INDIGENOUS INCLUSION IN INTERNATIONAL CLIMATE POLICYMAKING

Reducing Barriers to Indigenous Participation in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

Kevin Breiner

PREPARED FOR EARTH RIGHTS INTERNATIONAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgments

Thank you to Professor Andrew Pennock and to my classmates, Erin Melly, Doug Weimer, Miguel García Moya, and Tihana Stojsavljevic. Your brilliant, thoughtful, and generous guidance has been indispensable to the growth of this project, and I am privileged to have had the opportunity to work with you.

Thank you to Natalia Gomez Peña, Keith Slack, and Kirk Herbertson of Earth Rights International. I am in awe of your work, and it has been an honor to be a small part of it.

Client

This report is prepared for Earth Rights International (ERI). ERI conducts litigation and advocacy across the globe to advance human rights, including the right to environmental quality.

Disclaimer

The author conducted this study as part of the program of professional education at the Frank Batten School of Leadership and Public Policy, University of Virginia. This paper is submitted in partial fulfillment of the course requirements for the Master of Public Policy degree. The judgments and conclusions are solely those of the author, and are not necessarily endorsed by the Batten School, by the University of Virginia, or by any other organization.

Honor Statement

On my honor as a student, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this assignment.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Indigenous Peoples are on the frontlines of a changing climate, facing grave threats to traditional means of subsistence and cultural practices. Yet they have little voice in negotiating the major international climate agreements forming the basis of the globe's collective mitigation and adaptation efforts.

Specifically, Indigenous Peoples are not meaningfully included in meetings convened under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the primary decision-making framework for international climate policy. Rather, nation states relegate Indigenous Peoples to the role of lobbyist and observer.

Within that role, Indigenous Peoples are further limited by an inadequate supply of resources to aid in navigating UNFCCC meetings. Without proper funding, Indigenous Peoples are limited in how many representatives they may send to any one meeting, and a lack of translators poses an additional bar to accessing relevant information.

This Applied Policy Project (APP) proposes policy alternatives to enhance the capacity of Indigenous Peoples to engage in UNFCCC meetings, including:

1. Deploying a series of workshops designed to assist Indigenous Peoples apply for grants and other funding opportunities that would allow them to attend UNFCCC meetings

2. Convening Indigenous communities in a series of workshops, created by Indigenous leaders, to build network cohesion and enhance lobbying power

3. Funding translators to assist Indigenous participants in UNFCCC meetings

After assessing these alternatives on the criteria of effectiveness, cost, feasibility, and equity, **I recommend that Earth Rights International advocate for a series of workshops convening Indigenous communities to enhance network cohesion.** Of the alternatives proposed, this option will create progress toward meaningful inclusion in a cost-effective and equitable manner. This intervention will bring relevant information to Indigenous communities and allow them to develop a cohesive set of preferences around which to organize. It will also promote the development of new leadership and collaboration.

INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

Systemic injustice precludes the meaningful inclusion of Indigenous Peoples (IP) in meetings convened under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC or the Convention), the primary decision-making framework for international climate policy. Failing to meaningfully include IP in UNFCCC meetings harms Indigenous People's right to self-determination, produces inequity, and diminishes the effectiveness of climate policy.

Earth Rights International

Earth Rights International (ERI) is a "growing global team of community activists, campaigners, and legal strategists who challenge powerful institutions that violate peoples' rights and destroy our planet for profit." (Earth Rights International, 2021a). In addition to initiating human rights and environmental litigation against the beneficiaries of extractive industry, ERI advocates extensively for climate justice.

In particular, ERI is dedicated to serving communities on the frontlines of climate change, experiencing not only a drastically changing environment, but also the abusive practices of powerful actors seeking to silence their demands for change. In furtherance of this mission, ERI has proposed an Agenda for Action with five main goals (Earth Rights International, 2021c) (directly quoted):

1. Decriminalize Opposition to Fossil Fuels and Deforestation
2. Fight Corruption and State Capture that Drives Illegal Resource Extraction and Deforestation
3. End the Use of Public Security Forces to Protect Fossil Fuel and Agribusiness Projects
4. Recognize and Respect Frontline Communities' Land Rights, and the Right to Participate in the Decisions that Impact their Territories and Environment
5. Allow Access of Frontline Communities to Global Climate Negotiations

This Applied Policy Project (APP) will further the fifth goal by proposing alternatives that will reduce barriers to the meaningful inclusion of Indigenous Peoples in UNFCCC meetings.

BACKGROUND

The UNFCCC and the Conference of the Parties

The UNFCCC is a multilateral treaty signed by 197 nations and sets the goal of limiting climate change to safe levels. (Farber & Carlarne, 2018).[1] The Conference of the Parties (COP) is the Convention's primary decision-making body; it meets annually and is responsible for negotiating and approving any major international climate agreements, e.g., the Paris Accords (United Nations, 2021). This APP primarily focuses on COP meetings, though there are also meetings that take place between COPs called "Intersessionals" that can also be grouped under the heading "UNFCCC meetings."

Climate Change and Indigenous Peoples

Indigenous Peoples number 370 million across 70 countries. The term "Indigenous Peoples" refers to one or more of a variety of factors, including the following:

- Self-identification
- Historical continuity with pre-colonial society
- Strong links to territories and surrounding natural resources
- Distinct social, economic, or political systems
- Distinct language, culture and beliefs
- Form non-dominant groups of society
- Resolve to maintain and reproduce ancestral environments and systems as distinctive peoples and communities

(UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, n.d-b) (some bullets directly quoted).

"Owing to their dependence upon, and close relationship with the environment and its resources," Indigenous Peoples are among the most directly impact by climate change. (UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, n.d.-a).

[1] Article 2 of the UNFCCC states the objective of "stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system." It does not set forth any particular targets, though the international community has generally agreed that we should avoid greenhouse gas concentrations associated with a 1.5 to 2-degree Celsius global average increase over pre-industrial temperatures.

The UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues describes just some of the impacts of warming temperatures:

- Glacial melting in the Himalayas reduces the long-term supply of water in the region.
- Deforestation and forest fragmentation threaten Indigenous communities in the Amazon.
- Indigenous Peoples in the Arctic face dwindling sources of traditional food supply, including polar bears, walrus seals, and caribou.
- Striking declines in reindeer populations harm the culture and economy of Saami communities in Finland, Norway, and Sweden.
- Indigenous Peoples in Africa's Kalahari Basin can no longer engage in traditional goat and cattle farming.

Marginalization of Indigenous Peoples

Despite the reality that Indigenous Peoples are among the most impacted by climate change, they do not have formal policymaking authority at the international level. Nation states have the power to decide when and to what extent they will be consulted, and they must largely receive climate policy from above. (Brugnach et al., 2014, p.21).

Even within their informal sphere of authority, IP are not fully included. Belfer et al. (2019) refine our understanding of Indigenous exclusion in a series of semi-structured interviews with Indigenous participants in UNFCCC processes. In these interviews, subjects identified a number of barriers to meaningful participation, including difficulties financing visits and applying for visas to attend meetings, limited access to negotiations, and language barriers making technical jargon difficult to translate and understand. Subjects also reported disrespect and tokenism.

Comberti et al. (2016) similarly report that a lack of finances, as well as limited access to information and negotiating experience, mean that "Indigenous representation and voice at COP meetings is extremely low." (p. 7). Moreover, their case study of COP 21 demonstrates how IP are kept out of central decision-making spaces and pushed largely into "side events" or other peripheral fora. This, together with a lack of support in the form of translation services and assistance navigating COP's complex procedures, produces an "illusion of inclusion." While Indigenous Peoples are invited to host gatherings and events in visible public spaces, making them seem like a central part of COP, they are granted little authentic power.

Lack of Indigenous inclusion in UNFCCC discussions is further evidenced by a lack of Indigenous representation in the policy these discussions produce. One analysis finds that there is no mention of Indigenous Peoples or knowledge in either the UNFCCC treaty itself, or the Kyoto Protocol, the first binding international climate treaty. (Smith & Sharp, 2012).

Likewise, Ford et al. (2016) find no explicit mention of Indigenous Peoples in the decision texts of the first eleven COP meetings (COPs 1-11). That status quo persisted for many years, with only slight improvement for the decision texts produced by COPs 11-16. The situation improved significantly in COPs 16-20, but there were still only twenty-nine mentions of Indigenous Peoples across these five texts.[2,3]

What is Meaningful Inclusion?

While the evidence shows that IP are not meaningfully included in UNFCCC meetings, it is difficult to pinpoint exactly what meaningful inclusion would look like. To develop a preliminary understanding of inclusion in this context, I offer a definition of inclusion developed by Gartner, then map it onto the Indigenous experience in UNFCCC meetings. (Romansky et al., 2021). The results are shown in Table 1.[4]

[2] COPs 11-16 occurred between 2005 and 2010. COPs 16-20 occurred between 2010 and 2014. (United Nations, 2021).

[3] Other scholars note a similar lack of representation in reports produced by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the UN body responsible for producing reports on the science of climate change. (Raffel, 2016; Smith & Sharp, 2012). While this is not direct evidence of exclusion in UNFCCC processes, it bolsters the claim that Indigenous Peoples are broadly excluded from decision-making in important UN processes.

[4] Gartner is an international consulting company. *See* https://emtemp.gcom.cloud/ngw/globalassets/en/about/documents/gartner-at-a-glance.pdf.

Table 1: Metrics of Inclusion

Metric	Definition[5]	Adapted to IP context
Fair treatment	Employees at my organization who help the organization achieve its strategic objectives are rewarded and recognized fairly.	The efforts of IP to attend and participate in UNFCCC meetings is rewarded with appropriate support.
Integrating differences	Employees at my organization respect and value each other's opinions.	IP are respected as equals at UNFCCC meetings. Traditional knowledge is valued alongside Western knowledge frameworks.
Decision making	Members of my team fairly consider ideas and suggestions offered by other team members.	Input from Indigenous communities is valued by all stakeholders.
Psychological safety	I feel welcome to express my true feelings at work.	IP feel invited to contribute to ongoing discussions/negotiations.
Trust	Communication we receive from the organization is honest and open.	Communication from state parties is open and honest; parties keep their promises.
Belonging	People in my organization care about me.	Non-IP stakeholders care deeply about issues affecting IP.
Diversity	Managers at my organization are as diverse as the broader workforce.	Attendees at UNFCCC meetings are representative of the communities impacted by climate change.

[5] Please note the definitions included in this column are direct quotes from Romansky et al. (2021). Quotation marks are omitted.

DRIVERS OF THE PROBLEM

To understand the root causes of exclusion, it is helpful to begin by thinking of the problem as it relates to formal and informal power. Formal power in this context means the ability to sign on to an international treaty, giving its holder the status of an official policymaker. Those with formal power might not have a great deal of influence (e.g., the U.S. has much more influence than Sweden), but they always have "a seat at the table." Informal power relates to the influence one may exert outside of formal policymaking processes.

In the formal domain, IP have no power, leading to exclusion-by-design. Because they cannot collectively join an international treaty, IP are "passive recipients of international recipes for [climate change] mitigation." (Brugnach et al., 2014, p. 21). As nonstate observers, their access to meetings depends upon the approval of nation-states, which get to decide what meetings are relevant to Indigenous Peoples and determine the extent of Indigenous participation. (Belfer et al., 2019).

In the informal domain, in which IP attempt to influence those with formal authority (i.e., nation states), inclusion is constrained by a number of different factors, some of which were alluded to in the introduction.

Predominant among these factors is a lack of funding, which constrains the capacity of IP to engage in effective self-representation. (Belfer et al., 2019; Brugnach et al., 2014; Comberti et al., 2016). Because they cannot afford to send large numbers of representatives to COP meetings, they are unable to advocate fully across a broad range of issues. Developed nations are able to send 40 delegates for every one sent by developing countries, and scholars note that the situation is worse for IP living within those developing nations. (Comberti et al., 2016). On top of that, some IP report feeling they have to advance their third-party funder's mission rather than their own. (Belfer et al., 2019).

A lack of funding is also limiting in other ways. Language barriers are a key constraint to full participation in negotiations, and IP cannot afford to hire translators. (Belfer et al., 2019). At COP 21, for example, the space provided for civil society was equipped with microphones and headsets, but a lack of translation support meant that all voices were not heard. (Comberti et al., 2016).

Scholars also note other capacity-related factors that contribute to IP exclusion, including lack of access to information, less negotiating experience, and lack of scientific and technical support staff. (Comberti et al., 2016). There is limited evidence describing these factors.

In addition to these capacity constraints and a lack of formal power, IP also report frequent disrespect and marginalization. While Indigenous culture has become more visible in UNFCCC meetings, increased visibility does not translate into increased power or influence. (Belfer et al., 2019; Comberti et al., 2016). Rather, Indigenous Peoples must consistently justify their legitimacy to other participants, are often treated as a novelty at UNFCCC meetings, and only see their traditional knowledge being valued when it supports or aligns with Western knowledge frameworks.

Comberti et al. (2016) discuss how IP are placed in highly visible locations, but the prejudice of other participants limits their impact. In one example, an Indigenous presentation of a cultural story was met with confusion and lack of understanding because it did not fit the traditional Western mold of presenting evidence in empirical rather than narrative form. In other examples, IP report the stares of other participants when they are wearing traditional dress, as well as requests to take photographs as if they are museum exhibits.

COSTS TO SOCIETY

Failing to meaningfully include IP in UNFCCC negotiations harms IP's right to self-determination, produces inequity, and diminishes the effectiveness of policy alternatives.

Right to self-determination

Under the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, "Indigenous peoples have the right to self-determination. By virtue of that right, they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development." (UN, 2007).

By excluding IP from climate policymaking, the UNFCCC infringes on this right to self-determination. As they are among those most impacted by climate change, IP cannot "freely pursue" their development without having a voice in shaping the course of mitigation and adaptation strategies. (UN, 2007, p.8).

Inequity

Exclusion also results in climate policy that disproportionately burdens IP. One example is the design of the UN Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation Program (REDD), which compensates developing nations for forest-related emission reductions. This program, created under the UNFCCC, has been criticized for drawing authority over forest resources away from Indigenous communities.

Phelps et al. (2010) point out that before REDD was established there had been a trend toward decentralizing forest governance, giving local communities more autonomy to govern their land with largely successful results. By attaching large financial incentives to forest preservation, however, REDD motivates national governments and other powerful actors to assert increased control over forest resources, shutting IP out of the governance process. (Phelps et al., 2010; Suiseeya & Caplow, 2013). Some scholars document instances where national REDD initiatives do not fully address the implications of new projects on Indigenous communities (Lemaitre, 2011) or actively restrict traditional Indigenous activities. (Ludlow et al., 2016).

It is probable that this inequitable outcome can be attributed at least in part to the exclusionary nature of the policy design process. Schroeder (2010) indeed points out that IP had "indirect, weak agency" in decision-making surrounding the design of REDD. While IP were consulted on some issues, they could only make interventions in meetings when invited, and their influence was largely exercised through informal channels including lobbying and talking with media.

Suiseeya & Caplow (2013) sum up the issue by remarking that "[non-governmental] organizations, indigenous peoples' groups, and scholars have argued that the fundamental challenges for forest carbon projects are . . . rooted in the anticipated substantial negative social impacts that could result from project implementation if local communities are not adequately engaged and accounted for." (p. 969).

Ineffective policy

Some argue that policy alternatives failing to incorporate Indigenous perspectives are less effective than those that do. Indeed, such alternatives do not capture valuable traditional knowledge held by Indigenous Peoples that contribute to superior land management and increased carbon sequestration.

In Latin America and the Caribbean alone, Indigenous Peoples occupy roughly 400 million hectares, 60% of which (240 million hectares) is located in the Amazon basin, an area with immense value to climate change mitigation efforts. (FAO & FILAC, 2021). This land is well taken care of, with areas protected by Indigenous Peoples suffering much less deforestation than others. A report prepared by the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) notes that 83% of deforestation in the Amazon occurs outside of areas controlled by Indigenous Peoples. (EDF, 2017).[6]

Chhatre and Agrawal (2009) bolster EDF's findings with a study of eighty "forest commons" in ten tropical countries. They divide each commons into four categories, depending on whether they have high carbon storage or high livelihood benefits (i.e., they are being used to generate income/sustenance); (1) high carbon-high livelihood, (2) low-low, (3) low carbon-high livelihood, and (4) high carbon-low livelihood. They find that commons under a high degree of local control are more likely than others to fall into the first category, offering high carbon storage and high livelihood benefits. This suggests that policies fostering less Indigenous autonomy are less likely to produce positive environmental and social outcomes.

[6] The EDF report does not directly address why IP-controlled forests experience so much less deforestation. One might assume, however, that IP use the land for much different purposes than others. The report notes the "cultural and socio-economic roles" of forest land for IP communities. (EDF, 2017, p. 4).

EXISTING INTERVENTIONS

History of Efforts to Include Indigenous Peoples

There has been a slow-growing movement to acknowledge and rectify the exclusion of Indigenous Peoples.

The first major recognition of Indigenous Peoples under the UNFCCC was the formation of Indigenous Peoples Organizations (IPOs) in 2001, followed by the International Indigenous Peoples' Forum on Climate Change (IIPFCC) in 2008. (Belfer et al., 2019, p. 15). By organizing into a "constituency" group, IPOs were able to increase their access to certain officials during UNFCCC meetings and set up a formal channel between the constituency and the UNFCCC Secretariat, the UN body responsible for facilitating negotiations. (Kuyper & Backstrand, 2016). The IIPFCC's mission is unifying the positions of all Indigenous Peoples into a cohesive agenda. (Claeys & Pugley, 2016).

In 2017, the COP created the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform (LCIPP), intended to facilitate the sharing of Indigenous knowledge, engage Indigenous Peoples in UNFCCC processes, and promote policy design respecting the rights of Indigenous Peoples. (Shawoo & Thornton, 2018). The LCIPP is still in the early stages of development. In 2019, the LCIPP Facilitative Working Group had its first official meeting (UNFCCC SBSTA, 2019); the same year, it secured approval of its 2020-2021 "Workplan," or implementation plan. Key activities proposed by the plan include scheduling annual meetings in conjunction with COP meetings, developing recommendations for engaging Indigenous Peoples in UNFCCC processes, and identifying additional funding opportunities for Indigenous participation in UNFCCC meetings. (United Nations, 2020).

Specifically, LCIPP activities are grouped into three categories: knowledge, capacity for engagement, and climate change policies and actions. Under each category, the LCIPP carries out a total of twelve activities, as represented in Table 2. (United Nations, 2020).

Table 2: LCIPP activities

Activity	Category	Name	Description
1	Knowledge	Annual meetings	Annual meetings occurring alongside COP; focus on traditional and Indigenous knowledge
2	Knowledge	Regional gatherings	Regional gathering with IP, parties to UNFCCC, local communities; focus on threats to specific ecosystems
3	Knowledge	Info. regarding IP curricula and materials	Spread curricula developed by IP that incorporate Indigenous knowledge related to climate change
4	Capacity	Annual training workshops	Annual trainings on building capacity for engaging IP; series of training webinars + an in-person training
5	Capacity	Outreach plan	Develop plan to disseminate information about LCIPP's objectives
6	Capacity	Engagement and input	Develop recommendations on engagement of IP across UNFCCC processes
7	Policies and Actions	Existing policies for participation	Map existing policies and practices for Indigenous participation in climate change-related bodies
8	Policies and Actions	Multi-stakeholder in-session workshop	Workshop with stakeholders on improving synergy in UNFCCC processes
9	Policies and Actions	Existing policies under Convention	Map existing policies regarding how they well they consider IP and local communities
10	Policies and Actions	Good practices for IP participation	Collect submissions on good practices for IP participation in national climate policy
11	Policies and Actions	Existing funding within UN system	Report on existing funding opportunities within UN for participation of IP
12	Policies and Actions	Promotion of LCIPP at national and regional level	Promote LCIPP at national and regional level

Capacity-Building Interventions

This Applied Policy Project will focus on alternatives to enhance the lobbying power of Indigenous Peoples. It is important to remember, however, that these alternatives are not proposed as a substitute for solutions addressing Indigenous exclusion at a more systemic level (for example, by giving a caucus of Indigenous Peoples from each nation voting power at UNFCCC meetings). Rather, the APP format is simply more amenable to technical, incremental solutions. Furthermore, the choice between systemic or adaptive change and technical or incremental change is a false one; we must do both.

To that end, I examine existing interventions that purport to build the capacity of Indigenous Peoples, nonprofit organizations, and others, to be more effective lobbyists and organizers. Three of these interventions build the capacity of Indigenous Peoples and nonprofit organizations to obtain funding. One convenes stakeholders involved in a public policy problem, increasing network cohesion and fostering leadership.

FUNDING

The simplest solution to boost funding would be to give out money. But this strategy is vulnerable to changing political and economic winds, and the amount of money offered by an institution in one year could be dramatically reduced or eliminated the next.

This is why I chose to focus my research on training programs that build awareness of the variety of pre-existing funding opportunities and the processes involved in obtaining that funding. While this strategy might not increase the total amount of funding available, it could reduce the dependence of IP on a single source of funding and raise awareness of existing opportunities. By making the existence of opportunities publicly available, the alternative will facilitate a more equitable distribution of funds.

I identified three interventions that fit this model. The first is a series of World Bank training programs designed to assist Indigenous communities apply for World Bank development projects.[7] The second and third are both training programs targeted at increasing the capacity of NGO staff. Assisting staff navigate the process of applying for grants was one component of both of these trainings.

[7] In a development project, the World Bank "provides financing and services to low- and middle-income countries to support development and change." https://www.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/products-and-services/brief/projectcycle.

WORLD BANK PROGRAMS

Seeking to increase Indigenous participation in the creation of development projects, the World Bank decided to fund a number of programs building Indigenous capacity throughout Latin America. (Uquillas & Gabara, 2000). These programs were funded with $100,000 to $200,000 grants and implemented in partnership with national governments.

Two of these programs, conducted in Colombia and Guatemala, are documented extensively.

The Colombian program, organized by a government agency, consisted of 100 local training seminars, 15 regional coordination meetings, and 3 national meetings. (Uquillas & Gabara, 2000). The content and training methods used were established in consultation with the Indigenous participants, and pedagogy was adapted to fit the governance style of specific Indigenous groups.

In Guatemala, the program consisted of a seminar, where participants designed the curriculum, and participatory training workshops. (Uquillas & Gabara, 2000). The workshops featured both traditional lecture material, as well as field work.

Uquillas and Gabara (2000) report that the Colombian program strengthened ties between the national government and IP, had a low rate of defection, and created a "multiplier effect," in which program participants shared their knowledge with other members of their community after program completion. The Guatemalan program passed on knowledge of the project development cycle to participants as intended, but the effectiveness of the program was likely diminished by a lack of sensitivity to traditional Indigenous practices.

CAPACITY BUILDING FOR NONPROFITS

Minzner et al. (2014) examine the effect of capacity building programs on nonprofits in a randomized control trial funded by the U.S. Administration for Children and Families (ACF). In this experiment, applicants eligible for the ACF capacity building program were randomly assigned to participate in the program or to a control group. The program funded "intermediary organizations to deliver capacity-building training." (Minzner et al., 2014, p. 552).

The program identified five areas for capacity building: organizational development, program development, revenue development, leadership development, and community engagement. Participants received group training, technical assistance, and financial awards for equipment, software, etc. Training topics included grant writing, strategic planning, board development, community outreach, and financial management.

Results showed that the program caused improvements in each of the five targeted areas. (Minzner et al., 2014). Participating organizations reported a number of benefits not reported by the control group, including, *inter alia*, diversified sources of funding and the provision of new services to clients.

Sobek (2008) explored the cost effectiveness of a capacity building program that included a series of 43 capacity-building workshops on grant writing, resource planning, logic models, and other skills related to nonprofit management. The author calculated the per-person cost of each event, tracked which events participating nonprofits attended, and arrived at the total amount spent on each organization. Regression analysis showed that an increase in investment was associated with an increase in capacity. Specifically, those who received greater investment were more likely to report confidence in grant writing, demonstrate knowledge of grant opportunities, and engage in program evaluation.

FOSTERING INFORMAL NETWORKS

I consider the potential benefits of building informal networks between Indigenous stakeholders given the work of Belfer et al. and an interview with Alberto Saldamando, counsel on climate change and Indigenous and human rights for the Indigenous Environmental Network (IEN).

First, Belfer et al.'s research shows that connections between IP and friendly national delegates can be instrumental in amplifying their voices. (2019). If IP have connections with members of national delegations, those members can use their formal authority to voice IP interests in meetings to which IP do not have access. In addition, alliances between IP-focused NGOs and other non-IP NGOs can increase each member's total lobbying power.

Saldamando similarly points out the benefits of intersectional alliances. (A. Saldamando, personal communication, Dec. 2021). In addition, he frames capacity building as an effort to inform Indigenous communities of relevant issues on the international level so that they can communicate with one another regarding preferred courses of action. Those seeking to assist in capacity building efforts can then advocate for those preferences before relevant governing bodies.

Kashian et al. (2014) demonstrate the network benefits of simply bringing information to relevant stakeholders. Their work evaluates the effect of capacity-building workshops on stakeholders associated with fish contamination in the Detroit River. (Kashian et al., 2014). The first workshop was focused on increasing knowledge of existing stakeholders, i.e., acquainting participants with the networks of people dealing with the problem. It also aimed to increase knowledge of the systems contributing to contamination of the river and identified what

participants thought were the top five issues related to such contamination. The second workshop created working groups to discuss these five issues.

The survey results demonstrated that the workshops contributed to the emergence of leaders among the stakeholders, new connections between participants, and an increase in perceived knowledge. (Kashian et al., 2014). Some actors that were not well-connected at the beginning of the workshops gained relationships with others who were well-connected.

CRITERIA

The policy alternatives I present below will be evaluated on the criteria of effectiveness, cost, equity, and feasibility.

Effectiveness

To assess effectiveness, I determined how many of seven inclusion metrics the proposed alternatives target, as well as the magnitude of impact on each metric from low (1) to high (3).

The inclusion metrics, as specified in Table 1 (p.5), are (Romansky et al., 2021):

1. Fair treatment: rewarding and recognizing efforts of IP to attend and participate
2. Integrating difference: treating IP as equals
3. Decision making: valuing input from Indigenous stakeholders
4. Psychological safety: IP feel invited to contribute and share ideas
5. Trust: honest and open communication between IP and state parties
6. Belonging: non-IP stakeholders care deeply about issues affecting IP and vice versa
7. Diversity: attendees at UNFCCC meetings are representative of those impacted by climate change

Cost

I provide a quantitative estimate of costs for each alternative, with underlying data and assumptions in the appendices.

Equity

I rank equity from low (1) to high (3) based on whether the alternative will create disparities between Indigenous Peoples who are able to access the intervention relative to those who are not.

Feasibility

Here, I assess feasibility from low (1) to high (3). Each alternative's feasibility is judged based on two questions related to implementation:

1. Is there a government agency or nonprofit organization that has the authority, desire, and funding to implement the alternative through a competitive bidding process?
    a. A competitive bidding process is preferred because the winning applicant will theoretically be able to implement the program most effectively and at least cost
2. Will the program reach its target audience? In other words, will the program be attractive enough to Indigenous Peoples likely to attend COP that it will have high take-up?

ALTERNATIVES

Alternative One: Workshops to Increase Capacity to Obtain Funding

Alternative One will implement workshops to increase awareness among Indigenous stakeholders of available funding opportunities to attend Conference of the Party meetings. It will also provide information on how to navigate the process of applying for those opportunities. The design is modelled after research on capacity-building programs for Indigenous Peoples in Latin America (Uquillas & Gabara, 2000) and nonprofit staff in the United States (Minzner et al., 2014; Sobek, 2008).

IMPLEMENTATION OVERVIEW

Under this alternative, an appropriate U.S. government agency will initiate a competitive grant application process, in which eligible nonprofit organizations can apply for funding to implement training workshops. Eligible nonprofits are those with capacity to implement the basic program design elements detailed below. Second, the nonprofit organizations that are successful in securing funding will implement the workshops. Note that this same basic structure will be deployed in Alternative Two.[8]

The following are the basic program design elements that a nonprofit organization must be able to complete in order to be eligible for funding:

1. Deploy workshops in one of the target locations
2. Compile a database of all available funding sources that could be used by IP to attend COP meetings, including information on how to apply for that funding
3. Create a basic curriculum on how to apply for available funding that is deployable in in-person workshops and over the internet
4. Identify Indigenous climate leaders and activists who would benefit from funding; this is likely a mix of people that have already attended some COP meetings and people who have never attended but are involved in climate activism within their communities
5. Facilitate internet access for IP leaders and activists attempting to apply for funding (e.g., submit their application on an online portal if they do not have internet access)

[8] A similar structure is used by the programs in Minzner et al.'s study of capacity building for nonprofit staff. (2014).

One potential barrier in implementing this alternative is that there is a limited number of "seats" in many COP spaces. For example, there is a limited number of badges for "civil society observers." (Comberti et al., 2016). This means that some IP who obtain funding through this alternative might not have access to the most pivotal meeting spaces. The implementing entity should therefore assist participants not only with obtaining funding, but also planning the entirety of their journey. Participants should be able to answer the following questions after completing this training:

1. Which part of COP will I be able to attend? How do I obtain the necessary credentials?
2. Do I want to attend if I will not be able to access certain meeting spaces?
3. If I am not going to access exclusive meetings spaces, what events can I still attend that would be valuable for my growth as a climate activist?

Participants could be a mix of individuals, including members of nonprofits interested in lobbying on behalf of their organizations, or individuals who simply want to attend events surrounding the conference and participate in civil society conversations. Likewise, participants could be a mix of experienced Indigenous leaders who simply want funding and others who are seeking more detailed guidance on how to get involved in climate activism. The program should be cognizant of these differences, ensuring that the experienced and well-connected participants have autonomy and independence, while also ensuring that those with less experience have necessary guidance and are prompted to think through important logistical questions. The implementing entity should consider recruiting Indigenous leaders to share and teach other participants about their experiences.

Alternative Two: Convening Indigenous Stakeholders

This alternative will assemble Indigenous stakeholders to increase access to information and network cohesion to enhance lobbying power. It will create discussion around how to navigate complex procedures at UNFCCC meetings, as well as the substantive policy issues facing participants. The purpose of this alternative is consistent with Saldamando's definition of capacity-building, which involves providing relevant information to Indigenous Peoples and providing space for Indigenous communities to form a cohesive set of preferences. It is also consistent with Kashian et al.'s approach to building leadership and connectedness among stakeholder groups.

IMPLEMENTATION OVERVIEW

As stated above, this alternative will use the same basic structure as Alternative One. One key difference in this alternative, however, is that the curriculum and teaching will be Indigenous-

led. While Alternative One seeks to disseminate fairly technical and generalizable information, this program is specifically designed to facilitate exchange between Indigenous Peoples. Having non-Indigenous staff facilitate this type of exchange would likely lead to misunderstanding and mistrust. Like the World Bank program outlined by Uquillas & Gabara (2000), this alternative will involve IP in the creation of the curriculum and pedagogical techniques.

The following are the basic program design elements that a nonprofit organization must be able to complete in order to be eligible for funding:

1. Convene IP leaders who have already participated in at least one COP. Co-create a curriculum on: (1) the relevant logistics and procedures associated with COP; and (2) the substantive policy issues decided at COP, with an emphasis on how they connect to IP.

2. Conduct outreach to Indigenous activists, leaders, and policymakers who are planning on, or would like to, attend a future COP meeting. It is important to target those most likely to attend a COP because the information is tailored specifically to participation in that forum.

    a. One option is for the funded organization to contact all IP granted access to COP within their geographic scope. The workshops could then be scheduled to occur before the COP meeting so that all participants can use their knowledge in the upcoming conference.

3. Convene workshops, some addressing the logistics and procedures of COP meetings, others addressing substantive policy issues affecting IP on the international stage.

    a. IP leaders who helped design the curriculum will need to lead/facilitate these workshops, or assist in finding others with that capacity

4. Explain how their workshops will facilitate engagement amongst participants.

    a. Example One: Participants will split into groups and decide what they think is the most important policy issue to address at COP (Kashian et al., 2014).

    b. Example Two: Participants will be encouraged to exchange contact information.

5. Develop a mechanism to test whether learning objectives were achieved. What do participants plan to do with their knowledge?

Alternative Three: Funding Translators

A significant barrier to Indigenous participation at COP is a lack of translation support. (Belfer et al., 2019; Comberti et al., 2016). In one example, a volunteer researcher had to translate an ongoing proceeding from English into Spanish, and her Indigenous partners had to then translate from Spanish into their native language. (M. Koromidou, personal communication, Jan. 31, 2022). Without this volunteer, these IP would have had no way to understand the proceedings. Even with this volunteer, they were relying on an untrained translator and had to filter information through two language barriers.

IMPLEMENTATION

As opposed to the above alternatives, which involve implementing training programs, this alternative would set up a direct funding mechanism matching translators to Indigenous Peoples attending COP. This means that any government agency or nonprofit with both the necessary funding and authority could implement this alternative without a competitive grant application process.

Implementation would occur in the following basic steps:

1. Identify need
    a. Conduct a survey of Indigenous Peoples who have already attended COP and explore which communities are most in need. Identify those IP who would like to partner with the implementing party to receive translation support.
    b. Quantify the need in terms of number of translators. Also, specify which languages are needed.
2. Once need is identified, locate translators and rates. Determine the number of translators that can be funded with existing allocations.
3. Connect translators with IP attendees. Facilitate agreements between translators and IP defining the scope of the translators' work.

Navigating Challenges Across Alternatives

A number of challenges will likely arise across multiple or all alternatives. Some of these challenges includes:

1. Obtaining funding. Nonprofits and government agencies will have to rely on limited budgets or raise more funds.

2. Authority. Government agencies may or may not have the authority to implement the alternatives as currently envisioned.

3. Networks. It will be difficult to locate all of the relevant IP stakeholders that should/would like to participate in these programs. The party implementing the chosen alternative will likely need an extensive list of informal contacts.

4. Organizing. Alternatives One and Two will both involve many logistical challenges, including scheduling workshops at times when all participants can attend, finding suitable meeting spaces, finding a geographic location for meeting spaces that allows many participants to attend, and ensuring all participants have lodging and food.

5. Geographic focus. Implementation will require narrowing the scope of the chosen intervention to specific regions and groups of Indigenous Peoples.

ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

Alternative One: Capacity-Building to Increase Funding

Under this alternative, I proposed that Earth Rights lobby the Department of State's Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor to fund the necessary training workshops. If the lobbying is successful, the Bureau will issue a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO), which both for-profit and non-profit entities can respond to with project proposals. This opportunity will specifically be for capacity-building for Indigenous Peoples in Latin America. I chose this geographic focus because the Bureau has recently issued two NOFOs for community-based projects in the region, including one focused on environmental defenders. (DRL, 2022a; DRL, 2022b). This indication that Latin America is a political priority for the Bureau, as well as the fact that Earth Rights does a significant portion of its work here, makes it an ideal candidate.

EFFECTIVENESS

I predict that this alternative will target four metrics: fair treatment, diversity, decision-making, and psychological safety. By potentially raising more awareness of available funding opportunities, this alternative could directly increase diversity at COP meetings. On the other hand, the alternative does not generate new funding, meaning the number of IP attending COP meetings could remain relatively static.

By recruiting IP interested in attending UNFCCC meetings and giving them new tools to attend, it will reward and recognize the efforts of IP to participate in climate policymaking (fair treatment). It will have less direct impacts on decision-making, because increasing attendance at COP meetings doesn't guarantee the voices of IP will be fully considered. And it might not immediately lead to an increase in psychological safety, i.e., it might take time for IP to participate in the intervention, then go to multiple COP meetings, before feeling invited to contribute and share ideas.

For these reasons, I rate this alternative as a 3 on fair treatment, a 2 on diversity, and a 1 on psychological safety and decision-making. This means the alternative receives an effectiveness score of 7.

COST

I estimate costs of about $900,000 per year over five years, for a total of roughly $4.5 million. These costs are associated with:[9]

- Wages for thirty employees, each devoting 10 hours per week to curriculum design and building a funding database, paid year-round at $25/hour.
- Event space to host 40 seminars
- The upfront and maintenance costs of designing a website to provide a database of funding sources
- The cost of round-trip plane tickets for 50 participants for 4 training events
    - The program will feature 4 annual training events, each lasting 10 days, with a total of 40 days of training per year
- Cost of 40 total days in a hotel for 50 participants

EQUITY

On one hand, this alternative will increase the accessibility of funding opportunities available to all IP. This should have the effect of redistributing some funding away from those who might have obtained it as a result of special connections and toward those who are more qualified to receive it.

On the other hand, some individuals will not be able to attend the program due to external constraints not faced by those who can attend (e.g., income, family or work situation). This means that those with the least means to attend will also be the least likely to obtain funding through the program.

Equity is medium.

FEASIBILITY

The Bureau has the legal authority to provide aid to developing nations under the Foreign Assistance Act. The Bureau has recently issued two NOFOs for projects in Latin America, one including capacity building components for environmental defenders (who are at severe risk of

[9] Sources for cost estimates are cited in the appendices.

political violence). (DRL, 2022a; DRL, 2022b). A program building capacity for IP to participate in UNFCCC meetings would align with several goals set forth in the Bureau's strategic plan. (DRL, 2022c).

Because the alternative proposes to connect participants with tangible resources (i.e., funding), it should generate enough interest amongst Indigenous activists to expect a high take-up. The program will also pay for travel and lodging, reducing a significant barrier to attendance. Feasibility will depend in part, however, on how effective the program is in reaching out to Indigenous leaders and community members.

Overall, feasibility is high.

Alternative Two: Capacity-Building for Knowledge and Cohesive Lobbying

EFFECTIVENESS

I predict that this alternative will target three metrics of inclusion: fair treatment, psychological safety, and diversity. I rate effectiveness as high on fair treatment, because the program will directly recognize and reward IP showing an interest in attending and participating in UNFCCC meetings. I rate effectiveness as medium on diversity, because the alternative will not directly increase Indigenous attendance, but it will generate increased interest and knowledge that could cause some IP who were only contemplating attendance to ultimately decide to attend. Effectiveness on psychological safety is low because the alternative will affect this metric only through increasing other metrics (i.e., more diversity and fair treatment -> more feelings of safety) and it will take time to develop, as stated above.

For these reasons, I rate this alternative as a 3 on fair treatment, 2 on diversity, and 1 on psychological safety. The effectiveness score is six.

COST

Similar to Alternative One, I estimate costs of roughly $900,000 per year over five years, for a total of roughly $4.5 million. These costs are associated with:

- Wages for thirty employees, each devoting 10 hours per week year-round to planning and coordination of the events and curriculum, paid at $25/hour.
- Event space to host 40 seminars
- The cost of round-trip plane tickets for 50 participants for 4 training events
- Cost of 40 total days in a hotel for 50 participants

EQUITY

This alternative confers a benefit on IP able to attend the program, but the program may be inaccessible to those who are subject to certain constraints (e.g., income, family, or work situation). However, Uquillas & Gabara suggest that in a program of this type, knowledge shared in the context of the workshops will be shared by participants with their communities, increasing overall access to information. (2000). Also, rather than focusing on funding, this program focuses on knowledge and organizing capacity, resources that are not rivalrous.

Increasing one group's knowledge or capacity does not necessarily diminish another's opportunity to access those resources as well.

Equity is high.

FEASIBILITY

The Bureau has the legal authority to provide aid to developing nations under the Foreign Assistance Act. The Bureau has recently issued two NOFOs for projects in Latin America, one including capacity building components for environmental defenders (who are at severe risk of political violence). (DRL, 2022a; DRL, 2022b). A program building capacity for IP to participate in UNFCCC meetings would align with several goals set forth in the Bureau's strategic plan. (DRL, 2022a; DRL, 2022b).

I predict that this alternative would generate relatively high take-up given the heavy involvement of Indigenous leaders in curriculum design and in leading the workshops. As with alternative one, the program will cover participants' travel and lodging. On the other hand, participants might view knowledge sharing and network building as relatively intangible resources that do not yield short term benefits. The program is also only useful to those who know they have the means to attend a UNFCCC meeting; others might not see the value in workshops designed in part to increase knowledge of COP procedures.

Feasibility is medium.

Alternative Three: Funding Translators

EFFECTIVENESS

I predict this intervention would target four metrics of inclusion: psychological safety, fair treatment, decision making, and trust.

The ability of IP to understand and process all necessary information at UNFCCC meetings is likely to have a direct and immediate impact on whether they feel invited to contribute and share their own ideas. Providing IP with translators will also have the effect of immediately rewarding and recognizing the efforts of IP to attend and participate in UNFCCC meetings. The alternative therefore scores a 3 on psychological safety and a 3 on fair treatment.

The intervention will have direct impacts on trust and indirect impacts on decision making. By enabling more honest and open communication (trust), it will make it more likely that Indigenous ideas will be valued by other parties in decision making. The alternative therefore scores 3 on trust and 2 on decision making.

The total effectiveness score is 11.

COST

I estimate that matching translators with 200 Indigenous Peoples would cost about $1.4 million per year, or about $7.1 million dollars over five years. This includes the cost of hiring translators for 14 days per year (the length of a COP meeting) and the cost of three employees working a total of 10 hours per week on implementation for three months out of every year.[10]

[10] As in the previous two sections, all citations to cost data are in the appendices.

EQUITY

This alternative will almost certainly widen the gap between Indigenous climate activists. Those who benefit from the program will have the ability to navigate UNFCCC meetings with a greater awareness and ease than those who do not have translation support. Because of the disparity in ability to communicate, issues important to those with translators might be prioritized over issues important to those without them.

Equity is low.

FEASIBILITY

I have not identified a government agency that could implement this initiative under existing authority. This means a non-profit would have to obtain the funding for the project.

The project would likely have high take-up because of the high value of translation services.

Feasibility is low, given the high cost and the difficulty of obtaining funding.

Outcomes Matrix

	Effectiveness	*Cost (NPV)*	*Equity*	*Feasibility*
Alternative One: Funding Workshops	7	$4.46 million	Medium	**High**
Alternative Two: Convening Stakeholders	6	**$4.45 million**	**High**	Medium
Alternative Three: Funding Translators	**11**	$7.1 million	Low	Low

Cost-Effectiveness Analysis

	Costs (NPV)	*Outcome Units*	*CE Ratio*
Alternative One: Funding Workshops	$4.46 million	35	**$127,436**
Alternative Two: Convening Stakeholders	$4.45 million	30	$148,432
Alternative Three: Funding Translators	$7.1 million	55	$128,782

The "outcome units" were generated by multiplying the effectiveness score of each alternative by five (the number of years for which costs were generated).

Recommendation

I recommend the implementation of Alternative Two.

In arriving at this recommendation, I first eliminate Alternative Three which, though it will directly improve four metrics of inclusion, is the most expensive option and has low equity and feasibility.

In comparing Alternatives One and Two, the cost of implementation and effectiveness are almost identical between the two options. This leaves equity and feasibility as the two criteria on which we can meaningfully compare the alternatives.

Given that considerations of equity underlie the entire purpose of this APP, I prioritize that criterion over feasibility, and find that Alternative Two is superior. Unlike Alternative One, it will not distribute a scarce resource to those who have the time and ability to participate in the program. Rather, participants in the Alternative Two program will be able to share what they learned with their communities at no cost to themselves.

IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of Alternative Two may proceed in four steps. Many components of the following plan draw from capacity-building programs described by Uquillas & Gabarra (2000) and Kashian et al. (2014).

First, Earth Rights and partners can lobby the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (DRL) to issue a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) to support capacity-building programs for Indigenous Peoples participating in COP meetings. The programs will be implemented in Latin America.

The NOFO will specify that the program will have two components: one focused on how to navigate a COP meeting, including the important policy issues that will be addressed, and the other focused on building networks between Indigenous stakeholders.

Second, the NOFO will be awarded to the best applicant, and the applicant will begin planning and curriculum design. The applicant will shape the curriculum and pedagogical techniques according to the input of Indigenous consultants familiar with targeted communities. (Uquillas & Gabara, 2000). The organization will also hold consultation meetings with Indigenous organizations and leaders in order to determine the best path forward.

During the planning and curriculum design phase, the applicant will set specific learning objectives and create a survey for participants to gauge pre-intervention capacity and knowledge. (S. Arthurs, personal communication, Nov. 2021) This survey will help shape the focus of the workshops and provide a reference point for a post-intervention survey. (Kashian et al., 2014).

Third, the applicant will conduct outreach and recruitment. This will overlap in timing with the planning/design phase and will include reaching out to all of the Indigenous environmental organizations in Latin America that generally participate in COP. (Uquillas & Gabara, 2000). This is an opportunity for the applicant to get a sense of potential interest in the project and whether any changes should be made to increase the appeal of the program.

Fourth, the applicant will execute the workshops. The program will consist of 4 training events per year, each lasting ten days, with a total of 40 seminars conducted by the end of the year.

Potential Implementation Issues

I organize potential issues by stakeholder group.

PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROGRAM

The program must offer tangible benefits to participants in order to ensure high take-up. If the benefits of the program are diffuse, while the costs are concentrated, this could dampen enthusiasm and prevent a strong base of support for the program from developing. To mitigate this potential issue, I propose that the program cover all the costs of attending the workshops, including airfare and lodging. By reducing the immediate costs of the program, the long-term benefits (more cohesive lobbying at COP) will seem more worthwhile. Resistance to the program will be met with stiffer opposition.

In addition to mitigating the costs of participation, it is also necessary to build trust with potential participants. This is why I propose co-designing the program with Indigenous leaders and community members (paid as consultants). As in the World Bank program described by Uquillas & Gabarra (2000), this will allow the program to adjust its pedagogical techniques in a culturally sensitive manner and ensure that participants will be trusting of the process and willing to invest their full attention.

INDIGENOUS ORGANIZATIONS

The success of the program hinges on whether Indigenous organizations are willing to promote it and encourage attendance. If they are considering whether to encourage their own employees to attend, they will want to know the program will deliver tangible results.

The risk of opposition from this stakeholder group could be mitigated by ensuring they are involved in the process. During the consultation meetings mentioned above, the specific needs and concerns voiced by Indigenous organizations must be properly noted and accounted for in program design. The workshop programming should focus on policy areas, for example, that are directly relevant to the work of these organizations.

INDIGENOUS CONSULTANTS

The program must recruit Indigenous leaders both capable of and willing to co-design the curriculum and facilitate the workshops. They must be convinced that the applicant will follow their guidance, rather than simply hire them in order to “check a box.” The Indigenous consultants, though they might not be officially affiliated with the applicant, must be the de facto leaders of program implementation.

THE APPLICANT

The organization that wins the grant from DRL will likely want to claim credit for the (potential) success of the program. This may incentivize them to exclude local communities and Indigenous leaders from decision-making. DRL must choose the winning applicant carefully, using a demonstrated history of working successfully with Indigenous communities as a criterion.

POLITICAL OPPONENTS

Many countries surrounding the Amazon region can be very hostile to environmental activists; many are killed or otherwise harmed at an alarming rate. (DRL, 2022a). This makes holding a conference for Indigenous environmental activists potentially dangerous. DRL should consult with the applicant regarding an appropriate location for the workshops, as well as steps that can be taken to ensure safe passage for program participants both to and from the project site. Perhaps, for example, the applicant could avoid publicly advertising the project and destroy all personal information collected from participants.

Acknowledging Difference

Though this project addresses a problem faced by Indigenous Peoples across the globe, Indigenous Peoples are not a monolith. In implementing this alternative, the applicant must tailor the program to the needs of specific Indigenous groups.

For example, some Indigenous communities have different leadership structures than others, resulting in different pedagogical needs. (Uquillas & Gabara, 2000). For example, Indigenous communities in the Sierra de Santa Marta region of Colombia prioritize respect for traditional leaders, while *Wayuu* communities have a less hierarchical governance structure. It is therefore important that seminars respond to each group's cultural preferences, in some cases speaking more directly with local leaders and in others being more inclusive of the whole community.

Of course, learning about and adapting to the needs of different groups requires the genuine consultation and involvement of those groups. This is why I propose placing curriculum design and pedagogy in the hands of Indigenous leaders/communities and ensuring that meaningful consultation occurs at all stages of the process.

CONCLUSION

Indigenous Peoples are at the frontlines of a changing climate, yet they are denied a voice in shaping how their futures will unfold. While correcting this systemic injustice will require a long and continued fight — one that has, in some sense, been ongoing for centuries — advocates have the ability to effect change in the immediate future. By allocating resources to support Indigenous Peoples' efforts at organization, lobbying, and policy entrepreneurship, we can take one more step toward climate justice.

APPENDICES

Appendix One: Costs for Alternative One

Alternative 1 Costs						
Year	0	1	2	3	4	**total**
labor/wages	$390,000	$402,675	$415,762	$429,274	$443,226	$2,080,937
infrastructure	$40,800	$41,252	$42,488	$43,761	$45,072	$213,371
travel and lodging	$454,000	$475,293	$489,551	$504,238	$519,365	$2,442,447
total	$884,800	$919,219	$947,801	$977,273	$1,007,663	$4,736,755
Present Value	$884,800	$892,446	$893,393	$894,343	$895,295	**$4,460,277**

Labor:

1. Assume a rate of $25/hour given average salary of a U.S. NGO employee (Glassdoor, n.d.).
    a. Note: although the program will be implemented in Latin America, U.S. nonprofits are eligible to apply. (DRL, 20221).
2. Costs in year 0 = $25 per hour * 10 hours per week * 52 weeks * 30 employees = $390K
3. The costs increase overtime, consistent with BLS estimates of wage inflation over the last two years (BLS, 2021).
    a. Average rate for 2020 and 2021 is 3.25%

Infrastructure:

1. Event space
    a. The cost of a WeWork event space for 50 people for one day is about $1000 in Bogota, Colombia. (Correspondence with Daniel Campuzano, 2022).
        i. Costs in year 0 = 1000 * 40 seminars = $20,000
    b. I attempted to get prices from WeWork in Colombia, Peru, and Brazil, but only representatives from Colombia responded.
    c. 3% inflation in Colombia (Statistia, n.d.-c).
2. Website
    a. Assume a relatively simple website just listing funding sources
    b. Upfront cost of $200, $50 per month for maintenance (Carney, n.d.)
    c. Costs in year 0 = $200 + (50*12 months) = $800
    d. Costs in year 1-4 = $50*12 = $600
        i. 3% inflation (U.S. Inflation Calculator, n.d.)

Travel and Lodging:

1. Average cost of round-trip plane tickets = $114,000
    a. Average price of round-trip tickets from Bogota to Brasilia, from Lima to Brasilia, and from Bogota to Lima = $570 * 50 people * 4 events
        i. Used cheapest flight shown on Google search for each pair of destinations; prices fluctuate fairly widely depending on the day chosen
2. Average cost of hotel stay in select Latin American cities = $170 (Statista, n.d.-a)
    a. Costs in year 0 = $170 * 40 total days * 50 participants = $340,000
3. Total costs in year 0 = $114,000 + 340,000 = $454,000
    a. 5% inflation is about the average for Colombia (Statista, n.d.-c), Peru (Statista, n.d.-d), and Brazil (Statista, n.d.-b).

Appendix Two: Costs for Alternative Two

Alternative 2 Costs						
Year	0	1	2	3	4	**total**
labor/wages	$345,000	$355,838	$367,016	$378,546	$390,439	$1,836,839
infrastructure	$40,000	$41,200	$42,436	$43,709	$45,020	$212,365
travel and lodging	$454,000	$475,293	$489,551	$504,238	$519,365	$2,442,447
total	$839,000	$872,330	$899,003	$926,493	$954,825	$4,491,651
Present Value	$839,000	$846,922	$847,397	$847,872	$848,349	**$4,229,541**

Labor:

1. Assume a rate of $25/hour given average salary of a U.S. NGO employee (Glassdoor, n.d.)
2. Costs of 10 NGO employees and 20 Indigenous consultants each devoting 10 hours per week per year to planning and coordination
    a. Year 0 = $25 hourly rate * 10 hours * 52 weeks * 30 people = $390,000
3. Total costs in year 0 = $390,000
4. Wages adjusted over time using 3.25% wage inflation rate (BLS, 2021), lump sum payments adjusted using average inflation of 3% (U.S. Inflation Calculator, n.d.).

Infrastructure:

1. Event space
    a. The cost of a WeWork event space for 50 people for one day is about $1000 in Bogota, Colombia. (Correspondence with Daniel Campuzano, 2022).
        i. Costs in year 0 = 1000 * 40 seminars = $40,000
    b. I attempted to get prices from WeWork in Colombia, Peru, and Brazil, but only representatives from Colombia responded.
    c. 3% inflation in Colombia (Statistia, n.d.-c).

Travel and Lodging:

1. Average cost of round-trip plane tickets = $114,000
    a. Average price of round-trip tickets from Bogota to Brasilia, from Lima to Brasilia, and from Bogota to Lima = $570 * 50 people * 4 events
        i. Used cheapest flight shown on Google search for each pair of destinations; prices fluctuate fairly widely depending on the day chosen
2. Average cost of hotel stay in select Latin American cities = $170 (Statista, n.d.-a)
    a. Costs in year 0 = $170 * 40 total days * 50 participants = $340,000
3. Total costs in year 0 = $114,000 + 340,000 = $454,000
    a. 5% inflation is about the average for Colombia (Statista, n.d.-c), Peru (Statista, n.d.-d), and Brazil (Statista, n.d.-b).

Appendix Three: Costs for Alternative Three

Alternative Three Costs						
year	0	1	2	3	4	**total**
Employees	$9,750	$10,067	$10,394	$10,732	$11,081	$52,023
Translators	$1,400,000	$1,445,500	$1,492,479	$1,540,984	$1,591,066	$7,470,029
total	$1,409,750	$1,455,567	$1,502,873	$1,551,716	$1,602,147	$7,522,053
Present Value	$1,409,750	$1,413,172	$1,416,602	$1,420,040	$1,423,487	**$7,083,050**

Labor:

1. 3 employees paid at $25/hour for 13 weeks, or 1/3 of a year, at 10 hours per week (Glassdoor, n.d.)
    a. Costs in year 0 = $25 hourly rate * 10 hours per week * 13 weeks * 3 employees = $9,750
2. These employees administer the program; find IP planning to attend COP and provide funds/facilitate process of finding a translator

Translators:

1. Used average daily rate for a translator provided by the UN (United Nations, n.d.)
2. Costs in year 0 = $500 per day * 14 days * 200 translators = $1.4 million

Costs increase over time in both categories according to a 3% inflation rate. (U.S. Inflation Calculator).

REFERENCES

Arthurs, S. (2021, November). *Interview with Sean Arthurs* [Personal communication].

Belfer, E., Ford, J., Maillet, M., Araos, M., & Flynn, M. (2019). Pursuing an Indigenous Platform: Exploring Opportunities and Constraints for Indigenous Participation in the UNFCCC. *Global Environmental Politics*, *19*(1), 12–33.

Brugnach, M., Craps, M., & Dequlf, A. (2014). Including indigenous peoples in climate change mitigation: Addressing issues of scale, knowledge, and power. *Climatic Change*, *140*, 19–32.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2021, December). *Employment Cost Index—December 2021*. https://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/eci.pdf

Chan, N. (2021). Beyond Delegation Size: Developing country negotiating capacity and NGO 'support" in international climate negotiations. *International Environmental Agreements*, *21*, 201–217.

Chhatre, A., & Agrawal, A. (2009). Tradeoffs and synergies between carbon storage and livelihood benefits from forest commons. *PNAS*, *106*(42), 17667–17670.

CIVICUS. (2019). *We Will Not Be Silenced: Climate Activism from the Frontlines to the UN*.

Claeys, P., & Pugley, D. (n.d.). Peasant and indigenous transnational social movements engaging with climate justice. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, *38*(3), 325–340. https://doi.org/10.1080/02255189.2016.1235018

Comberti, C., Thornton, T., Korodimou, M., Shea, M., & Riamit, K. (2016). Adaptation and Resilience at the Margins: Addressing Indigenous Peoples' Marginalization at International Climate Negotiations. *Working Paper, Environmental Change Institute, University of Oxford*.

Dunlap, A. (2018). Counterinsurgency for wind energy: The Bii Hioxo wind park in Juchitan, Mexico. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, *45*(3), 630–652. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2016.1259221

Earth Rights International. (2021a). *Earth Rights International*. https://earthrights.org.

Earth Rights International. (2021b). *Campaigns*. https://earthrights.org/campaigns/

Earth Rights International. (2021c). *Frontlines of Climate Justice: Defending Community Resistance to Climate Destruction*. https://earthrights.org/wp-content/uploads/Frontlines-of-Climate-Justice_Framing-Document.pdf

Environmental Defense Fund. (2017). *Amazonian Indigenous Peoples Territories and Their Forests Related to Climate Change: Analyses and Policy Options*. http://www.edf.org/sites/default/files/indigenous-territories-barrier-to-deforestation.pdf

Facilitative Working Group. (2021). *Good practices for indigenous peoples' and local communities' participation in national climate policy*. Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform. https://lcipp.unfccc.int/lcipp-background/2020-2021-workplan?function=883

Farber, D., & Carlarne, C. (2018). *Climate Change Law*. Foundation Press.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO), & Fund for the Development of the Indigenous Peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean (FILAC). (2021). *Forest governance by indigenous and tribal peoples*. http://www.fao.org/3/cb2953en/cb2953en.pdf

Ford, J., Maillet, M., Pouliot, V., Meredith, T., & Cavanaugh, A. (n.d.). *Adaptation and Indigenous Peoples in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*. *139*, 429–443.

Glassdoor. (n.d.). *How much does a Non-Profit make?* Glassdoor. https://www.glassdoor.com/Salaries/non-profit-salary-SRCH_KO0,10.htm

Hill, C. (2018). *Fighting Back: A Global Protection Strategy for Earth Rights Defenders*. Earth Rights International.

Kashian, D., Krause, A., Sano, L., Nowell, B., & Drouillard, K. (2014). Capacity building in stakeholders around Detroit River fish consumption advisory issues. *Freshwater Science*, *33*(2), 674–678.

Korodimou, M. (2022, January 31). *Interview with Michaela Koromidou* [Personal communication].

Kuyper, J., & Backstrand, K. (2016). Accountability and Representation: Nonstate Actors in UN Climate Diplomacy. *Global Environmental Politics*, *16*(2), 61–81.

Kuyper, J., Linner, B., & Schroeder. (n.d.). Non-state actors in hybrid global climate governance: Justice, legitimacy, and effectiveness in a post-Paris era. *WIREs Climate Change*.

Kwiatkowski, R., Tikhonov, C., Peace, D., & Bourassa, C. (2012). Canadian Indigenous engagement and capacity building in health impact assessment. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, *27*(1), 57–67.

Lemaitre, S. (2011). Indigenous Peoples' Land Rights and REDD: A Case Study. *Review of European Community & International Law*, *20*(2), 150–162.

Ludlow, F., Baker, L., Brock, S., Hebdon, C., & Dove, M. (2016). The Double Binds of Indigeneity and Indigenous Resistance. *Humanities*, *5*(3), 1–19.

Minzner, A., Klerman, J., Markovitz, C., & Fink, B. (2014). The Impact of Capacity-Building Programs on Nonprofits: A Random Assignment Evaluation. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *43*(3), 547–569.

Paluck, E., Green, S., & Green, D. (2019). The contact hypothesis re-evaluated. *Behavioural Public Policy*, *3*(2), 129–158.

Phelps, J., Webb, E., & Agrawal, A. (2010, April 16). Does REDD+ Threaten to Recentralize Forest Governance? *Science*. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40544553

Potter, C., & Brough, R. (2004). Systemic Capacity Building: A Hierarchy of Needs. *Health Policy and Planning*, *15*(5), 336–345.

Raffel, S. (n.d.). Climate Communication and the Exclusion of Indigenous Knowledge. *2016 IEEE International Professional Communication Conference*, *2016*, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1109/IPCC.2016.7740496

Romansky, L., Garrod, M., Brown, K., & Deo, K. (2021). *How to Measure Inclusion*. Harvard Business Review. https://hbr.org/2021/05/how-to-measure-inclusion-in-the-workplace

Rotem, A., Zinovieff, M., & Goubarev, A. (2012). A framework for evaluating the impact of the United Nations fellowship programmes. *Human Resources for Health*, *8*(7), 1–8.

Saldamando, A. (2021, December 10). *Interview with Alberto Saldamando* [Personal communication].

Schroeder, H. (2010). Agency in international climate negotiations: The case of indigenous peoples and avoided deforestation. *International Environmental Agreements*, *10*, 317–332.

Seminario: Latin American Seminar on Indigenous Legal Defense. (n.d.). Earth Rights International. https://earthrights.org/how-we-work/indigenous-seminar/

Shawoo, Z., & Thornton, T. (n.d.). The UN local communities and Indigenous peoples' platform: A traditional ecological knowledge-based evaluation. *WIREs Climate Change*.

Smith, H., & Sharp, K. (n.d.). Indigenous Climate Knowledges. *WIREs Climate Change*, *3*, 467–476.

Sobeck, J. (2008). How Cost-Effective is Capacity Building in Grassroots Organizations? *Administration in Social Work*, *32*(2), 49–68.

Suiseeya, K., & Caplow, S. (2013). In pursuit of procedural justice: Lessons from an analysis of 56 forest carbon project designs. *Global Environmental Change*, *23*(5), 968–979.

UN. (2007). *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2018/11/UNDRIP_E_web.pdf

UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. (n.d.-a). *Climate Change and Indigenous Peoples*. https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/backgrounder%20climate%20change_FINAL.pdf

UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. (n.d.-b). *Who Are Indigenous Peoples?* https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/5session_factsheet1.pdf

UNFCCC. (n.d.-a). *Statistics on Participation and in-session engagement*. UN Climate Change. https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/parties-non-party-stakeholders/non-party-stakeholders/statistics-on-non-party-stakeholders/statistics-on-participation-and-in-session-engagement

UNFCCC. (n.d.-b). *What are governing, process management, subsidiary, constituted and concluded bodies?* UN Climate Change. https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/bodies/the-big-picture/what-are-governing-process-management-subsidiary-constituted-and-concluded-bodies

UNFCCC. (2021). *Admitted NGOs*. https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/conferences/side-events-and-exhibits/admitted-ngos#eq-2

UNFCCC Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA). (2019). *The 1st Meeting of the Facilitative Working Group of the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform.* https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/SBSTA2019_04E.pdf

United Nations. (2020). *2020-2021 Workplan*. United Nations: Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform Web Portal. https://lcipp.unfccc.int/lcipp-background/2020-2021-workplan

United Nations. (2021a). *About the Secretariat*. United Nations Climate Change. https://unfccc.int/about-us/about-the-secretariat.

United Nations. (2021b). *Conference of the Parties*. United Nations Climate Change. https://unfccc.int/process/bodies/supreme-bodies/conference-of-the-parties-cop.

Uquillas, J., & Gabara, T. (2000). *Strengthening Indigenous Organizations: The World Bank's Indigenous Capacity-Building Program in Latin America* (LCR Sustainable Development Working Paper No. 10). World Bank.

Wood, B., Dougill, A., Quinn, C., & Stringer, L. (2016). Exploring Power and Procedural Justice Within Climate Compatible Development Project Design: Whose Priorities are Being Considered? *Journal of Environment & Development*, *25*(4), 363–395. https://doi.org/10.1177/1070496516664179