

**ASIA REGIONAL PREPARATORY PROCESS
for the
5TH GLOBAL MEETING OF THE INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' FORUM
at IFAD, 2021**

Summary Report

Prepared By :

Dictaan – Bang-oa, Eleanor P.
Espanola, Ruby B.

Table of Contents

Contents	Page No.
A. Introduction to the Asia Process and The Asia Regional Meeting	3
B. Summary of the Meeting Proceedings	5
C. Summary of Discussion Points	8
D. Consolidated Regional Recommendations	15
Annex 1 : Summary of the South East Asia Subregional Consultation	
Annex 2 : Summary of The South Asia Subregional Consultation	29
Annex 3 : Summary of the Mekong Subregional Consultation	39
Annex 4 : Summary of the Consultation with IPAF-Asia Partners	46

**Asia Regional Preparatory Meeting for the 5th Global Meeting of the Indigenous Peoples Forum at IFAD:
The Value of Indigenous Food Systems, Resilience in the Context of COVID-19 Pandemic¹
November 26, 2020**

A. Introduction

The Asia Regional Preparatory Meeting for the 5th Global Meeting of the Indigenous Peoples’ Forum at IFAD was composed of three (3) subregional consultations and another one specifically for the IPAF-funded projects in the region. Lead by the members of the IPF Steering Committee, IFAD Rome and the Asia Regional IP Focal Point, in coordination with the Asia Indigenous Peoples’ Pact and Tebtebba with support from the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, these were all held virtually due to the current COVID-19 mitigation measures.

The subregional consultations were undertaken with a common program of activities². Aside from the discussions on the IFAD and the IPF, the IPAF consultation³ was more specific to project updates and concerns. All ten (10) projects in Asia were represented and they participated in the subregionals up to the regional meeting. They were joined by different IPOs, IP representatives from IFAD-funded projects, some NGOs working with IP communities, IFAD representatives from Rome, the subregional hubs and country offices. The table below provides the schedules and number of participants in the consultations. It is quite hard to disaggregate further due to the limited nature of the virtual platform.

Table 1: Consultations Towards the Asia Regional Preparatory Meeting :

Consultations	Date	Participants
Asia Regional Preparatory Meeting - Main Report	26 November 2020;	60 participants from 13 Asian countries representing IPOs, IPAF partners, IFAD-funded projects in (India, Indonesia, Nepal & Viet Nam), Mr. Nigel Brett, Director of IFAD Asia-Pacific Division, Mr. Alessandro Marini, IFAD Philippine Country Director and IFAD -Rome)

¹ See Attachment M1.

² See Attachment 3a, Annex 3.

³ See Attachment 4a, Annex 4.

South-East Asia (Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Timor Leste) Subregional Consultation - Annex 1	20 November 2020	37 (IPOs, IPAF Partners, IFAD- Funded Projects Philippines, Mr. Alessandro Marini, IFAD Philippine Country Director)
South Asia (Bangladesh, India, Nepal & Pakistan) Subregional Consultation - Annex 2	19 November 2020	49 (IPOs, IPAF partners, IFAD- Funded Projects in Nepal& India, Ms. Rasha Omar –SA Hub and India Director)
Mekong (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand & Vietnam) Subregional Consultation - Annex 3	18 November 2020	47 (IPOs, IPAF Partners, IFAD- Funded Projects in Cambodia and Vietnam, Mr. Thomas Rath – IFAD Mekong Hub; Mr. Meng Sakphouseth-Cambodia CPM, Mr. Nguyen Thanh Tung, Vietnam CPM, NGOs)
Consultation with IPAF Partners - Annex 4	17 November 2020	28 from 8 countries (IPAF partners, Mr. Mattia Prayer Galletti-IFAD, Steering Committee Members in Asia, Tebtebba)

Key results from the four (4) consultations were consolidated, presented, validated and finalized during the Asia Regional Preparatory Meeting for 5th IPF5 at IFAD. The main report presents a summary of the key points emerged from the Asia Preparatory Meeting for the 5th Global Meeting of Indigenous Peoples' Forum at IFAD. It is accompanied by brief accounts of the four consultations held prior to the meeting, noted here as Annexes 1 -4 based on the dates they were held. Also in the annexes are copies of the presentations and other details referred to in each report.

B. Summary of Proceedings

The Asia Regional Preparatory Meeting is the concluding event of the series of virtual consultations carried out to prepare for the 5th Global Meeting of the Indigenous Peoples Forum at IFAD. This regional meeting along with the sub-regional consultations in Mekong, South and Southeast Asia and the IPAF-Asia partners was organized “to ensure that indigenous peoples lead their own direct engagement and contribution in the preparation process for the Indigenous Peoples Forum at IFAD”. The virtual meetings and discussions, while embarking upon the theme “The value of indigenous food systems: resilience in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic”, were directed to gather the diversity of perspectives and recommendations from Indigenous Peoples in various countries in Asia where IFAD operates and track the progress on past agreements and commitments made in the past Indigenous Peoples Forum at IFAD.

Participating are a total of 60 participants⁴ from 13 countries representing indigenous peoples’ organizations and networks, IFAD and IPAF-financed projects and IFAD Rome, Asia-Pacific, subregional hubs and country offices. This meeting was jointly organized by the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP), Asia Regional Steering Committee of the Indigenous Peoples Forum, IFAD, International Work Group on Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) and Tebtebba. It was held virtually utilizing a combination of presentations followed by an open forum to reflect, clarify and respond to questions from the participants, country workgroups, plenary reporting and video screening.

The meeting opened with a keynote address from Mr. Nigel Brett, Director of the IFAD Asia-Pacific Division. He highlighted the vital contributions of indigenous peoples in biodiversity conservation resulting from their sustainable use and management of their land, territories and natural resources as he reiterated its significance in agriculture and food systems. He explained that IFAD’s engagement with indigenous peoples has been at full blast for more than a decade. This commitment to support self-driven development of indigenous peoples is manifested through several mechanisms established in IFAD i.e IPAF, or the dedicated small grants support for indigenous peoples, IFAD Policy of Engagement with Indigenous Peoples and the Indigenous Peoples’ Forum at IFAD. The concrete recommendations from the regional meetings are expected to lead to wider engagement of indigenous peoples with IFAD.

Mr. Lakpa Nuri, Environment Program Manager of AIPP, presented a summary⁵ of the series of consultations from November 17-20 to prepare for this Asia Regional Preparatory Meeting. In plenary, the consolidated recommendations related to the IPF theme from the subregional meetings were presented by Ms. Eleanor Dictaan- Bang-oa, Coordinator of Indigenous Women’s Programme of Tebtebba. To finalize these, the

⁴ Attachment M2

⁵ Attachment M3

session was opened for further discussions. The final key recommendations to the 5th IPF at IFAD, 2021 is captured in Table 3, Section D of this report.

Mr. Bashu Aryal, the Asia Regional IP Focal Person, presented the status of engagement of indigenous peoples with IFAD at the subregional and country levels⁶ Mr. Aryal pointed out the significant advancement relative to the location of IFAD projects. These has occurred in varying degrees in the areas of knowledge management, country strategy and project design, partnership and access to resources. The succeeding Section B is a summary of the discussion points related to the IFAD consolidated from the subregional and regional activities.

From the plenary discussion, participants worked by country to discuss and come up with three priority recommendations for engagement of indigenous peoples with IFAD at country level. The three priority recommendations presented by the country workgroups are contained in Table 4,Section D.

Mr. Mattia Prayer Galletti, Lead Technical Specialist, IFAD-Indigenous and Tribal Issues, linked the 5th IPF at IFAD to the Global Food Summit being planned later in 2021. He underlined the importance of grabbing this opportunity to engage and be part of the forthcoming event. A packet of recommendations related to the food system will be developed from the 5th IPF at IFAD to be forwarded to the said summit. Ms. Mai Thin Yumon, also the Regional Steering Committee member for the summit, mentioned that the five action tracks of the summit are the opportunities where indigenous peoples can engage. Ms. Pratima Gurung raised the inclusion of persons with disabilities in the Food Summit.

The introduction to the 5th Global Meeting of the IPF at IFAD included important announcements regarding the logistics of the event. The meeting is scheduled from February 2-3 and will be concluded on February 15. It will be held virtually because of the COVID-19 pandemic. The meeting includes preparation of the regional action plan. And there will be opportunities to interact with IFAD senior management and network with external partners.

Ms. Maithin announced the opening of nomination for regional members of the IPAF Board and Asia representatives to the Global Steering Committee of the Indigenous Peoples Forum at IFAD. The general criteria for the selection of IPAF Board Members and the list of previous members were presented⁷. Nomination is open until February 2021. Nominations with attached curriculum vitae can be sent directly to IFAD. The IPF Regional SC members can also receive nominations which they can forward to IFAD.

The criteria and qualifications for the members of the Global Steering Committee (GSC) of the Indigenous Peoples Forum at IFAD was also presented by Joan Carling and

⁶ Attachment M4.

⁷ Annex 4, p.49.

Mathia. It was stressed that members of the GSC need to devote time for this volunteer work and that there are a lot of responsibilities of being a member of the GSC. Based on the requisites provided, participants regrouped into South and Southeast Asia subregions to discuss and select among themselves the IPF RSC member. Mr. Pallab Chakma was elected from South Asia while Ms. Yun Mane, from South East Asia will continue her post as RSC Member. For the Asia youth representative to the GSC, there were only few indigenous youth representatives in the regional meeting so it was decided that Ms. Mai Thin will consult with youth leaders and representatives as soon as possible within the year. She remains eligible to another term as indigenous youth representative.

Before concluding, participants were introduced to IFAD IP Awards 2021– IFAD’s latest initiative for IP engagement. There are three categories where IPs and their organizations can apply i.e. : Best Performing IPAF-funded project, Best Performing IFAD-funded project and Best Performing Non-IFAD funded projects. There are eight (8) applicants in Asia i.e. 3 IPAF projects, 2 IFAD projects and 3 non-IFAD project. They were all invited to briefly present⁸ about their projects to the participants. The meeting decided that, AIPP will send to all participants the videos and a scoring sheet to enable voting after the meeting.

In conclusion, the Asia representatives to the GSC and Mr. Galleti expressed gratitude to everyone’s contribution. He acknowledged that there is still a gap in the dissemination of the IFAD Policy of Engagement with Indigenous Peoples and urged support from IPs through more active IP engagement towards making their voices heard. He recognized that a lot of work should be done in addressing issues related to access to land especially in relation to the prevailing food systems which is unsustainable.

⁸ Attachment M5

C. Summary Discussion Points

Table 2: Consolidated IFAD-Related Discussion Points from the Consultation with IPAF partners, Subregional and Regional Meetings

Comments, Observations and Questions	Responses from IFAD
IFAD Engagement with Indigenous peoples	
<p>*What is the level of engagement of IPs in the project implementation of IFAD-funded projects?</p> <p>*Why is IFAD not operating in Malaysia and Thailand?</p>	<p>Some have achieved 80% participation of indigenous peoples at the project level. The Mekong subregion has the highest number of participation. In South Asia, there are more indigenous peoples participating in India mostly in the North-East area. IFAD is measuring participation based on its proportionality to the population of indigenous peoples in the project area. This is a minimum standard.</p> <p>* Malaysia and Thailand are classified as middle high income countries. It is when countries are interested that IFAD comes in. IFAD however has operations in these countries because of the IPAF projects and proposals coming from IPOs.</p>
<p>How to encourage IPs to involve more in the project activities?</p>	<p>The policy enables or provides guidelines to be followed at the country level most important of which is the FPIC.</p> <p>In practice, country programs and Indigenous peoples organizations should be connected or dialogue to translate the policy into practice. Let's work in a parallel way : IFAD provide the guidelines to engage IPs in the COSOP and project processes and cycle. IPOs should network together and start dialogues with IFAD country programs which lasts for 6 years. Vietnam just finished their COSOP formulation but IPOs can still engage in the implementation and midterm process.</p>

<p>How can IFAD support indigenous peoples in the value chain?</p>	<p>IFAD can link with private sector, open a platform for value chain actors to provide opportunity for IPs to engage in the market.</p>
<p>IFAD financing are generally loans and accessible to big projects with high economic results. How can IPs, with small scale initiatives access/benefit from these loans?</p>	<p>Indigenous peoples are part of the work of IFAD. There are currently 64 projects engaging IPs over a total of 250 projects in the world. From these, there is a diverse range of 1 – 100% of the beneficiaries are IPs.</p> <p>Projects are decided with governments negotiated with ministry of finance. There is need to maximize impact and economic return of investments, thus, the tendency to target high economic zones; Almost 7M USD is directed to IPs across these global projects.</p> <p>IFAD projects provide grants to communities at a cost sharing arrangement and a poverty inclusion fund which subsidizes communities.</p>
<p>In Bangladesh, connection with the IFAD country team has been established and there is a planned virtual meeting. Does IFAD have any plan to organize a national policy dialogue with indigenous peoples, government and IFAD?</p>	<p>There were 2019 and 2018 discussions with the country team and Chakma Circle Chief Devashish Roy. Unfortunately, the country director left. The conversation will resume when a new country director is assigned.</p>
<p>IP traditional food is very healthy but there are no scientific studies to strengthen promotion and capture markets. How can IPs access IFAD to promote organic agriculture? These are initiatives on the ground that are effectively addressing health, livelihoods and climate change impacts and mitigation.</p>	<p>The significance of indigenous food and food systems have been acknowledged, thus the focus of the upcoming IPF at IFAD and the Global Food Summit. For the IPF will be specifically looking into the value of indigenous food system and resilience. A collective evidence from all regions is needed to push the message on the promotion of IP food systems forward.</p> <p>At the country level, IFAD have specific programs. If IFAD project areas are within IP areas (i.e Districts 1-5 in Nepal), interventions</p>

	<p>to this end can be included but it is important to link with the IFAD country offices in terms of project financing.</p> <p>Further, IFAD Nepal has work on IP food /culinary in 2021 and documentation of indigenous recipes.</p>
Is IFAD-Nepal coordinating with IPOs?	IFAD-Nepal has been engaging and coordinating with NEFIN and engaged more IPOs in the 2019 dialogue in collaboration with LAHURNIP.
<p>There is a higher prevalence of PWDs in IP communities due to malnutrition resulting to many impairments.</p> <p>Does IFAD have any strategy to integrate disability in its program? In relation to data, does it include PWDs in data disaggregation?</p>	<p>The aspect of disability is currently not included in IFAD operations. IFAD is now preparing for replenishment negotiation, where a strategy for disability can be included. If the prevalence is higher in IP communities, this will help push the agenda but will need IPO cooperation in terms of providing data.</p> <p>There is an initiative on disability using the Washington Group Questions on Disabilities. Nepal was selected as pilot country targeting Karnali and Lumbini areas. Currently, 500 households were surveyed with PWDs and disaggregation is ongoing.</p>
<p>Can IFAD support legalization of traditional liquor produced by IPs?</p> <p>Can IFAD support IPs to register patent rights to indigenous food and food processing knowledge?</p>	<p>IFAD cannot go against law nor undermine tradition and culture. The issue is not in the production but its consumption and impact (i.e alcohol abuse leading to domestic violence). There is a need to find a balance between the two.</p>
Access to finance resources for IPs in geographically isolated areas is a big challenge. We are doing work in partnership with state livelihood mission but there's still a lot more needed in this aspect. Is there any specific policy to address capacity building to enable access to	This can be better discussed with IFAD Country Program Managers. There is nothing that prevents capacity building in the context of the IFAD programs.

livelihood opportunities in IFAD projects?	
Can IFAD involve research organizations for innovative solutions as they have more capacity and human resources?	IFAD have existing partnerships with different stakeholders in different projects. Research institutions usually come in to look into where further investigation is needed. This should be included in the planning stage. The issue will be whether or not the initiative will be able to capture IP perspectives.
In terms of sustainability of IFAD projects, why not we move towards startups?	This event is one way of bridging the gap between IPOs and IFAD. Continue engaging especially at the country level to move forward the conversations. There should be follow up from here. There is a need to see how to continue the level of engagement with IFAD at the country level. This is a good exchange for now that can also be used as an opportunity to move forward.
Land is the basis of indigenous peoples' livelihoods and food systems. How can IFAD support land security for IPs (i.e facilitate registration of ancestral domains)?	The CHARMP Project in partnership with the Department of Agriculture in the Philippines is related to ancestral domains. We are still gathering lessons for possible engagement in the future on upland agriculture which overlaps with indigenous communities. For the time being in Mindanao, IFAD is ensuring FPIC is upheld for its projects in the area. The national law has no proactive stand on supporting indigenous peoples in securing CADTs. There is also a collaborative initiative with ILO regarding ancestral land titling in Mindanao, Philippines and initiatives on food with other UN agencies like the FAO.
Will IFAD also extend help to victims of calamities like typhoons and COVID19 pandemic as an approach to solve the crisis?	IFAD is not a humanitarian agency. Financial instruments are not flexible to emergency responses unless governments specifically request for it. There were special cases like the tsunami in Indonesia but this was very unique experience. IFAD can redirect part of the

	<p>funding to restore and rehabilitate in areas where it operates.</p> <p>The new realities under COVID-19 is part of the discussions related to the medium term economic recovery. In consultation with governments and local people, there is a need to ensure that the reality of COVID19 is taken into account in IFAD interventions.</p>
<p>How can IPs access IFAD resources/support?</p>	<p>IFAD's regular program is a program agreed with the government. The entry point for receiving IFAD support out of the regular program is to have the endorsements of the government in the preparation of country strategies where government and IFAD, in consultation with stakeholders, decide areas of interventions focused on IPs.</p> <p>IPAF is a limited funding that supports innovative projects to showcase good practices. The core of investment is in our regular programs which are negotiated with governments. <u>The issue is how can IPOs be part of the discussion in identifying the priorities where and when specific projects are designed. We need to have the IPOs to raise their voices and their own agenda in the COSOP formulation stage.</u> This is a commitment which Country Programme Managers can take to make sure IPs are not left out. In the Philippines we have a good partnership with farmers organizations.</p> <p>The entry point in negotiating any investment is through the Ministry of Finance who negotiates the COSOP. This is where strategic priority areas are defined including IFAD's priority areas for investment. The COSOP has a 6-years lifespan. Multistakeholder consultations</p>

	<p>are held to input into the design of specific programs and activities under the COSOP.</p> <p>It is important to make sure that IP perspectives, needs and demands are included in the design of the projects. Let's watch out for the schedules regarding the COSOP. This is an operational approach which is very welcome. Once information is confirmed, contact the country team/director to request that IPs be part of the consultation process.</p> <p>The IPF provides space for dialogue with IFAD towards a regional action plan. COVID-19 is important in relation to the engagement policy which we should input to the Regional Action Plans.</p>
<p>Most of the time IP traditional agricultural systems i.e. shifting cultivation is threatened by impacts of climate change and big agrobusinesses within IP territories. Available facilities set quite high standards for agricultural products and development of indigenous agriculture is usually not prioritized by governments. Can IFAD projects or governments put in place mechanisms to provide technical and finance support accessible to IPs in order for them to build their own seeds storage and market their organic products to improve income generation?</p>	<p>IFAD is gradually engaging with farmers' organizations. There should be a platform where indigenous peoples are represented as have been done in IFAD's farmer dialogues. Identify ways to involve people who can represent the voice of the indigenous peoples in the processes that already exist. Build partnership in the project at the local and national levels.</p>
<p>How are the recommendations accepted by the governing body integrated in the COSOPs? Are the COSOPs reflecting the IFAD Policy</p>	<p>The task of IFAD is to ensure that the policy is known and implemented. There are gaps in implementation which should not be taken for</p>

<p>of Engagement of Indigenous Peoples? IFAD is also engaging with other partners. Are these partners fully aware of the IFAD policy where they need to do consultations with IPs to obtain FPIC?</p>	<p>granted, thus, the need for more engagement. One of these is the recently approved action plan which calls for renewed effort to disseminate the IP policy. This is a point that needs to be addressed as IFAD engages different partners in new project areas.</p>
---	--

Observations about IFAD-funded projects

- Most of the IFAD fund goes to Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fishery and projects are focused on modern agriculture contrary to the capacity and need of indigenous communities.
- IFAD-funded projects on the national level through government agencies have little impact to local communities but projects supporting local communities proved that there are a lot of impacts to the livelihoods of local communities.
- At the operational level, IFAD engages other partners but it is not clear if they are aware of IFAD’s IP Policy. Quite a number of IFAD’s partners and government agencies are not aware of the policy.

Indigenous Peoples Assistance Facility (IPAF)

<p>IPAF is giving grants to all countries, but there is no project in Myanmar. Have there ever been a grant to IPOs in Myanmar? Indigenous peoples in Myanmar have many issues, their rights are not recognized.</p>	<p>The IPAF fund is for small projects whose ownership should be with indigenous peoples.</p>
--	---

<p>The support provided to IPOs is very small. Level of implementation is limited because the grant is small. We recommend to increase the grant so IPOs can work in synergy.</p>	<p>In terms of increase in funding of the IPAF, funding depends on the availability of resources. IFAD is mobilizing resources to provide small-scale funding through IPAF. The absorptive capacity of IPOs to manage funds is also considered in the IPAF grants.</p>
---	--

-

D. Recommendations

Indigenous Peoples raised the need to shift agricultural development and food security strategies from a commercial framework to protecting, promoting and giving premium to organic farming and support to indigenous farming and production systems i.e. shifting cultivation and rotational farming among others. Indigenous farming and production practices uphold the principles of biodiversity and resource conservation as can be gleaned from the fact that most of the remaining frontiers of biodiversity and natural resources are in IP territories. These are significant factors in sustaining indigenous food systems, food security, health and well-being of indigenous peoples and climate change mitigation in the long run. As a major global player in the agricultural front, the following recommendations are directed to IFAD as the Asia input to the 5th IPF at IFAD. Table 1 is the regional level recommendations consolidated from the different consultations and the regional meeting. Table 2 is a list of three (3) priority recommendations by IPs at the country level.

Table 3 : Key Recommendations to IFAD, Governments and Other Development Agencies Related to the Value of Indigenous Food Systems, Resilience in the Context of COVID-19 Pandemic, 5th IPF at IFAD .

<i>Productions Systems</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Support indigenous peoples traditional food production and livelihood systems (agriculture, livestock, fisheries, forest-based resources/NTFPs) through :<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Support to the production of indigenous food varieties and respect for the right of IPs to choose appropriate and acceptable varieties to plant/cultivate/raise especially basic food staples<ol style="list-style-type: none">i. wild honey, walnut, livestock and milk; wheat, pulses and vegetables (Bakarwals/Pakistan)ii. millet, ragi, mushrooms, local vegetables – Orissa;iii. rice (Phil)iv. wheat, barley, local vegetables and fruits, elephant yam, ghongi, moringa , chiuri- Nepal;b. Promote indigenous knowledge and practice on food and medicinals highlighting the roles of women and indigenous spirituality in ensuring food and well-being while facilitating intergenerational, intercultural exchange and climate change mitigation. These maybe done through<ol style="list-style-type: none">i. Seed and food exchanges;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Broaden current initiatives on documentation and promotion of indigenous recipes i.e. direct support to indigenous food/culinary fairs (ie. “we eat together”,IPAF-PASD Thailand) and an IP Food Festival during the IPF and the Global Food Summit being organized by the FAO; iii. Revival/retrieval of indigenous food crops and sources whether cultivate or not. c. Enhanced support to documentation, innovations and start- ups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Engage appropriate institutions/agencies i.e. research institutions to look into the improvement of traditional varieties towards food sufficiency.This, however, has to be done with the effective participation of IPs to ensure cultural, gender and other considerations are integrated. ii. Establish and operationalize platforms or centers for knowledge exchange across IP communities and to consider annual publications on indigenous food crops and products
<p>2. Invest on the enhancement of production systems and services i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. irrigation systems and the protection of watersheds; b. introduction and application of appropriate farming systems to ensure yield and diversity (i.e tunnel farming in Nepal enabled production of off-season vegetables,commanding better crop quality and prices) ; c. community collective farming (Cambodia, Indonesia).
<p>3. Enhance and ensure access to use of ICT for weather advisories, crop planning, pest and disease management, documentation and dissemination of best practices of youth farmers to strengthen resilience of food systems. (India)</p>
<p>4. Invest on the development and promotion of community seed banks (e.g HA/Cambodia, PASD/Thailand); establishment of food forest (Myanmar)</p>
<p>5. Support policy dialogues between IPs with local and national government agencies for sustainable production systems, organic farming and conservation and safeguard of indigenous seeds.</p>
<p>Post-harvest processing, Consumption and Marketing</p>
<p>6. Support development or provision of appropriate post – harvest technology.</p>
<p>7. Support farm to market infrastructure and facilities like farm to market roads, food banks and solar-powered cold storage facility , among others.</p>
<p>8. Support agricultural product development/enhance processing towards achieving market standards.</p>
<p>9. Support community-based social enterprises (i.e. fish; mussel and seaweed especially for Mukkuvar women in Tamil Nadu, India)</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. provide opportunities to build community capacities on entrepreneurship as a way to enhance livelihoods and generate local jobs/employment especially for displaced migrant workers and unemployed youth/productive sector; b. provide technical support in developing and implementing marketing plans
10. Support community cooperatives (Indonesia)
11. Provide free space to enable IP communities to sell their products.
12. Enhancing government support for marketing, linkages and participation in the value chains (i.e. government buying local products- Timor Leste; OPELIP – found good market for watermelon-India). Create or tap into markets and health-related initiatives, accessible to IPs, that put premium on organic food and products.
13. Enhanced market information and facilities drawing lessons from Aman’s <i>Aman-COVID</i> in Indonesia, <i>Marketplace</i> in Thailand and the <i>NPEMD-OTOP</i> experience in Vietnam which used online platforms and social media with consideration of language understandable to communities/grassroots.
14. Support and strengthen communities to develop and operationalize their Participatory Guarantee Systems.

Policy, Governance and Other Important Factors Affecting the Sustainability of IP Food Systems

<p>15. Ensure access to IP productive assets/lands and resources through :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Investment on the development and implementation of community-based forest protection and management plan and strategies for communities to effectively benefit from their Community Forest Certificates (Indonesia)(Philippines); b. Investment on the development of or implementation of defined needs in the Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plan (Philippines); c. Protection of natural food sources
<p>16. Effectively address threats to indigenous peoples’ food systems i.e. :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the criminalization of IP traditional livelihoods i.e. rotational agriculture (Thailand), swidden/shifting cultivation (Philippines and Indonesia); the revised Forest Rights Act(India); b. corporate/private intrusion and pollution of productive assets from industrial effluents i.e. mines (India/Philippines); monocrop plantations

<p>(Cambodia,Indonesia);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. promotion of inorganic farm inputs, high-yielding varieties and non-food crops (i.e. tobacco) as a state response to hunger and poverty; d. quarrying and other extractive industries and monocrop plantations which impact on the integrity and fertility of lands and resources that support indigenous food systems; e. tourism and privatization of lands and resources for tourism development which competes and impacts on indigenous food systems; f. impacts of climate change on IP food systems ; g. corporate/private capture of traditional food and medicinal sources through patent rights; h. impacts of different trade agreements that liberalizes the agricultural sector and threatens to divest IPs of their traditional seeds and control of their food systems i.e. the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTTP).
<p>17. IFAD to arrange dialogue with governments to discuss threats to sustainability of IP food systems.</p>
<p>18. Support the strengthening of IP governance systems on sustainable resource use to find balance between food sufficiency, livelihoods and environmental protection (INREMP Phil : provision of alternative livelihood sources to enhance forest conservation). This includes the documentation of customary law and governance for the interest of the youth.</p>
<p>19. Tap into the productive energies and skills of the youth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Encourage/mobilize/incentivize youth engagement in agriculture/fisheries/livestock-based activities as livelihoods or alternative occupations to prevent migration. b. Develop agricultural and allied social enterprises for IP communities especially for and with the youth.
<p>20. Create specific spaces to ensure effective engagement of indigenous women with IFAD and IFAD projects with due consideration of their specificities and marginalized positions as indigenous women.</p>
<p>21. Promote food security especially among women and children highlighting nutritional value of local food, safe production practice , access and availability.</p>
<p>22. Documentation of nutritional/medicinal value of traditional food and medicinals (i.e. support Sukhi and PASD initiatives)</p>
<p>23. Build capacities of IP communities to access IFAD extension services and finance</p>

resources.	
24. Specific needs of persons with disabilities should be addressed in food systems and responding to food security.	
Recommendations for the Advancement of IPAF	
IPAF is giving grants to all countries, but there is no project in Myanmar. Have there ever been a grant to IPOs in Myanmar? Indigenous peoples in Myanmar have many issues, their rights are not recognized.	The IPAF fund is for small projects whose ownership should be with indigenous peoples.
The support provided to IPOs is very small. Level of implementation is limited because the grant is small. We recommend to increase the grant so IPOs can work in synergy.	In terms of increase in funding of the IPAF, funding depends on the availability of resources. IFAD is mobilizing resources to provide small-scale funding through IPAF. The absorptive capacity of IPOs to manage funds is also considered in the IPAF grants.

Table 4 : Priority Recommendations to Advance the Engagement of Indigenous Peoples with IFAD at the Country Level

Bangladesh
1. IFAD Country Office to initiate and facilitate activities with IPs to enhance engagement.
2. Provide capacity building spaces specifically for IPs i.e. raising awareness on IFAD's Policy of Engagement with Indigenous Peoples.
3. Design project for livelihood development with and for IPs.
Cambodia
1. Organize orientation for indigenous peoples on IFAD and its work at the country level in coordination with the Ministry of Ethnic Minorities;
2. Effective implementation of the FPIC on any project and provide resources to enable full participation of IPs in the process.
3. Joint project with IFAD, government and indigenous peoples.
India
1. Invest in the revival and strengthening of indigenous food systems, documentation of indigenous knowledge and conservation of indigenous seeds through seed banks.
2. Support and build networks for the protection of land and resource rights of IPs, specifically the campaign against the recent 2019 amendment of India's Forest Rights Act, intrusion of development projects into IP lands resulting to all kinds of resource extraction and displacement;

3. Development of infrastructures for irrigation, safe drinking water, post harvest services and develop entrepreneurship to strengthen livelihoods especially among indigenous youth and women to livelihoods.
Indonesia
1. Facilitate or support networking/advocacy and/or partnerships to strengthen Indigenous Peoples' food systems, livelihoods and security consistent with local knowledge and culture.
2. Facilitate or support IP efforts to push for the recognition of customary forest and lands, as well as the reclamation of customary lands as part of the implementation of the agrarian reform and of the social forestry programmes of the Indonesian government.
3. Support programmes related to the advancement of indigenous food production systems by providing opportunities for indigenous and local communities to build their capacities to safeguard and develop livelihoods and local food.
Lao PDR
1. Capacity building in different areas and different sectors.
2. Provide income generation opportunities for indigenous peoples' communities especially women and youth.
3. Enhance information systems on markets, demand and supply as support to livelihoods and food security of indigenous communities.
Myanmar
1. Recognize rotational farming as a significant part of the IP food system and livelihood and provide enabling support for the registration of their lands including lands used for rotational farming.
2. Support the protection of traditional seeds in IFAD projects instead of the usual preference for high-yielding imported seeds;
3. To establish a resource center for IP Food production, livelihoods and marketing.
Nepal
1. Enhance engagement with IPs through wider consultations with IPOs at the provincial, local and central levels and providing the enabling conditions i.e. capacity building especially for women, PWDs and the youth, to ensure meaningful and holistic participation;
2. Invest in the conduct of intensive and specific study on IP food systems in relation to food security and the right to food. Results and information should be disseminated widely especially among IPs and relevant agencies;
3. Support and build on the institutionalization of the IP agenda in government;
Philippines
1. For IFAD to convene IPOs to inform them of its work, strategies and implementation including where and how IPs can engage. IP/participants in this meeting can provide list of IPOs and concerned IP communities/local organizations.
2. For IFAD to include IPs in activities it is organizing i.e. multi-stakeholder dialogues in relation to the COSOP and the knowledge learning market place that also serves as a space for policy dialogue;

<p>3. IFAD to support the advancement of land security for IPs. Land, food/agriculture and lives, including development initiatives are compromised without land security. Use the ongoing study on the CHARMP as a space for further discussion/engagement with IPOs/IP communities, including addressing the complicated issue of ancestral lands in the BARMM and Mindanao.</p>
<p>Pakistan</p>
<p>1. IPs representatives must be involved at the development stage of IFAD projects.</p>
<p>2. Reports of the projects should be shared with the IFAD country office.</p>
<p>3. Develop a communication plan that ensures appropriate and timely information reaches IPOs and communities.</p>
<p>Vietnam</p>
<p>1. Support education of youth and children specially on IP's natural resource management systems and culture, including community initiatives on this regard;</p>
<p>2. Support women by introducing /linking their products to the markets;</p>
<p>3. Acknowledge, recognize and promote the use of IP knowledge in biodiversity protection, climate change mitigation, medicinals and protect the resources that sustain it;</p>

Annex 1
SOUTH EAST ASIA SUBREGIONAL CONSULTATION
20 November 2020

Executive Summary Report

The South-East Asia Meeting is one of the series of meetings leading to the Asia Regional Preparatory Meeting for the Indigenous Peoples Forum at IFAD (IPF-IFAD) in 2021. It was attended by 37 representatives of indigenous peoples organizations and IPAF beneficiaries in Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines and Timor Leste (see Attachment 1a). Other participants are representatives from, the IFAD-funded projects and IPAF-RIPO from the Philippines, IFAD country, regional and Rome offices.

The meeting started with a welcome and overview of the program by Ms. Maithin Yumon , member of the Regional Steering Committee of the IPF-IFAD. She then proceeded to introduce Ms. Joan Carling, also a member of the IPF Steering Committee. Ms. Carling introduced the IPF, its functions, the concept of the 5th IPF in 2021 and how the subregional meeting is linked to the regional preparatory meeting leading to the IPF. Participants were then briefed on the “Advances in the implementation of IFAD and Indigenous Peoples policies” by Mr. Mattia Prayer Galleti, IP Focal Point-IFAD. He discussed IFAD’s Policy of Engagement with Indigenous Peoples with emphasis on the nine (9) principles of engagement, and how these are operationalized through the IPF and its funding facility, the IPAF and the latest IFAD Awards for Indigenous Peoples, among others⁹.

The sesión on “Progress in achievement of the regional action plan formed at last global meeting”, was lead by Mr. Bashu Aryal, IP-Regional Focal Point who discussed how IFAD is cascading the policy at the regional and country levels (see Attachment 1b). A plenary session for clarification and questions on the three (3) presentations from the participants. The Table 1, Section B below summarizes the questions and points for clarification raised by participants and the corresponding responses.

Participants were introduced to the Indigenous Peoples Assistance Facility (IPAF) by Ms. Ruby Espanola – the IPAF focal person in Tebtebba (see Attachment 4c, Annex 4). Tebtebba serves as the Regional Co-Manager for Asia and Pacific since the IPAF 3rd Cycle. Two partners were invited to provide a briefing on their projects. Ms. Suharsi of SATUNAMA Foundation in Indonesia presented briefly on the current results of the “Local Value Strenthening in Village and Indigenous Forest Community – Based Management in Merangin District, Jambi, Indonesia” project (see Attachment 1c). This was followed by Ms. Aisah Mariano of the Asia Young Indigenous Peoples Network working on the “Dap-ayan Village : Intergenerational Learning by Doing” project in the Philippines (see Attachment 1d).

⁹ <https://bit.ly/2TyqdIg>

With some time left from the session, IWGIA's video¹⁰ on IP engagement at IFAD was shared. Ms. Carling underscored the need to advance IP engagement not only in Rome but also at the local and country levels where the difference is felt.

From here, the participants proceeded to the country break-out groups to further discuss good practices, challenges, opportunities and recommendations in relation to indigenous food systems in the context of the COVID – 19 pandemic. Table 2, Section C reflects their discussions as reported in the plenary.

Before the closing, Mr. Galleti presented the Indigenous Peoples Award – the latest initiative from IFAD. Ms. Carling followed with information on the selection of the IPAF Board Member and IPF Steering Committee member from the región. She discussed the roles, functions and criteria for these regional members with a note that the selection will be done during the regional consultation.

In closing, Mr. Galleti reiterated that this consultation is a step in the process to the regional and global meetings including the possibility to have country level discussions with IFAD country teams. It is important that these discussions are reported back. This is also useful for us at IFAD to be able to explain how IFAD operates.

In relation to COVID -19, experiences show that the pandemic has provided an opportunity to go back in realizing the importance of traditional food and traditional economies that makes IPs independent from the market. Dependence on the market, can otherwise, make IPs more vulnerable.

-
- ¹⁰ Videos accessible at : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KZVsx6oQQwg&feature=youtu.be> (short version--7 mins and half long)
 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HQYOecOHhFk&feature=youtu.be> (long version-21 minutes and half long)

B. Summary of Discussion Points in Relation to IFAD

Table 1 : Summary of Discussion Points

<i>Questions and Points for Clarification from Participants</i>	<i>Responses from IFAD Team</i>
<p>Land is the basis of IP livelihoods and food systems. How can IFAD help in the struggle of IPs to secure their lands?</p>	<p>The CHARMP Project in partnership with the Department of Agriculture in the Philippines is related to ancestral domains. We are still gathering lessons for possible engagement in the future on upland agriculture. National law has no proactive stand on supporting CADTs. At the moment, IFAD is ensuring FPIC for its projects.</p> <p>There is also a collaborative initiative with ILO ancestral land titling and the FAO on food.</p>
<p>What does IFAD have in support to mitigating the impacts of COVID-19?</p>	<p>IFAD is not a humanitarian agency. Financial instruments are not flexible to emergency responses unless governments specifically request for it. The new realities under COVID-19 is part of the discussions related to the médium term economic recovery in consultaion with governments. The IPF provides a space for dialogue with IFAD towards a regional action plan. COVID-19 is important in relation to the engagement policy which we should input to the regional action plans.</p>
	<p>IPAF funding very small but is in the core programs negotiated with governments. For inclusión and Access to IFAD proojects, it is important that IP voices and agenda are raised and heard at the COSOP formulation stage. There are stakeholders consultations to input into the COSOP which is designed with governments through the Ministry of Finance. These is where strategic priority áreas are defined including IFAD's priority áreas for investment.</p>
<p>How do you assess the acceptance of the recommendations by the IFAD Executive Board and it integration in the COSOP? At the operational level, for example, IFAD engages other partners but it is not clear if they are aware of IFAD's IP Policy.</p>	<p>The task is to ensure that the policy is known and implemented. There are gaps in implementaion which should not be taken for granted, thus, the need for more engagement. One of these is the recently approved action plan which calls for renewed effort to disseminate the IP policy.</p>

C. Results and Recommendations from the Country Workgroups

Table 2: Country Workgroups Results

Q1 : Identify and discuss the good practices of indigenous peoples' food systems and livelihoods during the COVID 19 Pandemic	Q2: Identify and discuss the challenges that indigenous peoples and their livelihoods face during COVID 19	Q3 : Identify and discuss the opportunities for strengthening good practice as sustainable solutions for the future, and how can IFAD support these practices
Indonesia and Timor Leste		
<p>In response to food supply in the time of COVID-19, IPs have tapped into their traditional agricultural practices and food sources (i.e forest and waters) that are diverse and independent from the market system.</p> <p>These agricultural and food systems are complimented by medicinal knowledge, social and spiritual values.</p> <p>Adaptation and Revitalization of the <i>Tolak Bala (Balala)</i> traditional ritual for community protection from misfortune and in the context of the pandemic, to prevent the plague or virus from entering the community. This ritual includes the preparation of traditional medicinals from local sources .These are believed to strengthen resistance against diseases.</p> <p>The <i>gotong royong</i> for example is a community self-help mechanism that effectively responded to food shortage among community members especially in the first 3 months of the pandemic.</p> <p>The importance of indigenous knowledge on wild/uncultivated</p>	<p>Lack of timely and appropriate information about COVID 19 and the imposition of the 'new normal' without readiness. This has resulted the influx into the communities from outside putting communities at higher health and environment risks.</p> <p>Decreased family incomes due to a) The adoption of monoculture by some IPs as an income source. Depending on the product, some found that their products had temporarily no market during the pandemic; b) The value of local commodities falls. For example pepper, previously 80 thousand / kg, now under 20 thousand. c) People depending on employment were either displaced from their jobs, thus the increase in unemployment; d) continuing ban on traditional farming practices (opening fields by burning) limiting food production during COVID 19.</p> <p>Lack of community capacity to manage forest and natural resources even if already</p>	<p>1) Support the protection of indigenous farming practices by putting resources into :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ sustaining food and livelihoods of IPs; ➤ appropriate capacity building activities; ➤ enhanced agricultural services and facilities including linkage and Access to market <p>2) Support community cooperatives.</p>

<p>food sources and medicinals and the roles of women and youth in all these community mitigating activities are relevant in ensuring community resistance.</p> <p>There was also an observed 60 – 80% Increased frequency of traditional farming practices (rotational farming, shifting cultivation) which ensure crop diversity. In this regard, food barns were enhanced with increased food stocks.</p> <p>While other rites and rituals had to be performed without the traditionally expected mass gathering, community solidarity was strengthened through the sharing of government aid especially to the poor and community COVID Teams were organized. In Timor Leste, government had been buying community products.</p>	<p>awarde their Customary Forest Certificates.</p> <p>Intrusion of logging and mining companies into IP lands despite the pandemic.</p>	
--	---	--

Malaysia

<p>Seed exchange among neighbors and communities;</p> <p>There was an observed revitalization of traditional medicine benefitting youth /knowledge transfer;</p> <p>Knowledge of food from forests also significantly contributed to preventing hunger in lockdown situations;</p>	<p>Inaccessibility of health services i.e in most cases, hospitals are 6 hours travel from the communities;</p> <p>The economic disruption resulting from the mitigating measures has meant loss of income and markets, contributing to alcoholism and depression. This situation has increased pressure and burden on women.</p> <p>An added pressure for women is the access to continuing education of children and youth in the light of the new normal. The</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government need to recognize, engage and support IP organizations in Malaysia that can help in the grassroot and implement IFAD strategies • Supporting traditional farming practices i.e research on how to increase productivity/yield • Supporting traditional resource management and practices through documentation and recognition
--	--	---

	<p>digital divide is emphasized where internet is inaccessible even if IP communities are just 15 minutes away from where it is accesible.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting activities which encourage intergenerational knowledge transfer; • Devise a marketing strategy that will allow better access to markets.
<i>Philippines</i>		
<p>IP food system is based on traditional sustainable systems and accepted as sustainable livelihood. These systems also contribute to climate change mitigation. Those practicing these are more resilient compared to those who shifted to commercial production;</p> <p>Most IPs are growing their own staple food, thus, not dependent on the market. While lockdowns restricted access to markets but there were alternative food sources from the territories. Some communities did not even access relief packages.</p> <p>For those who were able to access the government’s relief services, women took a frontline role by distributing the packages and clean –up drives; men engaged in food for work schemes.</p> <p>Local government units facilitated food product exchange among communities and provinces.</p> <p>Backyard gardening during the lockdown have also become an alternative food source while serving as physical exercise. There were also cases of gardening in unused</p>	<p>CHARMP 2 project focused on agricultural infrastructure and promotion of cash crop production for livelihoods. What is important in the área, however, is rice sufficiency especially in the context of the growing population.</p> <p>Access to appropriate and timely services including markets for products.</p> <p>Need to look into crop diversification and organic markets. In Bukidnon, ventures into cut flower production incurred losses not only because these are non-essentials in the time of pandemic but also due to oversupply and supply restrictions. The same is true with the flower and vegetables producers in Northern Philippines.</p> <p>On the positive side, the importance of food production aside from cash crops is a clear lesson that should inform resilience strategies.</p>	<p>1. Support IPs in securing their rights to lands and the resources therein.</p> <p>a) provide financial resources to enable IPs to advance the processing of their tenurial instruments (i.e CADT in the Philippines) ;</p> <p>b) invest in community-determined development priorities (i.e the Ancestral Domains Sustainable Development and Protection Plan /ADSDPP, Philippines)</p> <p>c)Support community-based forest protection programs</p> <p>2. Support IP food sovereignty by :</p> <p>a) recognition and protection of indigenous agricultural systems. Support innovations and IP knowledge that allows farming without too much pressure on the environment instead of criminalizing traditional systems.</p> <p>b) ensure full and effective implementation of FPIC regarding introduction of agricultural technology. There is a tendency for big</p>

<p>cooperative properties. IP communities who shifted to tourism have gone back to work on their abandoned farms.</p> <p>Teduray have the Sulagad System – a system that ensures food security while sustaining land and resources. The pandemic is a sign that nature is already weak and cannot provide so there is need to revive sustainable farming .</p> <p>Rituals have also been performed by IPs to keep communities safe from pandemic. Rituals accompany traditional lockdown mechanisms adopted during the pandemic. These includes the ‘ali’ in Palawan and the ‘dimalas’ among Tedurays.</p> <p>There are 3 traditional food processing practices to prevent food waste . There are preservation through salt, sugar and sundrying. There is also the “agamang” (physical structure where food stocks especially rice are stored).</p>		<p>projects to introduce high value/yielding crops in response to income generation and poverty alleviation.</p> <p>3. Support to appropriate technology while promoting traditional agricultural systems i.e :</p> <p>a) ensure irrigation systems, farm to market and transportation services;</p> <p>b) crop diversification based on local preferences and stocks;</p> <p>c) provide appropriate post-production/harvest technology and services including Access to link links to market.</p> <p>4. Enhance and continuing support to local government units and agencies towards effectively balancing food sufficiency, forest and environmental protection, linkages to product development and markets.</p>
---	--	--

Annex 2 :
SOUTH ASIA SUBREGIONAL PREPARATORY MEETING
17 November 2020

Executive Summary Report

The South Asia Meeting is one of the series of meetings leading to the Asia Regional Preparatory Meeting for the IPF at IFAD in 2021. It was attended by around 87 (see Attachment 2a) representatives of indigenous peoples organizations, IPAF and IFAD-funded projects from Bangladesh, India, Nepal and Pakistan, IFAD country, regional and Rome offices.

The meeting started with a welcome and overview of the program by Ms. Joan Carling, member of the Regional Steering Committee of the Indigenous Peoples' Forum (IPF) at IFAD. She then proceeded to introduce the IPF, its functions, the concept of the 5th IPF in 2021 and how the subregional meeting is linked to the regional preparatory meeting leading to the IPF. This was followed by Mr. Mattia Prayer Galletti, IP Focal Point-IFAD who gave a briefing on IFAD, its Policy of Engagement with Indigenous Peoples¹¹ with emphasis on the nine (9) principles of engagement, and how these are operationalized through the IPF and its funding facility, the IPAF and the latest IFAD Indigenous Peoples' Award.

Mr. Bashu Aryal, IFAD's IP Focal Point for Asia, discussed the progress in the implementation of the Asia Regional Action Plan (RAP) agreed upon in the 4th IPF at IFAD, with focus on South Asia (see Attachment 2b).The RAP contains 25 actions, three (3) of which are of common nature applicable to all hubs and six (6) are focused on South-East Asia. Ms. Rasha Omar, also present in this meeting, is leading the implementation in IFAD's South Asia hub.

In the area of knowledge management, there are ongoing initiatives on traditional knowledge in various forms and media in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Bangladesh and India. These includes two(2) studies on jhum practice in relation to sustainable development and climate change, gender study, a symposium on shifting cultivation and sharing of results from the nutrition pilot project in the Sustainable Development Forum, all in India and the documentation of traditional knowledge in Afghanistan and Pakistan. While there is no project in IP areas in Bangladesh, discussions have commenced with the Chakma Circle Chief and IFAD looks forward to further discussions with the broader IPOs this November or December 2020.

As to the country strategies (COSOP) and design, the RAP intends to engage IPs in the full project circle and this can be through engaging IP experts in supervision missions. Supervision missions will also take into consideration gender issues. In Nepal, the Nepal Federation of Indigenous Nationalities (NEFIN) was consulted and they also participated

¹¹ <https://bit.ly/2TyqdIg>

in the online survey for the COSOP review and formulation. Visibility of IPs was addressed in the India and Nepal projects where data disaggregation is ensured through the projects design. Mr. Aryal underscored the importance of IP participation in the following upcoming processes:

- 1) India will be undertaking its midterm review
- 2) Bangladesh COSOP is scheduled for drafting in 2021

On partnerships, IFAD engaged in the ILO 169, UNCT and the state in developing the action plan in Nepal while there is also a continuing engagement of the UNCT to develop an action plan for the implementation of the UNDRIP in India and Bangladesh. These come in the forms of periodic consultations with IPs and IPOs, high level dialogues and linking IPs to IFAD projects.

In relation to access to resources, there is a plan to respond to the supply chain support to local products and facilitate public/private investments to promote product to niche markets. India is targeting specialized products while Nepal is targeting high mountain area crops.

Ms. Carling opened the plenary session for clarification and questions on the three (3) presentations. Table 1, in Section B below summarizes the emerged discussion.

Updates on the IPAF projects in Asia was presented by Ms. Ruby Espanola – the IPAF focal person in Tebtebba which is serving as the Regional Co-Manager for Asia and Pacific (see Attachment 4c, Annex 4). Dr. Luna Panda, Executive Director of Pragati Koraput, one of the IPAF partners in India, was invited to present a short video on their project focused on the youth. Dr. Panda highlighted the importance of providing alternative yet meaningful activities for the youth in their most productive ages. The project responded to these through the planting of nutritious but endangered local food crops, application of the system of rice intensification as a climate resilience approach and marketing surplus production and convergence with different institutions. She ended with a note that the current results, if scaled up and developed into an enterprise, can provide livelihoods and income and divert the trend of labor migration among the youth while addressing SDGs 1, 2, 5, 12 and 15 (see Attachment 2c).

With some time left from the session, IWGIA's video on IP engagement at IFAD¹² was shared. Ms. Carling underscored the need to advance IP engagement not only in Rome but also at the local and country levels where the difference is felt.

From here, the participants proceeded to the country break-out groups to further discuss good practices, challenges, opportunities and recommendations in relation to indigenous

¹² Videos accessible at : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KZVsx6oQQwg&feature=youtu.be> (short version--7 mins and half long) or <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HQYOecOHhFk&feature=youtu.be> (long version-21 minutes and half long)

food systems in the context of the COVID – 19 pandemic. Section C reflects the results from the country discussions as reported in the plenary.

Ms. Rasha Omar, IFAD South Asia Hub and Country Director for India, picking up on the concerns in relation to recovery from the COVID – 19 impacts stressed the need for more active and sustained engagements at the country level to enable the identification of what adjustments need to be done. Mr. Aryal added that it would be good to take the recommendations.

The meeting was concluded with the announcements for the selection of the 2 Asia members of the IPF Steering Committee – one from South Asia and one from the South-East and one for the IPAF Board. Criteria (may pp ba sya for attachment?) for these positions was presented and discussed by Ms. Carling and encouraged participants to think about possible candidates from the subregions. Selection will be done during the Asia Regional Preparatory Meeting following this subregional consultation.

Another matter announced was the ongoing process for the IFAD IP Awards. Participants to the regional meeting will have a chance vote on the best candidates from the región. There are three categories i.e best IFAD-funded Project, best IPAF Project and best non-IFAD project. All candidates for the award will be presented in the said forthcoming meeting but the process for votation will be determined by the meeting.

In closing, IFAD and the GSC members expressed appreciation for the active participation of the participants.

B. Summary of Discussion Points in Relation to IFAD

Table 1 : Plenary Discussion Points on IFAD

Questions/points for clarification and observations	Responses from the IFAD Team
<p>IFAD financing are generally loans and accesible to big projects with high economic results. How can IPs, with small scale initiatives access/benefit from these loans?</p>	<p>Indigenous Peoples are part of the work of IFAD. There are currently 64 projects engaging IPs over a total of 250 projects. From these, there is a diverse range of 1 – 100% of the beneficiaries are IPs.</p> <p>Projects are decided with governments negotiated with ministry of finance. There is need to maximize impact and economic return of investments, thus, the tendency to target high economic results. Almost 7M USD is directed to IPs across these global projects. IFAD projects provide grants to communities at a cost sharing arrangement and a poverty inclusion fund which subsidizes communitis;</p>
<p>There had been a meeting with the IFAD Country Team but there is no IFAD Project in the CHT, Bangladesh.</p>	<p>From 2019 and 2018 discussions brought to Bangladesh CPM so there was an initiative to reach out. An initial discussion was held with Chakma Circle Chief Devasish Roy where we planned to bring the discussion higher at the UNCT level. Unfortunately, the country director left. We can resume this conversation, possibly by December 2020, when a country director will be assigned.</p>
<p>IP traditional food is very healthy but there are no scientific studies to strengthen promotion and capture markets. How can IPs access IFAD to promote organic agriculture? There are initiatives on the ground that are effectively addressing health, livelihoods and climate change impacts and mitigation.</p>	<p>The significance of indigenous food and food systems have been acknowledged, thus the focus of the upcoming IPF at IFAD and the Global Food Summit. For the IPF, we are specifically looking into the value of indigenous food system. We need collective evidence to push the message on the promotion of IP food systems forward.</p> <p>At the country level, IFAD have specific programs. If your area is located within IFAD Project areas (i.e Districts 1-5 in Nepal), we can do something. Its important to link with the IFAD country offices.</p> <p>Further, IFAD Nepal has work on IP food /culinary in 2021.</p>
<p>Is IFAD-Nepal coordinating with IPOs?</p>	<p>IFAD-Nepal has been engaging and coordinating with NEFIN and engaged more IPOs in the 2019 dialogue in collaboration with LAHURNIP</p>
<p>There is a higher prevalence of Persons with Disabilities in IP communities due to malnutrition resulting to many impairment. Does IFAD have any strategy to integrate</p>	<p>The aspect of disability is currently not included in IFAD operations. We are now preparing for replenishment negotiation, where we can include a strategy for disability. We request you for data on PWDs . If the prevalence is higher in IP communities, this will help push the agenda;</p> <p>The Washington group (¿) started an initiative on disability and Nepal was selected as pilot country targetting Karnali and Lumbini areas.</p>

<p>disability in its program? In relation to data, does it include PWDs in data disaggregation?</p>	<p>There were 500 households surveyed with PWDs and disaggregation ongoing.</p>
<p>Can IFAD support legalization of traditional liquor produced by IPs? Can IFAD support IPs to register patent rights to indigenous food and food processing knowledge?</p>	<p>We cannot go against law nor undermine tradition and culture. The issue is not in the production but its consumption and impact (i.e domestic violence) Lets find a balance;</p>
<p>Is there any specific policy to address capacity building to enable access to livelihood opportunities in IFAD projects? Access to finance resources for IPs in geographically isolated areas is a big challenge. We are doing work in partnership with state livelihood misión but there's still a lot more needed in this aspect.</p>	<p>This can be better discussed with IFAD Country Program Managers. There is nothing that prevents on capacity building if in the context of the IFAD programs.</p>
<p>Can we involve research organizations? I am concerned about the longterm sustainability of IFAD projects. Can IFAD support moves towards Startups? How can rural farmers reach IFAD?</p>	<p>IFAD have existing partnerships with different stakeholders in different projects. Research institutions usually come in to look into where further investigation is needed. This should be included in the planning stage. The issue will be whether or not the initiative will be able to capture IP perspectives. This event is one way of bridging the gap between IPOs and IFAD. Continue engaging especially at the country level to move forward the conversations.</p>

C : Results and Recommendations from the Country Work Groups

Table 2 : Country Workgroup Results

Country	Responses and Discussion Points
Q1 : Identify good practices of IPs food systems and livelihoods during COVID 19 pandemic	
Bangladesh	<p>a. Indigenous peoples of the CHT practice Jum farming (shifting cultivation). This is their traditional farming. They grow different crops, including rice. Through this farming IPs preserve varieties of seeds.</p> <p>b. Nowadays indigenous peoples are growing mushrooms and cultivating honey bees.</p> <p>c. They are also involved in fishing.</p> <p>d. A large number of IPs are now engaged in vegetable farming. They are growing vegetables on a large scale.</p> <p>e. Indigenous peoples like dried food and they preserve dried food in two ways - sun dried and smoke dried. Through this way they preserve fish, meat, vegetables etc.</p> <p>f. Boiled food is all time favourite for IPs. Even they are fond of boiled vegetables. Shrimp paste is another favourite food of IPs.</p>
India	<p>a) The indigenous people grow a wide range of food crops like cereals, millets, pulses, tuber crops which could meet their consumption needs.</p> <p>b) Non cultivated foods like roots and tubers collected from forests, mushrooms, fish, wild birds etc. constitute a significant part of the food system of indigenous communities.</p> <p>c) Barter system of exchange practiced among indigenous communities where they could exchange different food items.</p> <p>d) Conservation of indigenous seeds enabled the indigenous people to continue their agriculture activities so that they could cultivate their food crops.</p> <p>e) The indigenous people have diversified livelihoods like agriculture, livestock rearing, fishing, bee keeping etc. which helped them in coping with the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>f) In some areas the indigenous people were promoted to adopt nutrition gardens for their food systems.</p>
Nepal	<p>a) During lock down, junk food is avoided</p> <p>b) Locally grown fruits are more consumed</p> <p>c) In terms of Himalayan region: wheat, barley</p> <p>d) In Terai: fish and green vegetables by Tharu community</p> <p>e) Indigenous have knowledge of food , but in COVID-19 pandemic, in community, we searched whatever available in local town eg: elephant yam by Tharu which is highly nutritious</p> <p>f) Ghongi: It is highly nutritious,</p> <p>g) COP 22 experience: Moringa farming importance</p> <p>h) We came to know the value of such food in pandemic situation, it needs more marketing value</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) COVID has helped to learn many things regarding food and nutrition j) We learnt to consume them again, we realized we have many things in our field. In the past we have forgotten to use. For eg: Gurjo(giloy), local alcohol k) In cities like KTM, there is increasing trend of modernization but in pandemic, it encouraged people to start agriculture even in small space. We were totally living out of traditional food l) City people used to be only in rush with their busy life. People were compelled to use junk and readymade food, even new generation were adopted to use readymade food. During pandemic, new generation are involved in getting prepared with local foods. m) Challenge: Less informed about the value of food in our society n) Pandemic has given youth an opportunity to know the depth of importance of food – intergenerational learning is revived o) Be mindful : Promotion of Consumption of Organic food in pandemic p) Migrant workers have started to do agriculture after they returned from abroad q) Tunnel house farming is started , so people can have access to off seasonal vegetables- contribute to increase income source- long term employment- food security
<p>Pakistan</p>	<p>The food systems of Bakarwals, the Indigenous People living in the mountainous regions of Azad Jammu Kashmir-Pakistan, is evolved by their centuries old knowledge, culture, habits and patterns of living in local ecosystems. The Bakarwals is a nomadic community which rear meat producing animals (sheep & goats) for livelihood. In addition, they have an indigenous knowledge about medicinal plants of AJK forests. The salient features of Bakarwals Food Systems are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Bakarwals prefer wheat-bread along with leafy vegetables and pulses. Mostly, the leafy vegetables are wild and collected from the nearby forest areas. b) Although, they produce meat producing animals but hardly afford to slaughter for their regular food consumption. Mostly, they eat mutton on special occasions like marriages, family and community festivals, and Eid. Because, they sell the animals in market to fulfill their remaining family needs. c) Bakarwals move their livestock to upper meadows of Himalayas in summer where their animals find good environment for health and plenty of plant species for grazing. Their animals produce large quantity of milk during this season. On an average each family collects from 30 to 60 liters of milk from their animals per day. They prepare butter and ghee from the milk and preserve for their whole year family consumption. This Ghee possess medicinal value as animals graze different medicinal plant species. d) The Bakarwals believe that the milk of sheep and goat create immunity in their bodies against diseases especially during COVID-19 as their animal graze different medicinal plant species. <i>We found rarely any COVID case among this community.</i> e) The use of wild honey with walnut is an important feature of their food system. They also believe that this honey help protect their children from cold, pneumonia and Corona.

	<p>f) Bakarwals possess indigenous knowledge about the medicinal plants, we have already documented it. They usually take its small quantity as food during disease and especially in winter season to help protect their children, elders and women from cold, fever, pneumonia, and COVID-19. The use of medicinal plants with food is an important component of their food system.</p> <p>g) Many old women and young girls are expert in using herbs in their daily foods and own specific recipe.</p>
Q2 : Identify challenges of IPs and livelihood during the pandemic.	
Bangladesh	<p>a) Due to sudden lack of income, restriction on movement, and closure of weekly markets, most of the poor indigenous families are faced with food insecurity.</p> <p>b) Fruits and vegetables growers faced a problem a lot; as the market was closed they couldn't sell their produce.</p> <p>c) As indigenous peoples live in the forest areas and remote places it was difficult for government agencies to reach out to them with relief materials during the lockdown. Therefore, most of the IPs remained without government support.</p> <p>d) Migrant workers suffered a lot while they were coming back to home after closure of their workplaces.</p> <p>e) Land grabbing was one of the big challenges that IPs faced during the pandemic.</p>
India	<p>a) There was fear of the pandemic as most of the indigenous communities do not have basic sanitation facilities and access to health care.</p> <p>b) As the indigenous communities live in remote areas, there was problem in communication for procurement of essential items, buy inputs for agriculture and market agriculture and other produces.</p> <p>c) Lack of transport facilities for agriculture and other produces caused loss especially for the perishable commodities like vegetables, fish etc.</p> <p>d) In some of the areas where indigenous people migrated to outside areas faced a lot of problem in the place of work as they were jobless. Many had returned home walking over days and nights.</p> <p>e) The wage labourers, drivers could not get any alternate source of livelihoods.</p> <p>f) The education of children has been worst affected as the indigenous people live in the remote areas where there is no mobile network and even most of the families cannot afford to have the smart phones.</p>
Nepal	<p>a) Still we are backward in overall. State has not intervened to its fullest to acknowledge the value of indigenous food among indigenous communities. Knowledge can be integrated in national policy which is important to bring balance in food system.</p> <p>b) Lack of strong advocacy by stakeholders</p> <p>c) Right to food and security awareness is lacking</p> <p>d) Hunger due to COVID is somehow addresses</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e) Lack of knowledge and skill transfer from youth to society- State is responsible f) Nation should take the responsibility to promote knowledge g) Indigenous organization is backward in realizing their responsibility to promote the knowledge of Indigenous youth. Only state is not responsible, we as an indigenous organization should take over it.
Pakistan	The livelihoods of hundreds of Bakarwals have been affected by the spread of COVID-19. Physical distancing, movement restrictions to up-hills and down to plains of Punjab, and illness of animals are reducing the efficiency of their livestock farming business. The supply of inputs and services is also affected by the pandemic. The disruption of animal health extension services combined with interrupted delivery and use of vaccines and medicines is increasing the chances of new epidemics, including those involving animal diseases that may cause major livestock losses due to large-scale mortality.
Q3 : Identify opportunities for strengthening good practices and how can IFAD support these practices.	
Bangladesh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Establishment of a food bank/rice bank is identified as one of the best solutions in the pandemic while communities were struggling for food shortages. b) Practice of traditional quarantine system by indigenous communities; they locked down their respective villages following their traditional way of lock down. c) Traditional way of preserving organic seeds d) Maintaining Village Common Forest (VCF) by indigenous peoples themselves. During the COVID 19 the community collected non-timber forest products from the VCF. It helped them a lot in the time of food shortages. They collected wild potatoes, bananas and different vegetables form the VCF.
India	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Revival of indigenous food crops, cultivated and non cultivated foods. IFAD can support for documentation of indigenous food systems with scientific validation. b) Conservation and multiplication of indigenous seeds c) Value addition of local produces through development of small enterprises d) Development of agri and allied enterprises for the indigenous communities, especially for youth. e) IFAD can support for policy dialogue with local and national Governments for sustainable production systems, organic farming and conservation and replication of indigenous seeds.
Nepal	<p>Learning from Pandemic: Back to farm, soil is important Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Blanket approach should not be adopted, we should follow holistic approach b) Right to food should be need based c) Identification of vulnerable group, communities etc d) We can contribute our role to aware indigenous communities about government policies and plan regarding indigenous community

	<p>empowerment. Local government can be pushed to address if communities are aware of it. But the problem is local government stakeholders are not aware on such issues.</p> <p>e) We want IFAD to help in indigenous food marketing</p> <p>f) We have Food preservation techniques (cooling system) in our society for long term use: potato, local alcohol, yam flour etc. We have not promoted such practices into wider community due to modernization. Indigenous food preservation technique skill should be transferred among youths. We can promote even in international level- Patent right should be adopted. This process is expensive. IFAD can help us donate fund in such context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Eg: Local alcohol should be in high production by patenting from the nation o Local alcohol and violence: Nation should realize that alcohol is not responsible o Chepang community: Chiuri plant when a baby girl is born, they have tradition to provide chiuri tree as a gift in marriage
Pakistan	<p>To face the situation, the action is underway by Sukhi Development Foundation through the funding of IPAF-IFAD to mitigate the negative impacts of the pandemic. The Sukhi has managed training sessions for Bakarwals youth to help improve their skill and knowledge about animal diseases, vaccination, use of medicines, improvement in wool quality and marketing skills. During training sessions, awareness against COVID-19 was also raised among Bakarwal youth. They were aware about the use of smartphones for animal disease control. A specific WhatsApp group is created of young Bakarwals where they share updated information about animal diseases and control, social events, animal market information, weather updates and COVID-19 pandemic SoPs imposed by the government. IFAD and Sukhi have provided valuable training, awareness and market links which saved their animal from mortality and helped enhance the profits and improved their livelihoods. These are existing small initiatives that IFAD can support and build on.</p>

Annex 3
Mekong Sub-regional Consultation Meeting
November 18, 2020

A. Introduction

The Mekong sub-regional preparatory meeting¹³ held virtually on 18 November 2020 was jointly co-organized by Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP), Asia members of the Global Steering Committee of the Indigenous Peoples Forum at IFAD, International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) and Tebtebba. The 4-hour online meeting was organized as part of the series of virtual events leading to the regional consultation in preparation for the fifth global meeting of the Indigenous Peoples Forum at IFAD. A total of 47 participants¹⁴ (28 men and 19 women) attended the meeting including representatives of indigenous peoples organizations and networks from 5 countries, Indigenous Peoples Assistance Facility (IPAF)-funded project partners, IFAD project country partners and IFAD staff.

B. Subregional Meeting Proceedings

Ms. Yun Mane, Global Steering Committee Member, graced the meeting with welcome and acknowledgement of participants from different countries. Afterwards, Ms. Joan Carling, Global Steering Committee Member, gave a rundown of the background of Indigenous Peoples Forum at IFAD and the objectives of the regional and subregional consultation meetings¹⁵.

Mr. Mattia Prayer Galletti presented updates on IFAD work and its implementation of its Policy of Engagement with Indigenous Peoples¹⁶. IFAD, as a development organization focused on transforming rural areas and food systems, is committed to support indigenous peoples' self-driven development and strengthen its partnership with indigenous peoples as expressed and integrated in the IFAD Strategic Framework (2016-2025) and IFAD 11 and 12. The IFAD Policy of Engagement with Indigenous Peoples include the Indigenous Peoples Forum and IPAF as instruments in translating the policy objectives into actual impacts. IFAD is committed to follow the nine principles of engagement specifically the free prior and informed consent (FPIC) which ensures that rights of indigenous peoples to self-determination should be respected in every operation. IFAD operates through its country strategies and IFAD-financed projects targeting indigenous peoples. New IFAD engagements directed to indigenous peoples include facilitating indigenous peoples' access to Green Climate Fund, Indigenous Peoples Awards and Strategy on Indigenous Peoples (2022-2025).

¹³ Agenda for the subregional meeting is attached as Attachment 3a.

¹⁴ See Attachment 3b for the list of the participants for the subregional meeting.

¹⁵ See Attachment 3c-i for the background and objectives of the regional meeting.

¹⁶ Copy of Mr. Mattia's full presentation can be accessed at <https://bit.ly/2TyqdIg>.

Mr. Bashu Aryal, IP Focal Point for IFAD Asia-Pacific Division, reported on the status of implementation of the Asia-Pacific Regional Action Plan 2019-2020¹⁷. The progress achieved in the regional action plan is manifested in areas of knowledge management, country strategy and project design, partnership building and access to resources. In terms of knowledge management, indigenous peoples traditional knowledge and practices were documented and disseminated in local languages. Engagement of indigenous peoples in IFAD country strategy and project design was observed in the involvement of indigenous peoples' representatives in local consultations during COSOP formulation, capturing of disaggregated data on IPs in the project monitoring and evaluation systems, and updating of project implementation manual to include engagement and participation of IPs. As to the partnership building, there were various opportunities to link with indigenous peoples organizations such as policy workshop, dialogues and awareness raising on the IFAD Policy of Engagement with IPs, and socio-economic development planning process of projects. Improvement as regards access to resources was seen in the participation of IPs in land use planning process, acquisition of Land Use Certificates and enabling IPs to access to markets. Key issues raised by the participants related to the presentations of Mr. Bashu and Mr. Mattia can be found in section C, Table 1.

The presentation of IPAF included sharing of recommendations from the consultation meeting with IPAF partners in Asia held on 17 November 2020 and results achieved from two IPAF-funded projects in Mekong region¹⁸. Among the recommendations to advance the implementation of IPAF are extension of project timeframe to 3 years, increase number of approved proposals for funding, conduct exit strategy planning for the projects and link local organizations to the national government to generate support for the project.

Two IPAF-funded projects implemented by Highlanders Association in Cambodia and Pgakenyaw Association for Sustainable Development (PASD) in Thailand were presented. The projects aimed to strengthen agricultural production of indigenous food, revitalize traditional crops, promote consumption of healthy indigenous food and improve economic activities of youth. The following are the key points shared:

- Indigenous food production is strengthened through establishment of seed banks and promotion of rotational and collective farming of indigenous peoples' communities.
- Traditional knowledge and practices related to indigenous food systems are strengthened through awareness raising on the importance of indigenous food systems, documentation of traditional crops, and mapping of nutrient-rich and climate resilient crops.
- Indigenous food production including food crops and income produced from sustainable farming practices and management of natural resources has helped indigenous peoples withstand the negative impacts of COVID-19 pandemic.

¹⁷ Copy of the full presentation is found in Attachment 3c-iii.

¹⁸ Copies of the presentations are found in Attachment 3c- iv, v, vi.

- Ensuring project ownership of indigenous peoples and building partnership with relevant stakeholders are key for effective project implementation and sustainability.

Participants worked in groups by country to discuss and share experiences about good practices and challenges of indigenous peoples' food systems and livelihoods during COVID-19 pandemic. Furthermore, in the discussions they identified opportunities for strengthening good practices as sustainable solutions for the future and how can IFAD support these initiatives. See the workshop results by country in Table 2 below.

Announcements regarding the regional preparatory meeting include the number of participants, nomination of 2 IPAF Board Members and selection of 2 members of the Steering Committee. For the regional meeting, there will be 3 to 4 participants per country including IPAF and IFAD-funded projects. The regional meeting scheduled on November 26, 2020 will focus more on the assessment of IPs engagement with IFAD in general and preparation for the upcoming Food Summit. In the selection of IFAD Board Members, 2 posts are needed to be replaced. The nomination will be circulated. The selection of Global Steering Committee members from Asia will be done in the regional meeting.

Mr. Mattia Prayer Galletti closed the meeting with appreciation of the contributions of the participants on the discussions related to the challenges and opportunities presented by the COVID-19 pandemic. From the sharing and discussions, indigenous peoples food systems can provide a form of resilience in times of crisis. He thanked the organizing team and all the participants in the meeting.

C. Summary Discussion Points

Table 1: Key Issues Raised and Response from IFAD

Key Issues Raised	Response from IFAD
With all the projects being implemented in Mekong region, what is the level of engagement and participation of indigenous peoples at the project level?	There is varied level of participation in different projects. Some of the projects do have 80% participation of indigenous people as beneficiaries. Mekong has the highest number of IP participants. In South Asia, the project in Northeast India has more IP participants compared to other areas. IFAD is measuring the participation of IP engagement by comparing to the proportionate population of IPs in the project area. Minimum of the proportion is being represented.
How to encourage indigenous peoples to be more involved in the project activities?	Indigenous peoples are expected to participate in the project cycle. That is part of the IFAD guidelines for the country program. IP representatives should be consulted during

	<p>the COSOP formulation and project identification, design, implementation, supervision and review processes. What should be done- each IFAD country program and IP organizations should be connected and have a dialogue so this policy will be translated into practice. I humbly request to all indigenous peoples' organizations to work in parallel way. We will provide further guidance to our country programs to engage IPOs and their representatives in the COSOP and project cycle processes. Also, representatives of indigenous peoples' organizations should start connecting to IFAD country program. We need to work sometime to engage in the COSOP process. We will send reinforcement messages to our country program. The way to participate is to start the dialogue between IFAD country team and indigenous peoples' organizations in the country level.</p>
<p>How to engage more in the country level to provide better support for IPs in the ground?</p>	<p>IPOs should network together as federation to have a common counterpart. The COSOP, a key document. Preparation of country strategy should include all potential partners. Opening the dialogue with CSOs, farmer, women, academe, research institutions which can provide value added to IFAD objectives in fighting poverty and ensuring food security.</p>
<p>How to support indigenous peoples to access the markets?</p>	<p>Linking with private sector, organizing a number of multi-stakeholder platform for value chain actor to provide opportunities for IPs to engage in the market.</p>
<p><i>IPAF-related</i></p>	
<p>IPAF is giving grants to all countries, but I didn't see grant for Myanmar, have you ever provided grant to any IPOs in Myanmar? Because in Myanmar, IPs have lot of issues, rights are not recognized.</p>	<p>IPAF process of approval and selection is not influence by recognition of government to IP rights. Selection is based on the merit of the proposal. In this cycle, no IPAF-funded projects in Myanmar. In the next cycle, Myanmar is most welcome to submit hoping there will be strong proposal. The ownership of IPAF belongs to indigenous peoples.</p>
<p>In IPAF, the support provided to IPOs is very small, thus, the level of implementation is limited because the grant is small. IPAF grant</p>	<p>The ceiling at the moment is USD 50,000. The funding depends on the availability of resources so we need to mobilize resources. Normally, we think big fund is better.</p>

should be increased so that the IPOs can work well in synergy.	Approving beyond the capacity of the IPOs can produce more damage. Small-scale funding can be an opportunity.
--	---

Table 2: Country Workgroup Results

Good practices of IPs food systems and livelihoods during the COVID-19 pandemic	Challenges that IPs and their livelihoods face during the COVID 19	Opportunities for strengthening good practices as sustainable solutions for the future and how can IFAD support these practices
CAMBODIA		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indigenous communities have natural resources such as lakes, rivers where they can catch fish and lands where they can grow food crops and vegetables for household consumption and market. - Shifting cultivation that produces climate resilient crops can generate enough food that can feed their families. - Collective farming is practice in indigenous communities to produce rice. - IPs are protecting their land and forest which serve as their sources of food ensuring food security for their communities. - Utilization of traditional water sources for farming so that they can still grow vegetable and crops in dry season. - IPs promoted traditional food crops connected to the market to earn income. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capacity building activities for indigenous peoples are not carried out because of restrictions. - Debt issues among indigenous communities growing monocrops have worsened. - Low income (from \$ 1500 to \$ 500) because of low price of IPs products such as cashew nuts and high cost of production. - Traditional meeting in the community is postponed. - The youth are coming back to the village because classes are not regular. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Customary land use of IPs is resilient and self-sufficient - Provide support for establishment of seed bank - Marketing and access to market - Extend project duration. - Support in processing and branding of indigenous products. - Improve water sources and irrigation system for farming
VIET NAM		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Self-reliance and traditional food production systems help IPs well sustained. - Products easily exchange among households within the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Communities earning income from tourism were the most affected. - Decreased in households' income because people cannot do work outside due to COVID-19 restrictions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traditional farming systems make IPs self-sufficient and less dependent on farm inputs from outside. - Promotion of IP organic products. Food products produced by IPs are safer

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IPs market small portion of their produce outside thus their livelihood is not heavily impacted by COVID-19. - Community members are helping each other in farming even during the busy season. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of access to markets due to Covid-19 restrictions - Women-led households face more problems because of income deficits. - Illegal trans-boundary movement of people can trigger COVID-19 infection threatening indigenous people living near the borders. - Lack of face-mask for protection against COVID-19 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - and chemical-free so they are easy to sell. - Use of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) such as smart phone application or website linking farmers/ IP groups to the market
--	---	---

THAILAND and LAO PDR

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensuring food security of indigenous peoples through home gardening and food processing for family consumption. - COVID-19 response efforts such as sharing of rice and food to IPs and non-IPs and donation drive to help indigenous peoples who live in the city. - Traditional ritual to protect indigenous community (lock down the villages) was revived and observed during the height of COVID-19 pandemic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Returning indigenous migrant workers (specifically youth) who lost job from abroad and the city are struggling to do farm work. - Indigenous peoples who produce cash crops cannot sell their crops because of travel restrictions. - The pandemic is causing stress and depression among indigenous peoples. - Lack of access to protective gears such as face mask and alcohol - Human trafficking for sex work is increasing - Indigenous youth have no access to online class because they do not have gadget/equipment and cannot afford to get internet connection. - IPs have difficulty accessing government services which require online registration since they do not have internet connection. - Lack of knowledge about COVID-19 is making people anxious of others. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capacitate indigenous youth and provide livelihood opportunities so they can live in the community. - Support product processing - Established long term project support (3-5 years) for indigenous peoples. - Networking with different organizations. - Create space for indigenous women engagement with IFAD-funded projects. - Creation of community fund to support production of indigenous food - Increase capacity of the community for climate change adaptation and disaster management - Support for indigenous peoples in addressing land rights issues. - Promote seed banking as a way to preserve and transfer traditional knowledge on farming. - Support traditional practices which strengthen resilience of community to respond to crisis.
--	---	--

MYANMAR

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indigenous farmers did not experience food shortage because of traditional subsistence farming. - Hunting and gathering food from forests - Practice of rotational farming/ shifting cultivation - People become more interested in growing crops /family farming - Food preservation such as drying and smoking meat, vegetables and grains. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Market-oriented and single crops growing can be unsustainable - Travel restrictions have limited access to markets - Families focusing on cash crop production are more challenged during the pandemic - Extreme weather events brought damages to crops during pandemic - Weakness in marketing strategy - Limitation in technology and lack access to telecommunication facilities - Traditional events were postponed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establishment of social enterprises for organic/healthy food - Celebrate World Food Day by promoting indigenous foods - Establishing food forests - Technical and financial support for nutrition identification of indigenous food - Establishment of sustainable seed bank - Mobilization of fund for production of nutritious food - Promote indigenous food systems and livelihoods thru food festivals, documentation and research
---	--	---

D. Recommendations Related to the Value of Indigenous Food Systems, Resilience in the Context of COVID-19 Pandemic

1. Provide support for establishment of seed bank as a way to preserve and transfer traditional knowledge on farming and indigenous food.
2. Support for establishment of social enterprises and access to markets development including processing and promotion of indigenous and healthy food products.
3. Improve water sources and irrigation system for farming.
4. Use of Information and Communications Technology (ICT) such as smart phone application or website as marketing strategies.
5. Established long term project support (3-5 years) for indigenous peoples.
6. Create space for indigenous women engagement with IFAD-funded projects and networking with different organizations.
7. Capacitate indigenous youth and provide livelihood opportunities so they can live in the community.
8. Creation of community fund .to support production of nutritious indigenous food
9. Support for indigenous peoples in addressing land rights issues.
10. Support traditional practices which strengthen resilience of community to respond to crisis including climate change adaptation and disaster management.
11. Support establishment of food forests in indigenous peoples' communities.
12. Technical and financial support for nutrition identification of indigenous food.
13. Promote indigenous food systems and livelihoods thru food festivals, documentation and research.

Annex 4

Consultation Meeting with IPAF-Asia Partners on the Value of Food Systems: Resilience in the Context of COVID-19 Pandemic, 17 November 2020

SUMMARY REPORT

I. Introduction

The consultation meeting with IPAF partners in Asia¹⁹ was organized by Tebtebba in preparation for the Asia Preparatory Meeting for the 5th Global Meeting of the Indigenous Peoples Forum at IFAD. The objectives of the meeting were :

1. Provide a better appreciation of the significance of linking IPAF-funded projects and the role of indigenous peoples to IFAD policy development at the different levels of implementation;
2. Share a general update on the status of implementation of IPAF-funded projects in Asia including their contributions in addressing COVID-19 pandemic as it relates to indigenous peoples' food systems; and
3. Develop specific recommendations related to IPAF, strengthening indigenous peoples' engagement with IFAD and indigenous food systems as a way to community resilience in the context of COVID19 pandemic.

A total of 28 representatives²⁰, 12 men and 16 women, of IPAF-funded projects in Asia, IFAD, Steering Committee Members of Indigenous Peoples Forum, and Tebtebba participated in the meeting.

II. Consultation Meeting Proceedings

The meeting started with the opening remarks from Ms. Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, Executive Director of Tebtebba and former UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. She expressed her appreciation of the meeting as a good opportunity to think through for the forthcoming Indigenous Peoples Forum. Futhermore, she stressed that "food sovereignty is an important issue especially because the markets are out of reach and many indigenous peoples have been directly affected- cash crops left along the way here in Cordillera; eco-tourism has also stopped. Many people are now out of jobs. This situation has brought back a lot of indigenous peoples to go back to the basics. Tourist areas, already abandoned farms, returned to producing subsistent food. It is essential to recover the knowledge in producing crops. It is an opportunity to go back to the traditional knowledge that allowed them to survive years of colonization."

Mr. Mattia Prayer Galletti, Lead Technical Specialist of IFAD, highlighted in his opening remarks the value of IPAF as a program. It is a facility that was introduced almost 15 years ago. It supports small-scale activities; highest element of ownership as aim. Also, he acknowledged the need to put all the ideas together that will eventually be used for knowledge-sharing.

¹⁹ See agenda for the meeting in Attachment 4a.

²⁰ See list of participants in Attachment 4b.

Ms. Ruby Española, the coordinator for IPAF Asia and the Pacific, shared the current status and results of the IPAF-funded projects in Asia which were gathered through a survey²¹ with current IPAF partners as respondents. The aim of the survey was to gather baseline information in terms of the status and achievements of IPAF-funded projects. Through the survey IPAF partners have shared their assessment and observations related to access and management of the IPAF, project implementation, participation of indigenous peoples in the project, results achieved in the execution of the projects and IFAD work in general.

In the panel discussion, contributions of three IPAF-funded projects to address COVID-19 pandemic through building resiliency of indigenous food systems were presented²².

Mr. Joseph Vincent, Chief Accountant of Organization for Community Development (OCD), shared that Project 2121 “Economic Empowerment of Young Women of the Indigenous Mukkuvar Community through Traditional Seafood and Handicraft Cooperative” focused on the revival of traditional knowledge about indigenous food, production, promotion of consumption and marketing of indigenous food spearheaded by indigenous women’s groups. Aside from the project achievements in building capacity of indigenous women and establishing income generating activities, he recommended potential interventions such as mussel culture and seaweed cultivation which IFAD can support.

Dr. Prasert Trakansuphakon, Chairman of Pgakenyaw Association for Sustainable Development (PASD), presented various contributions of Project 1948 “Youth for Nutrition Sensitive Indigenous Food Systems” in Thailand particularly in raising awareness on the importance of indigenous food systems and promoting consumption of nutritious indigenous food among young mothers and youth in the community. Through the project, youth were trained in social enterprise development, local products processing and innovation. Attending trade fairs and selling online were the strategies in promoting and marketing indigenous food products.

Mr. Prabhakar Adhikari and Ms. Luna, Secretary and Executive Director of Pragati Koraput shared about Project 2172 “Empowering Tribal Youth for Nutritional Food Security and Income Enhancement” and their initiatives in strengthening indigenous food systems by building capacity of tribal youth in farming. Among the outputs of the project mentioned are the organization of producer teams, establishment of seed banks and youth engagement in farming. Recommendations to strengthen resiliency of indigenous food systems include development of irrigation system in the indigenous communities, promotion and support for agricultural entrepreneurship among tribal youth, and utilization of information and communications technology for weather advisories, crop planning, pest and disease management. A short video clip about the project was shown after the presentation.

²¹ The summary of the survey results can be found in Attachment 4c.

²² Copies of the presentations can be found in Attachment 4d,e,f.

Ms. Joan Carling, Global Steering Committee member, shared the background of the regional and global meeting of the Indigenous Peoples Forum at IFAD (IPF). The forum established in 2011 at IFAD is a permanent process of consultation and dialogue between representatives from indigenous' institutions, IFAD and governments. The forum is a key instrument to ensure that the IFAD Policy of Engagement with IPs is implemented in the country and regional levels.

Regional consultation meetings are being organized to ensure that the forum reflects the diversity of perspectives and recommendations gathered from indigenous peoples in the various regions where IFAD operates. The meetings serve as an opportunity to track the progress on past agreements and to call for IFAD to support initiatives to recognize and protect indigenous peoples' rights, value their traditional knowledge, strengthen their participation on IFAD-funded projects and ensure FPIC. Ms. Joan presented some of the recommendations coming from the 4th Global Meeting of the IPF for the participants to have an idea of the kind of discussion and agreements that indigenous peoples put to the Governing Council of IFAD.

In the group workshops, discussions revolved around bridging the gap between IPAF, IFAD and indigenous peoples in general, based on participants' experiences, lessons learned and challenges they face as they implement projects and engage with the indigenous communities they are working with. After the discussions, the group outputs were reported in plenary. The group outputs from the workshop were consolidated in section C, Table 1 and 2 .

In the plenary, there were questions raised related to the presentations of IPAF-funded projects. The questions dwell on the sustainability of the projects and management of seed banks after the project. Dr. Prasert of PASD responded to the questions and emphasized that seed banking is not something new it is part of traditional practice in the community. For social enterprise, youth groups are looking for solution to generate income. For example, the young people maximize social media to market farm produce online. They innovate some local products for marketing.

Mr. Mattia Prayer Galletti of IFAD shared his response to the recommendations shared by IPAF partners. He acknowledged that the two-year implementation period of IPAF can be a limiting factor. The recommendation to make it 3 years to have time to think of sustainability issues is important. IFAD needs to do more, for example, in financing more proposals. Also, there is a need to disseminate IFAD Policy of Engagement with Indigenous Peoples to project partners of IFAD in country level.

He encouraged the IPAF partners to engage by nominating new members of the IPAF board for better mobilization strategy. Indigenous peoples' representatives should be the one speaking for IPAF. Also, he underscored the importance of having a dialogue with the government where IP representatives are engaging to influence the decision of government. He was impressed to hear about the projects, motivation of young people to retain the importance of traditional knowledge. They were a reference to the resilience of the indigenous peoples and indigenous peoples food systems. He mentioned that there

will be a UN food system summit. This is an important opportunity to showcase the importance of indigenous food system and why indigenous food systems are so valuable. Ms. Karla Sofia Pita Vidal presented the IFAD Indigenous Peoples Award which is aiming to recognize the efforts and achievement. The selection process was divided by the regions (each region has its own way of selecting). Steering Committee of the IPF to update us on the process. We have 3 nominees from IPAF in Asia- HA Cambodia, Pragati Koraput India, INWYN Nepal. It would be good to highlight the nomination in the presentation of IPAF-funded projects in the subregional preparatory meetings. The nominees for the Best Performing IPAF-funded projects in Asia will compete with Africa, Latin America and Pacific. It is important for participants to vote and winners will have the chance to present their achievements during the global meeting on February 2021. It is important that the projects will be able to show and promote commitment from IFAD for IPAF to be more understood and attract more resources.

Ms. Joan Carling announced in the meeting the opening for the selection of IPAF Board and Global Steering Committee Members. She enumerated the following general criteria for selection/nomination of IPAF Board Member:

- a. Indigenous person familiar with indigenous peoples work on the ground relating to the issue of self-determined development with all its holistic approach- poverty alleviation, supporting sustainable development from indigenous peoples' perspectives
- b. Have some level of knowledge and engagement with IFAD preferably, or have the commitment and time to be familiar with how IFAD works; history of engagement with IFAD like the Indigenous Peoples Forum at IFAD
- c. Preferably have some familiarity and knowledge of project review and analysis
- d. Issue of time since this is a volunteer work.
- e. Assist in fund-raising for the IPAF; should be able to do networking with donors for IPAF
- f. Expected to do outreach to indigenous peoples organizations
- g. Possibly assist and link IPAF and IFAD at the country level

There will be two (2) members of the IPAF Board to be selected- 1 for South East and 1 South Asia, selection should have to respect gender balance.

For the selection of the steering committee, this will be discussed more during the regional meeting. But this is just to alert the participants about the selection process, it would be good to have a more inclusive process in choosing. We will check if there is a formal nomination or just a call. We will get back to you on this. You can already start the nomination.

For the closing, Ms. Eleanor announced the schedule of the subregional meetings. Links for the meeting will be sent to the participants in email. She thanked all the participants for their rich contributions in the discussion and the assistance of the Steering Committee for the meeting.

C. Summary Discussion Points

Table 1: Mekong and South East Asia Group Output

(AYIPN-Philippines, HA-Cambodia, PASD-Thailand, Satunama-Indonesia moderated by Ms. Yun Mane- GSC member)

<p>How can IPAF further support the advancement of the current relevant results from your projects, especially in relation to sustaining these beyond the project timeframe?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities related to food production such as promotion of traditional crops and establishment of seed banks should continue as well as the intergenerational transfer of traditional knowledge to the young people • Sustainability is most important; 18 months is too short and we have to endure the impacts of the pandemic. Extend the project duration for at least 3 years. • IPAF needs to conduct exit strategic planning to see what works in the community which needs to continue • Continuous support of IFAD to its projects will be good. There should be wide information dissemination of projects
<p>How do we enhance and ensure effective implementation of the IFAD's Policy of Engagement with Indigenous Peoples especially at the national and local levels? How do we ensure that IPs, especially those affected by IFAD-funded projects are effectively consulted and engaged as IPs?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take into account the lessons learned and good practices from the IPAF project implementation to feed into national and local policy or mechanism to create appropriate support for indigenous peoples. IFAD should develop these mechanisms for access of indigenous peoples • Put up regulations/ legal framework -national policy to support indigenous peoples in the local level • Address limited fund given to staff doing work in the community • Link local organizations with national government to generate support for the project • Share to the communities we are working with the IFAD Policy of Engagement • Use of social media platforms to share our contributions in advancing development of indigenous peoples. • IPAF should have a focal person to engage the partners in the country level to share the IFAD Policy of Engagement with IPs and give guidance in improving the engagement and

	ensure that the policy is implemented on the ground.
--	--

Table2: South Asia Group Output

(Ecohimal-Nepal, INWYN-Nepal Pragati-India, OCD-India, Sukhi-Pakistan, Taungya-Bangladesh moderated by Mr. Bashu Aryal-CPO, IFAD Asia and the Pacific)

<p>How can IPAF further support the advancement of the current relevant results from your projects, especially in relation to sustaining these beyond the project timeframe?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exit strategies defined in proposal can be carried out but there is a need for extension of project time frame due to delays caused by COVID-19 pandemic. • Capacitate community to manage and institutionalize good results from the project - example the implementation by women’s group of the regulations developed; for community to own them. • Enhance linkage of women groups to local government/municipalities; established but disturbed by the pandemic. • Carry out policy dialogue to tackle youth engagement in agriculture and entrepreneurship. • For IPAF and Tebtebba to document best practices and share the documentation to indigenous peoples. <p><i>Linkages with IFAD</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Bashu Aryal committed to link with country PMOs, he asked partners to remind him in email - b.aryal@ifad.org. • There will be an upcoming activity by IFAD in Bangladesh on November 2020. The organizers are trying to connect with indigenous peoples. • IFAD to address youth migration through livelihood and provide agricultural technology/ services <p>Observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Bangladesh, IFAD is working in plains not in Chitagong Hill Tracts. • In India, the Orissa Livelihood Program is not linked with indigenous peoples.
<p>How do we enhance and ensure effective implementation of the IFAD’s Policy of Engagement with Indigenous Peoples</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connect with local government units and agencies and inform them about

<p>especially at the national and local levels? How do we ensure that IPs, especially those affected by IFAD-funded projects are effectively consulted and engaged as IPs?</p>	<p>our initiatives under IFAD and they can also link us to IFAD country program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of local language for information dissemination. • Support localized policy dialogues (i.e. state-district level dialogues with law makers). • Explore possibilities to link with national level indigenous peoples organizations /networks. • Enhance access to government services supporting livelihoods and production of indigenous peoples. • Pakistan project extended beyond project intent. <p><i>Challenges:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuing support /resources and expertise to sustain results vs. corporate capture • Continue with IP resources/knowledge and management; community and nature based livelihoods /enterprises for economic development
--	--

D. Recommendations

1. To advance IPAF implementation:

- a) Extension of project duration (3year project)
- b) Increase number of proposals being supported under IPAF
- c) Conduct exit strategy planning for the projects
- d) Capacitate community to manage and institutionalize good results from the project for community to own them
- e) Facilitate linking of organizations to the national government to generate support for the project
- f) For IPAF and Tebtebba to document best practices and share the documentation to indigenous peoples

2. For effective implementation of IFAD Policy of Engagement with Indigenous Peoples and engagement of indigenous peoples affected by IFAD-funded projects

- a) Take into account the lessons learned and good practices from the IPAF project implementation to feed into national and local policy or mechanism to create appropriate support for indigenous peoples. IFAD should develop these mechanisms for access of indigenous peoples
- b) Share to the communities we are working with the IFAD Policy of Engagement
- c) Use of social media platforms to share our contributions in advancing development of indigenous peoples.

- d) IFAD should have a focal person to engage the partners in the country level to share the IFAD Policy of Engagement with IPs and give guidance in improving the engagement and ensure that the policy is implemented on the ground.
- e) Connect with local government units and agencies and inform them about our initiatives under IFAD and they can also link us to IFAD country program.
- f) Use of local language for information dissemination.
- g) Support localized policy dialogues (i.e. state-district level dialogues with law makers).
- h) Explore possibilities to link with national level indigenous peoples organizations /networks.
- i) Enhance access to government services supporting livelihoods and production of indigenous peoples.