



ILO EVALUATION

- **Evaluation Title:** Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors
- **ILO TC/SYMBOL:** GLO/12/12/EEC
- **Type of Evaluation :** Independent, Final
- **Country(ies) :** Nepal, Peru and Cameroon
- **Date of the evaluation:** March 2016
- **Name of consultant(s):** Ms Sille Stidsen
- **ILO Administrative Office:** WORKQUALITY
- **ILO Technical Backstopping Office:** WORKQUALITY
- **Other agencies involved in joint evaluation:** None
- **Date project ends:** March 2016
- **Donor:** country and budget US\$ EIDHR, EC, \$820,782
- **Evaluation Manager:** Mr Ritash Sarna (STATISTICS)
- **Key Words:** Indigenous peoples' rights, Convention 169

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO's evaluation policies and procedures. It has not been professionally edited, but has undergone quality control by the ILO Evaluation Office

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
List of acronyms	3
Executive Summary	4
Evaluation background and methodology	5
Key findings.....	5
Conclusions	6
Lesson learned.....	7
Recommendations.....	8
Introduction: Project background	10
Project overview	11
<i>Actors and actions</i>	12
Evaluation background	13
Evaluation scope and criteria	14
Timeframe	14
Methodology	15
Evaluation criteria and questions.....	15
Data collection	17
<i>Country visits and Skype interviews</i>	17
Methodological limitations	18
Acknowledgements.....	19
Main findings	19
Relevance	19
Effectiveness.....	21
<i>Delivery of expected results</i>	22
<i>Factors that enabled or limited the achievement of the objectives</i>	25
Efficiency	26
Gender dimensions	27
Impacts.....	28
Sustainability.....	29
<i>Capacity-strengthening of partner institutions</i>	29
<i>Potential for expansion and replication</i>	29
<i>Indigenous peoples in the new strategic and programmatic framework</i>	30
Conclusions	30
Lessons Learned and emerging good practices	31
Recommendations	32
Recommendations for ILO HQ - Indigenous peoples' unit in the GED.....	32
Recommendations for ILO Country Offices	33
Recommendations to ILO Peru	34
Recommendations to ILO Nepal.....	34
Annex 1: Overview of results as compared to the project log-frame	36
Annex 2: List of interviews	42
Annex 3: Inception Report Including data collection plan	46

List of acronyms

CA	Constitutional Assembly (in Nepal)
CPA	Comprehensive Peace Agreement (Nepal)
CAR	Central African Republic
CEACR	Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions
DEVCO	Directorate General International Cooperation and Development of European Commission
EIDHR	European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights
FAQ	Frequently Asked Questions
GTPI	Grupo de Trabajo de Políticas Indígenas (Peru)
LAHURNIP	Lawyers Association for the Human Rights of Nepalese Indigenous Peoples
MoFALD	Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development, Nepal
PRO169	Programme for the Promotion of Convention No. 169
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNIPP	United Nations Indigenous Peoples' Partnership
UNPFII	United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues

Executive Summary

Adopted in 1989, ILO Convention No. 169 on indigenous and tribal peoples is the only legally binding international instrument that sets a standard for the promotion and protection of indigenous peoples' rights. As part of its institutional mandate to promote and advise on the implementation of the Convention, the ILO has implemented a series of projects over the past 20 years that have sensitized key actors on the application of the Convention, built capacity on its implementation, and generated a series of knowledge products aimed at informing stakeholders as well as a broader range of actors on indigenous peoples' situation, and the scope and application of the Convention. While some of these projects have been centrally managed by Headquarters in Geneva, and others have been managed directly by country offices, the project under evaluation here is one of the latest in the series of centrally managed projects.

With the overall objective of enhancing the protection and promotion of indigenous peoples' rights in Asia, Latin America and Africa, the specific objective of the project was originally formulated as supporting 'national processes on indigenous peoples in Nepal, Peru and the Central African Republic, with a view to setting good examples for neighbouring actors'. Due to increasing tensions and conflict in the Central African Republic around the time the project started up, however, the project's geographical focus in Africa was shifted to Cameroon instead.

The **target group** of the project is defined broadly as

- Key government policy planners, implementers, and local community-leadership
- Indigenous peoples and institutions at national and community level
- Indigenous peoples - particular attention to indigenous women and youth
- Workers and employers organizations
- The wider public and mass media, including community radios and social media where possible
- Key national and regional actors, including regional human rights institutions and law enforcement agencies / institutions, such as ombudsmen, national human rights commissions and labour inspectors

Activities included trainings of key government and non-government actors in the implementation of the convention at country-level, and an international course for high-level government officials at the ILO Training Centre in Turin; fellowships / internships for indigenous youth; sharing of experiences on the implementation of the Convention regionally and across regions - through a wide range of studies and

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

publications; and finally workshops with media-actors and publication of a guide for media on how to approach indigenous issues in their publishing and broadcasting.

The project was implemented between June 2013 and March 2016, with a total budget of EUR 799,193.70, out of which EUR 699,294.50 (87,5%) were granted by the EC (DEVCO B1, financed by the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights).

Evaluation background and methodology

The evaluation has been carried out by an external consultant between December 2015 and March 2016, and forms part of ILO-system's efforts at generating and managing knowledge on practical experiences with its actions, with a view to nurturing organizational learning, and feed these experiences into the future development of programmes and projects. The main clients of the evaluation are thus ILO staff in Headquarters and field offices and ILO's tripartite constituents - along with the DEVCO B1-unit of the European Commission, which manages the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, that have provided the funding for the project.

The OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impacts and sustainability constitute the framework of the evaluation, and on the basis of these criteria a set of specific evaluation questions was developed in the evaluation's inception phase (included in the report's Methodology-section).

The evaluator visited two of the three project countries, namely Peru and Nepal, and reached actors in Cameroon through Skype and phone interviews. The primary methods of data collection were semi-structured interviews with actors involved in the project implementation as well as external stakeholders; desk review of project-related documents (project documents, training schedules and curricula, implementation partners' reports on activities, participants' evaluations from trainings, studies and publications published under the project, etc.); and a more limited review of external thematic resources, in order to inform the assessment of the project's strategic relevance in relation to the socio-political context (newspaper articles, reports from other institutions on the situation of indigenous peoples' rights in the respective countries, etc.). The findings presented in this report are based on triangulation of data obtained from these different sources.

Key findings

The key findings of the evaluation can be summarized as follows:

The project's **relevance** was high: the objectives are well aligned with the target group's needs and priorities, as well as with EU and ILO strategic priorities. The time-frame was somehow ambitious, but worked out with very satisfying results. The fact that the project builds on previous years' work, with similar approaches that have been gradually refined over the years, accounts for the high relevance and timeliness of the activities implemented in each of the three project countries as well as centrally.

The project's **effectiveness** was satisfying, and staffing challenges in project countries arising from the non-availability of complimentary project funds that were expected at the time of designing the project, were handled smoothly, and almost all activities implemented as planned. The project contributed to the establishing of a new Working Group on Indigenous Policies (*Grupo de Trabajo de Políticas Indígenas*) in Peru, which is considered a highly effective way of advancing the implementation of the Convention's provisions on the right to participation. Some factors that contributed to the effective implementation of the project include strong coordination from head quarters; efficient administrative cooperation between headquarters and country offices; the clear continuity between this and former projects; and cross-fertilization of approaches between countries and regions.

The evaluation found that the **efficiency has been high** - project resources have been spent economically, and with a view to producing the best possible results, in consideration of the resources available.

It is too early at this point to assess the wider **impacts** as such of the project's activities, but it is clear that the project has contributed to the long-term process that is needed to secure better protection and promotion of indigenous peoples' rights. As mentioned before, **the coherence and continuity between past and present activities is one of the key strengths in the project design, and a key element in the project's potential for having impacts in a long-term perspective.**

The project contributed to the implementation of an existing international rights-framework, acknowledging that this is a complex process, which is best supported in a long-term perspective, with repeated actions of support to the various actors who can promote implementation (or ratification) in the countries where the Convention is relevant. The project has contributed to the capacity-building of actors that can advance the implementation of the Convention in all three countries, as well as generation of reports and publications that will be used by multiple actors in the years to come - and with this long-term perspective the project intervention can be considered **sustainable**. On the other hand, the project set-up did not allow for continuous relationship-building and institutional cooperation with key actors in the project countries, which could potentially have secured an even higher level of sustainability.

Conclusions

The project has been timely and relevant in all three implementation countries, and contributed satisfyingly to the promotion of indigenous peoples' rights and the application of Convention No. 169. A wealth of stakeholders have been reached, and most of the expected results have been achieved.

Implementation of activities has been effective and efficient, and the cooperation and coordination between headquarters and field offices has been remarkably smooth. The strong role played by technical staff at headquarters in the project implementation has ensured effective sharing of experiences

between countries and regions, and much-appreciated guidance, inspiration and back-stopping to the project-responsible staff in country offices.

Given the complexity of the implementation of the Convention, much support is needed at country-level, and the **lack of technical staff in field offices with a clear mandate to dedicate their time to work on the promotion of Convention No. 169 and indigenous peoples' rights in a broader sense, was identified as the main operational challenge** in the implementation of the project. The outcome and impact of the project could have been higher and more significant, if specialized and dedicated staff had been available in the field offices. This would have allowed the ILO to engage on a more continuous basis in key processes that took place simultaneously with the project implementation, such as the emblematic consultation processes in Peru, where the implementation of a 2011 law on consultation is in its early stages; or the debates and dialogues around the development of the new Constitution in Nepal, which was finalized in September 2015. More continuous engagement with government, indigenous organizations and civil society could also have built stronger institutional strengthening in the project countries, than what could be achieved under the given project set up.

While gender dimensions were not considered in the project design as such, **the project has made important contributions to gendering the analysis of indigenous peoples' situation**, and making indigenous women's particular situation and concerns, as well as the rights-framework that protect them, more visible.

The regional spill-over effects that were anticipated in the project design, with its emphasis on engagement with neighbouring actors, and 'setting good examples', **proved hard to achieve** within the de-facto very short implementation-period, and the relatively limited number of activities implemented. **The publications that were produced have the potential, however, to contribute to such long-term impacts in the future.**

Lesson learned

Indigenous peoples' right to participation and consultation are considered the cornerstones of Convention No. 169, and in light of that, **the establishment of the Working Group on Indigenous Policy** in Peru (*Grupo de Trabajo de Políticas Indígenas -GTPI*), **represents a promising institutional development**, with its formalized space for dialogue between indigenous peoples and state institutions. Given the complexity in operationalizing indigenous peoples' right to political participation, the evaluation has identified this experience as the key 'lesson learned' under this project:

The GTPI has proven highly successful in establishing new lines of communication, and a new level of sensitivity within state institutions towards indigenous peoples' aspirations. Over the course of its first year of operation, it has convened state actors from 10 different institutions, and presented its visions for aligning public policies and administrative practices with indigenous peoples' rights. According to the GTPI's self-evaluation in late 2015, these dialogues have generated a relation of trust between indigenous peoples' representative organizations and state actors, and a number of public

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

institutions have subsequently established their own procedures for closer coordination with indigenous peoples.

Recommendations

The evaluation's overall recommendation is to **continue the promotion of Convention No. 169 on indigenous and tribal peoples**, as implementation remains challenging, and **continued capacity-building and guidance on its application is needed**. More specifically, the following actions are recommended:

Recommendations for ILO HQ - Indigenous peoples' unit in the GED

- **Continue global cooperation on the promotion of indigenous peoples' rights**, and the elaboration on analysis and guidance on the application of the Convention within different thematic areas. Continue fund-raising for Headquarter-driven projects with activities in different countries, focusing on sharing of experiences, facilitated by the technical staff at Headquarters, and engage in country offices' processes regarding designing new projects for / with indigenous peoples where needed.
- **Enhance the distribution and promotion of reports, studies and publications on indigenous peoples' situation and rights, externally as well as internally.**

Recommendations for ILO country offices

- **Combine headquarter-initiated projects with country-office initiated activities** - with sufficient staffing resources to gain a continuous presence over a longer period of time, allowing the ILO to not only implement a series of pre-planned project activities, but also to engage meaningfully in relevant national processes as and when the need for ILO's institutional accompaniment occurs.
- **Support consolidation and institutional development of indigenous peoples' organizations** - Increase engagement with indigenous peoples' organizations at the sub-national / de-central level, and include de-central / regional activities in future projects for / with indigenous peoples, with a view to using the project cooperation to enhance the capacity and visibility of these actors.

Specific recommendations to ILO Peru

- **Re-engage in the emerging consultation processes, providing institutional accompaniment** - Allocate staff resources to engage in emblematic consultation processes as an observer in the near future.

- **Continue the support to the *Grupo de Trabajo de Políticas Indígenas* (GTPI),** which represents a promising institutional development, where the ILO's presence is crucial. Allocate staff resources to accompany the GTPI.

Specific recommendations to ILO Nepal

- **Take a pragmatic look at what can be done in the current hostile political context, and identify specific areas where Convention no. 169 can serve as a tool for inclusive development,** affirmative action, etc.. Analyze possibilities for promoting indigenous peoples' access to social services and social protection, and put these issues on the national agenda via donor cooperation and dialogue with relevant ministries and other actors.
- **Engage in the emerging law-reform process that is underway,** following the adoption of the new constitution last September: **the development of the governance framework for the future federal states is of particular importance for indigenous peoples,** and the government is committed to developing this as a matter of priority. Consider fund-raising for solid engagement in the law reform process, and monitor the development of the governance framework for the federal states, and raise the issue of alignment with ILO Convention No. 169 in high-level dialogues.
- **Engage strongly in the donor cooperation group on indigenous peoples and gender equality, known as the Social Inclusion Action Group (SIAG)** - joint donor involvement is key to re-inserting indigenous peoples' issues on the national development and policy-development agenda. Allocate staff resources to engage strongly in the SIAG, with a view to enhancing the group's joint voice on indigenous rights issues; use the SIAG as a forum to push jointly for the government to revise and simplify the National Action Plan for the implementation of Convention No. 169.

Introduction: Project background

Adopted in 1989, ILO Convention No. 169 on indigenous and tribal peoples is the only legally binding international instrument that sets a standard for the promotion and protection of indigenous peoples' rights. It was adopted in 1989, and has to date been ratified by 22 countries: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela in Latin America, The Central African Republic in Africa, Nepal and Fiji in the Asia-Pacific Region, and Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands and Spain in Europe.

In 2007, ILO Convention No. 169 was complemented by the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), when this new instrument was adopted by the UN General Assembly. The adoption of the UNDRIP generated a new momentum for promoting indigenous peoples' rights, in international policy and programming, as well as at the national level in countries where indigenous people live. This impetus was further strengthened with the High-level plenary meeting of the UN General Assembly in 2014, known as the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples, in which states reaffirmed their commitment to implement the UNDRIP in the outcome document. In this context, ILO Convention No. 169 remains a strong tool for the operationalization of the commitment to respect and promote indigenous peoples' rights, due to its legally binding nature, the wealth of experience generated in the countries that have ratified it, and not least because of the institutional anchoring of the Convention in the ILO, and the supervisory and advisory engagement that is offered by the ILO System.

As part of its institutional mandate to promote and advise on the implementation of Convention No. 169, the ILO started a Programme to Promote Convention No. 169, known as the PRO 169, in 1996. PRO 169 was driven by a small unit placed in the Labour Standards Department in headquarters (NORMES), and was centered around capacity building, dialogue, and documentation and exchange of experience between countries and regions. This entirely donor-funded programme managed to attract enough project funding to place technical staff in selected countries in Latin America, Africa and Asia. The PRO 169 project portfolio grew in the early 2000s, with one project following the other continuously, and centrally managed and country-managed projects complementing each other. This allowed PRO169 to place technical staff in selected countries in Latin America, Africa and Asia, and gave it a quite high level of external visibility. The close cooperation between the country-based PRO169 staff hired under different projects, Labor Standard Specialists in the regions, and the specialists in Geneva, proved to be an efficient way of promoting the ratification and application of Convention No. 169, as well as other Conventions relevant for the protection of indigenous peoples' rights (most importantly Convention No. 111 on Employment and Occupation - *Convention concerning Discrimination in Respect of Employment and Occupation, 1958*).¹

¹ This has been acknowledged in evaluations of former PRO169 projects.

The project we are evaluating here was conceptualized within the PRO 169 framework, and its activities largely complement other initiatives carried out under that programme in previous years. Shortly after the project agreement with the EU was signed, however, the main grants on which the PRO 169 had relied were no longer available, wherefore the PRO 169-programme effectively had to close down, as funding to pay for PRO169 staff at headquarters and in project countries dried up. Consequently, this project's organizational framework turned out to be quite different from what was anticipated at the time the project was designed.² Fortunately, the more or less simultaneous ILO office reform established a new indigenous peoples unit within the Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch (GED) under the Conditions of Work and Equality Department. The project coordination and management was smoothly moved to this new unit, where a Senior Specialist on Equality and Non-Discrimination, and newly appointed focal person on indigenous peoples, took over the project Coordination as of December 2014.³

Project overview

The **overall objective** of the project was stated as follows:

“The rights of indigenous peoples in Asia, Latin America and Africa are better protected and promoted”

The **specific objectives** were

“National processes on indigenous peoples in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic are supported, with a view to setting good examples for neighbouring countries and the regions”

With a total budget of EUR 799,193.70, out of which EUR 699,294.50 (87,5%) were granted by the EC (DEVCO B1, financed by the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights), the project was implemented over a 33-months period, running from June 21, 2013, to March 31, 2016. The project was originally planned as a 24-month intervention, but due to delays in the implementation of activities, and resulting under-spending of the project funds, a no-cost extension of an additional 5 months was approved by the EC in April 2015. A further no-cost extension was provided for 4 months in March 2016. At the outset of this evaluation (December 2015), the final activities were still being wrapped up - mostly in the sense that studies carried out under the project were being finalized and some of them prepared for publishing.

² For some months funds from the United Nations Indigenous Peoples Partnership complemented the staffing resources under the project we are evaluating, which secured some continuity in the staffing situation at the country level - but these resources soon dried up too.

³ This new position is funded by ILO's regular budget, and thus represents a new level of institutionalization of the indigenous peoples rights-expertise within the ILO structure.

The project's **geographical focus** was centered around one country in Latin America, Africa and Asia respectively in the project design, namely Peru, the Central African Republic, and Nepal: **Peru** was chosen because the country is on the forefront of developing a national framework for effective implementation of Convention No. 169 with its 2011 adoption of a law on Indigenous Peoples' Right to Prior Consultation (*Ley del Derecho a la Consulta Previa a los Pueblos Indígenas u Originarios*). The **Central African Republic** and **Nepal** are the first countries to have ratified Convention No. 169 in Africa and Asia respectively. All three countries are thus considered to be at the forefront in their regions, and it was considered strategic to invest resources in supporting the consolidation of the developments, and make sure experiences were shared with neighboring countries as well as internationally where relevant.

Early on in the project implementation it became clear that the situation in the Central African Republic was too unstable for the planned project activities to be viable, wherefore the Africa component of the project was moved to **Cameroon**, where the political climate was favourable for the promotion of the issues the project worked with. The fact that the planned project activities were conceptualized within the former PRO 169-framework made this move possible, as they complemented former initiatives that had been implemented in Cameroon too, as part of a broader PRO 169 presence in the Central African Region.

Actors and actions

The **target group** of the project is defined as

- Key government policy planners, implementers, and local community-leadership
- Indigenous peoples and institutions at national and community level
- Indigenous peoples - particular attention to indigenous women and youth
- Workers and employers organizations
- The wider public and mass media, including community radios and social media where possible
- Key national and regional actors, including regional human rights institutions and law enforcement agencies / institutions, such as ombudsmen, national human rights commissions and labour inspectors

The project has reached out to these actors through

Trainings of key government and non-government actors in the implementation of the convention at country-level, and an international course for high-level government officials at the ILO Training Centre in Turin. During the course of implementation of the project, the training concept was broadened to also encompass other forms of strategic discussions with key government and non-government actors in Peru and Cameroon, where emerging political discussions

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

opened a space for the ILO to contribute constructively with technical input on the Conventions (Convention 111 and 169), and their application in other countries.⁴

Fellowships / internships for indigenous youth

Sharing experiences on the implementation of the Convention regionally and across regions - through a wide range of studies and publications

Workshops with media-actors and publication of a guide for media on how to approach indigenous issues in their publishing and broadcasting

Pragmatic solutions for the implementation of activities needed to be found in each implementation country, given the unanticipated lack of dedicated staff with the closing of the PRO 169. In all three countries, external cooperation partners such as indigenous organizations, NGOs and academic institutions came to play a stronger role in project implementation than anticipated, and external consultants were hired on an activity-by-activity-basis to coordinate events.

Evaluation background

The main **purposes** of this evaluation can be summarized as

- Documenting the main results, and analyzing the viability of the strategies employed towards achieving the stated objectives, in light of the given challenges in the project context in each country
- Assessing the implications of structural / organizational changes between project design and implementation
- Identifying factors that enabled or limited the achievement of project objectives
- Assessing future prospects for promoting indigenous peoples' rights, in the context of the new programmatic framework and the situations in each of the project-countries

The evaluation forms part of the ILO-system's efforts at generating and managing knowledge on practical experiences with its actions, with a view to nurturing organizational learning, and feed these experiences into the future development of programmes and projects. An external consultant has been hired to carry out the evaluation, and the process is managed and coordinated by an Evaluation Manager (from the Department of Statistics). ILO staff in Headquarters and field offices and ILO's tripartite constituents are the main clients of the evaluation, along with the DEVCO B1-unit of the European Commission, which manages the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, that have provided the funding for the project.

⁴ Explained in ore detail below.

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

Evaluation scope and criteria

Among the three project-countries, Peru and Nepal are both at critical junctures in terms of moving ahead with the implementation of C169, and at the forefront of developments in this regard within their regions, wherefore these two countries were selected for country-visits. Actors in Cameroon were reached through Skype and phone interviews.⁵

The OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impacts and sustainability form the backbone of the evaluation framework. Specific evaluation questions are included in the section on Methodology below.

Timeframe

The evaluation was carried out over a span of 28 working days, starting with briefings at the ILO head office in Geneva in early December 2015. The data collection and report-writing took place in January-February 2016.

⁵ The justification is further elaborated in the section on Methodology below.

Methodology

The specific evaluation questions agreed on in the inception phase were as follows:

Evaluation criteria and questions

Relevance
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the problem been clearly analyzed, and the target group identified? 2. Were the project objectives consistent with the target group's needs and priorities? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Was the target group involved in the project design? ○ Did the project take gender specificities into consideration in its design and implementation? Were indigenous women's particular needs addressed? 3. Was the intervention logic clear and consistent? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is it clear how the inputs and activities would contribute to the achievement of the objectives? ○ Was the foreseen timeframe realistic to achieve the expected results? ○ Was the project management structure sufficiently clear and realistically designed? 4. Was the project aligned with ILO and EU overall objectives and priorities, as expressed in Programming and Strategy documents?
Effectiveness
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the project execution contribute to its objective of enhancing the protection and promotion of the rights of indigenous peoples in Asia, Latin America and Africa? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Were national processes on indigenous peoples supported in Nepal, Peru and the Central African Republic, with a view to setting good examples for neighbouring countries and the regions? 2. Did the project deliver the expected results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are legal/institutional reforms and capacity development of government officials and indigenous peoples in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic documented, shared and given visibility in neighbouring countries and within the regions? ○ Are emerging good practices on indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru, and the Central African Republic documented, shared and given visibility in neighbouring countries and within regions? ○ Are key stakeholders, including trade unions, employers' organizations, the wider public, indigenous youth, education institutions and the media in Peru, Nepal and the Central African Republic well informed of current international standards and emerging good practices on indigenous peoples' rights? 3. What major factors enabled or limited the achievement of the objectives?

Efficiency
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the project management demonstrate the capacity to efficiently coordinate, administer and backstop the project implementation arrangements? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Were inputs delivered in a quality and timely fashion? ○ Were the management and coordination arrangements sufficiently clear, adequate and responsive to partners' and beneficiaries' needs? ○ What were the main operational implementation difficulties and what was done to address them? 2. To what extent has the project collaborated with and coordinated action with other relevant ILO Programmes and Units? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Has there been synergies with other ILO activities at country-level, and / or has the project leveraged other funds? 3. Have resources been spent as economically as possible in relation to producing the expected results/outputs?
Gender dimensions
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have indigenous men and women benefitted equally from the project? 2. Has the project implementation addressed indigenous women's particular situation and concerns - and how? 3. Has the project contributed to a gendered analysis of indigenous peoples' rights, and succeeded in making this visible across sections in the ILO, and among external stakeholders?
Impact
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the wider impacts of the project's actions? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are there specific immediate and emerging long-term examples from the implementation countries? 2. Were there significant unforeseen effects - positive or negative? 3. What was done to enhance / mitigate them, with a view to ensuring the greatest possible overall impact?
Sustainability
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent has the capacity of partner institutions been strengthened, and what needs to be done to further enhance their contributions to promoting indigenous peoples' rights in the future? 2. Are there elements for actual and potential expansion or replicability of the project to other areas or regions?

Data collection

The primary methods of data collection for the evaluation were **semi-structured interviews** and **desk review of project-related documents** (project documents, training schedules and curricula, implementation partners' reports on activities, participants' evaluations from trainings, studies and publications published under the project, etc.). In all three implementation countries **key actors in the project**, as well as **key external stakeholders**, who could provide observations on the project context, were interviewed (such as indigenous rights experts, NGO representatives, relevant staff from other UN organizations, etc.). The evaluator carried out all interviews alone, with a view to securing stakeholders' space for sharing their observations and reflections freely. An interview log is included in Annex 1, for the sake of transparency.

In addition to the project-related document-review and interviews, some **external thematic resources** were reviewed in order to inform the assessment of the project's strategic relevance in relation to the socio-political context (newspaper articles, reports from other institutions on the situation of indigenous peoples' rights in the respective countries, etc.). This methodology was chosen in consideration of the kinds of activities implemented, and the limited time available to carry out the evaluation.

At the outset of the evaluation-process, the evaluator was **briefed at the ILO Headquarters** by the Project Coordinator (Martin Oelz, Senior Specialist on Equality and Non-discrimination, GED); Shauna Olney (Chief, GED); the evaluation Manager Ritash Sarna (STATISTICS) and WORKQUALITY's Focal point for Evaluations, Rasha Tabbara; Xavier Beaudonnet (NORMES), and Ruaridh Hastings (PARDEV).

Country visits and Skype interviews

Two of the three implementation countries were visited, in order to carry out face-to-face interviews, and collect more context information than electronic means of communication alone would have allowed. Peru and Nepal were chosen for the country-visits, as both countries are going through crucial processes in terms of operationalizing the implementation of Convention No. 169:

Peru is among the 'first generation' of countries that ratified Convention no. 169 in the early years after its adoption in 1989 (Peru ratified in 1994). The institutional framework around the implementation of the Convention is relatively well consolidated, and Peru is considered to be at the forefront of implementation with the 2011 adoption of a Law on Consultation (*Ley del Derecho a la Consulta Previa a los Pueblos Indígenas u Originarios*), and an ombudsman-institution (la Defensoría del Pueblo) that is deeply engaged in overseeing the implementation of the Convention, and providing input to the state apparatus on how to develop the legal framework and institutional practices further. Tensions and complexities in the implementation of the Consultation-law and its regulatory framework, however, remain.

Nepal, on the other hand, is in the early stages of implementation, being one of the last countries to ratify, and the first country in Asia to do so (in 2007). Ratification of

the Convention in Nepal formed part of the peace process that formally ended a ten-year armed Maoist insurgency with a Comprehensive Peace Agreement adopted in 2006. Key elements of the Convention are clearly reflected in the Interim Constitution that governed the country during the prolonged process of drafting a new Constitution (2008-15). The actual new Constitution, which was adopted recently (in September 2015), however, does not reflect the same level of alignment with the Convention. The issue of indigenous peoples' rights has lost traction in the national political context during the post-insurgency country-restructuring-process that the drafting of the new constitution formed part of - and actual steps taken towards preparing implementation of the Convention remain limited.⁶ At this particular point in time, it is, therefore, of utmost importance for the ILO to take stock of the strategy employed to promote the implementation of the Convention in Nepal, and this evaluation presents an opportunity to contribute to this reflection process.

Cameroon has not (yet) ratified Convention No. 169, but indigenous peoples are gradually gaining more visibility in the national political and developmental context, and civil society and indigenous peoples' organizations are getting more articulate in their demands for ratification. Recent years have seen increasing recognition of indigenous peoples' rights in the Central African region, with the ratification of Convention No. 169 in the Central African Republic in 2010, and the adoption of the Law on Indigenous Peoples in the Republic of Congo, also in 2010. Actors involved in the project implementation in Cameroon were interviewed via Skype and telephone connections.

The evaluation-findings presented in this report have been generated through **triangulation of observations** recorded in the individual interviews with internal and external actors and stakeholders, face-to-face in the case of Peru and Nepal, and via Skype or phone connections in the case of Cameroon, and the desk review of project-related and external documents.

Methodological limitations

It should be noted that quite a few of the studies and reports produced under the project were finalized at the very end of the project period, wherefore most have not yet been distributed efficiently. The evaluator has therefore only been able to assess their thematic / strategic relevance, and not their actual use - which would be interesting to look into in future evaluations or impact studies, given the central role the production of studies and reports play in the ILO's work on promoting indigenous and tribal peoples' rights. This could be done through an online questionnaire

⁶ It is widely argued that C169 is divisive, and its implementation would lead to national dis-integration. Quite a few interviewees shared the view that the current public discourse around the Convention is highly influenced by misinterpretations, and that these same misinterpretations are influencing donor agencies to be very cautious in their engagement in the promotion of the Convention.

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

distributed widely to a range of institutions and individuals that are considered the target group for the publications.

It should also be noted that evaluation data from Peru and Nepal are more extensive than the data obtained from Cameroon, as the country visits with their many face-to-face meetings with interlocutors naturally provided broader, and more in-depth information, than what can be obtained over Skype. It proved difficult, too, to set up Skype or phone conversations with all intended interlocutors in Cameroon, wherefore evaluation data from here are more limited.

Finally, the fact that national elections are coming up in Peru in April 2016, influenced the meeting schedule a bit, and a few actors were too busy with the preparatory process to be able to meet with the evaluator.

Acknowledgements

The evaluator wishes to acknowledge the dedication of ILO staff, implementation partners and external actors in Peru, Cameroon and Nepal, who took the time to share their observations and reflections on the evaluation questions. A special thanks goes to the field office staff in Lima and Kathmandu, and their external consultant colleagues, who scheduled, and re-scheduled, the meetings that form the backbone of the data-collection.

Main findings

Relevance

The project design was made in Headquarters, based on experiences generated through previous year's PRO169 engagements in the three implementation countries and regions, many of which have been funded through EIDHR project grants too (since 2006). The evaluation found no evidence of target group involvement in the project design. Field office-involvement was very limited too - but field office staff did not consider this a problem, since the project objectives are quite straightforward (promoting indigenous peoples' rights, through support to 'national processes'), and open enough to accommodate the specificities of each of the given country contexts.⁷ The objectives are clear, and well aligned with the target groups' needs and priorities - **all actors the evaluator has spoken to, have confirmed the high relevance of the initiative.**

Gender specificities were not clearly taken into consideration in the project design (more on this in the section on Gender below), but the implementation did, to a limited extent, seek to address indigenous women's

⁷ Some level of target group involvement was achieved in the planning of activities, in all three implementation countries.

needs: Both women and men were targeted by the activities, and the gender balance in the participation in activities was reasonable. In Peru, the study on indigenous women's labour conditions constituted a significant contribution to making indigenous women's situation and needs more visible.

The **intervention logic was reasonably clear and consistent**, but the evaluation finds that achieving the specific objective of 'supporting national processes... with a view to setting good examples for neighbouring countries and the regions' would have required accompaniment of key actors, and ad-hoc engagement in key events / processes in the project countries, that went beyond the specific activities planned under the project (discussed in more detail in the section on Relevance below).

The timeframe was somehow ambitious, but the results were achieved to a satisfying extent (these findings are elaborated more in the section on Effectiveness below). The project implementation structure was designed under the assumption that PRO 169 would generate complimentary project funding to secure full-time, dedicated staff in the project countries - which did not happen. Staffing at field-office level was therefore a challenge to the project's implementation (discussed in more detail in the section on Efficiency below), but not an obstacle - the project was implemented successfully despite this challenge.

The project was well aligned with the overall EU and ILO objectives and priorities, as expressed in the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), which has funded the action, and the ILO's Programme and Budget 2014-15 respectively: The project has contributed to fulfil the ILO Programme and Budget's Outcome 18 (*International labour standards are ratified and applied*), with its clear focus on promotion of ILO Convention No. 169. The EU's funding instrument for promotion of democracy and human rights aims at providing support for promoting human rights in non-EU countries, and within this framework, promotion of indigenous peoples' rights is one of the priorities. The project's alignment with these priorities is very clear.

In each of the three project countries, the project contributed meaningfully to the implementation of the ILO country strategies (Decent Work Country Programmes in Nepal and Cameroon): the Cameroon DWCP⁸ consistently mentions indigenous peoples as one of the vulnerable groups targeted under the programme, referring also to the experiences gained under previous years' PRO 169 activities in the country. The Nepal DWCP gives a quite high priority to promoting the application of Convention No. 169, with the convention and the draft National Action Plan on Implementation being specifically mentioned under priority 3 'Promotion of fundamental principles and rights at work', and again specifically mentioned in one of the outcomes.⁹

⁸ Known as the *Programme Pays pour le Travail Décent (PPTD) 2012-17*.

⁹ *Outcome 3.1: Constituents and major stakeholders have improved capacities to address the implementation gap in respect of conventions 29, 105, 169 and 182 and to ratify conventions of national priorities*. Nepal Decent Work Country Programme 2012-17, p. 22-23.

Effectiveness

The project clearly contributed to enhancing the protection and promotion of the rights of indigenous peoples in the three project countries. All the activities that were implemented were timely, and responded to actual needs, according to the many stakeholder views gathered during the evaluation.

The regional spill-over effects (setting good examples), that were anticipated in the project design with its emphasis on engagement with neighbouring actors, **proved hard to achieve within the de-facto very short implementation-period**, and the relatively limited number of events carried out under the project. However, some initiatives carried out under the project do have potential to generate these effects in the future: The regional studies produced in the Central African Region known as the Congo Basin and in Asia respectively, have potential to inform policy- and development-debates across these regions in the near future, when the publications are finalized and launched. In Peru, the seminar on statistics and indigenous peoples, which gathered a wide range of actors from the South American region with a view to generating informed debate on how the country can use the coming census to generate national statistics on the indigenous population, has a potential to influence key processes and policies in that country in the future too.

Achieving the specific objective of supporting 'national processes on indigenous people' in the project countries, 'with a view to setting good examples for neighbouring countries and the regions' was challenging: Both because of the short timeframe of actual implementation of project activities - and even more so because of the lack of long-term, dedicated staff with a clear mandate and time to engage in the key 'national processes' that were ongoing during the time of implementation. **With no long-term or permanent staff in place** to work on the project implementation as part of a broader mandate to promote Convention No. 169 and indigenous peoples' rights, **field offices were forced to focus almost exclusively on implementation of the series of activities funded by the project.** While a lot was certainly achieved, and expectations met in the implementation of these planned activities, some important opportunities to support key national processes were missed in both Peru and Nepal too:

In **Peru**, the emblematic Law on indigenous peoples' right to prior Consultation (*Ley del Derecho a la Consulta Previa a los Pueblos Indígenas u Originarios*) is in the early stages of implementation, and a complicated and contested consultation process around an oil extraction process in the Loreto Department in the Amazon, known as *El Lote 192*, culminated in 2015, being the second consultation process to conclude under the new law. Almost all actors the evaluator talked to in Peru, including staff in the office of the Vice Minister of Interculturality, NGOs, indigenous rights activists and the UNDP, regretted the fact that the ILO had not been able to accompany this important process as an observer. Many pointed out that given the key role the ILO played in the process leading to the adoption of the law, it would be natural for the ILO to have a stronger presence during these early stages of implementation too, where the practical application of the law and its regulations is hammered out.

In **Nepal**, the drafting of a new constitution that formed part of the peace process that was agreed on with the Comprehensive Peace Agreement that ended the Maoist war in 2006, started out in the early years with a strong focus on social inclusion (proportional political representation, access to natural resources, identity issues, etc.), well aligned with the principles of Convention No. 169. The dominant political discourse has changed dramatically over the years, however, and the past couple of years have seen the rise of a political debate that has turned increasingly hostile towards these issues - with a dominant counter-discourse of strengthening national integration taking the centre stage. Donor engagement in promoting an inclusive process, and securing a social inclusion-oriented new Constitution in the extremely diverse country,¹⁰ has fallen dramatically over the past few years too, illustrated by the fact that the previously very active Social Inclusion Action Group for donor cooperation and coordination has become much less active than in the past, and shifted its focus more towards gender issues lately. In this context, the ILO could, if staff resources had been available, without doubt have played an important role in terms of providing continued backstopping in the interpretation of the Convention, opening spaces for dialogue between Government, CA Members, indigenous peoples and civil society organizations, etc., as it did in the early years of Constitution-drafting with the formation of the Indigenous Caucus in the Constitutional Assembly, etc.. The absence of the ILO as a visible player¹¹ in this process the past few years is regrettable.

On another note, however, the project also showed a high level of efficiency in terms of 'supporting national processes', despite the limited staffing resources, through other initiatives in Peru: **The proactive engagement in establishing the *Grupo de Trabajo de Políticas Indígenas (GTPI)* is a noteworthy example of a very strategic move towards operationalizing a space for indigenous peoples' participation in political discussion of matters that affect them**, c.f. the core provisions of the Convention. The evaluation considers this a positive lesson learned, wherefore it is described in more detail in the Lesson Learned section below, as well as in an Annex to the report.

Delivery of expected results

A detailed overview of the project's specific outputs as compared to the planned activities, as per the project document's log frame, is included in Annex 1.

Evaluated against each of the three expected results, the project's results can be summarized as follows:

¹⁰ The 2001 census listed 92 spoken languages, and 59 indigenous groups are officially recognized in national legislation. Various studies have documented the deep-rooted and multi-faceted social exclusion over the past 10 years, and most indigenous groups fall within the categories of 'highly excluded' or 'excluded' groups in the World Bank's 2013 study the *Nepal Multidimensional Exclusion Index* (Bennett and Parajuli 2013).

¹¹ This dramatic decrease in the ILO's visibility on these issues was commented upon by almost all actors interviewed in Kathmandu.

Expected result 1: Legal/institutional reforms and capacity development of government officials and indigenous peoples in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic are supported

The project has delivered most of the expected trainings plus some extra capacity-building initiatives that responded strategically to emerging debates and opportunities (Peru and Nepal). All these trainings / workshops / seminars are considered timely and valuable by the stakeholders the evaluator has talked to. It is worth highlighting that the value added by seizing opportunities to add complimentary activities in Peru and Nepal, in response to the given administrative / political situation during the course of implementation of the project, is considerable. These initiatives have scaled up the significance of the project, despite its otherwise limited reach (few activities in each country).

The evaluator has **not found clear examples of actual legal or institutional reform that can be traced back to the project interventions** in any of the three implementation countries. Given the scale of the intervention (limited number of activities within a very short time frame), this is to be expected, and probably the ambition expressed in the expected result was too high, as also noted in the section above on 'Relevance'. There is no doubt that the project has contributed to legal and institutional development in a longer-term perspective.

Two recent political / institutional developments in Nepal are, however, deemed closely related to the renewed constructive attention to Convention No 169's application in Nepal that the launching of the FAQ Guide has generated: Most importantly, the Government's submission to the ILO of a progress report on the implementation of the Convention (delayed for years, and finally submitted in 2015, and examined by the Committee of Experts in November-December 2015); and the fact that the Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development (MoFALD) has made a budget allocation for generating a 'plan for the implementation of the Convention' within the current fiscal year (also an initiative that follows up on a process that has been dormant for years, after a Draft National Action Plan on Implementation of the Convention got stalled in the Ministry of Home Affairs in early 2009).

Expected result 2: Emerging good practices on indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru, and Central African Republic are documented, shared and given visibility in neighbouring countries and within the regions

Most of the planned studies have been carried out, but are not yet published. Their finalization for publishing is underway, and their launching is expected within this year.

A wide number of issues are dealt with in the studies, and if distributed effectively, they have **potential to influence a range of actors' engagement in**

promoting and protecting indigenous peoples' rights. The study on indigenous women, which was published in Peru, has been very well received, and some of the actors interviewed expressed that it had caused them to start looking more into gender-issues in their work with indigenous peoples than they had otherwise done.

The evaluator found **no evidence of production of 'regular updates on the implementation of ILO Convention No. 169'** in the project countries (Nepal, Peru and Cameroon), as planned in the project document. Some of the stakeholders interviewed expressed that more sharing would have been useful. It is not clear in the project document what form this sharing was supposed to take, and with the de-facto very short implementation period, it is understandable that structured inter-regional updating could not take place.

Expected result 3: Key stakeholders, including trade unions, employers' organizations, the wider public, indigenous youth, education institutions and the media in Peru, Nepal and Central African Republic are well informed of current international standards and emerging good practices on indigenous peoples' rights

The planned activities under this result were trainings in each country for media professionals (mass media, community radio-producers and social media), and production of outreach and awareness-raising materials in the three project countries. The awareness-raising material was envisaged to be a combination of producing new material, and updating existing tools and guides that continue to be in demand. One specific publication that was planned was a compilation of relevant decisions, comments, observations and recommendations of the ILO supervisory bodies, similar to what has been produced under earlier PRO169 projects.¹² Such a compilation was indeed produced, though in a less ambitious and cheaper format, and distributed in the context of various training activities, during the UNPFII, etc.

The media trainings were implemented in all three countries, and deemed important and successful by the stakeholders interviewed. The kinds of media-actors targeted varied according to the different country-contexts, with separate trainings for mainstream / national-level media and community-level indigenous communicators respectively in Peru, and joint trainings for a range of media actors in Cameroon and Nepal. **A media guide was produced in Cameroon**, and validated in a second workshop with media-professionals, after which it has been published in French and English. A global media guide has been developed too, and will be published in English, Spanish and French in 2016.¹³

12

http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@ed_norm/@normes/documents/publication/wcms_126028.pdf

¹³ Co-funded with other sources.

In all three countries, stakeholders stressed the **strategic importance of generating respectful media coverage on indigenous peoples that analyzes their situation critically**, in light of international standard-setting instruments.

The evaluator has not been able to gather specific evidence of increased coverage of indigenous peoples' issues after the media seminars - wherefore an assessment of the extent to which the various stakeholders mentioned are 'well informed of current international standards and emerging good practices on indigenous peoples' rights' is hard to make. Similar to what was discussed under Expected result 1, the project design was probably a bit too optimistic too, in terms of what could realistically be achieved with 1-2 media workshops in each region. That being said, it is clear that the project activities under this component have been timely and well received.

In Peru and Cameroon, the consultants associated with the project implementation were tasked with delivering presentations on indigenous peoples' rights in a number of other actors' fora, the evaluation finds that this has been a strategic way of doing more than was originally planned to achieve the project's Expected Result no. 3.

Factors that enabled or limited the achievement of the objectives

The evaluation has identified a number of factors that enabled or limited the achievement of the project objectives respectively. These are summarized in the table below.¹⁴

Enabling factors	Limiting factors
Leadership commitment to the principles of Convention No. 169 and the importance of its promotion (Peru, Cameroon)	Over-cautious approach at times, fear of political interference (Nepal, Peru)
Strong technical personnel within ILO field office (Cameroon) and headquarters	Down-scaling of staff resources as compared to earlier projects (all countries) - institutional cooperation with government, CSOs, IPOs and other actors is disrupted, which makes it hard to support ongoing national processes
Strong coordination from headquarters - timely and high-quality technical inputs to those responsible for activities in field offices	'Encapsulated approach' , with focus on singular events - limited engagement with institutions in project countries, as well as limited cross-fertilization into other units / areas of work within the ILO (e.g. forced labour, child labour, informal economy...)
Efficient administration process - HQ to field offices	Hostile political environment in Nepal , where the letter and spirit of Convention No.

¹⁴ Please note that the two columns are supposed to be read separately - there is no direct correlation between left and right, the observations are put in a table to generate a better overview.

	169 lost traction in the latter part of the Constitution-drafting process (2012-15) ¹⁵
Clear continuity between former project and activities under this project	Decreased donor cooperation around indigenous peoples' issues in Peru and Nepal ¹⁶
Cross-fertilization between regions - particularly around the work with media (experience-sharing facilitated by the Project Coordinator at HQ)	Institutional challenges within indigenous organizations - limited resources and technical capacity to work on the complex legal issues that fall within the scope of Convention No. 169 and other international instruments, as well as weak links between grass-roots and national-level representation

Efficiency

The project implementation has been highly efficient: The project started with considerable delay, and the project's de-facto implementation period was only app. 9 months (roughly between April-December 2015). Nevertheless the Coordinator and not least his colleagues in field offices managed to implement all activities meaningfully, and with context-relevant adjustments and even additions, over the course of this very short time-span.

The project was a so-called centrally managed project, which was designed, coordinated and managed financially from the Headquarters in Geneva, with disbursements to field offices on an activity-by-activity basis. While one field office expressed that they would prefer to work with locally-managed projects in the future (the Andean Office in Peru), all field office staff the evaluator spoke to expressed a very high level of satisfaction with headquarter staff's coordination, support and administrative efficiency (including Peru). Some characteristics of this efficiency that were repeatedly mentioned by field office staff include

- Regular communication
- Meticulous guidance on and input to the development and execution of project activities
- Sharing of products along the way that provided inspiration and new angles on field office staff's own work

¹⁵ A new Constitution was promulgated in September 2015, after an eight-year long process that set out as very inclusive and consultation-oriented - and ended with a de-facto top-down finalization, resulting in a constitution that is strongly criticized by some indigenous peoples and other minority groups (pers. Communication with LAHURNIP leadership).

¹⁶ In both countries this is probably partly caused by the ILO's decreased ability to lead this donor-cooperation, with the loss of IP-technical staff in field offices upon the closing of PRO169. In Nepal, it is also closely linked to the hostile political environment, which has caused a strong reluctance among donor agencies to engage in indigenous peoples' issues. In both countries, the donor cooperation is in a process of re-consolidating now, which is a promising development.

- Efficient responses to queries

The lack of dedicated technical staff in field offices was the main operational challenge in the implementation of the project. When the project was designed, it was assumed that the PRO169 programme would continue, and be able to pool funding from different projects to pay for staff in selected countries: Even though the PRO169 was always fully funded by external sources, the programme had built up a continuous engagement over the years through implementation of successive projects promoting Convention no. 169 in certain countries, including the countries where this project was implemented, and it was assumed that this situation would continue. The fact that the PRO 169 de facto closed in 2013 due to the drying up of the external funding on which it had relied, changed the organizational context around the implementation of this project drastically, as compared to what had been anticipated in the project design. Creative solutions to this unforeseen staffing challenge were found in each country-context: A considerable part of the field-office-coordination of activities was taken care of by external consultants, who were partly paid for with the project funds, and partly with other sources.¹⁷ Another solution was to delegate the implementation of some activities to external partners, which for the most part worked well, and can be considered an efficient solution. That being said, it is also clear, as described in the section on Effectiveness above, that **the outcome and impact of the project could have been higher and more significant, if specialized and dedicated staff had been available in the field offices.**

Other units in the ILO were only marginally involved in project implementation, which is understandable given this project's staffing situation, and the need to focus exclusively on execution of specific activities. But again, **if dedicated staff had been in place on a long-term basis, significant synergies could have been generated with other areas of work** that interface with some of indigenous peoples' current challenges in the labour market, such as forced labour, child labour, domestic labour, work in the informal economy, access to social protection, etc..

In consideration of these operational challenges, the evaluator finds that project resources have been spent economically, and with a view to producing the best possible results.

Gender dimensions

In general terms, indigenous women and men have benefitted equally from the project. Enhancing the protection and promotion of indigenous peoples' rights is ultimately benefitting indigenous men and women alike. In terms of the implementation of activities, the gender balance was satisfying - in some trainings and capacity building activities women constituted more than half of the participants

¹⁷ UNIPP funds in the early stages of the project implementation, later there were some contributions from the ILO regular budget too)

(e.g. the Turin training for high government officials and the training of young professionals in Peru). More efforts could, however, have been made towards involving indigenous women's organizations in the implementation of activities. In Peru, this was done through cooperation with ONAMIAP, whereas no involvement of indigenous women's organizations was found Cameroon or Nepal.¹⁸

Gender dimensions were not considered in the project design as such, but nevertheless **the project has taken some steps towards addressing indigenous women's particular situation and concerns**: Indigenous women's issues were addressed in some of the capacity-building activities (e.g. the training of young indigenous professionals in Peru, and the media training in Cameroon), and gender dimensions were prominent in some of the publications produced under the project: The Peruvian study on entrepreneurship and in the use of natural resources in indigenous communities, women's empowerment was considered one of the criteria for the identification of culturally sustainable indigenous entrepreneurship, wherefore the analysis was gendered throughout the study. Another example is the guide for media professionals produced in Cameroon - here indigenous women's particular vulnerability is highlighted throughout, and the legal and institutional framework protecting indigenous women is presented along with a presentation of the framework for protection of indigenous peoples' rights. Specific sections on indigenous women's rights are included in some of the Asian studies too (e.g. the one on indigenous rights in Malaysia). Most importantly, the study on indigenous women's labour situation in Peru (*Estudio sobre la situación laboral de las mujeres indígenas en el Peru*) has contributed significantly to 'gendering' the analysis of indigenous peoples' rights, and to make indigenous women's particular situation more visible to relevant actors. Many of the actors the evaluator spoke to in Peru regarded the publication important, including the ombudsman-institution (*Defensoría del Pueblo*), whose Chief of the Indigenous Programme talked about the need to continue broadening the understanding of the gender-dimensions in the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights - for example when designing consultation processes, which are less accessible to indigenous women than men, due to the long hours participants need to be away from home. The consultant was not, however, able to assess whether these publications have been taken in, and used, in other sections within the ILO.

Impacts

It is too early at this point to assess the wider impacts as such of the project's activities, but as also mentioned in the sections on Effectiveness and Sustainability, it is clear that the project has contributed to the long-term process that is needed to secure better protection and promotion of indigenous peoples'

¹⁸ In Nepal, two well-consolidated national-level indigenous women's organizations exist, namely the National Indigenous Women's Federation, and the National Indigenous Women's Forum, respectively. In Cameroon, The Cameroon Indigenous Women Forum works with Mbororo women, but it is not clear to the evaluator how consolidated this organization is.

rights. With one exception, mentioned below, it is not possible at this point to isolate the contributions of this relatively limited project to this long-term process, as all activities form part of a continuum of ILO engagements in the issues at stake in all three implementation countries as well as in the wider regions, as described in the Project Background-section. The evaluator finds that **this coherence and continuity between past and present activities is one of the key strengths in the project design, and a key element in the project's potential for having impacts in a long-term perspective.**

One emerging long-term example of a potentially important impact that can be partly ascribed to this project, is the establishment of the *Grupo de Trabajo sobre Políticas Indígenas* in Peru. The potential of this space for continuous dialogue between indigenous peoples and the state is described in more detail in the section on Lessons learnt and emerging good practices below.

The evaluation did not identify any significant unforeseen effects.

Sustainability

The project activities built on previous ILO initiatives in the three project countries and regions, and were all focused on the promotion of Convention No. 169 and indigenous peoples' rights in a broader sense - which in itself renders it a high degree of sustainability: it has contributed to the implementation of an existing international rights-framework, acknowledging that this is a complex process, which is best supported in a long-term perspective, with repeated actions of support to the various actors who can promote implementation (or ratification) in the countries where the Convention is relevant.

Capacity-strengthening of partner institutions

Individual actors from government institutions, CSOs, IPOs, indigenous youth and media-representatives have strengthened their capacity to contribute to the promotion of indigenous peoples' rights in the future, through participation in the project's workshops, seminars, trainings, etc. The fact that the activities consisted in a series of events, trainings, and production of publications can be considered another sustainability factor, in the sense that no institutional dependence was created among implementation partners through the project (no longer-term salaries for project partners were covered through the project). On the other hand, institutional strengthening of partner institutions as such has been limited, given the same circumstances.

Potential for expansion and replication

The evaluation has found all activities timely and effective, given the limited budget and the un-predictability of future funding for similar activities. The project has shown that a series of relatively smaller events can indeed contribute to nurturing different actors' engagement in the continued promotion of Convention no. 169 and other international standards for indigenous peoples' rights: Capacity-building of a broad range of actors, engagement of the media, and production of technical resource-papers on indigenous peoples' situation,

rights and development, indeed has potential for replication in other, similar circumstances (with limited funding and a continued need for support).

Indigenous peoples in the new strategic and programmatic framework

The ILO Programme and Budget for the biennium 2016-17 provides a good framework for continuing to support the promotion of Convention No. 169, with its focus on decent work in the rural economy (Outcome 5); formalization of the informal economy (Outcome 6); and on protecting workers from unacceptable forms of work (Outcome 8). Indigenous peoples are mentioned specifically under each of these three Outcomes, and there is a broad scope for promoting the application of essential elements of Convention No. 169 through production of technical resource papers addressing indigenous peoples-specific aspects of each of these themes, building further on the experiences gained under this and previous PRO169 projects - in combination with other, new initiatives. The recent adoption of a new overall strategy for ILO support to indigenous peoples, titled *Indigenous Peoples' Rights for Inclusive and Sustainable Development*, and adopted by the Governing Body in November 2015, provides further impetus for such continued support.

Conclusions

The project has been timely and relevant in all three implementation countries, and contributed satisfyingly to the promotion of indigenous peoples' rights and the application of Convention No. 169. A wealth of stakeholders have been reached, and most of the expected results have been achieved.

Implementation of activities has been effective and efficient, and the cooperation and coordination between headquarters and field offices has been remarkably smooth. The strong role played by technical staff at headquarters in the project implementation has ensured effective sharing of experiences between countries and regions, and much-appreciated guidance, inspiration and back-stopping to the project-responsible staff in country offices.

Given the complexity of the implementation of the Convention, much support is needed at country-level, and the **lack of technical staff in field offices with a clear mandate to dedicate their time to work on the promotion of Convention No. 169 and indigenous peoples' rights in a broader sense, was identified as the main operational challenge** in the implementation of the project. The outcome and impact of the project could have been higher and more significant, if specialized and dedicated staff had been available in the field offices. This would have allowed the ILO to engage on a more continuous basis in key processes that took place simultaneously with the project implementation, such as the emblematic consultation processes in Peru, where the implementation of a 2011 law on consultation is in its early stages; or the debates and dialogues around the development of the new Constitution in Nepal, which was finalized in September 2015. More continuous engagement with government, indigenous organizations and

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

civil society could also have built stronger institutional strengthening in the project countries, than what could be achieved under the given project set up.

While gender dimensions were not considered in the project design as such, **the project has made important contributions to gendering the analysis of indigenous peoples' situation**, and making indigenous women's particular situation and concerns, as well as the rights-framework that protect them, more visible.

The regional spill-over effects that were anticipated in the project design, with its emphasis on engagement with neighbouring actors, and 'setting good examples', **proved hard to achieve** within the de-facto very short implementation-period, and the relatively limited number of activities implemented. The publications that were produced have the potential to contribute to such long-term impacts in the future.

Lessons Learned and emerging good practices

The establishment of the Working Group on Indigenous Policy (*Grupo de Trabajo de Políticas Indígenas* -GTPI) in Peru, represents a promising institutional development, wherefore the evaluation has identified this as the key lesson learned under this project. The group was established by a ministerial resolution in November 2014 (Resolución Ministerial N°403-2014-MC), and is considered a permanent space for tripartite dialogue between indigenous organizations, the Vice Ministry of Culture, and state institutions with mandates that affect indigenous peoples.

Consultation and participation are considered the cornerstones of Convention No. 169 on indigenous and tribal peoples, and recent years have seen important developments towards a more institutionalized approach to Consultation, notably in Peru, with the adoption of the Law on Consultation in 2011 (*Ley del Derecho a la Consulta Previa a los Pueblos Indígenas u Originarios*). The emerging experiences with formal consultation processes under the law, however, have revealed a need for more open spaces of dialogue between indigenous peoples and state actors, and it was this realization that led to the initiative to establish the GTPI: Whereas consultations will always have their agendas defined by the specific intervention (policy, development project, programme...) under discussion, the GTPI constitutes an open space for dialogue where indigenous peoples themselves set the agenda, and initiate discussions on the issues they want to bring to the attention of the state, (local) authorities, and other actors.

The operational practice of the GTPI is for indigenous representatives to debate the issues on the agenda thoroughly, until a consensus can be reached on key messages to deliver to the concerned state institution - where after this institution is invited for a dialogue. This operational practice has proven highly successful in establishing new lines of communication, and a new level of sensitivity within state institutions towards indigenous peoples' aspirations.

Over the course of its first year of operation, the GTPI has convened state actors from 10 different institutions, and presented its visions for aligning public policies and administrative practices with indigenous peoples' rights. According to the GTPI's self-evaluation in late 2015, these dialogues have generated a relation of trust between indigenous peoples' representative organizations and state actors, and a number of public institutions have subsequently established their own procedures for closer coordination with indigenous peoples.

Recommendations

The evaluation's overall recommendation is to **continue the promotion of Convention No. 169 on indigenous and tribal peoples**, as implementation remains challenging, and **continued capacity-building and guidance on its application is needed**. More specifically, the following actions are recommended:

1. *Recommendations for ILO HQ - Indigenous peoples' unit in the GED*

1.1. Continue global cooperation on the promotion of indigenous peoples' rights, and the elaboration on guidance on the application of the Convention within different thematic areas: Experiences in Peru and Nepal alike have shown that indigenous organizations' demands tend to go beyond what is provided for in the Convention, wherefore the ILO's presence, clarifications and capacity building is continuously needed. Strong headquarter-involvement in planning and execution of specific activities in the project countries towards these ends have proven inspirational and successful, and it is recommended to continue seeking synergies between activities in different countries through active headquarter involvement in specific projects.

Action - medium term:

- Continue fund-raising for Headquarter-driven projects with activities in different countries, and focus on sharing of experiences, facilitated by the technical staff at Headquarters. Cooperate with country offices in the elaboration of new projects.
- Engage in country offices' processes regarding designing new projects for / with indigenous peoples where needed.

Priority: High.

1.2. Enhance the distribution and promotion of reports, studies and publications, externally as well as internally - a wealth of analysis and technical reflections and guidance on indigenous peoples' situation and rights have been produced under this as well as previous projects. Their relevance is confirmed by stakeholders, but they are not necessarily visible, or easily accessible. A starting point for enhancing the promotion of these resources could be to evaluate their current use more in-depth, get a clearer insight into the

target groups' needs, and develop specific publication formats and distribution strategies (for internal as well as external distribution).

Actions - short term:

- Carry out an evaluation of the current use of ILO indigenous peoples-related publications, and develop specific publication formats and distribution strategies (for internal as well as external distribution) based on this.
- Enhance the accessibility and visibility of indigenous peoples-related publications on the ILO website.

Priority: High

2. Recommendations for ILO Country Offices

2.1. Combine headquarter-initiated projects with country-office initiated activities - with sufficient staffing resources to gain a continuous presence over a longer period of time, allowing the ILO to not only implement a series of pre-planned project activities, but also to engage meaningfully in relevant national processes as and when the need for ILO's institutional accompaniment occurs.

Action - medium term: Fund-raise for continuous promotion of Convention no. 169; prioritize staffing resources in project design and budgeting in order to ensure the availability of human resources to provide technical input to relevant national processes, as needs arise. Seek inspiration and input from technical staff at HQ if and when needed, and promote synergies with other areas of the ILO's work (e.g. within the fields of forced labour, domestic work, child labour, etc.).

Priority: High.

2.2. Support consolidation and institutional development of indigenous peoples' organizations, with focus on enhancing the sub-national organization-building, and strengthening of the links between local / regional organizations and chapters and the indigenous organizations acting at the national level, as well as general capacity-building on the application of Convention No. 169, presentation of inspirational practices from other countries, strengthening of negotiation skills / building capacity for constructive dialogue, etc.. Institutional development of IPOs is needed, for these organizations to play an ever more constructive role in the promotion and implementation of Convention No. 169 and other international instruments, and has potential to contribute significantly to enhancing the constructive cooperation between IPOs and states, at central as well as de-central levels, in the future.

Actions - short, medium and long-term:

- Increase engagement with indigenous peoples' organizations at the sub-national / de-central level.

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

- Include de-central / regional activities in future projects for / with indigenous peoples, with a view to using the project cooperation to enhance the capacity and visibility of these actors.

Priority: High

3. Recommendations to ILO Peru

3.1. Re-engage in the emerging consultation processes, providing institutional accompaniment - the evaluation has identified this as a clear request from state actors, NGOs, indigenous organizations and international organizations alike. The consultation-practice is emerging and fragile, wherefore international attention is needed. No other institution can play the role the ILO can play here, with its institutional mandate to provide guidance on the implementation of the Convention that provided the framework for the formulation of the Law on Consultation (Convention No. 169).

Actions - short- to medium term: Allocate staff resources to engage in emblematic consultation processes as an observer in the near future.

Priority: High

3.2. Continue the support to the *Grupo de Trabajo de Políticas Indígenas* (GTPI), which represents a promising institutional development, where the ILO's presence is crucial. Supporting the GTPI's regional work would be a strategic way to also indirectly support the capacity-building of indigenous peoples' organizations at the sub-national level (c.f. recommendation above on support to de-central institutional development of indigenous peoples' organizations).

Actions - short, medium and long-term: Define the ILO's role in the GTPI clearly, and allocate staff resources to continuously accompany the group. This can be included in future project proposals.

Priority: High

4. Recommendations to ILO Nepal

4.1. Take a pragmatic look at what can be done in the current hostile political context, and identify specific areas where Convention no. 169 can serve as a tool for inclusive development, affirmative action, etc.

Actions - short and medium term: analyze possibilities for promoting indigenous peoples' access to social services and social protection, and put these issues on the national agenda via donor cooperation and dialogue with relevant ministries and other actors (in line with UNDAF Outcomes 1 and 2).

Priority: Medium

4.2. Engage in the emerging law-reform process that is underway, following the adoption of the new constitution last September: the development of the

governance framework for the future federal states is of particular importance for indigenous peoples, and the government is committed to developing this as a matter of priority. ILO can play an important, strategic role here, in terms of bringing together the government, indigenous peoples and other stakeholders, and opening a space for dialogue. Strong engagement of sub-national indigenous organizations is important in this process, and could serve also to lay the foundation for developing constructive cooperation between indigenous peoples and the new federal states.

Actions - short and medium term: Raise funds for solid engagement in the law reform process. Monitor the development of the governance framework for the federal states, and raise the issue of alignment with ILO Convention No. 169 in high-level dialogues.

Priority: High

4.3 Engage strongly in the donor cooperation group on indigenous peoples and gender equality, known as the Social Inclusion Action Group (SIAG) - joint donor involvement is key to re-inserting indigenous peoples' issues on the national development and policy-development agenda. SIAG is in process of re-consolidating itself, and expects stronger cooperation in the near future. This provides a good opportunity for the ILO to use the leverage of SIAG to promote indigenous rights issues, and particularly the application of Convention no. 169.

Actions - short, medium and long term:

- Allocate staff resources to engage strongly in the SIAG, with a view to enhancing the group's joint voice on indigenous rights issues.
- Promote the Frequently Asked Questions Guide on Convention no. 169 to SIAG members
- Use the SIAG as a forum to push jointly for the government to revise and simplify the National Action Plan for the implementation of Convention No. 169, as per the ILO Commitment in the UNDAF's outputs 3.2 and 9.2. The ministry has expressed that this is on its agenda for this fiscal year (yet considerable resistance can be expected, in light of recent years experiences). Getting a National Action Plan adopted before the law-reform process takes full speed would be a strategically important move.

Priority: High

Annex 1: Overview of results as compared to the project log-frame

Expected result 1: Legal/institutional reforms and capacity development of government officials and indigenous peoples in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic are supported		
Planned activities	Actual outputs	Observations
Technical trainings for key national stakeholders in the implementation of ILO Convention No. 169 in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic (2 trainings per region, 3 days each, 40 participants from line ministries)	<p>Congo: Meeting of Parliamentarians 29 July, 2014</p> <p>Cameroon: Workshop on non-discrimination in the labour market, based on the CEACR's comments on implementation of Convention no. 111. Oct 2015</p> <p>Cameroon: Tripartite workshop on indigenous peoples' rights (<i>What do the international instruments say?</i>), Yaounde, 8-9 April, 2015. 30 participants representing government institutions, civil society, indigenous communities, the United Nations system, international organizations, media, and traditional and local authorities.</p> <p>Peru: 3-day capacity-building of 50 commissioners from 23 of the Ombudsman institution's regional offices</p>	<p>Nepal: Workshop with government + indigenous leaders postponed till early Feb, and paid for with other resources.</p>
Course for high government officials (decision-makers) and indigenous leaders on indigenous peoples' rights and development at the ILO Training Centre in Turin, Italy (3 participants per region, 5 days)	<p>Turin: Indigenous and tribal peoples: rights and development. ILO International Training Centre, Turin, Italy, 13-17 April, 2015. 22 participants from IPOs, NGOs, Academia, government institutions, members of parliament, ILO, the private sector.</p>	<p>The training was originally planned for high government officials and indigenous leaders, and only for 9-10 participants in total (3 per region). The number of participants was more than doubled, and the range of actors expanded (6 IPO representatives, 5 researchers/academics, 3 NGO representatives, 3 government representatives (line ministries), 2 MPs, 2 from ILO and 1 from the private sector.</p>

<p>Indigenous Youth field-based fellowships/internships with PRO 169 (6 fellows)</p>	<p>Nepal: Interns in office Peru: Training programme for young indigenous professionals, conducted by the Universidad Antonio Ruíz de Montoya, Instituto de Ética y Desarrollo. Oct 27-30 + 17-20 Nov 2015, 15 indigenous participants. Cameroon: Resident fellowship-programme for 5 indigenous youth in an NGO <i>Centre pour l'Environnement et le Développement</i> (CED).</p>	<p>Cameroon: The training was originally planned for 6 indigenous youth, but it turned out to be more difficult than expected to identify a representative from the Bedzang community.</p>
<p><i>Additional activities</i>¹⁹</p>	<p>Peru: Día de la Estadística (20-21 Oct 2015) Peru: Support to the establishment and activities of the <i>Grupo de Trabajo Sobre Políticas Indígenas (GTPI)</i>. A permanent space for dialogue between indigenous peoples and the state - IPs can set the agenda and take up discussions of the issues they need to discuss. Peru: Presentations on the scope of C169, and the right to Consultation, at an internal event in the Ministry of Energy and Mining, on 10 Aug, 2015; and again during a course for 200 state employees, organized by the Ministerio de Cultura (12 Aug, 2015). Nepal: Capacity-building of parliamentarians²⁰, carried out by NEFIN (Aug. 18, 22 and Sep3) + regional meetings with IPOs, local authorities and political parties, launching the Frequently Asked Questions-guide on C169.</p>	<p>Día Estadística: Peru is one of the only countries in South America that does not include an indigenous identifier in the national censuses. The <i>Día de la Estadística</i> was an event that brought together actors from other countries in the region, with Peruvian policy-makers and staff from the concerned government authorities, to bring experiences from other countries into the national debate on how to include an indigenous identifier in the upcoming census. Getting national statistical information on IPs is considered an important step towards making IPs and their particular needs more visible in national planning and policy-making. The event was organized in cooperation with UNFPA, UNDP and others, and the event in itself is considered an important contribution to bringing the discussion on the need to identify indigenous peoples in the census into the public domain - as there are forces in the country who have wished to avoid this.</p> <p>GTPI: The emerging consultation practice, under the new</p>

¹⁹ Activities not included in the original project design

²⁰ Members of the Constituent Assembly.

		law, has revealed a need for dialogue between IPs and the state in a much broader sense than what specific consultations allow for - in response to which the GTPI was established in 2014. Seven IPOs involved. Work on a consensual basis, invite state actors for dialogue - the outcome is promising so far. 8 sessions have been held, plus some in selected regions. ILO, UNDP, UNFPA and AECID participate as observers in the sessions.
Expected result 2: Emerging good practices on indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru, and Central African Republic are documented, shared and given visibility in neighbouring countries and within the regions		
Activity	Results	Observations
Production and distribution of regular updates on the implementation of ILO Convention No. 169 in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic		No Regular updates have been produced. Probably partly because it has not been clearly defined what was expected. Project staff in the three countries expressed that they would have liked to know more about what was going on in other countries, wherefore the evaluator concludes that producing regular updates was indeed a good idea - but it should have been defined clearly when and how.
Comparative legal study on the 2011 law on indigenous peoples in the Republic of Congo, Convention 169 and efforts in the Central African sub-region known as the Congo Basin	The study is ready - and awaiting validation at a workshop before publishing.	The study will be presented at a validation seminar in Congo in the near future (either with EC funds, or other ILO funding).
Regional Study of legal and policy-related protection of indigenous peoples in Asia	Country-studies carried out in Malaysia, Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, and up-dates to earlier ILO studies regarding Bangladesh and Nepal.	An overview report is under production, and its launch is planned for IP Day 2016 (partly funded by project funds).
Community-based 4 sectoral studies on indigenous peoples and exploitation of natural resources	Peru: <i>Estudio sobre experiencias de emprendimiento indígena en el uso y aprovechamiento de Recursos Naturales en el Perú</i> Central African countries: Local studies on the employment situation	Central Africa-study: A policy brief based on the sectoral studies on labour conditions is being produced now, and publication is planned for this year.

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

	in the forestry sector have been carried out	
<i>Additional activities</i>	<p>Norway: Updating of an earlier produced study on Consultation practices in Norway</p> <p>Nepal: Analysis of new constitution (will feed into Regional Study)</p>	The case study on consultation practices in Norway will be published in English and Spanish in 2016.

Expected result 3: Key stakeholders, including trade unions, employers' organizations, the wider public, indigenous youth, education institutions and the media in Peru, Nepal and Central African Republic are well informed of current international standards and emerging good practices on indigenous peoples' rights		
Activity	Results	Observations
National workshops for mass-media, including community radios and social media where possible, on indigenous peoples' rights (40 participants in each workshop - 1 per region)	<p>Nepal: <i>Communicating the rights of indigenous nationalities for inclusive economic development</i> - training for indigenous and non-indigenous journalists, organized in cooperation with the Federation of Indigenous Journalists (FONIJ) and the Federation of Nepali Journalists (FNJ). September 22-24, 2015.</p> <p>Cameroon: <i>National Workshop for media professionals</i>, 7-8 Aug 2014. 40 participants from public and private medias, including print, radio, television, community radio, etc. Also participation from indigenous representatives and NGOs. <i>Validation workshop</i> on the Guide for Media Professionals on Indigenous Peoples, 28 May, 2015.</p> <p>Peru: <i>Two one-day seminars with journalists from 9 national medias in total</i>, organized in cooperation with the Ministry of Culture (July 21 and Aug 21, 2015). <i>Two capacity-building workshops with indigenous communicators</i> in Pucallpa (Nov 5-7) and Pune (Nov 12-14) respectively. 31 indigenous communicators trained in total. Organized in cooperation with the network of indigenous communicators (Red de Comunicadores Indígenas del Perú, REDCIP).</p>	
Production of outreach and awareness raising materials in Nepal, Peru and CAR	Cameroon: Media Guide published online in French and English	Production of a global media guide is planned for 2016.

<p><i>Additional activities</i>²¹</p>	<p>Peru: Contributions to other actors' events: the <i>Mes Indígena (Ministerio de Cultura)</i> - in particular, a seminar on indigenous peoples' rights and a Forum on the right to consultation; Exhibition on indigenous peoples' rights at the 1st Amazon Congress, organized by IPOs, NGOs and the Universidad Antonio Ruiz Montoya; Exhibition at the Conference for Indigenous Communicators, Aug 14, 2015 (<i>Plataforma de Comunicadores Indígenas / ONAMIAP</i>); GIZ seminar on the right to consultation, 26-27 Oct)</p> <p>Cameroon: Presentation on indigenous peoples' rights at UN Conference in Yaounde (Regional Human Rights Office)</p>	
--	--	--

²¹ Aligned with the objective, but not included in the project document.

Annex 2: List of interviews

Peru

Name Position	Institution	Role in the project	Date of interview / discussion
María Arteta , Vice Director	ILO Sub-Regional Office for the Andean Countries, Lima	Project supervision / overall responsibility from Sep 1, 2015	19.1.16 + 22.1.16
Hernán Coronado , Consultant	ILO Sub-Regional Office for the Andean Countries, Lima	Coordinated all project activities between April 2015 and project closing (almost all), on a consultant basis	19.1.16 + 22.1.16
Liliam Landeo , Former PRO 169 Project Staff	ILO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean	Started the project - in her capacity as PRO 169 staff. Contract ended in December 2014.	21.1.16
Florencio Gudiño , Chief, regional Programme and Technical Cooperation Unit	ILO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean	Overall responsible for regional programming	21.1.16
Angela Acevedo , Director of Prior Consultation Alvaro Galvez , Director of Indigenous Politics	Viceministerio de Interculturalidad Ministerio de Cultura	Key project interlocutor - the Vice Ministry is the main state actor responsible for indigenous peoples	19.1.16
Daniel Sánchez , Jefe del Programa de Pueblos Indígenas	Defensoría del Pueblo de Perú	Key project interlocutor - the Defensoría is deeply engaged in defending and promoting indigenous peoples' rights	19.1.16
Manuel García Consultant, (former PRO 160 Project Coordinator, ILO) Alison Hospina , Interculturality and Gender Analyst	UNDP Dialogue and conflict prevention project <i>(Alianzas para el diálogo: Prevención de conflictos sociales en el uso de recursos naturales)</i>	Key project interlocutor - UN interagency cooperation, cooperation on specific activities	20.1.16
Jorge Prado , Indigenous	Confederación Campesina del Peru	Key project interlocutor - as GTPI member	20.1.16

representative in the Grupo de Trabajo de Políticas Indígenas (GTPI)	(CCP) / Executive Council member of el <i>Fondo Indígena en Perú</i>		
Manuel Glave , Senior Researcher	GRADE - Grupo de Análisis para el Desarrollo	Implementation partner - Responsible for the study on indigenous peoples' entrepreneurship and natural resource use	21.1.16
José Carlos Rojas , Coordinator	Universidad Ruiz de Montoya, Lima - Institute for Ethics and Development	Implementation partner - Responsible for the course for indigenous representatives on indigenous peoples' rights	21.1.16
Jorge Agurto	Servindi	External stakeholder	22.1.16
Javeir Mujica , Human Rights Expert	Peru Equidad	External stakeholder	22.1.16
Flica Barclay Indigenous Peoples' Rights Expert			

Nepal

Name Position	Institution	Role in the project	Date of interview / discussion
Mukta S. Lama Professor, Central Department of Sociology/Anthropology	Former ILO staff, now Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu	National PRO169 Project Coordinator 2009-2010	1.2.16
Anshu Gurung	Former ILO staff	National Project Coordinator (UNIPP Project) 2012-2014	1.2.16
Ganesh Nepali Section Officer Khil Raj Rai Section Officer Nirmala Thapa Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Specialist	Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development, Government of Nepal	Key government stakeholder	1.2.16

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

<p>Nagendra Kumar Kumal President</p> <p>Dandu Dhokpya Vice Chair</p> <p>XX Project Coordinator</p> <p>Kandangwa Nanda Advisor</p>	Nepal Federation for Indigenous Nationalities (NEFIN)	Implementing partner	2.2.16
Saloman Rajbhansi	ILO Nepal, Kathmandu	Project-responsible and IP focal point in ILO Kathmandu	2.2.16
Gajurdhan Rai Secretary General	Federation of Nepalese Indigenous Journalists (FONIJ)	Implementing partner, Media seminar	2.2.16
Jit Bahadur Gurung GESI Specialist	Governance Facility, (Denmark +UK +Switzerland)	External stakeholder	2.2.16
Keith Leslie	World Bank Programme for Accountability in Nepal (PRAN)	Senior development expert, long-time engagement with indigenous issues	2.2.16
<p>Sarita Moktan Head, Personnel and Administration, active in SIAG</p> <p>Sabine Piccard Gender and Social Inclusion Specialist</p>	Swiss Embassy		3.2.16
Monika Thowsen Counsellor	Norwegian Embassy	External stakeholder	3.2.16
Shankar Limbu	LAHURNIP	Key stakeholder and implementing partner	3.2.16
Suni Lama Chairperson,	Nepal Indigenous Women's Federation (NIWF)	External stakeholder	4.2.16
Jose Assalino Country Director	ILO Nepal, Kathmandu		24.2.16

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

Coen Kompier Labour Standards Specialist	ILO Regional Office New Delhi, India		2.3.16
--	---	--	--------

Cameroon

Name Position	Institution	Role in the project	Date of interview / discussion
Serge Buopda, Consultant	ILO	Coordinated some project activities, on a consultant basis	26.1.16
Benoît Guiguet, Labour Standards Specialist	ILO Country Office Cameroon	Responsible for project coordination in Cameroon	9.2.16
Samuel Nguiffo, Secretary General	Centre pour l'Environnement et le Développement (CED)		Contacted, no reply
Nadine Mballa Wilson	OHCHR, Yaoundé		Contacted, no reply, 2 nd email 16.2.16
Gervais Nzoa	UNPFII Member	Chief guest in seminar on C111, Oct 2015.	9.2.16
Ms. Hawe Bouba Vice Chair	MBOSCUA		22.2.16

Annex 3: Inception Report

Introduction to the project

The project was conceptualized as part of the PRO 169 project portfolio, and as such builds upon experiences gained under previous PRO 169 projects, just like the project design is built around the PRO 169 way of working on the promotion of the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples' Convention (promotion of legal reform). The **overall objective** of the project was stated as follows

“The rights of indigenous peoples in Asia, Latin America and Africa are better protected and promoted”

The **specific objectives** were

“National processes on indigenous peoples in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic are supported, with a view to setting good examples for neighboring countries and the regions”

With a total budget of EUR 799,193.70, out of which EUR 699,294.50 (87,5%) were granted by the EC (DEVCO B1, financed by the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights), the project was implemented over a 29-months period, running from June 21, 2013, to November 20, 2015. The project was originally planned as a 24-month intervention, but due to delays in the implementation of activities, and resulting under-spending of the project funds, a no-cost extension of an additional 5 months was approved by the EC in April 2015. At the time this evaluation is starting, the final activities are still being wrapped up - mostly in the sense that studies carried out under the project are being finalized and some of them prepared for publishing.

Early on in the project implementation it became clear that the situation in the Central African Republic was too unstable for the planned project activities to be viable, wherefore the Africa component of the project was moved to Cameroon, where the political climate was favourable for the promotion of the issues the project worked with.

The 2013 ILO office reform happened simultaneously with the project start, wherefore the organizational set-up during implementation was quite different from what was foreseen while the project was designed: the project was designed as part of the Programme to Promote ILO Convention No. 169, which was closed with the office reform and its mandate moved to the new Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch. Naturally this has impacted considerably on the implementation of the project, which needs to be taken into consideration in the evaluation.

Actors and actions

The target group of the project is defined as

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

- Key government policy planners, implementers, and local community-leadership
- Indigenous peoples and institutions at national and community level
- Indigenous peoples - particular attention to indigenous women and youth
- Workers and employers organizations
- The wider public and mass media, including community radios and social media where possible
- Key national and regional actors, including regional human rights institutions and law enforcement agencies / institutions, such as ombudsmen, national human rights commissions and labour inspectors

The project has reached out to these actors through

Trainings of key actors in the implementation of the convention at country-level, and other forms of (substituted with other forms of strategic discussion in some cases); and an international course for high-level government officials

Fellowships / internships for indigenous youth

Sharing experiences on the implementation of the Convention regionally and across regions - through a wide range of studies and publications

Workshops with media-actors and publication of a guide for media on how to approach indigenous issues in their publishing and broadcasting

Conceptual framework and scope of the evaluation

The TOR asks the evaluation to assess the

- **Relevance** of the objectives and project strategic approach, including how it fits within the EU's work on the issue of indigenous peoples
- **Effectiveness** of strategies to meet this objectives, including the extent to which gender issues were addressed
- **Efficiency** in the utilization of financial and human resources available to the project.
- **Impact** of interventions at different levels, including the longer-term effects in addressing the rights of indigenous peoples.
- **Sustainability** of results taking a short, medium and long term perspective.

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

- as per the DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance.²² The TOR further stresses that **gender mainstreaming and a women-specific focus** should be part and parcel of the evaluation criteria and questions.

The evaluation is expected to produce a series of **recommendations** for future development and follow-up, particularly addressing the **focus** and **strategy** for future ILO interventions supporting indigenous peoples.

The evaluation will **assess interventions in the project's 3 target countries**, namely Nepal, Cameroon and Peru, as well as the **spill-over effects in neighbouring countries**, and the **project coordination and management** activities by the ILO headquarters in Geneva. The TOR defines the scope of this work as consisting in

- Desk review of relevant project documentation
- Briefings at ILO Geneva
- Country visits in two of the three implementation countries
- Skype interviews and other data collection methods for the last implementation country

Additional focus areas

Apart from the focus areas covered in the TOR's evaluation questions, the evaluator proposes to include

- An **assessment of the implications of the structural changes around the ILO's work on promotion of Convention No 169**, which happened right around the time the project was started - the project was 'moved' from NORMES, to the new Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch
- An **assessment of the strengths and weaknesses in the implementation set-up** (staffing, division of roles and responsibilities between headquarter and country offices, etc.)
- A **brief assessment of the future prospects of promoting indigenous peoples' rights and socio-economic development as prescribed in Convention no. 169 under the new Programmatic Framework** - how do the lessons learnt from this project relate to the new programmatic and strategic framework?²³

²² DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance:

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

²³ Programme and Budget 2016-17 and the new strategy for engagement with indigenous peoples, adopted by the Governing Board in November 2015 (*Indigenous peoples' Rights for Inclusive and Sustainable Development*, GB.325/POL/2).

Gender aspects will be documented and analysed across all evaluation criteria, and in order to enhance the Evaluation's gender analysis, the gender dimension is added to the TOR's evaluation criteria, and elaborated upon in 3 specific evaluation questions on the gender dimensions of the project implementation.²⁴

Evaluation questions

The TOR outlines a comprehensive list of specific evaluation questions. The consultant proposes to modify/condense these slightly, in order to both allow for an expansion of the scope, adding further focus areas / questions (as suggested above), and to bring the number of specific questions in line with the ILO Inception Report guidance, which suggests to work with 2-3 specific evaluation questions per criteria.²⁵ Limiting the number of specific evaluation questions allows greater clarity throughout the evaluation process, and is an important first step towards producing a user-friendly evaluation report.

The specific evaluation questions, as modified and expanded by the consultant, are presented below. For a detailed account of the changes proposed, as compared to the evaluation questions included in the TOR, please refer to Appendix 3.

Relevance of the project:

1. Has the problem been clearly analyzed, and the target group identified?
2. Were the project objectives consistent with the target group's needs and priorities?
 - o Was the target group involved in the project design?
 - o Did the project take gender specificities into consideration in its design and implementation? Were indigenous women's particular needs addressed?²⁶
3. Was the intervention logic clear and consistent?
 - o Is it clear how the inputs and activities would contribute to the achievement of the objectives?
 - o Was the foreseen timeframe realistic to achieve the expected results?
 - o Was the project management structure sufficiently clear and realistically designed?
4. Was the project aligned with ILO and EU overall objectives and priorities, as expressed in Programming and Strategy documents?

²⁴ Please refer to the overview of the evaluation questions below for more details.

²⁵ International Labour Organization - Evaluation Unit, Checklist 3: *Writing the Inception Report* (March 2014)

²⁶ The second part of the question is the evaluator's addition.

Effectiveness of the project

1. Did the project execution contribute to its objective of **enhancing the protection and promotion of the rights of indigenous peoples in Asia, Latin America and Africa**?
 - o Were national processes on indigenous peoples supported in Nepal, Peru and the Central African Republic, with a view to setting good examples for neighbouring countries and the regions?
2. Did the project deliver the expected results:
 - o Are **legal/institutional reforms and capacity development of government officials and indigenous peoples** in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic **documented, shared and given visibility** in neighbouring countries and within the regions?
 - o Are **emerging good practices** on indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru, and the Central African Republic **documented, shared and given visibility in neighbouring countries and within regions**?
 - o Are **key stakeholders**, including trade unions, employers' organizations, the wider public, indigenous youth, education institutions and the media in Peru, Nepal and the Central African Republic **well informed of current international standards and emerging good practices on indigenous peoples' rights**?
3. What major factors enabled or limited the achievement of the objectives?

Efficiency of the project:

1. Did the project management demonstrate the capacity to efficiently coordinate, administer and backstop the project implementation arrangements?
 - o Were inputs delivered in a quality and timely fashion?
 - o Were the management and coordination arrangements sufficiently clear, adequate and responsive to partners' and beneficiaries' needs?
 - o What were the main operational implementation difficulties and what was done to address them?
2. To what extent has the project collaborated with and coordinated action with other relevant ILO Programmes and Units?
 - o Has there been synergies with other ILO activities at country-level, and / or has the project leveraged other funds?
3. Have resources been spent as economically as possible in relation to producing the expected results/outputs?

Gender dimensions

1. Have indigenous men and women benefitted equally from the project?
2. Has the project implementation addressed indigenous women's particular situation and concerns - and how?

3. Has the project contributed to a gendered analysis of indigenous peoples' rights, and succeeded in making this visible across sections in the ILO, and among external stakeholders?

Impact

1. What are the wider impacts of the project's actions?
 - o Are there specific immediate and emerging long-term examples from the implementation countries?
2. Were there significant unforeseen effects - positive or negative?
 - o What was done to enhance / mitigate them, with a view to ensuring the greatest possible overall impact?

Sustainability

1. To what extent has the capacity of partner institutions been strengthened, and what needs to be done to further enhance their contributions to promoting indigenous peoples' rights in the future?
2. Are there elements for actual and potential expansion or replicability of the project to other areas or regions?

Methodology

The primary sources of data collection for the evaluation will be **semi-structured interviews** and **desk review of project-related documents** (project documents, training schedules and curricula, participants' evaluations from trainings, studies and publications published under the project, etc.), **as well as external thematic resources** (newspaper articles, reports from other institutions on the situation of indigenous peoples' rights in the respective countries, etc.). This methodology has been chosen in consideration of the kinds of activities implemented, and the limited time that is available to carry out the evaluation.

In all three implementation countries **key actors in the project**, as well as **key external stakeholders**, who can provide observations on the project context, will be interviewed (such as indigenous rights experts, NGO representatives, relevant staff from other UN organizations, etc.). The evaluator will keep a log of interviews, which will be annexed to the evaluation for the sake of transparency, and the evaluation-findings will be based on **triangulation of the data obtained from interviews, review of as from project-related and external documents, training evaluations, etc.**

At the outset of the evaluation, the evaluator was briefed at the ILO Headquarters by the Project Coordinator (Martin Oelz, Senior Specialist on Equality and Non-discrimination, GED); Shauna Olney (Chief, GED); the evaluation Manager Ritash Sharna (Evaluation Unit) and WORKQUALITY's Focal point for Evaluations Rasha Tabbara; Xavier Beaudonnet (NORMES), and Ruaridh Hastings (PARDEV).

Country visits

The evaluator proposes to visit Nepal and Peru, in order to assess the project outcomes in two very different country-contexts:

Peru is among the 'first generation' of countries that ratified Convention no. 169 in the early years after its adoption in 1989. The institutional framework around the implementation of the Convention is well consolidated, and Peru is considered to be at the forefront of implementation with the 2011 adoption of a Law on Consultation. Tensions and complexities in the implementation of the Convention, however, remain.

Nepal, on the other hand, is in the early stages of implementation, being one of the last countries to ratify, and the first country in Asia to do so (in 2007). Ratification of the Convention in Nepal formed part of the peace process that formally ended a ten-year armed Maoist insurgency with a Comprehensive Peace Agreement adopted in 2006. Key elements of the Convention are clearly reflected in the Interim Constitution that governed the country during the prolonged process of drafting a new Constitution. The actual new Constitution, which was adopted recently (in September 2015), however, does not reflect the same level of alignment with the Convention. The issue of indigenous peoples' rights has lost traction in the national political context during the post-insurgency country-restructuring-process that the drafting of the new constitution formed part of - and this has posed major challenges for the ILO in the implementation of the project. At this particular point in time, it is, therefore, of utmost importance for the ILO to take stock of the strategy employed to promote the implementation of the Convention in Nepal, and this evaluation presents an opportunity to contribute to this reflection process.

The country visits will provide good opportunities for generating evaluation data on the project context - through interviews and discussions not only with project actors, but also with independent indigenous rights' specialists, other UN organizations, etc.

Actors in **Cameroon** will be reached too through Skype and phone interviews. Key questions will be shared by email prior to these interviews.

A comprehensive **Overview of the Data Collection Questions, Indicators, Sources and Methodology**, which constitutes the primary evaluation instrument, is included in Appendix 1.

Appendix 2 contains a list of interlocutors, developed in cooperation between the Project Coordinator and the Consultant. For each country, the Consultant is in the process of identifying a few more external specialists / other actors to be interviewed, in order to establish the overview of the country-level project context that is needed to analyse the viability of the project design, and assess its overall relevance, efficiency and impact.

Evaluation report

The evaluation findings will be presented in an evaluation report, as per the ILO guidance 'Preparing the Evaluation report' (Checklist 5 - ILO Evaluation Unit). The consultant is furthermore committing to producing the Evaluation Summary, following the ILO Evaluation Unit's format (Checklist 8), as well as concise notes on Lessons Learnt, again in accordance with the ILO Evaluation Unit's format.

Work plan

In agreement with the Evaluation Manager, the Project Coordinator, and the ILO offices in Peru and Nepal, the country visits will take place in mid/late January and early February respectively. With this schedule, the consultant needs to request an extension of the deadline for submission of the Draft Evaluation Report by one week, as compared to the timeline outlined in the TOR, as we also discussed during the inception meetings in Geneva.

The work plan will thus be as follows:

Task	No of work days	Dates
Inception meetings Geneva, incl. travel	4	Dec 7-10
Inception Report	2	Dec 14-18 + Jan 6-7
Desk review of project-related documents	2	Jan 1 st week
Skype interviews Cameroon	2	Jan 1 st week
Country visit Peru, incl. travel	7	Jan 18-22
Country visit Nepal, incl. travel	4	Feb 1-4
Drafting Evaluation Report	5	Feb 7-14
Revising evaluation Report	2	Feb 24-29
<i>Total</i>	<i>28</i>	

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

Overview of submissions

Deliverable	Submission
Inception report	Dec 18 / Jan 7 (revised)
Draft Evaluation Report	Feb 14
Final Evaluation Report	Feb 29
Summary of Evaluation Report	Feb 29

Appendix 1

Data collection overview: Evaluation Questions, Indicators and Data Sources

Evaluation criteria and questions	Indicators (Objective/ Subjective)	Data sources
<p>Relevance</p> <p>5. Has the problem been clearly analyzed, and the target group identified?</p> <p>6. Were the project objectives consistent with the target group's needs and priorities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Was the target group involved in the project design? o Did the project take gender specificities into consideration in its design and implementation? Were indigenous women's particular needs addressed? <p>7. Was the intervention logic clear and consistent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Is it clear how the inputs and activities would contribute to the achievement of the objectives? o Was the foreseen timeframe realistic to achieve the expected results? o Was the project management structure sufficiently clear and realistically designed? <p>8. Was the project aligned with ILO and EU overall objectives and priorities, as expressed in Programming and Strategy documents?</p>	<p>Level of clarity, detail and coherence in the project document's presentation of the problems, target groups, activities and modalities of implementation and management</p> <p><i>ILO staff, consultants and project stakeholders' views, including indigenous men and women</i></p> <p>Records on project formulation - evidence of stakeholder involvement?</p> <p>Explicit and implicit references to ILO and EU programmatic frameworks and strategies in project documents and project-productions (studies, reports, etc.)</p>	<p>ILO and project documentation</p> <p>Secondary sources - reports, articles, etc.</p> <p>Interviews with project staff</p> <p>Interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries</p> <p>Interviews with independent experts</p>
<p>Effectiveness</p> <p>4. Did the project execution contribute to it's objective of enhancing the protection and promotion of the rights of indigenous peoples in Asia, Latin America and Africa?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Were national processes on indigenous peoples supported in Nepal, Peru and the Central African Republic, with a view to setting good examples for neighbouring countries and the 	<p>Evidence of project activities, incl. project progress reports, records and evaluations of trainings, media reports.</p> <p>Tangible project products - published studies, reports, guidelines, etc.</p> <p><i>Project staff's perceptions</i></p>	<p>ILO and project documentation</p> <p>Interviews with project staff and ILO</p> <p>Interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries</p> <p>Interviews with</p>

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

<p>regions?</p> <p>5. Did the project deliver the expected results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Are legal/institutional reforms and capacity development of government officials and indigenous peoples in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic documented, shared and given visibility in neighbouring countries and within the regions? o Are emerging good practices on indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru, and the Central African Republic documented, shared and given visibility in neighbouring countries and within regions? o Are key stakeholders, including trade unions, employers' organizations, the wider public, indigenous youth, education institutions and the media in Peru, Nepal and the Central African Republic well informed of current international standards and emerging good practices on indigenous peoples' rights? <p>6. What major factors enabled or limited the achievement of the objectives?</p>	<p><i>ILO Management's perceptions, country offices</i></p> <p><i>Project beneficiaries' and other stakeholders' individual perceptions, as recorded in interviews (men and women)</i></p> <p><i>Independent experts' perceptions</i></p>	<p>independent experts</p>
<p>Efficiency</p> <p>4. Did the project management demonstrate the capacity to efficiently coordinate, administer and backstop the project implementation arrangements?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Were inputs delivered in a quality and timely fashion? o Were the management and coordination arrangements sufficiently clear, adequate and responsive to partners' and beneficiaries' needs? o What were the main operational implementation difficulties and what was done to address them? <p>5. To what extent has the project collaborated with and coordinated action with other relevant ILO Programmes and Units?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Has there been synergies with other ILO activities at country-level, and / or has the project 	<p>Project-related progress- and monitoring reports, correspondence, records of staff meetings, etc.</p> <p><i>ILO staff, consultants' and project partners' views</i></p> <p><i>ILO Management's view, Country- and Regional levels</i></p> <p><i>Project stakeholders' and beneficiaries' views, including indigenous men and women</i></p> <p><i>Evaluator's cost-benefit analysis</i></p>	<p>ILO and project documentation</p> <p>Interviews with ILO staff, consultants and project partners</p> <p>Interviews with ILO management - Country Offices / Regional Offices</p> <p>Interviews with project stakeholders and beneficiaries</p>

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

<p>leveraged other funds?</p> <p>6. Have resources been spent as economically as possible in relation to producing the expected results/outputs?</p>		
<p>Gender dimensions</p> <p>4. Have indigenous men and women benefitted equally from the project?</p> <p>5. Has the project implementation addressed indigenous women's particular situation and concerns - and how?</p> <p>6. Has the project contributed to a gendered analysis of indigenous peoples' rights, and succeeded in making this visible across sections in the ILO, and among external stakeholders?</p>	<p>Evidence of project activities, incl. project progress reports, records and evaluations of trainings and other events</p> <p><i>Beneficiaries' views, in particular indigenous women's own perception</i></p> <p><i>ILO staff, consultants' and project partners' views</i></p> <p><i>ILO Management's view, Country- and Regional levels</i></p> <p><i>Independent experts' perceptions</i></p>	<p>ILO and project documentation</p> <p>Interviews with beneficiaries - men and women</p> <p>Interviews with ILO staff, consultants and project partners</p> <p>Interviews with ILO management - Country Offices / Regional Offices</p> <p>Interviews with independent experts</p>
<p>Impact</p> <p>4. What are the wider impacts of the project's actions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Are there specific immediate and emerging long-term examples from the implementation countries? <p>5. Were there significant unforeseen effects - positive or negative?</p> <p>6. What was done to enhance / mitigate them, with a view to ensuring the greatest possible overall impact?</p>	<p>Project-related progress- and monitoring reports</p> <p>Evidence of post-project (or rather post-activity) initiatives by partners or beneficiaries that reflect enhanced capacity to promote indigenous peoples' rights - writing, media reports, legal developments, changes in administrative practices, etc.</p> <p><i>ILO staff, consultants' and project partners' views</i></p> <p><i>ILO Management's view, Country- and Regional levels</i></p> <p><i>Independent experts' perceptions</i></p> <p><i>Beneficiaries' views</i></p>	<p>ILO and project documentation</p> <p>Media reports, meeting records, etc.</p> <p>Interviews with ILO staff, consultants and project partners</p> <p>Interviews with ILO management - Country Offices / Regional Offices</p> <p>Interviews with independent experts</p> <p>Interviews with beneficiaries - men and women</p>
<p>Sustainability</p> <p>3. To what extent has the capacity of partner institutions been strengthened, and what needs to be done to further enhance their contributions to promoting indigenous peoples' rights in the future?</p> <p>4. Are there elements for actual and potential expansion or replicability of</p>	<p>Evidence of post-project (or rather post project activity) initiatives by partners or beneficiaries that reflect enhanced capacity to promote indigenous peoples' rights - writing, media reports, government's administrative or</p>	

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

<p>the project to other areas or regions?</p>	<p>legal developments, etc.</p> <p><i>Beneficiaries' views</i></p> <p><i>Project partners' views</i></p> <p><i>ILO staff, consultants' and project partners' views</i></p> <p><i>ILO Management's view, Country- and Regional levels</i></p> <p><i>Independent experts' perceptions</i></p> <p><i>Consultant's analysis of particularly significant lessons learnt</i></p>	
---	--	--

Appendix 2

Proposed list of interlocutors²⁷

1. National project staff & consultants

Liliam Landeo, former Project Staff, llandeo@gmail.com

Hernan Coronado, Project consultant, hernancoronado@gmail.com

Manuel García, former Latin America Coordinator (cayetano1941@yahoo.es)

Serge Boupda, former Regional Coordinator for Central Africa and National Coordinator for Cameroon (sergebouopda@gmail.com)

Anshu Gurung, National Project Coordinator (anshugrg66@gmail.com)

Mukta Lama, former National Coordinator for Nepal, mukta12@gmail.com

2. ILO staff (field level)

Deputy Director, DWT Andean Region, Maria Arteta, (arteta@ilo.org)

Carmen Moreno, director for the sub-regional office (Andean countries) until Sep 1, 2015 (morenoc@ilo.org)

Florencio Gudiño, Chief, Regional Programming, Latin America, Lima (gudino@ilo.org)

Jose Assalino, Director, ILO Katmandu (assalino@ilo.org)

Programme Officer, Nepal, Saloman Rajbanshi, (saloman@ilo.org)

Labour Standards Specialist, Coen Kompier, New Delhi (kompier@ilo.org)

Labour Standards Specialist, Benoît Guiguet, Cameroon (guiguetb@ilo.org)

Senior Workers' Specialist for Latin America, Carmen Benitez (benitezc@ilo.org)

Roberto Villamil, *Especialista en Actividades para los Empleadores*, (villamilr@ilo.org)

Eduardo Rodríguez Calderón, *Especialista en Actividades para los Trabajadores* (rodrigueze@ilo.org)

²⁷ As of the date of submission of the Inception Report - a few more actors will be added, and project staff at country-level will be asked for further input to its finalization.

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

3. Staff at headquarters in Geneva

Shauna Olney, Chief, Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch, ILO Geneva
(olney@ilo.org)

Martin Oelz, Senior Specialist on Equality and Non-discrimination (oelz@ilo.org),
Team leader (Indigenous peoples), Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch

Albert Barume, former PRO 169 Coordinator and Specialist on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples' Issues (nmkra@hotmail.com)

4. Partners: Indigenous peoples, government, UN, NGOs

Peru

Patricia Balbuena, Viceministra de Interculturalidad, Lima, Peru,
pbalbuena@cultura.gob.pe

Alvaro Galvez alvarogalvezp@gmail.com (director de politicas) o Angela Acevedo –
Directora de Consulta, Lima (angelaacevedo@gmail.com), Viceministerio de
Interculturalidad, Peru

Daniel Sanchez - Jefe del Programa de Pueblos Indígenas de la Defensoría del Pueblo,
Peru, dsanchez@defensoria.gob.pe

Jorge Prado - Representante Indígena ante el GTPI y el Fondo Indígena, Peru,
jpradosccp@gmail.com

Gladyz Vila - ex presidenta de ONAMIAP (organización de mujeres indígenas)
retamawayta@gmail.com

Representative from AIDSESEP

Representative from GRADE

Representative from the UN Country Team on Indigenous Peoples

Nepal

Ms Lila Adhikari, Under Secretary, Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development,
is our focal person for indigenous issues, ladhikari.ojha@gmail.com

NEFIN – Nepal Federation of indigenous Nationalities, President Nagendra Kumar
Kumal, info@nefin.org.np.

Lawyers Association for Human Rights of Nepalese Indigenous People (LAHURNIP),
Mr. Shankar Limbu, shankar1database@gmail.com

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

Federation of Nepalese Indigenous Journalists (FONIJ), Mr. Gajurdhan Rai , Secretary General of FONIJ : gajurrai@hotmail.com

UN Resident Representative

Cameroon

Samuel Nguiffo (snguiffo@yahoo.fr), Secrétaire général, Centre pour l'Environnement et le Développement (CED)

Nadine Mballa Wilson, OHCHR, Yaoundé, nmballa@ohchr.org

Gervais Nzoa, UNPFII Member, Tel. 237 99885806 Mail:nzoager@yahoo.fr, Yaoundé Cameroon

Mr. Messe Venant, OKANI

Noel Olinga, OKANI

Representative MBOSCUA - Indigenous pastoralist Mbororo organization

5. External actors and experts

Peru

Marco Huaco - Docente universitario en la materia de Derechos Humanos en la Universidad de San Marcos , Lima - marcohuaco@gmail.com

Representatives from key NGOs or other institutions engaged in indigenous issues in Peru

Nepal

Ek Raj Chaudhary - grass-roots journalist in Bardiya District (Radio Gurbaba)

Keith Leslie - Senior Expert on Indigenous Issues and Project Coordinator of the World Bank's Programme for Accountability in Nepal

Representatives from other bilateral development organizations that have been involved in supporting ILO's PRO 169 activities in Nepal in the past? (e.g. Norway, Denmark)

Cameroon

Representative(s) from key NGOs engaged in indigenous issues in Cameroon

Other experts on indigenous issues and rights in Cameroon

Appendix 3

Changes to the TOR's evaluation questions - explanation and justification

Relevance of the project:²⁸

5. Has the problem been clearly analyzed, and the target group identified?
6. Were the project objectives consistent with the target group's needs and priorities?²⁹
 - o Was the target group involved in the project design?
 - o Did the project take gender specificities into consideration in its design and implementation? Were indigenous women's particular needs addressed?³⁰
7. Was the intervention logic clear and consistent?³¹
 - o Is it clear how the inputs and activities would contribute to the achievement of the objectives?
 - o Was the foreseen timeframe realistic to achieve the expected results?
 - o Was the project management structure sufficiently clear and realistically designed?
8. Was the project aligned with ILO and EU overall objectives and priorities, as expressed in Programming and Strategy documents?³²

²⁸ The specific evaluation questions presented here represent a condensed and re-organized version of the relevance-questions outlined in the TOR. The two following notes explain the most important modifications to the original questions.

²⁹ Modified from the TOR's question: '*including with national gender policies and strategies*' has been deleted, in order to distinguish clearly between the target group's needs and priorities and existing national policies. Gender aspects are addressed in another question.

³⁰ The second part of the question is the evaluator's addition.

³¹ Modified from the TOR's question:

- '*Was the project's strategic approach feasible, relevant and the intervention logic clear and consistent (e.g. between inputs, activities, outputs and indicators of achievement)?*' The answer to the question whether the strategic approach was feasible and relevant will be the overall conclusion to the more specific questions proposed by the consultant - and presented in the final section on key evaluation findings.

³² More specifically the ILO's Programme and Budget (P&B) at the global level, and the Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCP) and United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) at the country level; and the EU's Global Public Goods and Challenges Programme as well as its policy commitments towards indigenous peoples (expressed, inter alia, in the *EU Council Resolution on Indigenous Peoples within the framework of development cooperation, (1998)*, which was reaffirmed in 2002 with the *Council Resolution on indigenous peoples*, and further consolidated with the *2005 European Consensus on Development*).

Effectiveness of the project³³

4. Did the project execution contribute to its objective of **enhancing the protection and promotion of the rights of indigenous peoples in Asia, Latin America and Africa**?
 - Were national processes on indigenous peoples supported in Nepal, Peru and the Central African Republic, with a view to setting good examples for neighbouring countries and the regions?
5. Did the project deliver the expected results:
 - Are **legal/institutional reforms and capacity development of government officials and indigenous peoples** in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic **documented, shared and given visibility** in neighbouring countries and within the regions?
 - Are **emerging good practices** on indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru, and the Central African Republic **documented, shared and given visibility in neighbouring countries and within regions**?
 - Are **key stakeholders**, including trade unions, employers' organizations, the wider public, indigenous youth, education institutions and the media in Peru, Nepal and the Central African Republic **well informed of current international standards and emerging good practices on indigenous peoples' rights**?

³³ The following questions from the TOR were taken out:

- *'What is the overall assessment of the validity of the project strategy and would there be a more effective way of addressing the problems and satisfying the needs in order to achieve the project objectives?'* The validity of the strategy is addressed under 'Relevance'. The latter part of the question cuts across the questions of relevance, efficiency and effectiveness, and the answer to this question will be one of the key overall findings of the evaluation (i.e. it cannot be considered a specific evaluation question, it sums up what we want to conclude).
- *Did implementing partners and other actors and beneficiaries, show interest, commitment and support in project implementation?* This will be captured as an aspect of the broader formulated question 3. The evaluator believes it is essential to capture other enabling and limiting factors too, and has thus re-formulated the question in a broader way.
- *What role did the ratification or application of ILO Convention 169 (depending on the country) play during the project implementation?* The convention was not ratified in any of the focus countries during project implementation, so the first part of the question is redundant. The role of the application of ILO Convention No. 169 will be dealt with under question 1.
- *Did target groups/beneficiaries participate in the formulation and implementation?* This question is dealt with in the section on 'Relevance', which analyses the project design.
- *Did the project contribute to increasing awareness among local and national stakeholders on the rights of indigenous peoples?* This question is rather broad, and more related to impact than to effectiveness. It is partly dealt with, in a more specific way, and within the scope of what the evaluation can uncover within the given time frame, under question 2, which examines the extent to which the project has 'given visibility' to emerging good practices on indigenous peoples' rights.

6. What major factors enabled or limited the achievement of the objectives?³⁴

Efficiency of the project:³⁵

4. Did the project management demonstrate the capacity to efficiently coordinate, administer and backstop the project implementation arrangements?
 - o Were inputs delivered in a quality and timely fashion?
 - o Were the management and coordination arrangements sufficiently clear, adequate and responsive to partners' and beneficiaries' needs?
 - o What were the main operational implementation difficulties and what was done to address them?
5. To what extent has the project collaborated with and coordinated action with other relevant ILO Programmes and Units?
 - o Has there been synergies with other ILO activities at country-level, and / or has the project leveraged other funds?³⁶
6. Have resources been spent as economically as possible in relation to producing the expected results/outputs?

Gender dimensions³⁷

4. Have indigenous men and women benefitted equally from the project?
5. Has the project implementation addressed indigenous women's particular situation and concerns - and how?
6. Has the project contributed to a gendered analysis of indigenous peoples' rights, and succeeded in making this visible across sections in the ILO, and among external stakeholders?

³⁴ Question added by the evaluator - essential to identify the lessons learnt.

³⁵ The following questions from the TOR were taken out, or integrated in the revised evaluation questions as presented above:

- *Were the reporting and monitoring systems adequate to capture progress and identify challenges so that appropriate changes could be made?* This will be addressed under question 1, as an aspect of the management and coordination arrangements.
- *Has the project leveraged other funds at the country level?* Integrated as an aspect of question 2
- *'Assess the performance of the project towards established baselines, designing a sustainability strategy and managing risks.'*
- *'Was the management efficient in ensuring timely delivery of quality outputs and address problems and concerns?'* Addressed under question 1.

³⁶ The first part of this sub-question is the evaluator's addition.

³⁷ These questions have been added by the consultant, in response to the feedback received upon submission of the Draft Inception Report.

Impact³⁸

3. What are the wider impacts of the project's actions?
 - o Are there specific immediate and emerging long-term³⁹ examples from the implementation countries?
4. Were there significant unforeseen effects - positive or negative?
 - o What was done to enhance / mitigate them, with a view to ensuring the greatest possible overall impact?

Sustainability

3. To what extent has the capacity of partner institutions been strengthened, and what needs to be done to further enhance their contributions to promoting indigenous peoples' rights in the future?
4. Are there elements for actual and potential expansion or replicability of the project to other areas or regions?

³⁸ The TOR's questions have been modified, in order to distinguish clearer between the evaluation of the achievement of the stated objectives (dealt with under 'Effectiveness'), and the evaluation of the project's overall impacts, as they emerge at this point in time. A more thorough examination of impacts would require more time than what is available under this evaluation, and possibly be more relevant a bit further down the line: the project activities are long-term-investments in nature (trainings, capacity building, production of documentation / analysis, media-work), and as such will show their impacts within a longer time perspective. Further, quite a few publications published under the project are only being finalized at the time of carrying out the evaluation, wherefore their use and impact will only be discernible at a later stage.

³⁹ The distinction between immediate and long-term impacts has been added by the consultant.

Annex 4: Terms of Reference

I. Project information

TC Symbol: GLO/12/12/EEC

Project No: 104071

Project title: Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic⁴⁰ through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors

Responsible Administrative and Technical Unit: Gender Equality and Diversity (GED) Branch of the Conditions of Work and Equality Department (WORKQUALITY)

Project duration: 24 months (01.07.2013 – 30.06.2015, no-cost extension until 20-11-2015)

Type of Evaluation: Final, independent evaluation

Donor: European Commission (DG EuropeAid Development and Cooperation)

Budget: Total budget of €799,193.70 of which the EC contribution €699,294.50

II. Project background and context

PROJECT RATIONALE

Indigenous peoples continue to represent disproportionately large numbers of those living on margin of societies in Asia, Latin America and Africa. An independent review report on the implementation of MDGs in 20 countries, commissioned by the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII), found that *"none of the MDG reports provide disaggregated data for indigenous peoples in a consistent manner and 30% [of the reviewed country Reports] had no mention of indigenous peoples"*. The extreme marginalization of indigenous peoples has much to do with, among others, the lack of standards or gaps in implementation of ratified international instruments on indigenous peoples, notably ILO Convention No.169 (Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989) and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).

Over the last five years however, Asia, Latin America and Africa have recorded important milestones towards a better protection of indigenous peoples' rights. In 2007, Nepal became the first country in South East Asia to ratify ILO Convention No.169. In 2010, Central African Republic became the first African country to ratify the same Convention. And in 2011, Peru adopted a new law on consultation with indigenous peoples. All these three achievements

⁴⁰ Central African Republic was replaced with Cameroon during implementation of the project due to the unstable situation in the country resulting from on-going conflict.

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

are ground breaking benchmarks, to which the ILO programme on indigenous peoples (PRO 169) contributed significantly with support from the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR).

The first two ratifications of ILO Convention No.169 in Asia by Nepal and Africa by Central African Republic have proven to be strategically important. They have sparked and stimulated debates on indigenous peoples in neighbouring countries with similar situations such as in Bangladesh, Indonesia, Republic of Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo and Cameroon. The Peruvian Law on consultation with indigenous peoples is equally regarded as a good practice, whose successful implementation will set precedent and breakthrough on indigenous peoples' rights in Latin America.

The ILO is responsible for the only existing legally binding international instrument on indigenous peoples open to ratification. The ILO Convention No.169 on indigenous and tribal peoples covers a wide range of rights, including on land, education, health, employment and most importantly consultation and participation of indigenous peoples in national decision making processes as well as national development programmes. The Convention's life spans far beyond the ratifying countries, to be referred to or quoted in peace accords, domestic courts, regional jurisprudences, investment policies, multi- and bilateral development policies, environmental agreements and various international processes, including on climate change. The Convention is a ground levelling tool for equal enjoyment of rights and participation of indigenous peoples in national development.

The ILO is thus uniquely positioned to provide support to these emerging good practices on indigenous peoples' issues in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic. It has twenty-plus years of unparalleled experience within the UN system in assisting countries set and implement standards on indigenous peoples. This explains partly why the ILO designed this project following consultation with other relevant actors in all respective countries and regions. Central African Republic was replaced with Cameroon during implementation of the project due to the unstable situation in the country resulting from on-going conflict.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The project seeks to support national processes on indigenous peoples in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic, with a view to setting good examples for neighbouring countries and the regions. It aims at forging two-ways relationship of mutual support between these three national processes and their respective regional as well as neighbouring relevant actors, such as umbrella indigenous organisations and regional human rights bodies.

To that end, the project is designed to achieve the key following results:

- Legal/institutional reforms and capacity development of government officials and indigenous peoples in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic are supported;

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

- Emerging good practices on indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru, and Central African Republic and Nepal are documented, shared and given visibility in neighbouring countries and within the regions;
- Key stakeholders, including trade unions, employers' organizations, the wider public, indigenous youth, education institutions and the Media in Peru, Nepal and Central African Republic are well informed of current international standards and emerging good practices on indigenous peoples' rights.

PROJECT COMPONENTS, MAIN ACTIVITIES AND EXPECTED RESULTS

Activities under Expected Result 1 on Legal/institutional reforms and capacity development

1. *Technical trainings for key national stakeholders in the implementation of ILO Convention 169 in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic.*
2. *Course for high government officials (decision-makers) and indigenous leaders on indigenous peoples' rights and development at the ILO Training Centre in Turin, Italy.*
3. *Indigenous youth field-based fellowships/internships with PRO 169.*

Activities under Expected Result 2 on sharing Nepalese, Peruvian and Central African experiences within the region

1. *Production and distribution of regular updates on the implementation of ILO Convention 169 in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic.*
2. *Comparative legal study on the 2011 law on indigenous peoples in the Republic of Congo, Convention 169 and efforts in Central African sub-region known as Congo Basin.*
3. *Regional study of legal and policy-related protection of indigenous peoples in Asia*
4. *Community-based 4 sectorial studies on indigenous peoples and exploitation of natural resources, including mining, oil, water and forests with a view to supporting development of good practices.*

Activities under Expected Result 3 on raising awareness among key national players

1. *National workshops for mass media, including community radios and social media where possible, on indigenous peoples' rights.*
2. *Production of outreach and awareness raising materials.*

PROJECT PARTNERS

The project is implemented by the ILO in collaboration and coordination with the following partners:

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

- United Nations Indigenous Peoples Partnership (UNIPP)
- ILO's constituents: Governments and Employers' and Workers' organizations
- Indigenous peoples' organizations
- Civil society organizations dealing with the indigenous peoples' issues

PROJECT MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The overall implementation is coordinated by the ILO headquarters in Geneva, thereby ensuring the links to the broader international and regional discussions and processes regarding indigenous peoples, such as the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Peoples' Issues and the Inter Agency Support Group on Indigenous Peoples.

A Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) based at the ILO headquarters was responsible for the overall coordination and operations until 31 July 2014. This overall coordination was then taken on by a newly created Senior Specialist position focusing on indigenous peoples, with the support of a half-time Technical Officer. Country-level operations are supported by national staff.

III. Evaluation purpose and scope

PURPOSE

Conduct an independent final evaluation of the EU-supported technical cooperation project "Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic". In line with the ILO Evaluation policy and donor requirements for project evaluations, a final evaluation must be conducted to assess project success in effectively achieving its intended objectives. The project ends on 20 November 2015.

Following ILO evaluation requirements, the evaluation will be based on the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and evidence of impact and sustainability through contributions of ILO support⁴¹. The evaluation will identify how donor funding contributes to the achievement of the project's objectives.

These findings would be invaluable in informing the ILO's and the EC's future work in this area. The primary users of the review and evaluation results are the ILO, implementing partners of the project, and the EC. ILO HQ units engaged in work on indigenous peoples, PARDEV, PROGRAM and the donor, will benefit from the lessons learned.

SCOPE

The final independent evaluation is planned for November 2015-February 2016 and is expected to provide recommendations on future steps to consolidate progress, ensure the achievement of objectives, and advance the policy debate on indigenous peoples. The total

⁴¹ DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance:
<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

duration of the evaluation will be for 28 working days, which will be the basis for paying the evaluator's fees.

The evaluation will focus on interventions in countries covered by the project (i.e. Cameroon, Nepal and Peru) and the spillover effects in neighbouring countries, as well as the project coordination and management activities by the ILO headquarters in Geneva. The final independent evaluation will combine a desk review of relevant project documentation; briefings at ILO Geneva; field visits to 2 selected countries which will be decided by the evaluator in coordination with the evaluation manager; and compilation of information on progress in other countries through other methods (e.g. phone/skype interviews, questionnaires, online surveys). For travel to project countries, the evaluator will be provided economy class travel tickets by air and the standard UN Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) applicable at the time of travel. This will be in addition to the evaluator's fees and will not affect the total number of days to calculate the evaluator's fees.

The evaluation will focus on OECD/DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and evidence of impact and sustainability. It will include recommendations for future development and follow-up in terms of focus and strategy for future ILO interventions regarding indigenous peoples. The evaluation report should be finalized by 29 February 2016.

The evaluation will integrate gender equality as a cross-cutting concern throughout its methodology and all deliverables, including the final report.

Evaluation criteria and questions

The project had a specific focus on protecting the rights of indigenous peoples in line with the ILO Convention 169. Gender mainstreaming and women-specific focus should be part and parcel of the evaluation criteria and questions. In this regard, the evaluation should assess:

- **Relevance** of the objectives and project strategic approach, including how it fits within the EU's work on the issue of indigenous peoples
- **Effectiveness** of strategies to meet this objectives, including the extent to gender issues were addressed
- **Efficiency** in the utilization of financial and human resources available to the project.
- **Impact** of interventions at different levels, including the longer term effects in addressing the rights of indigenous peoples.
- **Sustainability** of results taking a short, medium and long term perspective.

The evaluation should comprise, but not necessarily be limited to the following aspects and questions. The evaluator, upon completing his/her initial desk review phase, may refine or propose further key questions in the inception report. The final key evaluation questions will be agreed between the evaluation manager and the evaluator.

a) Relevance of the project:

- Has the problem been clearly identified and assessed?
- Have the project development and results, as well as the target beneficiaries, been clearly identified and realistically set?

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

- Was the project strategic approach feasible, relevant and the intervention logic, clear and consistent (e.g. between inputs, activities, outputs and indicators of achievement)?
- Was the project relevant to ILO objectives and priorities, especially Programme and Budget (P&B) at the global level and Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCP) and United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) at the country level?
- Was the project relevant to the EU's priorities and objectives in the area of indigenous peoples?
- Was the foreseen timeframe realistic to achieve the expected results?
- Was the project management structure, including the relation with partners and external actors, sufficiently clear and realistically designed?
- Were the project objectives consistent with the target group's needs and priorities, including with national gender policies and strategies?
- Did the project take gender specificities into consideration in its design and implementation?

b) Efficiency of the project:

- Did the project management demonstrate the capacity to efficiently coordinate, administer and backstop the project implementation arrangements? Were the management and coordination arrangements sufficiently clear, adequate and responsive to partners and beneficiaries needs?
- To what extent has the project collaborated and coordinated action with other relevant ILO Programmes and Units.
- Were the reporting and monitoring systems adequate to capture progress and identify challenges so that appropriate changes could be made?
- Has the project leveraged other funds at the country level?
- Assess the performance of the project towards established baselines, designing a sustainability strategy and managing risks.
- Were inputs delivered in a quality and quality and timely fashion?
- Was the management efficient in ensuring timely delivery of quality outputs and address problems and concerns?
- Have resources been spent as economically as possible in relation to outputs and benefits?
- What were the main implementation difficulties and what was done to address them?

c) Effectiveness of the project

- Did the project execution focus on the achievement of objectives?
- Did the project deliver expected results (quantity and quality as compared with workplan and progress towards achieving the results)?
- Did implementing partners and other actors and beneficiaries, show interest, commitment and support in project implementation?
- What role did the ratification or application of ILO Convention 169 (depending on the country) play during the project implementation?
- Did target groups/beneficiaries participate in the formulation and implementation?

- Did the project contribute to increasing awareness among local and national stakeholders on the rights of indigenous peoples?
- What is the overall assessment of the validity of the project strategy and would there be a more effective way of addressing the problems and satisfying the needs in order to achieve the project objectives?

d) Impact

- To what extent have the project's actions had a demonstrated impact towards the achievement of the project's objectives? Assess results and impact against baselines and provide specific examples of results and impact if/where applicable in the field. So that it allows the donor to determine how its funding has helped produce change.
- Did the project have any significant (positive or negative) unforeseen effects? What could have been or could be done to enhance or mitigate them so that the project has a greater overall impact?

e) Sustainability

- How far has the capacity of partner institutions and services been strengthened and what needs to be done to enhance this in the future?
- Are there elements for actual and potential expansion or replicability of the project to other areas or regions?

f) Lessons learned

The evaluation is expected to generate lessons that can be applied elsewhere to improve programme or project performance, outcome, or impact. The evaluation report should contain a section on lessons learned which summarizes knowledge or understanding gained from experience related to the ILO project intervention. Lessons learned can highlight the strengths and weaknesses of interventions to improve quality of delivery; contribute to sharing innovative responses to potential challenges; and/or allow practitioners to reuse lessons from previous experience into the design of future projects. A specific template will be provided to the evaluation consultant to use in documenting lessons learned.

g) Emerging good practices

The evaluation should look at the emerging good practices in the area of protecting the rights of indigenous peoples. A template will be provided to the evaluation consultant to document the good practices.

h) Findings and recommendations

The evaluation is expected to assess the overall project results based on the established rationale, strategy, methodology and criteria, and determine the extent to which these results address the identified problem and the context and constraints. Based on the findings and analysis, the evaluation should recommend strategy adaptations or revisions for eventual follow-up actions.

IV. Evaluation methodology

This evaluation will utilize a mixed method approach which will include a desk review of available materials, briefings and interviews with key stakeholders in Geneva, and interviews (including focus group discussions) with key stakeholders and partner organizations. Country visits to 2 selected countries, which will be decided by the evaluator in coordination with the evaluation manager, will be undertaken for data collection with the project stakeholders and partners. Information on progress in those countries not selected for field visits will be collected through other methods (e.g. phone/skype interviews, questionnaires, online surveys).

The evaluator will receive all relevant project documents, progress reports and other relevant written material, including ILOs evaluation guidance, policy documents and templates that should be utilized for drafting the report. He/she will be briefed by ILO responsible staff. Based on the desk review and briefings, the evaluator shall present an inception report specifying the evaluation methodology and/or evaluation instruments (interview lists and guides, questionnaires and sampling to be used in a short inception report prior to conducting the evaluation. Any revisions to the evaluation criteria and/or questions could be proposed in the inception report, and will be discussed between the evaluator and the Evaluation Manager before any action is taken to put these changes into effect. The inception report should also include the evaluator's proposal for the two country visits including a justification and the selection criteria used for the selection. The timing and approval of the inception report shall constitute the first output of listed output in the TOR. Sources and methods for data collection, data analysis and reporting are required.

Individual interviews and focus groups with project implementing partners and stakeholders will be carried out at the minima with: relevant ILO staff, project partners in the three selected countries, selected stakeholders (e.g. trade union participants, indigenous peoples organizations), national ILO offices, and project managers from the EC.

The evaluation will take a participatory approach. A draft report will be produced and submitted to the ILO and to the implementing partners for comments and feedback. The comments will be consolidated by the evaluation manager and the evaluation report will be revised by the consultant who will keep a log of all comments received and how the evaluator has dealt with (or why not) in a table format for submission to the evaluation manager when submitting the draft report.

A final revised report will be submitted to the ILO reflecting any feedback or correction from parties concerned. The expected output of the evaluation is a concise report of about 25-30 pages plus annexes and templates presenting evaluation findings addressing general and specific evaluation objectives.

V. Main deliverables

- a) A short inception report (max 10 pages) specifying the evaluation methodology and/or evaluation instruments, not later than 15 December 2015;
- b) A draft evaluation report (not longer than 30 pages), including lessons learnt and emerging best practices, not later than 7 February 2016;

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

- c) An evaluation summary according to the ILO template provided, not later than 29 February 2016; and
- d) A final evaluation report, including a log of how the consultant incorporated the comments, not later than 29 February 2016.

VI. Management arrangements

The evaluation will be conducted by an external evaluator, with the support of the Evaluation Manager in the Department of Statistics (Mr Ritash Sarna) and Evaluation Focal Point of the WORKQUALITY Department (Ms Rasha Tabbara). The CTA and project team staff will facilitate access to relevant information and documentation, as required.

VII. Evaluator appointment and qualification

CRITERIA:

The independent evaluator will be selected on the basis of proven evaluation experience (seven years minimum) and meeting the following independence criteria:

- 1) Have no previous or current involvement – or offers of prospective employment – with the ILO project or programme being evaluated; and
- 2) Have no personal links to the people involved in managing the project/programme (not a family member, friend or close former colleague).

The evaluator will have knowledge and previous experience in the field of indigenous peoples, with proven experience in project evaluations. Previous experience in evaluating EC-funded projects is an asset. The evaluator should be fluent in English, working knowledge of Spanish and/or French will be an advantage.

TIMEFRAME:

The evaluation is expected to start on 1 December 2015 and end by 31 January 2016, with the final report to be submitted by 29 February 2016.

The evaluation timeframe will be as follows: A total of 28 non-consecutive working days, including online surveys (if any), desk review, individual interviews with project partners and stakeholders (through country visits and telephone interviews), drafting report and feedback from the ILO and implementing partners and presenting findings.

REMUNERATION AND PAYMENT SCHEDULE:

The total amount of the contract reflects 28 non-consecutive work days.

Travel expenses will be paid separately.

Final evaluation of the project GLO/12/12/EEC: *Supporting the implementation of indigenous peoples' rights in Nepal, Peru and Central African Republic through enhanced participation of neighbouring and regional actors*

Practical arrangements

Within the context of this assignment, the consultant will be expected to undertake a certain number of trips, which will be determined later, in agreement with the Evaluation Manager.

In accordance with the relevant ILO rules, the ILO will provide pre-paid return air tickets in economy class and by the most direct route. Any upgrade or deviation in the journey made by the consultant will be at his own expense.

The ILO will also pay Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) at the standard UN rate for the dates of the trips to cover lodging, meals and incidentals while on travel agreed with the ILO. The DSA will always be paid to the consultant by bank transfer after each trip and upon presentation of the relevant proofs of travel (boarding pass and hotel invoice).

Although the ILO covers the subsistence expenses, it accepts no liability in the event of accident or illness and it is the responsibility of the consultant to take out any insurance policy he might consider necessary.

Please also note that it is the full responsibility of the consultant to obtain any visa that might be required and that the ILO does not bear any cost incurred in the processing of visas.