks these and requires companies to provide assurances that indigenous rights will be respected.

Q4. Does your organization use established or ad hoc procedures for the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples in activities supported by your organization that affect them?

WWF's Indigenous Peoples policy states that "WWF will not promote or support, and may actively oppose, interventions which have not received the prior free and informed consent (FPIC) of affected indigenous communities, and/or would adversely impact – directly or indirectly – on the environment of indigenous peoples' territories, and/or would affect their rights". The WWF Mainstreaming document provides guidelines for the implementation of FPIC based on internationally agreed standards.

WWF is continuously guided by this principle and continues to work to ensure its practical implementation. Particular challenges occur where there are significant pragmatic challenges to FPIC procedures. These include situations where: national FPIC frameworks are lacking or conversely where different guidelines co-exist, the title/tenure of different groups is not recognised, marginalized groups are excluded or overshadowed in consultation processes or choose not to engage, and where protected areas boundaries were established in the past without FPIC procedures. Some examples of WWF's work to help advance FPIC procedures on the ground are provided below.

- **Multistakeholder initiative to harmonize FPIC procedures.** In August 2012, **WWF DRC**, with support from the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad), organised a workshop with local and international civil society leaders and private sector representatives to harmonize different FPIC guidelines in view of REDD+ FPIC protocol requirements. Through a participatory approach, the group also developed an FPIC questionnaire to enable REDD+ project managers in the field to tailor their efforts to the specific needs and criteria of each community. The workshop produced draft FPIC guidelines for the DRC which were then field tested with government agencies in the Mai Ndombe district in a total of five communities (Mopulenge and Tshuma, Lebo, Embeyu and Enkiu). A new harmonized document is now being developed. Key challenges are time and resources and issues regarding community tenure rights and gender have arisen.
- **Promoting formalisation of national FPIC requirements.** **WWF Cameroon** has been advocating over many years to formalise FPIC requirements and guidelines and has been working towards this objective with the government. Such a framework was issued for REDD+ projects in 2014 and WWF continues to advocate for FPIC application for all major development and infrastructure projects involving land occupied by local and indigenous peoples. This builds on earlier (1997-2002) multi-actor efforts to expand the formal requirement of a 30-day consultation period for protected area and other related zoning decisions into a two-phase, five-year programme on information sharing, participatory

mapping, and community capacity building prior to and overlapping with an extended consent and gazettal phase. **Lessons learned from these earlier consultation processes, however, underlined the important challenges in ensuring adequate voice and representation of the interests of the Baka.** WWF recognizes that consultation with indigenous/tribal groups must be a continuous process and we are working to ensure better representation of the Baka. In particular, WWF and a local NGO are facilitating direct agreements between indigenous Baka communities and the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife concerning all aspects of Baka use and access to Boumba-Bek National Park and other such agreements are in preparation for the Nki National Park and Lobéké National Park.

- **Improving and going beyond FPIC.** WWF Paraguay looked internally at how they apply FPIC in work with IP and the results of the evaluation were shared through information sessions with all WWF staff as well as a working session in the community with the IP involved. The evaluation showed that more is required in FPIC with IP, including providing **specific processes and details when Indigenous Peoples are included alongside peasant communities.** It also showed that the FPIC process is not enough: **on-going consultation and interaction is needed** with IP, whose communities, territories and natural resources are under pressure from illegal farming, logging, and charcoal production and deforestation and degradation. Continued consultation has been very useful for WWF Paraguay to understand important socio-economic and cultural considerations whilst proposing new resources management tools such as the creation of environmental services certificates (PSAs).
- **Capitalising on the existence of an enabling legal framework.** WWF Namibia has been able to build on an **enabling national legal framework** that grants use rights over wildlife to rural communities who have organized themselves as conservancies. The conservancy legislation and operational framework provide a structure for the provision of **technical support services directly and through local CSOs to conservancies,** including those predominantly comprised of San communities. The Nyae Nyae Conservancy, for example, was registered in 1998 and represents approximately 2300 people (predominantly Ju/'hoansi San) occupying an area of about 9000 km². It is managed through a locally elected Management Committee, which employs the Conservancy Manager, office administrative staff and Community Rangers, who are largely responsible for game and natural resource monitoring. The conservancy members participate in decision making over resource use, benefits distribution, etc. through community meetings. Community benefits generated through the conservancy include cash income from trophy hunting; game meat from trophy and own use hunting; employment by the conservancy as well as the conservancy joint venture private tour and / or hunting operators. Other local livelihood activities include veld food gathering, craft production and sales, natural plant products harvesting and sales, small scale livestock keeping and gardening, as well as employment and social grants through government services. Outstanding challenges are low literacy levels (high school dropout rate) and inadequate managerial skills that continue to hamper the ability of the community to optimise the full potential of their conservancy area.

Q5. Have you established a complaint mechanism which can be accessed by indigenous peoples in case of conflict or disagreement within the context of these activities?

A [Project Complaints Resolution Process \(PCRP\)](#) for the WWF Network was endorsed by WWF International's Board in 2015 to provide a channel for raising and resolving concerns related to the implementation of WWF social policies in our conservation work. The PCRP is intended to respond to concerns raised by stakeholders who may be affected by WWF-supported conservation activities. It was designed in the spirit of dialogue and conflict resolution and to serve as one channel to improve mutual understanding, strengthen WWF's accountability and provide a foundation for increased collaboration with other actors. The PCRP provides a **common, basic procedure** applicable across the Network; **offices are encouraged to adapt it to ensure it is effective in their national and local contexts.** WWF International and the SD4C regional hubs are currently co-hosting a series of **WebEx discussions for all offices to introduce the process and refresh staff knowledge on the social policies** themselves.

Additional mechanisms for receiving complaints have also been developed. WWF Canada has a complaint mechanism outlined on its website, which can be accessed by indigenous peoples and all other external stakeholders in case of conflict or disagreement. **WWF Paraguay** has established a **network of local NGOs in order to streamline any complaints** or conflicts related to projects that may originate in indigenous communities. **WWF Colombia's** "*Ethical guide for action*" provides guidance for timely and direct resolution of any conflict through direct discussion between affected parties and maintaining respectful language in front of third parties. In addition, one of the key achievements of **WWF Colombia** is the Citizen's Action Dialogue (CAC), designed to bring together communities and government agencies to discuss and find agreements. The CAC is a powerful participation mechanism based on the Constitution (1991) and includes three stages: preparation, negotiation and follow-up. "*This mechanism facilitates participation, conflict resolution and negotiation and provides an opportunity for communities to come up with proposals to face challenges, threats, based on civil rights and responsibilities*" (Empowering speech, 2014).

In practice, **complaints from indigenous communities are often voiced through direct interactions and conversation with WWF staff.** This can be effective when the relations established are strong and good trust exists. For example, the WWF **Living Amazon Initiative** manages conflict directly with Indigenous leaders or representatives both at regional and national level. A bureaucratic system for submitting complaints is experienced by some as a more colonial approach to issue resolution.

Q6. Indigenous peoples have their own worldviews and practices on how to live in harmony with nature, as well as traditional conservation practices and related customary laws. How are these integrated into your conservation policies and programs?

A number of WWF offices actively integrate traditional conservation practices and related customary laws in their conservation policies and programs:

- **Using customary laws, indigenous planning tools and participatory mapping.** In the northern eastern region of India, where large tracts of forests are the jurisdiction of

Indigenous Peoples, **WWF India** has worked to **leverage customary laws and traditional customary practices** towards improved forest and biodiversity protection. In **Indonesia** and elsewhere, WWF has supported mapping of territories and documentation of traditional regulations. This has been a critical step and an opportunity to conduct further FPIC – communities are informed of future interventions and have the rights to choose to engage or not. In **Colombia**, indigenous organisations have their own tools for planning and exercising of rights: **WWF Colombia capacity building addresses concepts and methodologies that will support these internal regulations and IP's territorial development.** **WWF Madagascar** promotes the concept of “dina”, which refers to a principle of community and traditional self-regulation, in the design and implementation of projects and programmes.

- **Funding support to IP sustainable development plans and visions.** In many places, local IP organizations enter **formal partnerships** with WWF if activities and interventions are in IP territories. These organisations are often the recipient of **grants and sub grants to conduct activities in their territories according to their aspirations and vision.** One example is the partnership of **WWF Indonesia** and **WWF Malaysia** with FORMADAT, the Alliance of the Indigenous Peoples of the Highlands of Borneo (an Equator Prize 2015 winner) to support their sustainable development and conservation vision for the Heart of Borneo at the border between Malaysia and Indonesia. This approach has become the model for integrating IP views, practices, traditions and aspirations in conservation policies and programs.
- **Collaborative management of Protected Areas:** In **Namibia**, institutional and technical support enabled the *Kwhe San* community to successfully **collaborate with the government in the management of the *Bwabwata National Park*, and to share in the socio-economic benefits from the park.** Nevertheless, the lack of control over “illegal” settlement in the park by communities moving into the park from neighbouring areas and the eroding of park resources remain challenging. There is the need to speed-up the signing of the MoU between the Ministry of Environment and Tourism and the *Kyaramacan Association* in order to secure the rights of the community, in accordance with the 2013 National Policy on Protected Areas, Neighbours and Resident Communities.
- **Supporting Indigenous organisations and development of indigenous REDD+.** **WWF Colombia** is supporting the Coordination of Indigenous Organizations of the Amazon River Basin (COICA), which represents 390 peoples with 2'779'479 inhabitants over 10,268,471 km² of the Amazon Basin, through nine national indigenous organizations. **WWF Colombia** also supports the Organisation of the Indigenous Peoples from the Colombian Amazon (OPIAC) to **develop and implement the Indigenous REDD+ approach in the Amazon**, namely *Proyectos REDD+ Indígena Amazónico* (RIA). RIA seeks to highlight the importance of the indigenous territories not only as carbon stocks but as **spaces that provide important ecosystems services and shelter spirituality, culture, identity, pride and future indigenous development.**
- **Protecting Indigenous traditions and livelihoods:** The indigenous Udege and **WWF Russia** have worked together to protect the core area of the Bikin forests from commercial logging

by using a public auction mechanism to win the Udege a 49-year lease of a 461,000 hectare region officially earmarked as a “Nut Harvesting Zone”. In these specially designated areas, the major resource use is the harvest of forest products; timber exploitation is limited by law. This is the first project in Russia to pass a special ethnological assessment which confirmed its **relevance to sustaining the traditional way of life of an indigenous group**. Both the Udege and WWF have a joint interest in protecting the Bikin forests, which are also home to one of the last populations of the endangered Amur tiger: for the Udege the Amur tiger is a sacred animal, while for environmentalists it is an iconic species and an indicator of the health of the wider ecosystem. Since April 2012, **the traditional knowledge and harvesting practices of the Udege have allowed their “Tribal Commune Tiger” association to cover all lease fees and costs** for the protection of the forest through their profits from the commercialization of non-timber forest products. The sales of carbon credits provide an additional source of income.

Q7. How are you working with States to ensure that they respect, protect, and fulfil indigenous peoples’ human rights when you collaborate with them to promote conservation? What are the challenges you face and the good practices you have in helping States adhere to their human rights obligations?

In addition to the opportunities and constraints for WWF in working with State actors outlined in question 3, the roles WWF offices play can be influenced by their status as a local NGO or an INGO acting as part of national civil society and the global CSO community. Some country offices are involved in policy advocacy and/or act as watchdogs in relation to governments and institutions, while others have mainly played the roles of technical advisors and programme managers. There are also important differences in terms of the legal status of offices in the countries where they are based which affect the roles any individual WWF office can play, for example:

- **Facilitation:** In some places, WWF has been asked, or has offered, to take on a facilitator role for building bridges between government and Indigenous Peoples. **WWF Nepal**, for example, has played an integral role as **mediator between government and communities in the development of REDD+, including conducting policy advocacy on the rights and participation of Indigenous Peoples at national level**. In this role, WWF Nepal has been able to create space for dialogue to bring in the community’s voice and institutionalised these communication channels while developing safeguards for the respect of Indigenous Peoples rights and participation in REDD+ to ensure that States do respect, protect and fulfil indigenous people’s human rights.
- **Policy advocacy:** In Indonesia, **WWF Indonesia** is currently engaged in an advocacy coalition to influence the revision of the biodiversity law for the recognition and protection of the rights and practices of Indigenous Peoples after the watershed Constitutional Court ruling in Indonesia that customary forest is not state forest (2013). The ruling opens the opportunity for Indigenous Peoples to have their territories recognized if mapped and documented, and after the districts and provincial governments have endorsed **local laws for the recognition and protection of IP rights**. WWF Indonesia is actively advocating with other CSOs for such

laws and schemes in at least 8 districts in Indonesia, especially in the Kalimantan region, where other forest tenure schemes like Hutan Desa (Village Forest) and Hutan Adat (Customary Forest) are also developed as mechanisms to secure stronger community rights.

- **Building Awareness, Capacity and Monitoring: WWF Nepal** is working with NGOs like NECIN, NEFIN (Nepal Federation of Indigenous Nationalities), and the government institution NEFDIN to **create awareness and develop capacity building especially on international instruments for IP**. Efforts are made to ensure that international provisions on IP are not violated in government policies such as National Forest Policy, GESI Strategy and Policy, Land Use policy, Wetlands policy, National Water Plan etc.
- **Contributions to international negotiations: WWF Paraguay** works with the Government of Paraguay, the Climate Action Network and the AILAC countries, to actively support the inclusion of indigenous rights in the preamble of the Paris Accords during the COP21. **WWF International** led the WWF Network's engagement in the Post-2015/Sustainable Development Goals intergovernmental negotiations, where WWF advocacy teams advocated for indigenous rights to natural resources. In the **Arctic**, WWF has attempted to convey the perspectives of Arctic indigenous peoples through participation in the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora & Fauna (CITES).
- **Supporting multistakeholder initiatives with government and IP engagement:** The Arctic Council has adopted ecosystem based management (EBM) as the management approach to protect and sustainably manage the Arctic marine environment at the circumpolar level. **WWF Canada** is producing a report and video that will be presented to the Arctic Council. This partnership involves stakeholders from Aboriginal, federal and territorial government bodies, industry and other interested parties and it abides by the requirements of the Inuvialuit Final Agreement, which was signed in 1984 after 10 years of negotiations. The Inuit Circumpolar Council has struck a special commission (Pikialasorsuaq Commission) to consult Inuit in both Canada and Greenland on the development of a shared Inuit vision of how to save the North Water Polynya - the world largest body of open water in the High Arctic. **WWF Canada** contributed funding in support of the establishment of this Commission and is holding workshops with Inuit leaders to support them collectively figuring out what type of management approach would be most appropriate. The findings will be released to the public in late 2016.
- **Supporting IP organisation recognition and project ownership.** In the DRC, a member of the PAP (Peuples Autochtones Pygmés) was employed by **WWF-DRC** to lead a programme of support to the PAP from 2009-2012. This programme raised awareness and helped **regroup and restructure the PAP to form a legally recognized entity**, which in turn facilitated the preparation of the national development plan for the DRC PAP financed by the World Bank. This programme also supported the production of more specific mapping of PAP distribution and their community lands in some cases. **Legal support** was also provided to help the PAP defend their rights. Financial, administrative, technical organisational support was provided to help the PAP put in a place a national democratic representation, which **unlocked World**

Bank funding to the PAP as the project owner and contracting authority (maître d’ouvrage) in 2014.

Examples of some of the **challenges** WWF offices have encountered in working with State actors are included here and additional challenges are discussed under Question 9.

- **WWF Madagascar** endeavours to work with the Malagasy government to promote good governance of natural resources for the implementation of legal and policy frameworks compatible with the sustainable use of resources. Nevertheless, a recurrent challenge are **governance gaps which have affected all spheres and levels of the public administration.**
- **WWF Central African Republic** and **WWF Cameroon** face many challenges in the revival and continuation of programmes that have been affected **by large reductions in international funding** in the wake of the global financial crisis, instability and war in the region. An additional challenge is that **fundraising for social programmes including those specifically for IP has historically been more difficult to obtain** than for “pure conservation” programmes.
- **WWF Colombia** works in close collaboration with the government advocating for the involvement of communities at an early stage of project and policies formulation. As part of this dialogue, they have promoted a bottom up approach for the development of national safeguards System for REDD+, participation in the development of the REDD+ strategy and the climate change policy and have developed legal analysis of the prior consultation for the development of REDD+ projects. Some of the challenges they have encountered relate to the **legal framework for the prior consultation, contradictions between government sectors and actors; the low capacity/number of public officials** with knowledge of indigenous/ethnic and collective rights; and the **high financial costs** tied to the inclusion and effective participation of indigenous peoples in Colombia particularly because of difficulties of access and communication.

Q8. What are the best practices and examples of progress in terms of respect for the rights of indigenous peoples in activities developed by your organizations of which I should be aware?

Examples of good practice have been included throughout the preceding sections and a few additional examples are provided here. WWF views its work to integrate our social policies in our conservation work – like our work on the physical and biological dimensions of conservation – as work in progress. We are eager to continue to improve and learn from others while sharing our own experiences.

- **WWF-DRC** has played an important role in **facilitation and negotiating space** opened by the REDD+ process that allows for communication between the state and local communities. This process has provided important insights into social dynamics and tenure conflict, including who owns the land and who should benefit from such conservation interventions. Gender inclusive processes have also been included, identifying and addressing barriers to women’s participation in these dialogues. This work has provided an important basis for

implementation of the recent community forestry decree and the development of a national policy regarding gender and community forest management. Community members also engaged in a **transparent, participatory micro-zoning process** to gain recognition for their land use and tenure. A total of 15 communities and a hundred community members have mapped their lands in this way to date, with many more due to participate in coming years. Starting in 2016, **communities will receive payments as rewards for protecting their forest in line with these micro-zoning plans.**

- **WWF Guyana** has been **building capacity for territorial governance and empowering indigenous peoples** to participate in the Guyana-Norway Agreement (GNA) Opt-In Mechanism. Guyana has the first national-scale payment for performance REDD+ system. Since the GNA's inception in 2009, a mechanism by which Guyana's indigenous communities could participate in the REDD+ was envisioned and the "opt-in" pathway has been anxiously anticipated. Guyana's Office of Climate Change and the Guyana REDD+ Investment Fund (GRIF) contracted WWF to pilot the mechanism based on our experience with community capacity development. WWF partnered with the North Rupununi District Development Board (NRDDB), an indigenous community organization, the Guyana Forestry Commission and the indigenous Wai Wai community of Kanashen **to develop a participatory monitoring system – community Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (CMRV) –** integrated with the national MRV system. Through CMRV, communities with titled lands have established systems to monitor their own resources, including forest cover and carbon content but also other resources important to them, such as water quality, biodiversity, fish and other wildlife stocks, timber, and non-timber forest products, in addition to criteria for measuring community well-being. **The active participation of local communities and the effective recognition of their rights over local natural resources are key components of this process.** The project has contributed toward building the capacity of Guyana's indigenous communities (owners of over 2 million hectares – more than two-thirds of titled indigenous lands) to make informed decisions about their resources and to become active participants in Guyana's carbon economy with the opportunity to opt in to REDD+. Community-based monitoring work is important in Guyana because it builds skills that are valuable to the communities for REDD+ and other natural resource conservation issues.
- In **Peru**, the preparation of a **dedicated funding mechanism to directly support indigenous peoples** in their efforts to protect the Peruvian Amazon through sustainable forest management **improved land tenure and governance as well as greater gender equality and inclusion.** In 2012, members of two national organizations representing Peruvian Amazonian indigenous peoples took part in the Dedicated Grant Mechanism (DGM), a special initiative of the World Bank's Forest Investment Program (FIP) **that places project design and funding decisions directly in the hands of indigenous peoples.** This led to a collaboration that culminated in the development of "Saweto, Living Memory," a DGM for Peru's Amazonian indigenous communities to be administered by **WWF-Peru** over five years. The DGM's name honors the Asheninka community of Saweto's ongoing fight to protect its forests from illegal logging—a fight that has cost some of its community leaders their lives and that exemplifies the larger struggle of all indigenous communities in the Peruvian Amazon. **The projects are intended to foster empowered, informed and inclusive engagement with forest issues, and**

to strengthen environmental and community governance and land tenure through titling and recognition of indigenous communities. The Saweto DGM will require authorities to live up to their legal and political commitments surrounding the governance of indigenous territories and international cooperation and adequate financial support.

- In the **Amazon**, WWF offices are developing an **Early Warning System to monitor threats to indigenous territories which aims to prevent escalation of conflict and prevent violation of human rights.** The system has two processes: first, the identification of threats by local IP organizations and second, the response to these threats. The observatory to monitor threats to indigenous territories is part of the Regional Strategy for the Conservation of Amazon Indigenous Territories and was identified as a need by the COICA.
- In **Indonesia**, WWF has successfully promoted **collaborative management principles in the management of national parks** by advocating the recognition of the rights of Indigenous Peoples in the Kayan Mentarang National Park since 1998 (KMNP became the first recognized National Park in Indonesia to be managed collaboratively in 2002). In addition, WWF has supported the mapping of Indigenous territories in Indonesia and ICCAs in Indonesia (at least 8 million hectares, and over 100'000 hectares of ICCAs) and facilitated the registration of at least 2 million hectares of IP territories. Moreover, in Papua, where development needs but also exploitation challenges are highest, WWF has successfully advocated for the adoption of the maps of “important places” of IP in the spatial and land use plans of three regencies/districts; this is an important spatial safeguard against aggressive forest and IP territory conversion by private sector and other players.
- Despite its cultural and environmental significance, **Colombia’s** Pacific region faces substantial threats from mining, illicit crop cultivation, illegal logging, livestock intensification, the expansion of agro-industrial cultivation, infrastructure. Scant economic resources, political turmoil, lack of environmental policies or governance, mismanagement of resources and possibilities for cooperation, and frequent conflicts also limit conservation opportunities and incentives. At the same time, independent carbon credit dealers and an onslaught of REDD+ initiatives are offering contracts to local communities, creating confusion and conflict around forest conservation. Facing this complex scenario, the Pacific region’s indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities have voiced their **concerns about possible REDD+ initiatives in the territory and the need to safeguard their rights.** **WWF-Colombia** and Colombia’s Patrimonio Natural (Fund for Biodiversity and Protected Areas) partnered with the Proceso de Comunidades Negras (PCN) y Agenda Común, an organization of Afro-Colombian groups, community councils and leaders. These organizations, in turn, formed alliances with the Latin American Institute for an Alternative Society and an Alternative Law (ILSA), the Bank Information Center (BIC), Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI), and the communities to **develop a set of safeguards that incorporate Afro-Colombian worldviews and perspectives, and protect the rights of Afro-Colombian people.** Through this participatory process, Afro-Colombian community leaders gained the knowledge and capacities needed to participate in REDD+ decision-making and defined a pathway to social and environmental REDD+ safeguards that reflect their needs and interests, and protect

their ancestral lands and rights. The process has helped ensure that their voices and perspectives are heard in the national REDD+ dialogue.

Q9 According to your view, what are the main challenges to ensure respect for the rights of indigenous peoples in the context of the conservation work you are doing? What could be done to further strengthen the protection and respect of the rights of indigenous peoples in your conservation work?

The preceding discussion has highlighted examples where WWF has been able to successfully work to promote the rights of Indigenous Peoples in our conservation work. At the same time, our own internal assessments tell us that we need to continue to make improvements based on lessons learned, including to deepen knowledge and capacity and to increase our ability to monitor our social impact. Some of the means we are pursuing or plan to build capacity and the consistency of our efforts are outlined below.

We also experience significant external challenges when seeking to combine conservation work with the protection of indigenous and local communities. We highlight some of these below and would welcome opportunities to collaborate with the Special Rapporteur, CIHR partners, indigenous and rights based organisations, governments and private sector partners to make effective progress on these in order to ensure respect and promotion of IP rights in conservation work. Some preliminary ideas are outlined below.

Some key **external challenges** include:

- **Weak enabling environments: lack of respect or abuse of rights and weak natural resource governance and corruption:** Some of the most challenging places for WWF's work are those where human and IP rights are not respected, unclear or contested, or even abused. In some areas, local governments may exclude IP in decision making or question IP special status. This is often coupled with weak rule of law and corruption which undermine equitable access and benefit sharing, participation, transparency and access to information and justice.
- **Aligning international commitments with national/local frameworks:** There are also often cases where key actors and stakeholders have conflicting interpretations on both the content of IP core rights and their application in specific situations, for example whether national/local legal frameworks specifically with regard to land provide or safeguard these rights, or situations where States do not confer ownership but only recognise and regulate access to, and use of, natural resources. In some cases, systems of concessions of land or natural resources to local populations have led to counter-productive effects where local political or economic elite captured the systems, marginalising targeted communities.
- **Challenges with regard to the implementation of FPIC:** In general, actors in the field still encounter many challenges with regard to the practical implementation of FPIC, such as determining exactly what constitutes prior information, what is an acceptable percentage of a population to be consulted in any given situation, lack of clarity on the representiveness of

the leadership of certain local groups, etc. There is also often a lack of awareness and understanding on how to conduct the proper FPIC process by state and non-state actors while IP communities are not always aware of their rights with regard to FPIC before development and conservation decisions concerning their communities, resources and territories are made. Timelines are often rushed, in particular when large commercial interests are competing for allocation of large tracts of land for agribusiness, logging or mining. WWF has taken important steps in applying safeguards and promoting IPs rights in working with private sector especially with aquaculture and pulp and paper, and provided input to FSC principles and RSPO standards. However, we see big challenges ahead with rising, unplanned land use change and encroachment on IP lands and territories, and the growing economic role of agribusiness and mining. This will require more systematic implementation and monitoring of proper and fair FPIC, as well as the fair benefit-sharing arising from the use of natural resources.

Some **suggestions** for making progress on these and other challenges include:

- **Practical Guidance and Multi-actor Collaboration.** While WWF offices are trying different approaches in these situations, such as raising awareness of national/international IP policies and guidelines with local officials, drafting Memoranda of Understanding with Government agencies that contain human rights provisions, supporting human rights training and Guidelines on Enforcement, etc. this a broader problem that extends beyond conservation. **Clear and practical guidance for state and non-state actors to ensure due diligence and best practice would help conservation actors address the challenges** encountered when working in areas where Indigenous Peoples' rights are not acknowledged or implemented by state partners. **Collaborative efforts among actors, including conservation organisations, Indigenous and rights based groups, donors, UN institutions including the OHCHR, and the private sector are needed to advocate for policy and legal frameworks that respect human rights.** Collaborative action is also needed to build the evidence base on the interlinkages between conservation activities and the fulfilment of Indigenous Peoples' rights and human rights in general. In this regard, we look forward to the work by the Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and Environment.
- **Supporting the voice of Indigenous Peoples.** Working in partnerships and coalitions with IP communities and organizations is a way to minimize the risk of large organisations, governments or businesses dominating the discussion and to establish more equitable relations. WWF is working to provide specific **support and capacity building to Indigenous Peoples** for territorial governance (including IP local knowledge) and to indigenous organizations to improve coordination between different organizational levels for more effective participation in decision making. We are also supporting the mapping and titling of IP territories and areas through advocacy work to enable national tenure and institutional frameworks and processes, including inclusive processes led by IP communities and organizations. Where IP rights recognition is low, WWF has seen that progress can also occur by building implicit recognition through enhanced consultative processes and outcomes gained for IP in conservation programmes: these can open avenues for more formal recognition in instruments such as management plans.

- **Contributing to the development of FPIC implementation:** WWF will continue to work to strengthen our application of FPIC mechanisms by building capacity and building consistent application in WWF projects including by partners or collaborators. **Partnerships between conservation, rights-based organisations, government agencies and human rights experts to build collective capacity and ensure that all actors in an area are “on the same page” on FPIC would be an effective way forward.** Experience has also shown that conducting regular programme assessments and participatory evaluations with affected communities is fundamental, particularly where indigenous/tribal populations (and women) occupy a marginalised position within the larger community.
- **Building knowledge and skills to address strengthen capacity to integrate IP rights:** While many WWF colleagues are actively working to integrate WWF social policies including on Indigenous Peoples, in parallel WWF is continuing to build capacity and awareness across different levels of staff. Staff turnover and internal transfers are a challenge for consistency. The **WWF Social Action Plan** targets inclusion of social principles in the project and programme design cycle, peer-to-peer support, design and monitoring tools, and better sharing of good practices as some of the paths to improving capacity.
- **Donor awareness and inclusive funding models:** While **stable funding** would contribute to steady progress, the absence of such funding represents a significant obstacle. Our regional internal assessments of social policy uptake in the Network identified typical conservation funding models – with rapid project proposal timelines and little donor support for institutional capacity building – as an important challenge to achieving project and programme designs that fully address indigenous issues. Rapid proposal timelines often mean there is insufficient time to do full inception phases. **A donor dialogue on funding models to support integration of human rights, indigenous rights and gender in conservation projects and programmes** would help move this forward. Donor requirements for due diligence could also help guide adequate internal budget allocations.
- **Monitoring social policy implementation:** As outlined above, many WWF offices track the social dimensions of their work, but this is not systematic across all offices. We are working to determine indicators at Network level that can guide WWF offices that are both cost- and time-efficient and that provide useful information. This is a shared challenge with other conservation organisations and the **CIHR has begun discussing ways to move the conservation community ahead.** New mechanisms, such as WWF’s Project Complaints Resolution Mechanism is an additional way to ground truth gaps in policy implementation and ensure rapid response where problems arise. The current design of WWF’s new work programme includes a set of social outcomes, which will also help institutionalise monitoring and accountability. **International guidelines and good practice examples** would also help guide individual institutional efforts.