



Latin America and Caribbean Region
Sustainable Development Working Paper No. 10

Strengthening Indigenous Organizations: The World Bank's Indigenous Capacity-Building Program in Latin America

December 2000



Jorge E. Uquillas
Teresa Aparicio Gabara

The World Bank
Latin America and Caribbean Regional Office
Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development SMU

LCR Sustainable Development Working Paper No. 10

**Strengthening Indigenous Organizations:
The World Bank's Indigenous Capacity-
Building Program in Latin America**

December 2000

Jorge E. Uquillas
Teresa Aparicio Gabara

Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development
Latin America and the Caribbean Region
The World Bank

Jorge E. Uquillas is a Senior Sociologist in the Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Unit of the World Bank's Latin America and Caribbean Regional Office.

Teresa Aparicio Gabara is a Social Anthropologist in the Environment and Natural Resources Management Division of the Inter-American Development Bank.

The findings interpretations and conclusions in this document are attributable to the authors, and should not be attributed in any manner to the World Bank, its affiliated organizations, members of its Board of Executive Directors or the countries they represent.

This working paper series is produced by the Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Sector Management Unit (John Redwood, Director) of the Latin America and Caribbean Regional Office.

Additional copies may be obtained either from the authors, or from LCSES Projects Assistant Peter Brandriss (pbrandriss@worldbank.org, or tel. 202-473-9379).

Cover photos (clockwise, from upper left)

Participants in training workshop, Nicaragua

Indigenous girl, Nicaragua

Consultations with indigenous and afroecuadoran leaders, Ecuador

Working group at training session, Guatemala

Contents

Background	1
Capacity Building to Strengthen Indigenous Organizations	2
Capacity-Building Projects Implemented through December 1999.....	2
Indigenous Universities in Chile	2
“Learning by Doing” in Three Regions of Bolivia	3
“Peasant-to-Peasant Training” among Forestry Communities in Mexico	4
The Ecuadoran Participatory Training Experience	5
Indigenous Peoples Training in Nicaragua	6
Strengthening the Fondo Indígena	6
Strengthening Indigenous and Afro-Honduran Organizations	7
The Indigenous Capacity-Building Program in Argentina	7
Other Projects under Implementation.....	8
Evaluating the Cases of Colombia and Guatemala	9
The Wider Perspective	9
Methodological Framework	10
Colombia: Indigenous Peoples Training and Institutional Strengthening	10
Impact of the Program	11
Institutional Aspects	12
Pedagogic Aspects	13
Intercultural Communication	14
Participation	14
Strengthening of Indigenous Peoples in Guatemala.....	15
Program Objectives	16
Project Impact	16
Institutional Aspects	16
Pedagogic Aspects	17
Communication Aspects	18
Participation	18
Conclusions	19
A Comparative Perspective	19
Results of the Program at a Broader Level.....	19
Issues to Address in the Future.....	21
References	23

Strengthening Indigenous Organizations

The World Bank's Indigenous Capacity-Building Program in Latin America

Jorge E. Uquillas and Teresa Aparicio Gabara

BACKGROUND

Indigenous peoples of Latin America have shown a great capacity for change and adaptation. During the past several decades they increasingly have recognized that to meet the challenges of modern society they cannot rely solely on traditional forms of organization, knowledge, and skills, but must also embrace new forms of organization and key elements of modern science and technology.

Largely in response to pressures from the larger society, indigenous peoples have formed their own grassroots organizations, as well as ethnic federations and confederations. These new organizations have often come into conflict with some existing class-based peasant organizations that originally were formed as branches of trade unions. In most Latin American countries indigenous organizations have now been created at the regional and national level, and some coordinating groups are being formed at the international level.

The improving social organization and mobilization of indigenous peoples has allowed some

of them to play an increasingly important role in social and political affairs and to advocate changes in the legal and institutional structures of their countries. Their efforts have been complemented by those of social advocates both from governmental and nongovernmental organizations who have led or participated in campaigns for indigenous peoples' rights. These efforts have started producing results. Though participation of indigenous organizations in official decisionmaking is limited, it is increasing, and a few countries have formally recognized certain rights of indigenous peoples and the importance of cultural diversity.

Globalization poses many new challenges for indigenous peoples. These challenges heighten the importance of consolidating indigenous organizations and improving socioeconomic conditions through greater involvement in determining how resources are distributed. To do this, indigenous peoples must broaden their knowledge and skills base, especially in the design, administration, and evaluation of development projects for their social groups and communities.

CAPACITY BUILDING TO STRENGTHEN INDIGENOUS ORGANIZATIONS

For the past several years the World Bank has been promoting a participatory approach to project preparation and implementation. In the process it has learned that effective participation requires special skills that are not evenly distributed among different stakeholders. Marginalized groups such as indigenous peoples are particularly likely to lack such skills. In addition, to improve implementation of its indigenous peoples policy, the Bank and its borrowers are increasingly promoting indigenous peoples' involvement in project preparation, implementation, and evaluation (World Bank 1996; Davis and Soefstetad 1995).

The World Bank's Indigenous Capacity-Building Program in Latin America started as a collaborative effort by the Environment Unit of the Bank's Latin America and Caribbean Regional Office, and the multilateral Fund for the Development of Indigenous Peoples of Latin America (*Fondo Indígena*). The training program received grants of between \$100,000 and \$200,000 from the Bank's Institutional Development Fund (IDF), as well as support from a trust fund of the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), which served to provide technical assistance and facilitate participation of indigenous organizations in the training process.

The main objective of the training program is to strengthen indigenous peoples organizations and increase their options for ethnodevelopment (socioeconomic change that is determined by them and is compatible with their specific cultural values) (Partridge and others 1996).

The program's strategy is to work with indigenous organizations and willing national governments to help groups of indigenous people build their own capacity for identifying needs, selecting development priorities, and formulating strategies and proposals that could be imple-

mented with a combination of their own resources and outside help. Follow-up activities include a joint search for possible lending operations that may allow the Bank and borrower governments to invest directly in indigenous development.

Each country's capacity-building program has largely been designed by the indigenous peoples and organizations themselves, based on their own needs. Although the specific agenda varies from country to country, they all address technical aspects such as participatory diagnostics, planning, and project administration. Another common feature is a participatory methodology based on some variant of the "learning by doing" approach. Moreover, except for Mexico and Colombia, the training programs have been held at the national level (Uquillas and others 1998).

The program has been well received by most governments and indigenous peoples. The main results of the 10 completed projects (listed in Box 1) are analyzed below. The analysis is based on final project reports and on evaluation workshops conducted in Quito (for the Andean region) and San Jose (for Mexico and Central America). There also are brief descriptions of other projects still under implementation. The cases of Colombia and Guatemala were subject to an external evaluation and are discussed in greater detail.

Capacity-Building Projects Implemented through December 1999

"Indigenous Universities" in Chile

The first series of indigenous training workshops was held in Chile. In-country coordination was handled by the National Corporation of Indigenous Development (*Corporación Nacional de Desarrollo Indígena, CONADI*) of Chile's Ministry of Planning and Cooperation.

Box 1. List of Capacity-Building Programs

Completed (as of December 1999)

1. Chile: *"Indigenous Universities"*
2. Bolivia: *"Learning by Doing" in Three Regions of Bolivia*
3. Bolivia: *Strengthening the Fondo Indigena*
4. Mexico: *"Peasant-to-Peasant Training" Among Forestry Communities*
5. Ecuador: *The Participatory Training Experience*
6. Nicaragua: *Indigenous Peoples Training*
7. Honduras: *Strengthening Indigenous and Afro-Honduran Organizations*
8. Argentina: *Indigenous Capacity Building*
9. Mexico: *Training Program for the Development of Indigenous Forestry Communities (second phase)*
10. Mexico: *Strengthening of Indigenous Women*

Under Implementation (as of December 1999)

11. Mexico: *Training Project for the Lacandona Forest of Chiapas*
12. Panama: *Institutional Strengthening and Sustainable Development of Indigenous Peoples*
13. Belize: *Institutional Strengthening of the Belize Indigenous Training Institute*
14. Costa Rica: *Institutional Strengthening of Indigenous Peoples*

The workshops began in January 1994 with the "First Indigenous Summer University," held in Temuco with an organization representing the Mapuche indigenous peoples. The second "Indigenous University" training course was carried out in September 1994 among Aymara and Atacameño indigenous organizations in the northern city of Arica.

These workshops sought to strengthen indigenous organizations and help them to better articulate their needs and self-development priorities using a participatory approach. The main themes were ethnodevelopment, project design and evaluation, organizational development, negotiation skills, indigenous laws, and women in development.

The courses involved representatives of 38 local organizations, including 24 groups with a social or cultural orientation, 6 grassroots community groups, and 5 producer or trade organizations. About 120 people were trained. At the end of each training event the trainers, trainees, representatives of the World Bank, and government coordinators of the program took part in an evaluation activity. The evaluation concluded that the courses had filled a vacuum, particularly at a time when Chile was in the process of de-

fining a new policy on indigenous peoples. It recommended, among other things, that further training be provided.

Some time later a follow-up proposal was presented to the Bank but was not approved by the operational unit dealing with Chile. Key staff in the unit argued against the project on the grounds that Chile's relatively high economic performance and increasing access to private sources of capital was leading to a reduction and eventual termination of Bank activities there.

"Learning by Doing" in Three Regions of Bolivia

The overall objective of the Bolivia participatory training project was to help build capacity among indigenous organizations and strengthen their self-management through a dynamic participatory process. This was expected to improve the trainees' ability to design and implement projects, and increase participation of indigenous peoples in political-administrative activities in the context of the decentralization process proposed by the government. The training project in Bolivia was implemented in three regions: indigenous organizations of the Altiplano assembled in Uncía, North of Potosí; representatives of the Valleys met in

Camiri; and, representatives of the Lowlands met in San Ignacio de Moxos.

From the beginning, workshop organizers established three conditions for the project: (a) that it be participatory; (b) that it contrast the three different types of Bolivian indigenous organizations—*asambleas de pueblos*, *centrales de pueblos*, and *federaciones*; and (c) that it be implemented by an interdisciplinary team. Therefore, the project adopted a “learning by doing” approach that included not only theory in the workshops, but also practice between workshops.

This project trained about 100 representatives of indigenous organizations. They include representatives of the *Asamblea del Pueblo Guarani*, the *Central de Pueblos Indígenas of Beni* (CEPIB), the *Central Indígena del Oriente Boliviano* (CIDOB), and both the *Federación de Ayllus* and the *Federación Sindical Unica de Trabajadores Campesinos* of North Potosí. The participants learned new skills for participatory analysis and planning. They also enhanced their ability for intercultural relations and socialization of the concepts used in the training process.

The capacity-building effort contributed to the official decentralization process that was being promoted in Bolivia at the time. That process led to the creation of indigenous municipal districts and adoption of participatory planning techniques for community development. In addition, the Bank's show of interest led to new operations benefiting indigenous peoples in Bolivia, including the Participatory Rural Investment Project, the Capacity-Building Program on Hydrocarbon Operations, and the Indigenous Peoples Development Project.

“Peasant-to-Peasant Training” among Forestry Communities in Mexico

In Mexico, some of the more developed indigenous forestry communities have trained their less experienced counterparts in a process that started in March 1995 in Nuevo San Juan Parangaricu-

tiro, Michoacan, and finished in September 1995 in Capulalpan, Sierra Juárez, Oaxaca.¹

The workshops took advantage of the methodological experiences gained by several indigenous forestry communities, and used examples of successful organizations such as the *Nuevo San Juan Parangaricutiro*, *Unión de Comunidades Indígenas Zapoteco-Chinanteca* (UZACHI), and the Indigenous Community of Ixtlán.²

The project's general objective was to improve the ability of indigenous organizations to formulate development strategies, identify problems, elaborate proposals, and formulate and manage specific projects that would increase their self-reliance. Specific objectives were to (a) conduct an exercise in strategic planning for community forestry development, and (b) train indigenous organizations' technical teams.

The training process involved three phases: (a) preparation and consultation with community leaders and governmental and nongovernmental organizations, (b) conducting the workshops, and (c) monitoring and evaluation. The first workshops, in the north at San Juan Nuevo Parangaricutiro, Michoacan, trained 47 people from 15 ethnic groups. The second workshops, in Capulalpan de Mendez, Sierra Juárez, Oaxaca, trained 46 people from 21 different indigenous organizations and several ethnic groups.

The participatory training demonstrated two important things: first, that members of indigenous communities already have many of the skills

-
1. In Mexico there are an estimated 10 million indigenous people and they own 80 percent of all forested land.
 2. Examples of organizations working on sustainability issues in Mexico include: Comunidad Indígena de Nuevo San Juan (CINSJ), Comunidad Indígena de Ixtlan de Juárez (CIJ), Unión Zapoteca Chinanteca (UZACHI), Unión de Comunidades y Ejidos Forestales de Oaxaca (UCEFO), and Unión Nacional de Organizaciones en Forestería Comunal (UNOFOC).

needed to design and execute forestry and natural resources management projects; and second, that the relationship between indigenous communities and governmental and nongovernmental organizations must transcend paternalistic attitudes.

The training program also helped the government learn about the managerial capacity of indigenous organizations. According to a public official who attended one of the evaluation sessions, this was one of the first times that financial resources were channeled directly to indigenous organizations in Mexico. He was convinced that the indigenous forestry communities had managed the funds in an exceptional manner, thus demonstrating their managerial and technical capacities.

The partnership between the Bank, the federal government, and indigenous forestry communities was instrumental in the approval of two important Bank loans that benefit indigenous peoples: the Forestry Communities Project and the Indigenous People and Biodiversity Project.

The Ecuadoran Participatory Training Experience

The participatory training project in Ecuador sought to strengthen the capacity of indigenous organizations to design and implement alternative projects and programs in natural resources management and development.

The project enjoyed active participation on the part of Ecuador's principal indigenous organizations, including:

- Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador (CONAIE) and its regional members—the Coordinadora de Organizaciones de la Costa Ecuatoriana (COICE), the Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas de la Amazonia Ecuatoriana (CONFENIAE), and the Ecuador Runacunac Riccharimui (ECUARUNARI)
- Federación Nacional de Organizaciones Campesinas e Indígenas (FENOCIN)

- Federación de Indígenas Evangélicos del Ecuador (FEINE)
- Coordinadora de Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica (COICA).

The project was facilitated on the part of the government by the *Consejo Nacional de Planificación del Desarrollo Indígena y Negro* (CONPLADEIN), which administered the funds, contracted the trainers, and was in charge of the general logistics.

The training project started with a consultation workshop in each of the country's three regions (Coast, Highlands, and Amazon). The consultations revisited the initial training agenda and made necessary adjustments, including specific capacity-building activities based on the social needs and development objectives of the indigenous organizations and their communities. About 75 people (25 per region) representing the communities associated with the main indigenous organizations participated in the workshops. The workshops used a participatory methodology that combined theoretical training with fieldwork.

At the end of each workshop an evaluation seminar was organized with the participation of instructors, training coordinators, participants, and representatives of municipalities and indigenous organizations. These final evaluation seminars also provided a forum for dialogue among government and indigenous organizations.

The dialogue fostered between the Bank, CONPLADEIN, and indigenous organizations helped pave the way for preparation of an Indigenous and Afro-Ecuadoran Peoples Development Project. Some of the trainees eventually contributed, as community counterparts, to preparation of that project. Additional training was provided during project design, particularly in the area of community diagnostics and planning using participatory techniques.

The Indigenous and Afro-Ecuadoran Peoples Development Project has built on the experiences of

the training project. Thus, it has a component on Institutional Strengthening of Indigenous and Afro-Ecuadoran Organizations that includes sub-components on formal and informal human resource formation, local community development planning, and technical assistance and direct financial support to indigenous implementing agencies (usually second-tier organizations or federations).

In addition, the Land and Water Component has special training activities to create indigenous paralegals—people knowledgeable about the national justice system who can help communities process their claims for legal recognition and title to their lands.

Indigenous Peoples Training in Nicaragua

The Vice Ministry for Indigenous Affairs of Nicaragua's Ministry of Social Action (*Ministerio de Acción Social, or MAS*) coordinated the implementation of a technical assistance project for indigenous communities in the Atlantic and Pacific Regions. The principal objective of the project was to strengthen indigenous organizations through a process of technical training on high priority issues.

The main thematic areas covered were strategies of indigenous development, community development based on self-management, organizational strengthening, and participation in the administration of public services at the regional and local levels. Several themes touched issues related to land regularization and enhanced natural resources management. Every workshop incorporated fieldwork into the curriculum to complement the formal training. At the end of each series of workshops, an evaluation and monitoring seminar was carried out.

Practically all ethnic groups in Nicaragua (*Miskito, Mayangna, Rama, Garifuna, Creole, Nandiri, Sebaco, Monimbo and Subtiaba*) were represented in the project. Participants belonged to the following indigenous organizations:

- *YATAMA* (pan-ethnic)
- *Movimiento Indígena Negro y Popular* (pan-ethnic)
- *Coordinadora Indígena Nicaraguense* (pan-ethnic)
- *SUKAWALA* (Mayangna)
- *AMICA* (Miskito women)
- *Asociación de Síndicos Indígenas de Yaspi Tasba* (mostly Miskito)
- Council of Elders (mostly Miskito).

A total of 97 indigenous people were trained: 30 participants were from the North Atlantic region; 32 from the South Atlantic, and 35 from the Pacific.

A key result of the project was that it filled a gap in the participants' knowledge. Most had a very good understanding of the current socioeconomic, political, and cultural situation of their communities, but they lacked training in the administrative and technical aspects of project management, finance and business, and negotiation.

In addition, the project contributed significantly to discussion of how indigenous peoples could participate in World Bank-financed projects and how the Bank could be more responsive to indigenous demands such as recognition of land rights. Both the Rural Municipalities Project and the Atlantic Biodiversity Corridor Project have addressed these issues by incorporating components on indigenous peoples' development, particularly additional capacity building on land tenure and natural resource management.

Strengthening the Fondo Indígena

The program has also supported a research and training activity of the Fondo Indígena, giving it greater visibility among indigenous organizations and governments. Its objectives were to document successful cases of indigenous development and prepare training material based on those cases.

Twelve cases were analyzed in Chile, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Mexico, with active participation

from the indigenous organizations of each country. The case studies cover areas such as indigenous self-government, education, production, and marketing.

The project was facilitated by in-country indigenous peoples specialists. These specialists provided technical advice and training to 12 indigenous researchers who in turn carried out the case studies in their communities, involving hundreds of actors in the process.

Final reports were presented at a workshop in Otavalo, Ecuador in May 1998. They have been published in a volume (Carrasco and others 1999) that will be used to produce training materials for indigenous communities.

Strengthening Indigenous and Afro-Honduran Organizations

The *Confederación de Pueblos Autóctonos de Honduras* (CONPAH) and the *Secretaría de Agricultura y Ganadería* (SEG) of Honduras conducted a training program between August 1998 and June 1999. A consultative advisory committee composed of delegates from different government agencies and indigenous organizations oversaw the activities of the program.

The fundamental objective of the program was to strengthen the technical and managerial capacity of indigenous and Afro-Honduran communities and organizations to promote a culturally sensitive and participatory development process in Honduras.

The training covered a broad range of issues, including forestry conservation, natural resource management, organizational strengthening, indigenous peoples rights, gender issues, bilingual education, participatory rural appraisal methodologies, development of training materials, and monitoring and evaluation.

A total of 730 indigenous representatives were trained in 18 seminars, workshops, meetings,

and courses; 36 percent of the participants were women. In addition, as a consequence of the program, 20 specific proposals for social and productive projects were generated, seven of which were accepted for financing by different donors.

The main achievements of the program include (a) developing working relationships with nine different indigenous and Afro-Honduran peoples, (b) helping CONPAH follow up on its commitments with member organizations, government agencies, NGOs, and donors, and (c) contributing to the design of an emergency reconstruction plan for indigenous and Afro-Honduran communities after Hurricane Mitch. The reconstruction plan will provide the foundation for an overall development plan for indigenous and Afro-Honduran Peoples.

The Indigenous Capacity-Building Program in Argentina

This project, completed by mid-1999, was very well received by indigenous peoples. In fact, the training initiative played an extremely important role in reducing past mutual grievances between the government and indigenous organizations. The Social Development Secretariat (*Secretaría de Desarrollo Social*), which had rather limited experience with ethnic groups prior to the participatory training program, managed the project in cooperation with the National Institute of Indian Affairs (*Instituto Nacional de Asuntos Indígenas*). The initiative helped close the historic gap and mutual distrust between indigenous peoples and central and provincial governments.

Indigenous organizations representing 14 ethnic groups worked with the two governmental organizations to plan indigenous peoples development initiatives. Twenty-two local and regional training workshops were conducted in four regions of the country (*Region Sur*, *NOA Andino*, *NOA Chaqueño*, and *Region NEA*). About 1,200 indigenous leaders and 20 different organizations participated in the workshops, which were fol-

lowed by a national meeting and an overall evaluation of the experience.

The internal evaluation reached the following main conclusions: (a) the project met its objectives in terms of institutional strengthening for indigenous organizations and capacity building for individual participants; (b) the project had a multiplier effect as reflected in several initiatives taken by the participants during and after its implementation; (c) the training workshops provided opportunities not only for training but also for participation, exchange, and networking among different levels (community, ethnic group, provincial, regional, and national); and (d) the trainers—80 percent of whom were indigenous—and the coordinators performed very well and carried out the project in an optimal way (SDS, CENOC, Banco Mundial 1999).

As a direct consequence of this program, an Indigenous Community Development Project (Learning and Innovation Loan) and a Biodiversity Protection Project (Global Environment Facility Grant) are in preparation, with INAI as the government counterpart. The project will initially work in three areas: (a) the Kolla of Finca Santi-

ago in Salta, (b) the Diaguita-Calchaqui and Quilmes of Amaicha del Valle in Tucumán, and (c) the Pehuenche of Hacienda Pulmari in Neuquén. Besides a component on sociocultural strengthening of indigenous communities, there are important components on sustainable use and conservation of natural resources.

Other Projects under Implementation

The World Bank has also approved IDF funding for the following countries, where projects are at different stages of implementation:

- Mexico—Training Program for the Development of the Indigenous Forestry Communities (second phase), and Training Project for the Lacandona Forest of Chiapas
- Panama—Institutional Strengthening and Sustainable Development of Indigenous Peoples
- Belize—Institutional Strengthening of the Belize Indigenous Training Institute
- Costa Rica—Institutional Strengthening of Indigenous Peoples (with the Mesa Indígena and the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture, IICA).

EVALUATING THE CASES OF COLOMBIA AND GUATEMALA

In 1998 an external evaluation of the Indigenous Peoples Participatory Training Program was undertaken in Guatemala (in June) and in Colombia (in August). The two case studies presented below are based on the information gathered in the field, as well as existing background material on the program. First the program is discussed within the wider national context, then the evaluation methodology is described briefly, and finally the Colombia and Guatemala cases are assessed in detail, including a comparative perspective.

The Wider Perspective

There are great contrasts between Colombia and Guatemala in terms of the size of their indigenous populations, the way the state is dealing with indigenous issues, the level of social organization found among indigenous peoples, and the political context. In Guatemala, indigenous peoples are the majority of the population (66 percent), whereas in Colombia, indigenous peoples represent only 2 percent of the population.

The state agencies implementing the project were established under different political conditions and historical periods. In Guatemala, the *Fondo de Desarrollo Indígena Guatemalteco* (FODIGUA), was established in 1994 as a result of peace talks following the cease fire between the government and guerrilla groups. In contrast, in Colombia the *Dirección General de Asuntos Indígenas* (DGAI), within the Ministry of the Interior, was established at the end of the 1940s during a period in which similar agencies were created by many governments in Latin America to help indigenous peoples assimilate into the broader national society.

FODIGUA was created as a government agency with a council composed of both government and indigenous peoples' representatives. All major decisions are taken at the council level. However,

there is no provision in FODIGUA's structure for indigenous participation in the organization's daily decisionmaking process.

In contrast, during its nearly 40-year history DGAI has functioned without any formal indigenous representation in its institutional structure. However, both institutions are bounded by the political interests of the governing parties.

At the time the training program was implemented both countries were experiencing an important opening towards indigenous issues, accompanied by the political will to support training and education programs among indigenous groups.

Another issue within the broader perspective of program implementation is the level of indigenous organization and the increasing level of education, particularly since the 1960s. In Guatemala 30 years of harsh repression had destroyed the higher level indigenous organizations and institutions, with the exception of some community-based cooperatives and Catholic action organizations. Only recently have indigenous peoples begun organizing themselves again at the local, regional, and national level. Internationally, however, the plight of Guatemalan indigenous peoples has been widely known through reports published by the United Nations Human Rights Commission during the last two decades.

Indigenous peoples in Colombia, on the other hand, have not only preserved their institutions but developed and strengthened them at all levels despite ongoing confrontations with guerrilla groups, the military, and drugs lords. In addition, they have developed strong alliances with the growing number of worldwide indigenous organizations (such as the World Council of Indigenous Peoples and the Indigenous Rainforest Alliance), indigenous support groups in

Europe and the United States, and international environmental institutions (such as the World Wildlife Fund, International Union for the Conservation of Nature, and Friends of the Earth).

By the time the project was implemented Colombian indigenous peoples had strong, local grassroots organizations, several well-established indigenous umbrella groups such as the *Consejo Regional Indígena del Cauca* (CRIC, established in the late 1960s), and two national indigenous organizations—the *Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia* (ONIC), and *Autoridades Indígenas de Colombia* (AIC).

Colombia's indigenous peoples also were well represented at the international level. For example, CRIC is a member of the *Coordinadora de Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica* (COICA), an umbrella organization for indigenous peoples in Amazonian countries. COICA, in turn, has observer status in the Amazon Cooperation Treaty, to which all Amazonian governments are signatories. Furthermore, COICA is a formal member of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) at the United Nations, which gives the group the right to participate in the UN Human Rights Commission and Subcommissions where international indigenous rights are discussed.

Thus, the indigenous peoples training program in Colombia was implemented under strong and well-founded indigenous structures, whereas in Guatemala indigenous peoples were still in the process of organizing themselves at all levels. Those differences, together with the political goodwill towards indigenous affairs in both countries, would shape program implementation in different ways.

Methodological Framework

The methodological framework designed to evaluate the program in the two countries includes both participatory and comparative components.

The participatory component was based on participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) methods and tools, including (a) consultations with key stakeholders in the program, (b) participant and nonparticipant observation techniques in the field, and (c) discussions with key sources and gender-selected groups. The study also included a review of existing information on the program.

The comparative component uses five sets of criteria: (a) impact criteria, dealing with program benefits and limitations, (b) institutional criteria, covering program impacts both on the implementing institution and the participating organizations, (c) pedagogic criteria, to examine the models used to train participants and their value as educational tools, (d) communication criteria, looking at intercultural and interethnic communication and the extent to which indigenous methodologies and techniques were taken into account, and (e) participation criteria, assessing trainees' degree of participation and decision-taking. The responses were tallied but not analyzed statistically because the sample was small and the subjects were not selected at random.

Colombia: Indigenous Peoples Training and Institutional Strengthening

In Colombia the program was implemented by the DGAI between 1995 and 1997. It targeted 10 indigenous peoples located in four different regions. The program was implemented according to the needs and wishes of each beneficiary group. The program formed six coordinating teams: one at the national level and five at the regional level (one each in the regions of the Guajira, Santa. Marta, Sierra Atánquez, Cauca, and Nariño). The six teams comprised 32 professionals, 20 of whom were indigenous people.

The main objectives of the program were: to strengthen indigenous peoples and their organizations so that they could participate more effectively in the development process at the local, regional, and national levels, both in state insti-

tutions, the private sector, and within civil society at large. The training themes chosen by the indigenous groups included:

- (a) Indigenous legislation and indigenous legal rights, including territorial rights
- (b) Transfer of state funds to indigenous communities
- (c) Fundamental concepts of indigenous traditional philosophy
- (d) Self-development, project design, and follow-up of microcredit and community-based development programs
- (e) Inter- and intra-ethnic relationships.

The program trained 1,200 indigenous people from 10 ethnic groups. The seminars usually had about 45 participants. However some of the ethnic groups, such as the *Paez* and some *Wayu* communities, saw a need for widespread training in certain themes—such as indigenous legal systems—and therefore assembled hundreds of people from their communities for those sessions.

All major indigenous organizations were contacted prior to program implementation, and the great majority choose to participate. The program included (a) 100 local training seminars preceded by consultation meetings with indigenous organizations and communities, (b) 15 regional coordination meetings, and (c) 3 national meetings for program planning, monitoring, and evaluation.

The consultation process with indigenous organizations was conducted at the national, regional, and local level. At the community level, consultations were made with (a) political and/or religious leaders, (b) traditional indigenous organizations such as the *cabildos* (a sociogeographic unit), (c) modern indigenous organizations, (d) direct participants, and (e) indirect participants (other community members).

The consultation process led to a set of agreements between the DGAI and each participating group on issues such as selection of training themes, indigenous and nonindigenous method-

ology, and interaction between the community and training activities, etc.

Impact of the Program

The program achieved all objectives agreed between DGAI and the 10 indigenous ethnic groups (including strengthening of traditional indigenous institutions, training activities with a multiplier effect, and strong indigenous participation).

The program also yielded indirect benefits. Most importantly, the program helped stimulate new dialogue between indigenous peoples and the state. For instance, the training activities on indigenous constitutional rights fostered a robust and open exchange of ideas.

Second, studies on traditional indigenous legal systems were undertaken as a part of the program. The results were presented by the indigenous peoples themselves at a national seminar on indigenous legal rights, and have since been published by the DGAI (DGAJ/MJD/CRIC 1997).

An innovative feature of the studies on traditional legal systems is that they started from an ethnic viewpoint including cultural, religious, and cosmological elements. Another unique aspect of indigenous legal systems in Colombia is that they have been incorporated into the national legal system, which means indigenous peoples may now administer justice, including punitive justice, within their communities. Thus, in Colombia today there is a degree of legal pluralism.

The main limitations on implementation were in administration, interinstitutional cooperation, and certain technical aspects.

The main administrative constraint was that program funds were channeled through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), which required DGAI to adopt new administrative procedures that took nearly a year to put in place. The participating communities and organizations were somewhat anxious to begin

program activities and they perceived the delay as proof of DGAI's operational inefficiency.

The program also could have had broader inter-institutional coverage. One of the two national indigenous organizations, ONIC, did not participate in the program, although many of its member organizations did (for example, the CRIC). ONIC had intended to participate, but midway through the preparation process decided to withdraw and to instead present a similar proposal to the European Union in the expectation that they would receive a larger grant and have greater control of the program. Unfortunately, the proposal did not go through.

In addition a state institution, the Planning Department's Territorial Development Unit (*Unidad de Desarrollo Territorial*), expressed interest in the program but ultimately had very limited participation. Greater involvement by both ONIC and the Territorial Development Unit would have enriched the program.

Finally, at the technical level the program did not incorporate a monitoring and evaluation system. This is an important area that calls for close attention in similar future projects.

Institutional Aspects

The program strengthened participating indigenous organizations and communities in different ways. One of the most important is that it improved their knowledge of the international framework of indigenous rights.

A case in point are the training seminars on International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention 169 dealing with indigenous rights, and especially the right to prior consultation on development schemes affecting indigenous communities (DGAI/MJD/CRC, 1997). That knowledge substantially helped indigenous groups in Santa Marta in discussions with regional authorities and the private sector about

the rebuilding of a harbor that would affect their way of life.

Institutional strengthening also came from revitalization and reactivation of indigenous cultural values. For example, the *Kenkuamo* people of the Santa Marta region selected three such themes along those lines: (a) recovery of traditions, (b) geography of the sacred, and (c) recovery of traditional music.

Research on indigenous legal systems by the indigenous organizations themselves proved to be a powerful mechanism for strengthening traditional institutions. Each of the participating groups dealt with that research in a different way. For instance, the *Awa* people of the Nariño region made a schoolbook on the traditional *Awa* system of sanctions and behavior, colored by the children. The *Paez* people, from the Cauca region, collected material for a publication on the legal system of the cabildos as currently practiced. The *Arhuaco* people, from the Sierra de Santa Marta, reactivated their judicial system as a mechanism to help solve interethnic conflicts.

Other activities that contributed to institutional strengthening include (a) new interethnic contacts facilitating the exchange of experiences and creation of new alliances, (b) training on project design and administration that brought about implementation of more than 60 community-based projects nationwide, and (c) training on intercultural mechanisms and understanding as the basis for cooperation between indigenous peoples and state institutions at the municipal and departmental levels—a very innovative approach to reaching agreements between indigenous and nonindigenous groups.

The program also strengthened the DGAI, providing the institution with new multidisciplinary teams made up of anthropologists, lawyers, economists, and linguists specializing in indigenous affairs.

The program has a potentially substantial multiplier effect. First, the training methodology could easily fit different indigenous cultures. Second, having the participating indigenous organizations choose a curriculum based on their own needs and interests facilitates replication of training activities at the local level. For example, the *Awa* people choose themes around cultural revitalization because many of their people are undergoing a rapid process of acculturation that is threatening their language and cultural traits.

Pedagogic Aspects

After forming a national coordination team DGAI decided to follow a consensus-building methodology specific to each indigenous group in the program. This way each indigenous community analyzed their own needs, chose working topics, and decided how to develop them. As a result, the groups' traditional and religious leaders (*mamos* among the *Arhuacos*, *alaulas* among the *Wayuu*, *taitas* among the *Guambianos*, etc.) had a continuing role in all the activities that were developed. Below are some illustrations of the different training models used.

Indigenous groups in the Sierra de Santa Marta region agreed that the principal objective of the program was to generate discussion that would benefit both the trainees and their authorities and religious leaders. The role of leaders and community authorities was to design a methodological framework that would make the training activities possible. Because the word of the traditional leaders is held sacred, there were no authority problems. On the contrary, the participants spoke fondly and with pride not only of their new knowledge, but also the way in which it was acquired in the presence of their leaders.

Instead of training workshops, the *Paez* leaders asked for assemblies and meetings to talk about and reflect on the application of the internal rights of each community and, in this way, become aware of the importance of indigenous

authorities' application of justice. *Paez* leaders asked that the training be directed not only toward the towns' governors and community leaders, but to the *Paez* communities in general.

The *Wayuu* of the Guajira, especially in the high and middle regions, have a different sociopolitical structure than other indigenous peoples in Colombia. While in the Sierra and the Cauca regions indigenous peoples have a relatively centralized decisionmaking framework, the *Wayuu* are socially, politically, and geographically dispersed.

The *Wayuu* social units are their small settlements, associated with totemic clans, that are distant from one another. Alliances between several settlements can form new frames of reference that transcend the autonomy of each one.

Conflict is inherent in the *Wayuu* social structure. Some conflicts last generations, with sophisticated alliance mechanisms articulated within that political system. An important regulating factor is the role of indigenous leaders—the *alaulas*. The training model selected by the *Wayuu* gave the *alaulas* responsibility for coordinating activities between settlements. The *alaulas* would come out in the morning and visit participants' homes, orienting and coordinating the training activities.

The program led to two regional meetings between the *alaulas* in three zones. They had specifically asked for training in interethnic issues, the origins of *Wayuu* peoples, project elaboration, structure of financing agencies, and legal forms of establishing intercultural agreements with state and private companies.

Although the program did not have a formal evaluation and monitoring system, every group that participated produced evaluations and conducted monitoring according to their own guidelines.

For example, the *Kaggaba* peoples of the Sierra de Santa Marta selected, among other methods,

the indigenous ritual of collective confession as a system of evaluation and monitoring. The confession ritual instills a state of orderliness among the participants. Each person enters a spiritual state called *yuluka* whereby all the expectations of the group come afloat. The collective *yuluka* allows entry to another spiritual state called *zhigoneshi*, where collective agreements are reached that will guide future activities.

Similarly, in the Cauca region the evaluation and monitoring system was used at the level of community assemblies. Partial evaluations were made at the end of each training activity and a final evaluation was done at the end of the program.

Intercultural Communication

As stated previously, the use of indigenous methodologies and techniques was the basic characteristic of the training program since its beginning. In addition, DGAI formed regional training teams according to the wishes and needs of each of the indigenous peoples. The teams were comprised of representatives of each ethnic group involved in the training. As a result, there were neither cultural nor linguistic communication problems.

When nonindigenous professionals were needed—primarily anthropologists and lawyers—they were closely linked to the training activities of the group. For example, the nonindigenous professionals were required to participate in the *Kaggaba's* collective confession ritual.

Participation

The selection of participants and trainers was an internal process carried out by each of the groups and organizations in the program. The importance given to the selection process by the communities can be appreciated by the example of the *Wayuu*.

Wayuu leaders and authorities formulated 14 criteria to select participants who could receive the training and later become trainers themselves. These criteria were:

- (a) knowing how to listen (*aapajuluin*)
- (b) adapting to any circumstance (*ee maa alain*)
- (c) always being available for public service (*ecin aa in*)
- (d) being hardworking (*tutuin*)
- (e) being dynamic (*yalayalaa*)
- (f) speaking the *wayuunaiki* language (*atujuin wayuunaiki*)
- (g) ability to interpret the message (*anaata sukua ipa putchi*)
- (h) ability to resolve conflicts (*hanaata akua ipa*)
- (i) expertise in the *Wayuu* culture (*erajuin sujua ipa wayuu*)
- (j) having good manners (*kamanein*)
- (k) having maturity and responsibility (*alailaun aa in*)
- (l) being peaceful (*anamiain*)
- (m) knowing how to deliver a message (*tutuin anuiki*)
- (n) ability of reflection (*ayawata sukua ipa kasa*).

A measure of the effectiveness of the program is the very low dropout rate. Among the *Kaggaba* peoples of the Sierra de Santa Marta, five students deserted and were replaced by five of their authorities; in the case of the *Wiwa*, three students deserted and similarly were replaced by authorities (one of the students deserted to continue his training as a religious leader, or *mamo*).

Another indicator of the program's effectiveness is the participants' role in making decisions about the training model. Box 2 contains a brief look at how the *Wiwa* incorporated participation into the model in accordance with their cultural norms. Participation of the *mamos* created a methodology in which knowledge was acquired within a cultural and religious context.

Box 2. The Role of the *Mamos*

Among the *Wiwa*, training activities began with the presentation of a menu of topics by members of the regional team. The *mamos* then explained in detail each one of the training topics, delving into their own history to arrive to the current situation¹. The objective of the *mamos* was none other than to enhance the comprehension of the students about the training topics, using various levels of teaching and knowledge transmission (verbal, spiritual, community, etc.). Afterwards, the *mamos* went to a place called “la Loma” to continue working at a more spiritual level while the trainers continued their work with the students.

Each daily training activity ended with closing arguments, where the *mamos* participated. In these arguments, each groups exposed their conclusions of the day and, in similar form, at the beginning of the morning training, they examined and explained the conclusions that were presented. The discussion continued in the communities always with the participation of the *mamos*. When it was necessary to improve the group dynamics or when the participants were not able to reach a consensus about any subject, emissaries were sent to the *mamos* to receive advise so that the group could continue their discussions.

The main lessons learned in the Colombian capacity-building experience are:

- (a) Indigenous peoples’ participation in capacity-building efforts is enhanced by strong social organization and recognition of the need to learn new skills.
- (b) Official government support is important not only to give the capacity-building program greater legitimacy among the participants but also to increase the multiplier effect of the program.
- (c) A basic condition for success is responsiveness to local demands and adaptation of methodologies to local cultures.
- (d) The institutional set-up must be carefully considered from the outset to avoid unnecessary delays and excessive bureaucracy in processing program funds.

Finally, although the capacity-building program was not supposed to lead to an investment operation, it is noteworthy that the government agency and four of the indigenous organizations that participated in the program are now beneficiaries of a combined development and biodiversity

protection project. In effect, the board of directors of the Sierra Nevada Sustainable Development Project is comprised of representatives of the DGAI and the four organizations (*Organización Gonawindua Tayrona*, *Confederación Indígenas Tayrona*, *Organización Yagumaín Bankuanarwa Tayrona*, and *Organización Indígena Kankuama*).

Strengthening of Indigenous Peoples in Guatemala

The training program in Guatemala has been implemented by *Fondo de Desarrollo Indígena Guatemalteco* (FODIGUA) in four different ethnic regions:

- Occidente (Quetzaltenango, Solola, San Marcos, and Huehuetenango)
- Nor-Occidente (Quiché)
- Centro (Chimaltenango, Sacatepeques, and Escuintla)
- Norte (Las Verapaces and Peten).

In total, 210 indigenous persons, from 21 Mayan linguistic groups, representing 154 indigenous organizations participated in the program.

Program Objectives

The objective of the program was to enhance the managerial and administrative capacity of indigenous organizations to design their own development strategies and carry out concrete projects. The training curriculum included a participatory assessment of the current economic, political, and social situation of the participants' communities as well as strategic planning, conflict resolution, negotiation skills, and budgeting.

The training program was conducted between July 1996 and May 1997 by a core team of five indigenous professionals (selected by FODIGUA) in close cooperation with indigenous organizations. The program consisted of an initial seminar in Guatemala City to define the objectives and curriculum of the training, and two principal components: (a) participatory training workshops and (b) a permanent monitoring program.

The program used a participatory "learning-by-doing" approach. The training curriculum directly incorporated the practical needs raised by the participants in discussions at the beginning of the workshops. Furthermore, the combination of more theoretical training with practical fieldwork enriched the learning experience of the participants. Many participants stressed the importance of directly applying their new technical skills in the field and expressed their need for future training activities linked directly to the design and implementation of projects.

During the workshops, the trainees participated in a midterm review and a final evaluation workshop. The final evaluation workshop was carried out in Quetzaltenango with the participation of government officials, indigenous representatives, and Bank representatives. The seminar not only considered the participants' assessment of the workshops but also the results of the field monitoring activities. At the end of the project, the participants expressed a high degree of satisfaction of the program, in particular with the themes covered and the methodological approach.

According to the internal evaluation, the main results of the training program have been (a) enhanced management capacity for indigenous organizations, (b) an improved relationship among FODIGUA, the government, and indigenous organizations, (c) 29 productive project profiles that have been presented to FODIGUA for financing, and (d) the design of community development projects, which some indigenous organizations have used to request financial resources from different government agencies.

Project Impact

The external evaluation confirms that the training program has been effective, even though it was conducted under severe limitations. Some specific results are that (a) the training has helped to incorporate new themes into the outline of their organizational training, and (b) the training has multiple effects because it has been able to train members of some indigenous communities in all aspects of the project cycle, including identification of community needs, project preparation, implementation, and evaluation.

The main limitations in program implementation were at the administrative, institutional, and political levels. At the political level, while FODIGUA was able to open an important space for indigenous peoples, it was also subject to constraints due to administrative and government change, internal factionalism, and corruption. At the administrative level the main limitation was inefficient processing of funds, which delayed program implementation. Finally, the major limitation at the institutional level was FODIGUA's inability to continue capacity-building efforts at the community and organization levels.

Institutional Aspects

The program had a positive impact on both the indigenous organizations and the implementing agency.

Participating indigenous organizations were strengthened through renewed dialogue with state and private institutions within the framework of program activities. For several indigenous organizations it was their first chance to select training themes based on their own needs.

For FODIGUA the program represented a pioneering effort through which it could crystallize the ideology and dual character on which the institution was established, although not without problems. The first and main problem FODIGUA confronted was lack of indigenous technical staff in running daily affairs, and relative lack of familiarity with indigenous working methods and tools in the planning phase. Nevertheless, once the program started trainers and trainees sought to incorporate indigenous content and procedures into the work in progress.

Both the participants and facilitators agreed that the training workshops, apart from their pedagogic value, were a positive encounter that fostered discussion and interchange between people from diverse organizations.

The institutional dimension in this case has two main aspects: the acquisition of new knowledge, and its possible application. There is no doubt that this new knowledge benefits not only the participants but also their communities and organizations.

However, application of the knowledge will require the necessary infrastructure and means of communication (for example, telephone and fax) to meet new institutional demands. For example, to put into practice newly acquired techniques about market fluctuation for agricultural products, the organizations would need to be able to check on regional and national market prices, arrival of checks to the bank, credit information, etc.

Fortunately, some new World Bank operations that began implementation in 2000—the Natural Resources Management Project and the Competitiveness Project—will help fill these gaps.

Pedagogic Aspects

The training program was coordinated by a working team organized by FODIGUA. This team selected the techniques and training methods to be used, taking into consideration the cultural differences of the participants. However, the grassroots indigenous organizations that sent their representatives to the program courses did not participate in this planning exercise and thus did not have the opportunity to elaborate a curriculum more akin to the Mayan cultural identity, characterizing 95 percent of the program participants.

The methodology used in the training workshop had two principal tendencies. The first and most general was a participatory pedagogy that involved the participation of the teachers in the working groups, field trips, etc., to promote a high level of intercultural communication. The second tendency was the classic pedagogy where the teacher goes through the curriculum by way of expositions, giving less opportunity for participation and not including cultural interaction as a priority. The participants preferred the participatory pedagogy.

The general feeling among the indigenous organizations was that the trainers knew little about indigenous affairs such as Mayan work methodology, community structures, and community development according to Mayan perceptions. This lack of knowledge meant that Mayan cultural and technical elements were not fully incorporated into the training workshop. Based on this, the Mayan organizations suggested that a second phase of the program should include training of the trainers in the aforementioned topics. They also suggested hiring more indigenous trainers to foster inclusion of traditional indigenous content and methods from the start.

The facilitators, implementing and financing agencies, and participants had different expectations for the workshops' outcomes. Various par-

ticipants and their organizations, as well as their communities, mistakenly believed they were supposed to present development projects to FODIGUA at the end of the workshops. Also, some participants, particularly women, said that they had expected a longer lasting program, including more follow-up activities, to see the program impact at the local and institutional levels.

Communication Aspects

Although the training *topics* were relevant to indigenous peoples, the training *model* did not include traditional indigenous methodology. In some workshops very satisfactory results were achieved when, at the participants' request, themes were analyzed from a Mayan perspective.

Though there was intercultural communication and sensitivity throughout the workshops, the facilitators lacked basic knowledge of indigenous models of communication and collective behavior. As a result, there was only minimal contribution to the development of Mayan sociocultural instruments.

Participation

The indigenous organizations were selected based on their needs and on a profile developed by the program's technical team. Similarly, facilitators and trainers initially were selected by the program. However, during the workshops participants provided names of other facilitators that could become integrated into the technical team.

The participants engaged in the decisionmaking process with respect to changes once the workshops were underway. However, the program never developed a set of indicators to determine outcomes of the workshops from the participants' perspectives. In other words, the program was not structured to include the participants in the decisionmaking process.

All program activities were highly engaging and allowed open communication among participants and facilitators. This open communication permitted changes to improve the program, allowed for collective evaluations at the end of the workshops, and provided a setting for open dialogue.

CONCLUSIONS

A Comparative Perspective

The impact of the program was highly positive in both Guatemala and Colombia. The main objectives of the program were fulfilled, namely, the strengthening of communities and indigenous organizations through a high level of indigenous participation in the development of training activities.

The training workshops provided the proper environment for intercultural communication among the facilitators and participants themselves. Nonetheless, the Guatemala program did not develop a specific approach to incorporating Mayan techniques and methodology; such an approach would have significantly enriched the workshops.

There were some unexpected additional benefits from the program. First, and most importantly, the program helped facilitate dialogue between the state and indigenous organizations. In Colombia studies on traditional indigenous legal systems were carried out by the indigenous groups and organizations. Once those traditional legal systems have been accepted and included in the constitution, it is expected that indigenous communities will administer justice, including punitive measures, according to their own rules.

Second, the program developed interethnic contacts between indigenous peoples from different regions, in some cases allowing them to exchange experiences with other groups for the very first time.

Third, there was a significant multiplier effect because after the training program indigenous organizations in both countries were able to share their knowledge and train other communities. This effect has been especially strong in Colombia due to the high degree of indigenous organization.

The main limitation of the program was at the administrative level. In Guatemala the processing requirements of the Bank and the government's executing agencies delayed program funds by as much as one year. This affected indigenous organizations' calendar activities, delayed the program, and created a negative impression of the implementing agencies.

Different training methods were used in the two countries. In Colombia the methodology was adapted to the specific cultural background of each of the participating groups. In Guatemala such adaptation was not possible on a consistent basis, in part because of the way the program was set up. In Colombia the methodology for training activities was given beforehand by the participating groups themselves. In Guatemala the framework of the program was designed by the coordinating teams, with participants involved in decisionmaking only during implementation.

Intercultural and interethnic communication was high in both countries, indigenous participation was much higher than expected, and both the participants and trainers were enthusiastic and committed. These factors made the program very successful.

Results of the Program at a Broader Level

The indigenous peoples capacity-building initiative is fulfilling its main objectives of providing specific skills for indigenous peoples and institutional strengthening both for indigenous organizations and collaborating government agencies. Indigenous peoples' organizations have participated fully in program design, selection of trainers, and implementation.

One of the short-term results has been enhancement of indigenous peoples' ability to formulate

development strategies and prepare better proposals to national, bilateral, and multilateral agencies. The program enables indigenous communities to design and implement projects based on indigenous cultural values, institutional structures, production systems, and technologies.

In the longer term this leads to greater access to investment resources. In some cases these resources come from existing national programs, such as the Colombian governments transfers to indigenous territorial jurisdictions. In other cases resources are coming from international cooperation agencies, such as the World Bank and Global Environmental Facility, which have projects in Ecuador, Bolivia, Mexico, and Argentina.

One strength of the initiative is its emphasis on the multiethnic character of the societies in which the training takes place. By taking the cultural diversity of many countries into account, the initiative supports indigenous peoples' expression of their own identity. In Guatemala, the importance of ethnic identity in the program was emphasized by the dual character—state/indigenous peoples—embedded in the structure of FODIGUA, the implementing agency.

In Colombia, training activities were implemented within a framework designed by, among others, community elders and religious leaders. For example, community-based religious leaders from the Santa Marta region played an important role in acquiring the new knowledge. In addition, the workshops were often conducted in the ethnic groups' own languages, thereby highlighting the importance of their cultures.

The workshops also created forums in which elders and young people came together to discuss the current situation and community issues. This fostered sharing of traditional indigenous knowledge and recuperation of indigenous culture.

The participatory training program directly strengthened indigenous communities through formal training and revitalization of traditional

forms of authority and self-government. The program indirectly led to discussions among indigenous peoples about how to reintroduce or consolidate existing indigenous organizational structures. Here the concept of consensus building (*concertación*) within indigenous communities and among indigenous organizations played a key role in revitalizing communities.

A prime example of the initiative's short-and long-term benefits is the study on indigenous legal systems in Colombia. The study was done by indigenous organizations with technical support from the regional coordinating teams. The results, presented at regional and national seminars, greatly strengthened the technical capacity of the organizations and helped recover important indigenous values. A long-term benefit of the study is the incorporation of indigenous legal systems into the Colombian constitution, thus allowing indigenous communities to administer justice according to their own rules.

In several other cases the program taught participants about their rights both as citizens of their countries and as peoples with special rights, such as the right to ancestral lands. In some countries, like Nicaragua and Ecuador, the program supported efforts to integrate indigenous rights into national legal frameworks. In Colombia the training project supported government efforts to improve indigenous peoples legislation and link it to ILO Convention 169, which has been ratified by the government. Moreover, the program developed the *concept* of prior consultation (included in Convention 169) into a well-defined *process*.

One of the initiative's most valuable outcomes is its fostering dialogue among indigenous communities, the government, and civil society. In Colombia the program facilitated first-time encounters not only between different ethnic groups, but also between different communities of the same ethnic group, such as the *Awa* people from the Nariño region and the *Kankuamo* people of the Santa Marta region.

Box 3. Evaluation of the Capacity-Building Programs in Mexico and Central America

Both government and indigenous representatives agreed on the need to continue capacity-building efforts and to have a program with the following characteristics:

- Permanent and continuous
- Defined but flexible institutional framework
- Fully participatory (responding to indigenous demands and managed by them)
- Indigenous focus
- Links between different academic levels and country experiences

The themes should respond to community needs, including project management, indigenous rights and legislation, marketing and processing of agricultural goods, financial sustainability, participatory methodologies, and improving production. The *mamos* to receive advice so that the group could continue their discussions.

The initiative often created conditions for a constructive interchange of ideas between indigenous peoples and governments, thus reducing the existing gap between them. In many cases the training projects created opportunities for consecutive indigenous peoples development initiatives. It also improved indigenous peoples participation in the design and implementation of development projects.

In October 1994 the World Bank and Fondo Indígena organized meetings in Cochabamba at which government representatives, NGOs, and indigenous organizations from several Latin American countries commented favorably on the capacity-building effort. Similarly, in May 1995, during the meeting of the First Assembly of the Fondo Indígena in Santa Cruz, Bolivia, the combined efforts of indigenous peoples, national governments, Fondo Indígena, and the World Bank were mentioned in reference to what was already being considered a successful experience.

In September 1998 the program was evaluated at meetings in Ecuador and Costa Rica. Representatives of indigenous organizations and government indigenous affairs agencies from the An-

des, Mexico, and Central America, as well as staff of Fondo Indígena and the World Bank, discussed the program and assessed its accomplishments.

At the end of both meetings all participants, particularly those representing indigenous organizations, gave a clear message that they wished the program to continue, in some cases under different modalities (that is, within World Bank projects).

Issues to Address in the Future

While evaluation of the program is mostly positive, there still are aspects that must be improved and issues that must be addressed to assure its continuation.

The first issue is the whether the capacity-building effort should remain a short-term initiative or become a regular program supporting training initiatives that could eventually be consolidated with non-Bank resources. Guatemala has already extended the program to other areas with external (European Union) funding; the program is now being coordinated through a national NGO.

Duration clearly can affect the program's value. In the short-term the training directly enhanced the managerial and administrative skills of indigenous peoples so that they could better design and implement their own projects—an important requirement for successful ethnodevelopment. However, experience shows that the program's effect is greater when theoretical training is combined with practical application in the field. Therefore a major challenge is to closely link training activities to follow-up projects in which workshop participants become key players in design and implementation.

In addition, it was clearly demonstrated that for indigenous communities and organizations to make the most of the training they must be given sufficient time to become acquainted with the program.

The second issue concerns the time it takes to implement grants. About 12 training programs have been completed in the first five years of the initiative, and additional proposals have been approved. Some delays by requesting governments could have been avoided with closer follow-up,

while other delays were due to the conflicting relationship between the state and indigenous peoples. Poor communication or misunderstanding between a government agency and an indigenous organization can set a proposed program back by several months. The World Bank also must take measures to reduce processing time for grants and improve performance of the training programs.

Regardless of the source of funding, capacity building is vital for indigenous development. The initiative analyzed in this study has depended on grant funds provided by the World Bank, with additional financing from governments and indigenous organizations. While this limited effort is worth continuing, capacity building truly needs to be a component of all projects focusing on vulnerable populations, including indigenous peoples. The World Bank is already implementing this concept in some projects. A case in point is Argentina's Indigenous Community Development Project, which builds on lessons from the training program and incorporates further capacity building through its Social and Cultural Strengthening Component.

REFERENCES

- Carrasco, Tania, Diego Iturralde, and Jorge Uquillas, coordinators. 1999. *Doce Experiencias de Desarrollo Indígena en América Latina*. Quito: Fondo Indígena.
- Davis, Shelton H., and Soeftestad, Lars T. 1995. "Participation and Indigenous Peoples." Environment Department Paper No. 21. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Dirección General de Asuntos Indígenas (DGAI, Ministerio del Interior)/Ministerio de Justicia y Derecho (MJD)/Consejo Regional Indígena del Cauca (CRIC). 1997. "Del Olvido Surgimos Para Traer Nuevas Esperanzas" –La Jurisdicción Especial Indígena. Bogotá: DGAI/MJD/CRIC.
- Partridge, William, Jorge Uquillas, and Kathryn Johns. 1996. "Including the Excluded: Ethnodevelopment in Latin America." Pp. 229-252 in Burki, Shahid, Sri-ram Aiyer, and Rudolf Homes. Eds. *Poverty and Inequality*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Secretaría de Desarrollo Social (SDS, Argentina), Centro Nacional de Organizaciones de la Comunidad (CENOC), and World Bank. 1999. "Programa de Capacitación para las Poblaciones Indígenas de Argentina." Buenos Aires.
- World Bank. 1996. "The World Bank Participation Sourcebook." Environmental Department Paper No. 19. Washington, DC: World Bank.

LCR Sustainable Development Working Papers

For back issues contact:

Peter Brandriss, Program Assistant
 Mail Stop I 6-601
 The World Bank
 1818 H Street, N.W.
 Washington, DC 20433
 U.S.A.

Tel. (202) 473-9379
 Fax. (202) 676-9373
 E-mail: pbrandriss@worldbank.org

<i>No.</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Author</i>
1	Environmental Guidelines for Social Funds <i>(available in Spanish)</i>	December 1998	Douglas J. Graham Kenneth M. Green Karla McEvoy
2	A Conceptual Framework for Violence Reduction <i>(available in Spanish)</i>	August 1999	Caroline Moser Elizabeth Shrader
3	Youth Violence in Latin America and the Caribbean: Costs, Causes, and Interventions	August 1999	Caroline Moser Bernice van Bronkhorst
4	Youth Gangs and Violence in Latin America and the Caribbean: A Literature Survey	August 1999	Dennis Rodgers
5	Violence and Social Capital: Proceedings of the LCSES Seminar Series, 1997-98	August 1999	Caroline Moser Sarah Lister
6	Defining Ethnodevelopment in Operational Terms: Lessons from the Ecuador Indigenous and Afro-Ecuadoran Peoples Development Project	January 2000	Martien van Nieuwkoop Jorge E. Uquillas
7	Perceptions of Urban Violence: Participatory Appraisal Techniques <i>(available in Spanish)</i>	February 2000	Caroline Moser Cathy McIlwaine
8	Incorporación de aspectos de género y desarrollo en las operaciones del Banco Mundial: Avances y recomendaciones	December 1998 <i>(publication date of original in English)</i>	Caroline Moser Annika Törnqvist Bernice van Bronkhorst
9	La raza y la pobreza: Consulta interagencias sobre afrolatinoamericanos (edición preliminar)	November 2000	Proceedings of June 19, 2000 roundtable in Washington