



1

Final Evaluation: Ireland Aid 3 (IA3)

Realizing the Rights of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples in East and Central Africa Programme, 2015-2018

Minority Rights Group International

“These discussions under trees can get things moving”

By: David Hampson and Ava Batay-an

¹ Photo credit for all photographs in this report is “Ava Batay-an/David Hampson”.

Table of Contents

NB: This Table of Contents – along with some references in the report - is hyper-linked. Left-clicking on the content description, e.g. “Scope”, or on the page number, e.g. 7, will take the reader to the section “Scope”.

Acronyms and Abbreviations	3
Executive Summary	4
Final Evaluation Consultancy Team	6
Scope	7
Methodology	8
Findings	9
Conclusions, against the Terms of Reference at Output Level	24
Conclusions, against the Terms of Reference, at Outcome level	26
General Conclusions	30
Recommendations	33
1) <i>Building on the Recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE).</i>	33
2) <i>Recommendations directly from our own research.</i>	35
Appendices	37
<i>Appendix A: Bibliography (only of quoted/directly used sources)</i>	37
<i>Appendix B: Pre-field visit questionnaire</i>	38
<i>Appendix C: MRGA Non-IA3 Partners in the Region but working on IP Concerns</i>	44
<i>Appendix D: What is a good Paralegal</i>	47
<i>Appendix E: Key Informants</i>	48
<i>Appendix F: Batwa Community Discussions on the Smiley Tool for Accountability to Affected Populations</i>	50
<i>Appendix G: List of Batwa elected to LC1 positions (as provided by AICM)</i>	51
<i>Appendix H: Transcript of a conversation on 10 September 2018 between Sam Mwandha, UWA Executive Director and Ava Batay-an</i>	51

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACHPR	African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights
ACTHPR	African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights
AICM	African International Christian Ministry (Uganda)
BACA	Bagungu Community Association (Uganda)
BDP	Batwa Development Program (Uganda)
BLG	Benet Lobby Group (Uganda)
BMCT	Bwindi Mgahinga Conservation Trust (Uganda)
CCFU	The Cross-Cultural Foundation of Uganda
CDRN	Community Development Resource Network (Uganda)
CESCR	Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (United Nations)
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
EOC	Equal Opportunities Commission (Uganda)
FB	Facebook
FDAPID	Foyer de Développement pour l'Autopromotion des Pygmées et Indigènes Défavorisés (DRC)
FPIC	Free Prior and Informed Consent
FPP	Forest Peoples Programme
HR	Human Rights
HURINET	Human Rights Network (Uganda)
IA	Irish Aid
IADI	Ik Agenda for Development Initiative (Uganda)
IMG Coalition	Indigenous Minority Groups Coalition
INGO	International Non-Government Organisation
IP	Indigenous Peoples
IPG	Indigenous Peoples Group
KII	Key Informant Interview
LC	Local Council
Logframe	Logical Framework
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MRGA	Minority Rights Group Africa
MRGI	Minority Rights Group International
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NAP	National Action Plan (Uganda)
NFA	National Forest Authority (Uganda)
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
OPDP	Ogiek Peoples Development Program
Pop-ed	Popular education
RAPY	Réseau des Associations Autochtones Pygmées (DRC)
RBA	Rwanda Bar Association (Rwanda)
SGBV	Sex and Gender-Based Violence
SMS	Short Message Service
UEFA	Union pour l'Emancipation de la Femme Autochtone (DRC)
UNDRIP	United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
UOBDU	United Organisation for Batwa Development in Uganda (Uganda)
UPR	Universal Periodic Review (UN Human Rights Council)
UWA	Uganda Wildlife Authority (Uganda)
UWESO	Uganda Women's Effort to save Orphans
WOPU	Women's Organisation for Promoting Unity (Rwanda)
Y2, Y3	Year 2, Year 3
YWCA	Young Women's Christian Association (Rwanda)

Executive Summary

The peoples upon which this evaluation is focused – Batwa, Benet and Ik – and other IPs in Uganda, Rwanda, DRC, Kenya and Tanzania share a common history of eviction, abuse, discrimination and marginalization.

This report encountered confidence from interviewees within and outside IA3 that indigenous land rights issues are gaining ground, even in an unfavourable global environment of closing borders and profit maximisation. The link to environmental stewardship by IPs – expressed in the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) – provides powerful potential for MRG partners to deepen global public understanding and create advocacy links to IPs. Continued support for regional litigation can ultimately provoke concrete national law changes.

Since the evaluator's last visit, there is a sense of positive change. More policy and recognition are in place. Whereas in 2010 Governments were neglecting IPs in national statistics and provision, MRGA has now been able, through the IMG Coalition, to add the Maragoli people to the list of IPs officially-recognized by Uganda's Equal Opportunities Commission² "to Uganda's national list of officially-recognized IPs. At community level, the threats are more varied – not only conservation projects, but private sector initiatives³. Yet at community level, committed paralegals are articulate and cite multiple successes, Batwa women are accorded more importance, and some gains are apparent of practical rights such as land, housing, and equally-paid employment. There is still so much left to achieve in practical and strategic rights: "Representation is not enough... our roads are bad... land is encroached.... HIV and AIDS..."⁴

The expected results of this IA3 program were "To make IP voices stronger" and "To keep decision makers accountable". The program objectives evaluated were "Programme Effectiveness" and "Recommendations for changes in methods or targets".

The report demonstrates that completion of Logframe activities⁵ have been effective in strengthening IP voices and gains in community understanding of human rights. Generally, the program should continue long-term its community level "discussion under trees". Effectively trained Paralegals at community level, and community representatives through accountability mechanisms, have raised those voices to partners, MRGA, local political structures and even made some spectacular interventions at the highest national level decision makers and power structures⁶. The research found that paralegals showed good understanding of a paralegal's role conceptually and in their respective communities. Partners also knew what they wanted from capacity building in their job of making voices stronger; more can be done in planning with them on a strategic approach to the more difficult job of holding decision-makers accountable.

Regarding changes in methods or targets, a list of recommendations is provided with fuller context on page 33. A concise summary of this report's recommendations is that MRG should:

² The Speaker of Parliament and the President have also reportedly directed that the Constitution be amended to include the Maragoli, but of course there is more to do to attain their strategic and practical rights.

³ Dr. Kidd cites as examples logging and oil palm in Congo Basin and oil and wind in Kenya, golf courses, trekking trails and casinos are other threats.

⁴ John Mark Lomeri of IADI

⁵ And judicious de-prioritising of less effective activities, such as the Facebook/Twitter accounts, with clear reporting of the reasons to the donor

⁶ One example is the Affirmative Action-based petition of Kenneth **Turyamubona** working alongside AICM, which was developed since 2013 and presented in different ways to different bodies – such as the Prime Minister's Office and the Equal Opportunities Commission.

Advocate and work with Irish Aid in approaching other donors to provide long-term support, including for extension of geographical coverage, para-legalism, continued capacity building, practical inter-partner collaboration and security concerns including for paralegals and evaluators.

Reach out to: allies, advocating that they include indigenous peoples in all research and action; neutrals, e.g. the judiciary, lawyers, Convenors of Clusters and MPs⁷ in training and representational work; and to those whose current practices are providing harmful or alienating to IPs, such as the UWA and the NFA.

Conduct a full participative, partner-MRG (i) program and partner recap, intervening with some partners on women's empowerment, gender strategy and organisational development and (ii) strategic planning process for the programme, aiming for the tough goals of holding power-holders accountable; a key tool in this might be a common, simple advocacy paper which outlines key demands and can be edited to suit the context⁸.

MRG should consider explicitly stating in the recap that: partners should seek other donors to reduce dependency on MRG; all income and expenditure from all donors should continue to be globally audited (not only project auditing); reporting should be timely and include relevant supporting documentation; MRG should ensure complementarity of approach with other donors; MRG should aim for increased flexibility in funding partners for longer time periods, relaxing a project-based approach, and considering the delegation of some paralegal transportation and evaluation budget lines; co-operation should be expected between partners (especially within countries); funds should be made available for cross-visits of community paralegals and partner staff.

The expected results of this recap and planning are greater focus, united purpose, and greater partner mutual learning and cooperation.

Regarding partnership, MRGA should: Visit partners more often, using public buses and motorbikes⁹, and expand its partner pool based on impactful, value-for-money work along the Existing-Emerging-Newly Emerging model. It should advocate to those partners and allies buying and allocating land for IPs that they provide leaseholds to give IP security, and to promote inward investment and development. For paralegal training, MRG should: conduct Training Needs Analysis, structure, understand and expand, inviting magistrates to sign – with MRGA staff - certificates for graduates and those selected in an expanded Bursary scheme; provide clarity of expectations for distances to be covered on foot by paralegals, with simple mechanisms (MRGA or delegated) for decision-making on transport costs; Engage local lawyers capable of dealing with the full range of rights issues in all countries to complement and extend the legal scope of paralegals' interventions; share legal research with the Benet and examine legal aid provisions in Rwanda; Re-examine match funding requirements which have provided obstacles for partners, particularly in raising funds for legal work.

There is potential for increased efficiency in communication; the evaluation encountered initial difficulties in arranging visits and partner prioritization, although ultimately, partners and MRG at all levels willingly and fully participated in all methodologies and provided a fulfilling experience for which the evaluators are grateful.

⁷ In some cases, this is a case of building upon previous work, for example, in Uganda MRGA have reached MPs through a national policy makers' dialogue, and lead the indigenous cluster on UPR and CESC under the coalitions coordinated by HURINET-U

⁸ for example, if a group of Ugandan partners wanted to approach Ugandan officials, they may (or may not) regard it as diplomatic to remove the names of partners from other countries; in Ikland, Ik representatives may choose to only use their own NGO name etc.

⁹ Obviously, making decisions incorporating safety when rains make road conditions difficult.

MRG can do more to maximise the motivating effect of its successes (e.g. Endorois and Ogiek cases) so that allies and potential adversaries hear of the good examples through a multimedia approach, including SMS on WhatsApp, text blast, blanket email, pop-ed materials and even merchandise.

The programme overall was effective and provided Irish Aid with good value-for-money, with multiple activities sharing relatively small sums. It can only be seen as one stage in a long-term and expanded commitment; history teaches that the rights of minorities and indigenous peoples always have to be claimed in an arduous, painstaking manner, requiring long-term, concerted, expanded donor, MRG, partner and community commitment.

Final Evaluation Consultancy Team

Ava Batay-an and David Hampson have previously worked together as a job-sharing couple or two consultants for CARE, Catholic Relief Services, DFID, Tanggol Kalikasan (TK) and Voluntary Service Overseas, and have always been invited back for repeat contracts. Both are UK nationals; Ava's background is in the Philippines, where they first successfully worked together to improve the national Community Based Natural Resource Management law in favour of Indigenous Peoples (IPs) and marginalised coastal communities. Ava and David regard their South-North, female-male composition as a strength, in addition to their complementary skill-sets (Ava more in IT, administration, local-to-national; David more in representation, strategic management, regional-to-international; both in community-based accountability and agency towards sustainable change).

Ava Batay-an <https://www.gdrc.org/uem/disasters/disenvi/erm-meha.pdf> is a grass-roots development professional, an Indigenous Person (of Bontoc mother and Kankana-ey father) and trained paralegal. These characteristics gained her warm welcome and immediate access in Batwa and Benet communities of Uganda and Rwanda. She became a Director at Philippine environmental human rights NGO - Tanggol Kalikasan (Defense of Nature) http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/eserv/UQ:108321/n02_Byers_Batay-FINAL.pdf and at Philippine Generations. She has since worked in the humanitarian development sphere in 8 countries, including for DFID supporting the integration of environmental concerns <https://www.gdrc.org/uem/disasters/disenvi/erm-meha.pdf> and most recently in the crisis zones inhabited by the Rohingya in Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, numerous peoples in South Kordofan, Sudan and the Maranao and others in Mindanao, the Philippines.

David Hampson, <https://www.linkedin.com/in/david-hampson/> set up Christian Aid's Gulf and then Central Asia programs, 1991-1999. As Director, he reset VSO Philippines' program towards vulnerable people in crisis areas, and towards VSO's opening to send Filipino professionals to serve overseas. He evaluated MRG's Batwa Gender Violence program in 4 countries using creative evaluation techniques and its Global Advocacy Program in 34 countries with visits to 5 http://minorityrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/Final_Report_GAP_Evaluation-2013.pdf. He also trained MRG Africa staff in **Participatory Evaluation** and was an MRG Reader for Central Asia. He has set up the security risk management systems of 5 NGOs and has been lucky enough to have served as Consultant, Director or Senior Manager in 28 countries, including for DFID, IFRC, Oxfam, SAVE and for UNFAO as Global Adviser for Accountability to Affected Populations.

Acknowledgments

Warm thanks to all who gave time, goodwill, opinions and advice, particularly those unpaid to do so, and to MRGA/MRGI and partners for arrangements and enriching final edits. Thanks to Dany Kahn, Gayia Beyer, Dennis Longid and Mai Taqueban who offered their home-space to write up, and to Simone Onana who translated the Executive Summary into French.

Scope

The Irish Aid 3 (IA3) project's scope was DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda, where marginalised groups were expected to strengthen their advocacy voices, and to hold decision-makers accountable for actions to address discrimination. IA3's project period covered July 2015 to end of June 2018.

This final evaluation's objectives require it to "not duplicate... an interim evaluation in 2017 which focused on the strategic litigation, and linked legal empowerment work, in Kenya and Tanzania... [but focus on] ... beneficiaries and advocacy targets in Eastern DRC, Rwanda and Uganda... on the capacity building elements... and... draw on the interim evaluation".

This final evaluation involved visits to DRC, Rwanda and Uganda partners¹⁰ and non-IA3 informants in the cities of Rwanda and Uganda. They included over 5000 km of land travel, (sometimes two evaluators sharing the back of) motorbikes and public buses to the Batwa of N. Rwanda (Ava), borders of E. DRC and Rwanda (David), the Batwa of SW Uganda (Ava and David), the Benet of E. Uganda (Ava) and the Ik of NE. Uganda (David).

This is a programme evaluation, not a description of those IPs' lives or common histories of eviction, abuse, discrimination and marginalization. In brief, the Batwa appear distinct because they have been scattered, denied territory (and therefore representation); "they need more attention than any other. You look at their poverty, their (level of) understanding. (IA3) is short-term funding. We are training paralegals, people able to grasp (the long-term)¹¹." The Benet are distinct because their seemingly clarified land boundaries (and thus land rights') were plunged into confusion when the Ugandan Government failed to ratify its own memo of 2005, but rather continued to encroach on Benet land, and confiscate their cattle as "fines". And the Ik are distinct because they number only 13,000 to 16,000¹² - small enough to be "endangered" if they were an animal species - and suffer intense, repeated raiding of crops and possessions from pastoralist peoples across the borders of Kenya and South Sudan, and from their more powerful neighbours in Uganda.

The evaluation's scope also does not include licence for in-depth discussion of core ethical issues or steps towards higher solutions, such as the particular situation of Rwanda's post-genocide policies which create obstacles to achieving strategic rights, the Ik's survival amongst dominant neighbouring peoples, or the Batwa's eviction for the conservation of, and earning from, gorillas. In the latter case, evaluators used personal connections to request interviews with a senior UWA official (see p.52 for transcript), which suggested openness to working together. This suggests that IA4 may create positive results for communities by holding such officials to their well-intentioned words, creating the expectation of responses as a requirement of their job, and creating the space to consider together the potential for the co-management of natural resources with IPs.

The evaluation's recommendations are provided in two parts: those extending the MTE's recommendations, and those stemming only from our own research.

¹⁰ But not to DRC, which has introduced month-long visa procedures involving either representation to Kinshasa or face-to face partner interviews with Government in Kivu. MRGI and the evaluators together chose to do the work in Rwanda, asking partners to make short trips across the borders from Bukavu to Cyangugu Kamembe (main town of Rusizi District, part of former "Cyangugu Prefecture" also called Kamembe, Shangugu, Rusizi, Kibuye, Karongi) and from Goma to Gisenyi Rubavu (previously "RubavuGisenyi")

¹¹ Faith Tushabe, Executive Director of AICM

¹² "The last census was 13,000 but many Dodoth settlers were included. Now we have grown, so we don't know, but right now we are doing our own census" John Mark Lomeri

Methodology

The program objectives evaluated were **(i) Programme Effectiveness** (in the past) and **(ii) Recommendations for changes in methods or targets** (for the future). The same tools were used to collect data for these different stages (shown in the next paragraphs as “Past” and “Future”). The tools are listed as they were used chronologically.

Pre-visit:

Literature search: Past: Primarily of MRG reports to Irish Aid and the (hyper-linked here) [Mid-Term Evaluation](#); also, grey literature and analysis of MRG’s press work on the [Ogiek Landmark Victory](#). Future: Primarily of previous work done by evaluators for MRG on some Batwa partners ([Batwa GBV Hampson 2010](#)) and reading of other NGOs and partners’/other stakeholders’ reports.

Interviews¹³: Past: Interviews of partners, stakeholders with specific programme knowledge, and MRG staff. Future: The preceding interviewees plus non-IA3 participants.

Pre-visit questionnaires: Past: To partners and MRG staff, Appendix B. Future: To evaluators’ contacts who had specific knowledge of issues (but not of the IA3 programme), Appendix C.

During the visit:

Timelines: Past: For each country, a timeline of completed key activities was drawn/added to (on a long paper roll) by representatives from all partners. Future: Space was allocated for a further year, until July 2019, to gather “realistic possible positive changes”.

Stakeholder Mapping: Past: With partners, of key partners and adversaries, mapping the relative power. A central paper of “IA3” was placed, and partners ripped pieces of paper, or “chapattis”; large pieces to show partners of greater importance within IA3, with smaller chapattis showing lesser importance (See Photos, p.11-13 to further clarify methodology). They placed them strategically to show greater frequency of contact if placed close to the centre, and to show which other partners they connected with frequently (putting them close to each other). Future: Partners then analysed their maps, with a view to potentially useful future action and linkages.

Logframe Scoring: Past: Individual representatives of all partners were given 20 stones, shown the 13 (simplified¹⁴) Logframe outputs written on a large roll of paper, and asked to freely distribute the stones according to “How confident are you that this output was achieved?” Confidence could thus be expressed in every one of the activities, or only in some. The key programme manager, Felicien Balikunda of MRG Africa, was then asked to conduct the same activity. Future: Voting was then conducted to 4 further (Future) questions: “What is the relative importance of: (1) the 13 outputs (in a follow-up programme)?” 2) The major binary IA3 programme objective split¹⁵ “To pursue legal cases of IPs” or “To capacity-build NGOs representing IPs”? 3) And on Objectives: “What is

¹³ Interviews started with MRGI in the UK pre-visit, but continued during and post-visit

¹⁴ Outputs 2&3 -Trainings and Refresher Trainings of paralegals – and 7&8; Country and Regional Network Meetings were merged, as uncontroversial distinctions. Others e.g. MRG-led and partner led-M&E were kept.

¹⁵ As seen by evaluators, though one Pre-Visit non-IA3 questionnaire respondent refused the binary premise, and some partners just voted them as equally important and mutually supportive.

the relative importance of the following: Advocacy; Para-legalism; Litigation¹⁶? And on Expected Results/Outcomes: 4) “To make IP voices stronger” or “To keep decision makers accountable”?

Checks on understanding: Paralegals in groups and individually were asked to brainstorm the “role of a paralegal”, and some organisations asked “What is capacity building?” Evaluators also checked the level of importance placed on evaluations.

Focus Group Discussions: Past: In all communities prompted by a “Smiley Tool” with participant voting their satisfaction levels of the past with stones next to angry; partly unhappy; partly happy or happy faces, and on what future improvements/results they wanted to achieve.

Key Informant Interviews: One-to-one interviews were conducted with IA3 and non IA3 partners.

The evaluators constructed hypotheses as they collected data, interviews and observations and added questions to test them before discarding them or converting them into conclusions.

Findings

Literature Search and Interviews: One issue which was prominent in early interviews with MRGI management in London was the importance of the Ogiek landmark victory at ACTHPR¹⁷ which took place on 26 May 2017. Around one year later, on 9 June 2018, MRGI occupied the fourth and sixth-placed articles in a Google Search “Ogiek landmark victory”.

2,370,000 results were generated by the search. Of the 30 top-placed articles, 29 were on-topic (one was about a Formula One racing event), mostly from an extensive and varied group of media sources, NGOs and NGO coalitions. A majority mentioned MRG.

This, and an impressive list of 94 articles and broadcasts¹⁸ generated directly by MRGI in the international press, show that MRGI is centrally-placed, and that the media work conducted by MRGI and others has succeeded. Millions have been reached, although not – as shown in Findings – many IP partners and communities.

Rwanda’s post genocide ideology creates a particular situation in the Government has made concrete practical responses to Batwa needs, but in which key stakeholders will not talk about ethnicity, minorities or peoples¹⁹, and thus strategic needs. This was later found to have program implications; WOPU and its paralegals discussed some future needs on its understanding of law, but had difficulties articulating on land rights’ strategy or envisaging a future better state in Stakeholder Mapping.

Pre-visit questionnaires:

¹⁶ Only AICM showed knowledge of the fourth Objective, Accountability Mechanisms, so they were excluded from used data. Instead, in a separate data set, a fourth category was introduced of Mid-Term and Final evaluations to gauge the extent to which these might have any role to play in learning.

¹⁷ The ruling was therefore made at the highest human rights court in Africa and is of a binding nature

¹⁸ “Kenya’s Ogiek Press Coverage”, provided by MRGI to the evaluators

¹⁹ “It’s Time to Open Up” Hampson

IA 3 Partners

Pre-visit questionnaires were emailed out to MRGA and (direct and indirect) project partners two weeks prior to the evaluators' arrival in E. Africa. Respondents were asked the following questions: What was the project's percentage completion? Which things had they done well and not done well? How do they think others could have done better? How could they have done better? What changes on the ground caused their plans to change? What strategies have they done to adapt to such changes. What key activities from the project helped to achieve project goals? What stopped you from achieving project goals?

Respondents perceived that the project was completed at nearly 100% with 6 out of the 8 respondents indicating between 90% - 98% and one at 100% project completion. Overall, respondents regarded activities such as capacity-building, paralegal training, conflict resolution, mediation and identification of emerging partners in Tanzania and Kenya as "well done" in IA3. MRGA also successfully facilitated the identification and inclusion of the Maragolis to the list of IPs held by the Equal Opportunities Commission of Uganda.

The other two respondents noted a 70% - 75% completion with one arguing that the project could have reached a 100% completion if only it had covered all the Benet sub counties, and for MRGA that the difficulty in dealing with the Tanzania Emerging Partner slowed down project implementation and caused a 75% project completion.

In terms of what organisations could have done better, the responses included: adhering to reporting deadlines; initial meetings with partners; investing more in capacity building; more communication with partners. Two partners and MRGA identified the lack of resources and funding as stumbling blocks in facilitating activities. AICM needed more funding to mobilise staff to reach their Batwa areas regularly; MRGA to allow them to travel to partners in other parts of the countries. BLG and WOPU wished that MRGA could have been more present in their areas and more regular in their communication MRGA added that they could have informed partners better on the concept of match-funding to ease the burden on lack of funds. MRGA identified that a periodic assessment of partner's capability to handle funds with due diligence could have eased reporting difficulties. AICM added that there was a need for Batwa representation in government.

The major change reported on the ground which changed MRGA's plan was a Tanzanian partner feeling harassed by Government and unable to implement Accountability Mechanisms. Other activity funding continued, and MRGA channeled some funds to a new partner in Uganda (Maragoli Community Association – MCA) which required urgent support.

Partners identified the following key things which helped to achieve project goals: community dialogue and sensitization meetings; role plays during trainings and workshops; legal empowerment activity that was followed by the Bursary; accountability mechanism and capacity building activities for partners which helped MRGA in assessing which partners will implement corresponding activities.

Non-IA3 Partners were asked about non-specific issues affecting IPs.

IP land rights. A key informant from Uganda Women's Effort to save Save Orphans (UWESO) in Uganda said that 'the environment has changed positively, mainly through enhanced awareness of the rights of IPs [but]... the Batwa of Uganda and Benet have not effectively accessed their full right to traditional ancestral land'. The Forest Peoples Programme (FPP) Coordinator Dr. Kidd, who has spent 20 years working on IP issues in Africa, added that the 'threats have broadened as the demand on land has increased. Ten years ago... [it was] focused on conservation but now this has been added to with the private sector (e.g. logging and oil palm in Congo Basin and oil and wind in Kenya) and continued competition for land from neighboring peoples. And whilst we have more policy in place

and in theory more recognition, (i.e. UNDRIP²⁰, FPIC²¹ etc) we are not seeing greater enjoyment of IP rights on the ground’.

On the Ogiek Victory. In contrast with IA3 partners, non-IA3 informants mostly knew about the Ogiek victory, with IP rights advocate Dr Kidd, exclaiming that the case was, ‘hugely motivating for other IPs in Africa as it provides a very rare and bright beacon of hope for the Ogiek and others. However, like the Endorois... it is yet unclear if this will provide motivation beyond the initial decision. For it to be fully motivational it would also have to be implemented on the ground’.

Findings: Timeline Exercise

Almost exclusively, partners only demonstrated knowledge about particular activities assigned to themselves by MRGA, with almost no expression of any activity completed by any other partner. This appears to be true for both existing and emerging partners.



Left photo, RAPHY's timeline exercise. Middle photo, RAPHY and paralegals. Right photo, RAPHY show good understanding of the role of paralegal.

Partner NGO's found it difficult to isolate and explain individual activities within IA3, and to differentiate them from their other work. Instead, they tended to indicate results.

Benet Lobby Group (BLG). BLG enumerated the following challenges during their IA3 implementation: funding was perceived as inadequate; project geographical scope was small; capacity building was limited to 3 staff members, and no Board members. They were nonetheless pleased to report positive results (M&E, mobilisation, awareness-raising, proposal-writing, local advocacy office assets, embrace of education) and attributed all of these to the IA3 programme.

BLG expressed that partnership with MRGA became apparent when MRGA needed to disburse funds prior to the conduct of an activity. They would not hear from MRGA again until another activity would need to be implemented. They suggested more constant contact and a more programmatic approach to develop their capacity as emerging partners. Greater flexibility of funding, which is not entirely activity based, might usefully be implemented.

²⁰ <https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/declaration-on-the-rights-of-indigenous-peoples.html>

²¹ <https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/publications/2016/10/free-prior-and-informed-consent-an-indigenous-peoples-right-and-a-good-practice-for-local-communities-fao/>

Ik Agenda for Development Initiative (IADI). For IADI, the IA3 Project has increased intra- and cross-country consciousness of IP issues. The Ik representatives overwhelmingly identified with the Batwa context. Of 19 marginalising experiences and responses expressed by AICM as being significant for the Batwa, the Ik shared 17 (the only two they did not share were “heavy child labour” and “obtaining job opportunities in UWA, NFA, MEMA and district councils”). In addition, the Ik highlighted their insecurity, mostly at the hands of neighboring peoples, with losing their land and being dictated to by NFA. The IADI timeline was more activity-oriented, showing a more nascent organisation compared to AICM’s more strategic timeline. IADI showed great interest in hosting exchanges with Batwa and/or Benet activists for cross-learning, and this could usefully be explored.

African International Christian Ministry (AICM) and IADI expressed similar sentiments to those of **WOPU** comparing the situation across borders: “We heard that in Rwanda, Batwa IPs are represented and listened to at all leadership levels”, but that “They cannot call themselves Batwa” or “They are called vulnerable groups”. Opportunity for partner cross-learning and strategizing is provided by a situation of diametrical opposition between the Governments in Uganda and in Rwanda, whose Government meets some practical needs of its IPs, but denies strategic needs. WOPU commented, “In Rwanda Batwa are not heard by leadership. If they were... it would be easy to advocate on human rights... The government... caters for all vulnerable people of which Batwa are just a small part”.

MRGA’s project coordinator commented that partner activities were consistent with the planned IA3 activities. Each country had been allocated 500 Euros (in YR1) and 1,000 euros (in each of YR2 & YR3) in small grants. Where there are 2 emerging partners like in Uganda, they had to equally share what is allocated to the country; 500 euros per emerging partner. The funds given to partners were audited at MRGA level, with an expectation that they would also show in any global audits. Significantly, WOPU elected to be audited for the first time, using a small sum from their coordination budget to hire an external auditor between 31st December 2016 to 31st December 2017.

Findings: Stakeholder Mapping

Key stakeholders. All partners placed the indigenous communities they represented as important and close to IA3 (or in the case of AICM assumed that they were synonymous with IA3).

MRG was seen as more important by emerging partners and to those focused solely on IPs.

Réseau des Associations Autochtones Pygmées (RAPY) from DRC showed MRG Kampala as unimportant but involved in more communication than the more important MRG London (shown as about 15 times bigger). Discussions showed a dissatisfaction from a perceived loss in status when ties to London were reduced. RAPY expressed contentment about with their relations with MRGA’s Felicien, but that in a structural and philosophical sense they wished to see a return to a modus operandi of 2008-11, perceived as more collaborative, and lamented MRGA staff turnover around the final days of IA2. MRGA explained that in IA2, the legal officer was in London, so DRC partners had more direct contact with London. In IA3, legal officers became regional-based. RAPY’s depiction of MRG was the exact opposite of their result for Government (very important at local level; unimportant at national level). Discussions showed the isolation of



BLG doing their stakeholder exercise, placing community at the centre of their stakeholder map.

DRC, in which Kampala-based staff and external evaluators²² are hired who are unable to travel to all programme countries (in this case DRC).

AICM in Uganda, a similarly long-term or Existing Partner, did not show any problem with loss of status, or access to MRGI in the (relatively nearby) Kampala, depicting one unified MRG as close to the centre of IA3.

WOPU's Stakeholder Map only showed paralegals (8 different names) and WOPU; in discussion, this reflected the Rwandan political context where ethnicity is taboo, WOPU's satisfaction with this part of the project, and a lack of understanding of its other elements. Further MRGA and IA3 recap/induction might address this gap.

There are differing results on the importance of government. Bigger and most sophisticated organisations (RAPY and AICM) or those whose members are involved in government (IADI) tended to show greater sophistication in their depiction of levels of government.



A strong contingency of women paralegals in Rwanda expressing their ideas of their definition of a paralegal using participatory tool, 'scoring'.

Rwanda paralegals see themselves as actors in the community and important; the impression was that being a paralegal was a proud status symbol and that they get respect from community. They claimed to be often consulted by community, particularly for husband-wife domestic issues, that their mediator role was being well used, and that local people are looking for their own solutions e.g. a husband who owned a plot and divorced his wife; the paralegal intervened and the wife received 50% of the land.

Paralegals and Lawyers. Understandably, lawyers and legal aid were only represented by organisations involved in the paralegal part of the project (AICM, FDAPID, RAPY and WOPU), however whether lawyers were seen as important (RAPY) or unimportant (FDAPID) they were distant from the heart of IA3. Further investigations with

MRGA showed that for Uganda, there was no local Ugandan lawyer on a retainer basis, and the previous legal officer based in Kampala did not appear – by the accounts of some partners and staff - to have made significant impact in outreach work. The key lawyer was therefore based in London, a situation which could be explained by her regional knowledge but which could not be expected to provide a sustainable model. The local contact made in Rwanda with Marie Louise Mukashema is very highly valued by WOPU and this might usefully be replicated. The evaluators found it surprising that the presence of an in-house MRG Rwanda-based human rights lawyer had not seemed to have led to practical benefits to partner; in fact, the Benets' residing memory of a visit to their area was hopes raised by land-based questions and dashed as no follow-up was experienced from MRGA. The issue remains a live one, with IA4 provision for the same case in year 2 and communities need to be advised of this fact.

Networking/partnership. Partners showed little evidence of networking with other national and international NGOs. In Stakeholder Maps, no partner mentioned any other partner from within IA3 and the only other NGO mentioned by name one other NGO (UOBDU). This is perceived to be a weakness in the part of the programme evaluated²³. Although slander, rumours and negative competition was seen as less prevalent than during the 2010

²² Felicien Balikunda has travel restrictions to Rwanda, which makes access to DRC more difficult and expensive; and external evaluator David Hampson who could not attain a timely DRC visa

²³ A former MRGI staff member felt that the same would not hold true in Kenya and Tanzania.

visit, there still does not appear to be a truly collaborative environment. Silo behaviour is perceived to be linked to a competitive NGO environment, with a need to encourage solidarity through cross-visits and inter-organisational placements.

MRGA. Interestingly, the main project coordinator included Ugandan stakeholders but not the other countries; this may be limited by his inability to travel to Rwanda, and only with great difficulty to DRC. He expressed that he focused on Uganda as this is where he operates. Closer to IA3 he has put the MRG partners, and beyond that, other organisations which shows his good understanding of the contextual environment of Uganda.

Logframe Scoring: Have Logframe outputs been completed?

The 13 outputs of the IA3 project (see Methodology) are found in the table below. Participants/key informants were asked to identify the extent of their confidence that these outputs have been completed. The table shows percentage scorings from partner and MRGA votes.

Table 1: Scoring on the question: “How confident are you that this output was achieved?”

#	Outputs as indicated in the IA3 Logframe	RAPY %	FDAPID %	WOPU %	IADI %	AICM %	MRGA %	BLG %	Ave %	Rank
1	Grants: 5 countries, emerging partners, test capacity skills	6	9	15	20	7	15	13	12	2
2	20 paralegal (re-training), 112 trained	23	39	26	34	24	20		24	1
3	6 paralegal bursaries: outputs from new learning (Y2)	0	0	20	0	12	5		5	10.5
4	3 HR violation cases (regional, international)	0	5	0	0	2			1	12
5	Legal support 4 cases	12	8	11	0	5	5		6	6.25
6	6 Capacity-building activities with partners	15	1	0	0	5	10	13	6	6.25
7	15 country-level meetings, 1 per year per country, 2 cross-country, Y2 & Y3 network meetings	0	15	0	0		20	23	8	5
8	1 Twitter/FB each country	0	0	0	0				0	13
9	3 Joint partner actions (obj 1/2/3)	7	11	0	10	5	5		5	10.5
10	5 national advocacy Y2 and Y3 (obj 1)	0	13	26	7	5	5	15	10	3
11	1 accountability mechanism tested each country	13	0	2	0	22	15	15	9	4
12	2 monitoring visits	9	0	0	29	2	5		6	6.25
13	3 partner-led monitoring to inform MRG staff	15	0	0	0	10		20	6	6.25

Colour Key

	0
	1-9%
	10-19%
	20-100%

From the voting exercise, participants and key informants had the greatest confidence that the following top 5 outputs were completed within IA3:

1. Paralegal training (and re-training)²⁴. An average score would be 8% (100% divided by 13 criteria). Confidence of 24% was expressed. RAPY commented that magistrates could usefully be invited, for their familiarization and collaboration with paralegals. If they had signed paralegals' certificates, they may be more favourable in supporting those same paralegals' handling of legal cases.
2. Small grants in 5 countries, to test the capacity and skills of emerging partners. Confidence of 12% was expressed.
3. 5 national advocacy outputs in Year 2 and Year 3. Confidence of 10% was expressed.
4. 1 accountability mechanism tested in each country. Confidence of 9% was expressed.

²⁴ All partners except BLG benefited from paralegal training. BLG declined to vote on this output.

5. 15 country-level, 1 per year per country, 2 cross-country, Year 2 & Year 3 network meetings. Confidence of 8% was expressed.

In discussions around this tool, **training of paralegals** was considered a significant success across every partner who benefited from this output in Rwanda, DRC and Uganda.

On the Logframe output, **‘1 grant per country per year for Emerging Partners to carry out small projects to test their emerging capacity and skills’**, emerging partners expressed high confidence. High morale was observed from emerging partners WOPU, IADI and BLG in relation to these grants; even with small amounts, they were pleased to have accomplished the expected outputs. Existing partner RAPH expressed strong reservations on the concept of emerging partners, some of which was rooted in a reported failure to consult RAPH in the process. This seems to be an example of where MRG can continue to improve its induction/recap, programme design and holding all partners accountable for co-operation, to reduce very natural competitive tendencies in favour of common work towards common objectives. Similarly, existing partner AICM in Uganda did not show marked co-operative tendencies, not showing relations with emerging partners in their timelines or stakeholder maps, and not being able to identify key evaluation informants in Kabale outside of their own structures. AICM’s Executive Director later indicated that AICM has supported several emerging IP CBOs including Action for Batwa Community Empowerment Group led by Kokunda Sylvia in Kanungu, and Basongora Group for Justice and Human Rights headed by Okaari a Musongora in Kasese. The evaluators requested additional informants from AICM without success, but were later advised that the District and Sub-county leadership would have been a key informant to give a positive appraisal of AICM’s work, and that a greater time allocation within AICM areas would have been useful.

Overall, the emerging partners showed greater enthusiasm for continued partnership with MRGA, showing satisfaction with low funding levels whilst expressing that with a larger amount they could make greater achievements towards needs. Established partners such as RAPH in DRC and AICM in Uganda were less supportive of the competition provided by emerging partnerships and the perceived sharing out of small amounts of money; in its to-be-welcomed paper on internal strengths and weaknesses, RAPH attributed lack of funds to be the cause of around half of its identified weaknesses²⁵.

Having an emerging partner in Rwanda was particularly valuable after YWCA, an existing partner of MRGA, decided to retract their partnership after completing the first of three years of IA3 project implementation. They found themselves over-committed to other projects and were unable to fulfil the agreement under IA3. Emerging partner WOPU was brought up to speed by training internal staff as paralegals along with their community counterparts, and eventually became ‘custodians’ to the paralegals of YWCA trained under the project. WOPU expressed eagerness for training and mentoring in organisational development, including financial management. The Coordinator has requested a volunteer to help with organisational development and management, and another to mentor the accountant on her professional skills.

MRGA found the distinctions of Existing, Emerging and now New Emerging Partners as helpful process in keeping MRGI risks low, and capacitating partners to a higher level for future opportunities.

²⁵ 12 out of 25, with others implied: “Auto-diagnostic dans RAPH” (Self-Evaluation of RAPH) p.1-2

The bottom 3 outputs as ranked by the participants are: 6 paralegal bursaries; outputs from new learning (Y2); 3 HR violations (regional, international) documented and; 1 Twitter/FB each country.

Paralegal bursaries were limited – for budgetary reasons - to two candidates in Uganda, and one in each of Rwanda, DRC and Tanzania, which may explain why this output was voted relatively unimportant by partners. One Bursary recipient commended the scheme and wished to see it expanded to other able candidates.

The completion of output, ‘three instances of documented minority and indigenous peoples’ human rights violations being taken to regional/ international mechanisms for action’ did not inspire great confidence amongst the partners. Surprisingly, even the internationally-recognised win of the Ogiek was not known by the partners, not even by Benet leaders and communities who are commonly believed to be from the same stock with only the Uganda-Kenya border separating them. Only two people interviewed – Donatien Munyali of RAPHY and Epiphane Kaniza of WOPU - knew about this case, after prompting by the evaluators. MRGA and partners have identified that the social media aspect of IA3, particularly creating twitter/FB account per country received the least votes and has not been fully implemented. This was explained comprehensively to Ireland Aid in the 28 September 2017 Final report for Year 2. In this evaluation, respondents expressed that the high cost and lack of internet access limited partners and potential supporters from engaging in social media activity. In Uganda, in a seemingly political move to stem dissent, the government has recently imposed tax on the use of all social media platforms, contributing to further stemming of social media usage.

MRGA explained further that a 0 vote on social media on their part does not mean nothing has been done. For example, FB/Twitter wasn’t rolled out fully because partners had difficulty accessing internet. Partners did not necessarily have gadgets such as smart phone, laptop or are in remote areas of the country without internet connection. Moreover, people may not necessarily have the skills to embrace this technology. In terms of MRGA fulfilling this task, only one [FB account](#) was created. The FB page appears to have been created almost two years after IA3 started. The low tally of 61²⁶ FB page Likes, and the lack of any activity for the past year²⁷ is perhaps an unnecessary abandoning of a site, which could be refreshed with a monthly post at little cost in effort. But overall, the explanation that FB/Twitter are de-prioritised appears valid and reasonable.

An example showing the success of social media when costs are covered is in the case of paralegals in Rwanda. All paralegals have phones with airtime bought for them with Irish Aid funds by WOPU and are involved in a WhatsApp group. Communities contact them by phone. Marie Louise Mukashema was identified as a responsive lawyer whom they can contact and who will go to the community as necessary. They meet five times a year, rotating the towns. Initially, meetings are in government offices (“inteko z’abaturationge”, and then in community work offices “Umuganda”) and then in homes (meetings of mothers and fathers called the sibom meeting and another called umugoroba w’ababeyi).

Logframe Findings: How should the programme develop in the future?

²⁶ Number of ‘likes’ at the time of writing.

²⁷ For comparison, https://www.facebook.com/southkordofanconsortium/?fb_dtsg_ag=Adz5zJCbIP3x7AKdFrXBxal7G0BU7-IWuDalJpwl-Qn-sw%3AAAdwds5jcup3ui92V_oq51QKXfezCoRcvGM7nANwCcSC1UA was set up in a 3-month period by the evaluators in Sudan. It has 555 likes and a 10,000+ Reach through the occasional post

Table 2: Scoring on the question: What would be the most important/your future priorities from the Logframe

#	Output	RAPY %	FDAPID %	WOPU %	AICM %	IADI %	BLG %	MRGA %	RANK
1	5 countries, emerging partners, test capacity skills	0	15	7	0	0	0	15	9
2	20 paralegal (re-training), 112 trained	12	26	24	20	35	10	15	1
3	6 paralegal bursaries: activities from new learning (Y2)	16	20	12	0	17	13	5	3
4	3 HR violations (regional, international)	16	0	2	8	0	15	5	5.5
5	Legal support 4 cases	9	11	5	0	0	10	10	7.5
6	6 Cap-building with partners	13	0	5	0	12	5	10	7.5
7	15 country-level, 1 per year per country, 2 cross-country, Y2 & Y3 network meetings	0	0	0	8	0	3	10	12
8	1 Twitter/FB each country	9	0	0	8	0	15	0	11
9	3 Joint partner actions (obj 1/2/3)	4	0	5	25	0		0	10
10	5 national advocacy Y2 and Y3 (obj 1)	4	26	5	20	22	10	15	2
11	1 accountability mechanism tested each country	0	2	22	13	0		10	5.5
12	2 monitoring visits	1	0	2	0	0	10	5	13
13	3 partner-led monitoring to inform MRG staff	15	0	10	0	15	8	0	4

Colour Key

	0
	1-9%
	10-19%
	20-100%

MRG's Paralegal training came out as the most desired and important activity for future endeavor, with BLG, an Emerging Partner asking to be included in future.

The next 5 highest-ranked activities were for continuing advocacy, bursaries, partner-led monitoring, accountability and taking on cases of human rights violations.

The bottom three activities were: 2 monitoring visits (unsurprisingly rated much lower than partner-led monitoring); 15 country-level network meetings and; 1 Twitter/FB each country. Most partners had not seen these implemented – or as an MRG staff member commented, they may not have labelled network meetings as such - and do not assess them as making relatively important impact.

NB: All of these results – and indeed the evaluation itself - need to be seen through the filter of who is participating. As stated in “Scope” only three of the five countries were covered. As one extreme example regarding the mid-ranking scoring for litigation, the 3 main partners with whom MRG litigates (PWC, EWC and OPDP) were therefore not covered, accentuated by the fact that the partner with whom MRG litigates in DRC is ERND, not RAPY. This report is therefore, by design, light on litigation and Kenya/Tanzania, upon which was the MTE focused. The findings on litigation are therefore unsurprising, but they add another example towards conclusions elsewhere that more focus could usefully be put on effective networking and lesson-sharing.

Scoring on Expected Results/Outcomes:

The IA3 project has two expected results/outcomes indicated in the Logframe:

1. The voices of marginalised groups in East and Central Africa are strengthened to advocate for their communities' human rights and;

2. Marginalised groups in East and Central Africa are able to hold decision-makers accountable for actions to address discrimination and in their role as duty bearers to progressively eliminate discrimination.

Partners and informants were asked to vote on these in terms of how the programme should develop in the future. The table shows percentage scorings from partner and MRGA votes.

Table 3: To what extent are the following important (from the Logframe)?

		RAPY %	FDAPID %	WOPU %	IADI %	BLG %	AICM %	Average: Partners	MRGA %	Average: Partners and MRGA
1	To make IP voices stronger	60	88	69	53	70	50	65%	60	63%
2	To keep decision makers accountable	40	12	31	47	30	50	35%	40	38%

Colour Key

	0-25%
	26-50%
	51-75%
	76-100%

Both partners and MRGA showed strong and almost identical preference for strengthening IP voices to advocate for communities' human rights over the pursuit of decision-makers' accountability²⁸. There is a strong understanding that well-organised and aware communities are better able to keep decision makers accountable. There was an appreciation that these two elements are inter-twined. Our supposition – backed up by interviews with some informants – is that partners see strengthening of IP voices as more feasible with what they see as small amounts of money. Keeping the powerful accountable is more difficult, more dangerous, but ultimately a key component of genuine sustainable political change. On further questioning, it was found that MRGA has not yet engaged with some of the powerful encroachers on IP rights, such as the UWA and the NFA, and that partner engagement is sporadic and almost spasmodic rather than planned as part of a strategic process. The particularly delicate context of Rwanda for legal and capacity work is touched upon on page 13.

Although limited in scope, Accountability mechanisms such as Community Score Cards, social audits, voluntary accountability teams²⁹ and participatory processes for developing social accountability tools³⁰ were highly valued by those partners involved. **Expected tangible results such as** increased community driven demand for improved services, community involvement in governance and greater transparency around public funds particularly in education and health sectors appeared to have been met; AICM reported frictions due to sudden demand on authorities, which may have caused some difficulties but which can also be seen as welcoming signs of life, creating teething problems.

Both emerging and existing partners would like to engage in meaningful dialogues which can eventually lead to joint management of forest lands and resources potentially benefiting all stakeholders.

Findings: Log frame Objectives

²⁸ Although an FDAPID staff member contested the 12% rating by his organisations' participants as "low", describing Accountability as a key element of FDAPID's work in protecting and promoting the rights of Batwa.

²⁹ Amongst the Batwa of SW Uganda via AICM

³⁰ Amongst the Ogiek of Kenya via OPDP

Three objectives³¹ of the IA3 project were voted upon (in terms of importance), with results shown as percentage votes of the partners and MRGA.

Table 4: What would be most important/your future Objectives from the Logframe?

		RAPY %	FDAPID %	WOPU ³²	IADI %	BLG %	AICM %	Average Partners	MRGA %	Average Partners and MRGA
1	Advocacy	24	42		37	100	59	52	43	48
2	Para-legalism	47	46		39	0	39	34	43	39
3	Litigation	27	11		21	0	0	12	13	12

Colour Key

	0-25
	26-50%
	51-75%
	76-100%

Partners have tended to vote for objectives with which they have been directly involved (e.g. DRC partners for para-legalism, and Uganda partners for Advocacy). These differences may also be partly explained by contextual difference on advocacy; even from the remote Ik communities, it might be easier to access power-holders in Kampala than for Kivu partners to access the very-distant Kinshasa.

Overall, in the far-right, “Average” column, Advocacy is clearly seen as the most important objective. A skewing-factor is clearly that BLG voted 100% Advocacy (in which they were involved) and 0% Para-legalism (in which they were not and of which they may not have a strong grasp of the potential. If they had voted equally for the top two-ranked categories – 50% Advocacy, 50% Para-legalism – the two would have been almost identical overall).

Litigation was understandably voted the lowest in the three countries visited as this specific Objective was mainly in Kenya and Tanzania, with a (non-IA3) DRC partner not covered in this evaluation; additionally, partners did not know about the successful landmark cases of the Endorois and Ogiek.

Findings: Log frame Objectives and Evaluation / Checks on understanding.

Evaluators initially found the organisation of meetings and schedules frustrating and slow; they had to take a lead in guessing at a relevant itinerary in areas and with some partners new to them, instead of MRGA taking the lead. Partners then tended to be late in confirming or provided contacts late, or not at all, or to declare themselves unavailable due to other priorities, or changed schedules three or four times involving evaluators in hours of extra travel or proposed bloated budgets for meetings. Evaluators wanted to check whether Mid-Term and Final Evaluations were regarded theoretically as unimportantly as they seemed to be in practice, or whether they were theoretically perceived as learning opportunities.

³¹ (1) To enable partner organisations to create and effectively utilise advocacy opportunities, individually and collectively, to represent their communities’ interests. (2) To build essential legal/ paralegal knowledge and skills among community representatives that are then used to benefit community members experiencing rights abuses. (3) To develop pilot accountability mechanisms to collect and channel feedback to decision makers from minority communities. (4) To pursue litigation to address violations of the rights of minorities and indigenous peoples. As explained in Methodology, only three have been considered by partners in the voting; ‘accountability’ was not considered by partners as it was only AICM in Uganda who participated in this process.

For any future undertaking, partners and MRGA voted Advocacy to the top spot of the Objective Logframe. Participants expressed that to ensure effective advocacy, para-legalism should be maintained and strengthened

Table 5: What would be most important, adding Evaluations to Objectives?

	RAPY %	FDAPID %	WOPU (not done) ³³	IADI %	BLG %	AICM %	Average Partners	MRGA %	Ave. Partners + MRGA
Advocacy	20	39		32	60	50	40	35	38
Para-legalism	40	43		33	0	33	28	35	32
Evaluations	18	8		17	40	17	24	20	22
Litigation	23	10		18	0	0	10	10	10

Colour Key

	0-9
	10-19%
	20-39%
	40-100%

Evaluation appeared to be appreciated by the participants; from all partners, the results came back as surprisingly high³⁴ almost at an average score with Objectives. Qualitative comments suggested that regular evaluations give the project sense of direction and guidance, and partner involvement in planning was seen as the preferable model. MRGA adding to these with qualitative comments about enjoying the use of the participatory tools.

Partners appear to plan face-to-face at the last minute; a more extensive recap/induction to MRG might usefully cover ways of working and programmatic cultural norms.

Checks on understanding:

The “role of a paralegal”: Paralegals in groups and individually were asked to brainstorm this. Paralegals showed pride in their role; “Being a paralegal is a proud status symbol and we get respect from community”, said Pacifique Uwamahoro. They also showed good understanding of a paralegal’s role conceptually and in their respective communities. Appendix D shows a list of answers shared by participants when asked to define a paralegal. The paralegals gave almost identical definitions of a paralegal; as one “who fights for human rights and one who has knowledge of the law”. Other definitions included the ‘link between community and lawyer’ sometimes serving as ‘advisor’ and ‘mediator’ of issues in communities. Appendix D shows a list of paralegal tasks as defined by participants. Key success stories offered by paralegals as evidence of their work included assisting fellow IPs in reporting SGBV to police and documenting evidence; conflict resolution processes amongst community members involved in domestic problems; and acting

Table 6: In the context of IA3, what is good capacity building? Responses from FDAPID

- 37%, Support, follow-up, communication, solar panels, transport to Paralegals
- 28%, Training and connections for Fundraising
- 18%, Logistical support e.g. vehicles (“MRG could contact MIVA”)
- 7%, Reporting support (“FDAPID, RAPY, WOPU could report together”)
- 5%, Support with work strategy (to consolidate approaches)
- 4%, Advocacy techniques, international mechanisms, training
- 0%, Financial management (“0% pre-financing rule could exclude some NGOs”)

³³ This exercise was not done with WOPU hence showing no result.

³⁴ With the caveats, of course, that (i) participants could feel it diplomatic to score evaluations as high, even though they were not scoring the evaluators themselves (ii) participants may not have prioritised evaluations highly before they experienced the participatory tools in use





as local advisors to fellow IPs on any issue in the community, e.g. domestic violence and land sharing in divorce cases.

“What is capacity building?”: Once it was clear to evaluators that paralegals and partners had a good understanding of their role, they checked the understanding of FDAPID (DRC) on capacity building, using brainstorming to elicit the criteria, and then participants scoring them using 20 stones each. The results are shown on the text box to the right.

Once again, the importance of paralegal activity, a feeling of inadequate funding, and a wish of Emerging Partners to collaborate came out strongly. And as in para-legalism, there appeared to be good understanding of the possibilities of capacity building.

Focus Group Discussions

Table 7: Smiley Accountability Tool

Questions asked to the community members				
How do you feel about your land situation?	62%	20%	9%	9%
How do you feel about living in this community/village	9%	38%	38%	15%
How do you feel about your knowledge of human rights and access to them?	4%	45%	32%	20%
How do you feel about the NGO assisting you? (IA3)	0	4%	44%	53%
How do you feel about the government?	53%	29%	15%	4%

Colour Key

	0
	1-19%
	20-49%
	50-100%

Land: Around 62% of the IPs feel angry about their land situation. In Rwanda, two Batwa communities in Butaro have each been provided relocation areas by the government but the people are not happy because they do not have land to cultivate. Similarly, the Batwa in Uganda are not pleased with the settlement area (provided by AICM) because their allocated land is only enough for the small hut per household but they do not have a portion of land to cultivate. The Benets are generally angry because of the ongoing dispute over land demarcation and largely due to being pushed out of the forest, one stating, “we have become a refugee in our own land”. The Ik said that they are subject to constant raids of all resources (harvests, and cattle when they have them) by Turkana, Dodoth and others, and also to threat by the National Forest Authority (NFA) and Ministry of Land whose boundaries were said to frequently shift. This result led the evaluators to use KIIs to investigate partner practice in buying and allocating land, particularly for the IPs. This may not be the ultimate dream of many Benet - male Benet informant Chebet Mungech said “You ask every Benet woman where they want to live, they say, “kaa” (meaning their forest home)!” – but it may be the most feasible in the short or medium-term. In Bikuto, the BDP (Batwa Development Program) have purchased various land over the last 15 years, retaining title for themselves, and allocating it to Batwa families, who are not allowed to sell it. AICM have allocated in the same way. Yet when information was triangulated to explore the potential of partners to issue leaseholds – and for MRG to advocate that they do so - multiple KIIs at all levels confirmed that the only conceivable impediment to this would be if the NGO needed the

security of being able to sell land to endure short-term financial troubles. This appears a weak justification; quick sales would not generate very significant revenue and would have severe reputational consequences. The terms of such leases could include a prohibition on selling to other ethnic groups and could also be relatively short at 20-30 years, thus encouraging Batwa development of the land. Paralegal Sylvia Kokunda, confirmed that the lack of security provided by NGOs was an ongoing concern “They know that the Batwa could sell off the land, so that we do not become squatters on other people’s land... they are protecting the land and saying “use it any way you want... It is kind of annoying, even though we have been able to use the land for agriculture and settlement. But there is another organisation called Bwindi Mgahinga Conservation Trust (BMCT)³⁵ – they give leases of 25 years. The Batwa then feel that the land is theirs ... they can even sell the leasehold to other Batwa...”



The Batwa community in Kinyarushengye, Uganda express their answers to a set of questions asked by the evaluator in a participatory exercise called ‘Smileys’. They expressed their answers by placing a stone inside a box indicating the following emotions: happy; partly happy, partly unhappy or; angry.

Settlement: In terms of living in their settlement villages/communities, 38% are sad and another 38% are somewhat happy. Their lack of satisfaction is attributed to the fact that they do not have an area of land to cultivate for their source of food. Satisfaction in Uganda is provided by their sense of community. In two N. Rwandan Batwa communities relocated by government into homes in “Bantu” communities seemed largely happy with the programme and their progress including enrolment of children into schools. A contrast was drawn between these homes and the photographs of pitiful shacks noted in [Batwa GBV Hampson 2010](#). Subsidies towards direct support (including food for the five most vulnerable people), *Gira Inka* (“one cow per person”) and access to health care, may blunt the rights agenda. They did not own land, but Government claimed to be looking for outside help to purchase land (e.g. with Red Cross funds). Requests were for training and involvement. One female Mutwa informant in

Uganda commented “I hope that Batwa would know how to read and write. And hopefully a Mutwa can be the one to translate in future meetings, like this one”. The above provision of practical rights contrasted with little provision in Uganda, although it may not be a representative picture of Batwa communities in Rwanda.

Human Rights: People responded positively on their knowledge of human rights but around 45% expressed sadness because their main issue of land rights remains unclear to them. This provides potential for MRG, in collaboration with other partners, to continue conscientising communities on issues of basic practical and strategic rights, as part of a strategic approach to advocacy.

NGOs: People had a resounding positive response towards the NGO assisting them – and by extension IA3 - with 53% expressing extremely happy with the contact they get from NGO. They are happy because the NGOs have been helping them understand about human rights, educating people about basic human rights and how to deal with them through community paralegals.

Government: On the contrary, 53% of the people feel angry towards the government and a further 29% showed sad feelings towards the government because of its minimal presence and assistance (with an exception amongst

³⁵ BMCT operates in South-western Uganda mostly in Kanungu District.

Ik women, who appreciated Ugandan Government interventions in livelihoods, including coffee land, and the eventual creation of “Ikland” as an area within which Ik people could elect their own leaders).

Focus Group Discussions used the above tool not only quantitatively but to elicit quotations and findings which are scattered throughout this report. An example of one FGD’s output – the Batwa of Uganda and Rwanda - is included as Appendix F.

Other Opportunities as Defined by Key Informants:

In Uganda, a number of non-IA3 partners of MRGA were interviewed in the capital city to get further perspectives on the role of MRGA in relation to IP concerns in the country. The following organisations were interviewed: Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC); Community Development Resource Network (CDRN); Human Rights Network Uganda (HURINET) and: The Cross-Cultural Foundation of Uganda (CCFU). In addition, a telephone interview was done with Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA).

The above partners gave positive views about MRGA’s role on IP concerns. CDRN executive director commended on the unique position of MRGA, well-placed to be working on IP rights. However, he added that, “MRGA needs to have more bolder presence, in terms of providing leadership on IP concerns... For instance, engaging with UWA... We need MRGA to have a stronger presence as a principal champion for minorities... presence that galvanises us... we would like to see MRGA with a bolder voice and bolder resources.” CCFU stressed the significance of a stronger advocacy campaign, which is not a cheap undertaking. One opportunity is the ratification of the convention of IPs. The country does not have a clear definition of IPs. Everyone claims to be an IP in Uganda. Hence, there is a need to ratify the convention of IPs as it sets obligation upon the state to protect IPs. EOC on the other hand, highlighted the positive and growing partnership with MRGA through the IMG Coalition. Through this coalition, EOC and MRGA made great progress in highlighting IP concerns in Uganda including the celebration of “IP Day 2017” (a first in Uganda) and the joint fact-finding mission to establish the authenticity of Maragolis as an IP group in Uganda. EOC also highlighted their tribunal function which should be maximised by marginalised groups. EOC claims to resolve and decide on an issue within 3 months, an opportunity for IP communities to bring their concerns for resolution. HURINET commends the presence of MRGA in the network. MRGA heads the IP cluster and the issues they put forward were compiled for an advocacy paper presented to the African Commission.

UWA Representation. In Uganda, one of the key government stakeholders in the land rights issues of IPs is the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA). None of the IA3 partners or communities, including MRGA, seem to have had any direct contact/engagement with UWA. The evaluators took the initiative to use personal connections and reach out to UWA’s head, Sam Mwandha, who claimed that the government was concerned about the plight of IPs displaced by conservation areas: “[They] deserve a certain degree of development like access to health, education and other basic social services... Allowing people to remain in forests will deprive them access to basic social services”. He cited the case of the Benets who he said were given 6000 hectares of land from the Mt. Elgon national park; some were apparently cheated of this and some sold the land to private individuals. A further 2,500 hectares was apparently allocated to the Benets but the problem is that the land was never degazetted.³⁶ UWA was reportedly open to engaging with any group supporting conservation including IPs who have been displaced as a result of conservation efforts in the ‘90s. See Appendix H for the full transcript.

³⁶ Degazettement³⁶ is defined as a loss of legal protection for an entire national park or other protected area. (Wikipedia)

In Rwanda, legal aid is expensive according to human rights lawyer and IP advocate Marie Louise Mukashema, but on the positive side, there is a national legal aid policy which recognizes paralegals. Mukashema worked with the paralegals throughout IA3 and recognized that they need further capacity building. She added, “The laws in Rwanda keep changing. The paralegals need refreshers.” She also wants paralegals to look at the Abunzi system. Abunzi is a traditional system of resolving land disputes, a legally-organised and recognized reconciliation process, and an opportunity for paralegal involvement. Marie Louise added, “I encourage the paralegals to be part of Abunzi. They get elected and they will have a 7-year mandate. The paralegals are well placed and well trained to explore this opportunity. Moreover, when you are a woman in Rwanda, you are well-recognised.”

Conclusions, against the Terms of Reference at Output Level

1. Have we completed all of the activities as planned and... has this been to a reasonably high quality?

There is strong evidence of activity completion – or justified and reported reasons for non- or semi-completion, such as Facebook/Twitter accounts – in the findings of IA3 pre-visit questionnaires, IA3 reporting, Key Informant interviews at MRG, and MRGA project coordinator’s Logframe scoring. Activities were overwhelmingly completed or exceeded. Satisfaction was shown at community level in the Smileys Tool where 53% were extremely happy and 44% somewhat happy with the way implementing NGO dealt with communities. Partners’ own recollections of activity completion was weak, both in their Timelines and Logframe scoring. There was not a clear demarcation evident between their activities with other donors, and their activities within IA3. Although this is common within NGO culture worldwide, it leaves room for potential improvement.

2. What problems have been encountered at this level?

Problems with **Facebook/Twitter** are recorded under Findings. Other problems were partner dissatisfaction with the **programme scope**: “The coverage was not good. Most of the areas in the community was not covered”. In **efficiency/willingness** in conducting activities, some partners expressed that other partners were not willing to attend meetings; similarly, evaluators felt that some of their early visit arrangements by MRGA and some partners were last-minute and inefficient, resulting in some visits being missed³⁷ (this improved markedly, and to a high standard, after face-to-face meetings, particularly with MRGA). In terms of **capacity-building needs**, some training activities were requested and budgeted, but match-funding requirements led to postponements. MRGA conceded there was no initial meeting held in terms of identifying new partners. And when partners were identified, some were not willing/able to contribute **match-funding**, which MRGA concedes it needs to more fully explain and help in a process which proves particularly difficult for partners in terms of legal aid (e.g. in Uganda, there is no known national legal aid programme to support minorities). It thus proves difficult for communities and partners to access justice, with the possibilities greatly increased where local lawyers are engaged. MRGA also self-identified that inclusive participative **programme design** was lacking and reported that it had employed a more acceptable process in IA4. On the **financial management** side of the project, adequate audit and financial reports were not always submitted on time to MRGA, whose staff reported that partners frequently miss out attaching supporting documents (expense receipts) on their financial reports. Fund transfers were often delayed from MRGA to partners due to overwhelming tasks (both at MRGA and partner levels). MRG has usefully extended its two-tier system

³⁷ As examples, AICM’s changing of schedules meant that evaluators only conducted Kanungu-based research over the phone; evaluators needed to play an executive role in organising their itinerary in areas and with partners new to them.

(emerging and existing partners) to a 3-tier system of new-emerging, emerging and existing partners. However, greater **flexibility of funding**, which is not entirely activity based should be implemented, as per partner requests.

3. How did changes on the ground in Uganda, DRC and Rwanda and internationally affect our plans and was our reaction and changes to plans appropriate and timely?

The coalition on Indigenous Minority Groups (IMG Coalition) has certainly paved ways in forging effective networking and partnerships towards addressing IP issues. One of the main offshoots of the partnership is MRGA's recommendation to include the Maragoli indigenous peoples' group which had never before been documented in the history of Uganda. A joint fact-finding mission was conducted to verify MRGA's recommendation and the government's Equal Opportunities Commission and the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development facilitated a process to include the Maragoli in Uganda's list of IPs of Uganda at the Equal Opportunities Commission.

The Batwa community have started to integrate women's rights in their community agenda. Batwa women are reported to be seen as a more important unit of Batwa communities. Abuses are being reported and paralegals are prominently supporting the cause of women. Batwa individuals have also started to make ground in local governance. Seven Batwa individuals (see Appendix G for full list) were elected in LC 1 positions in the Batwa communities covered by AICM.

Some partners – OPDP and others – did manage to raise match-funds for the activities committed in the project, but others did not, partly because of delays in the donor signing contracts. The consequence of this was a reduction in activities or postponing these activities due to lack of funds.

4. How did we anticipate and/or respond to developments in the legal cases being litigated and implemented in (Kenya, Tanzania and) DRC, and was this effective and appropriate?

There has been no development on the DRC case after the Progress Report: "A new case in DRC commenced in November 2015 (Year 1 of the project) against the Government of DRC before the ACHPR on behalf of the Batwa of Kahuzi-Biega National Park, who were evicted in the 1970s from their ancestral home without compensation or consultation. Admissibility submissions were lodged in Year 1 and we were promised an admissibility decision in Year 2, but the Commission has repeatedly delayed this due to workload issues. We have consistently requested a decision be delivered as soon as possible. When it comes to a possible new case in Uganda, we are currently looking at the possibility of supporting the Benet community. Further work (i.e. analysis & investigation) on this potential case is expected to happen in Year 3." A provision for the same case is proposed for IA4.

KIIs indicated support for litigation, and an understanding that this is a long, slow process. Confidence was expressed by interviewees within and outside IA3 that indigenous land rights issues are gaining ground, even in an unfavourable global environment of closing borders and profit maximisation, and that the link to environmental stewardship by IPs – expressed in the Mid-Term Evaluation - was a strong one.

There was a pronounced lack of knowledge – and sometimes interest – in what other IA3 partners were achieving, the Ogiek landmark victory being the most poignant example. Despite hugely successful attempts by MRGI to achieve widespread media coverage for the Ogiek case, partners interviewed remain relatively unaware of this victory, and communities even more so. This does not necessarily mean that the messages were not sent, but suggests that they have not been retained.

5. How have any problems affected the activities and to what extent have they been overcome?

Demand for more dialogues on community issues have increased but the project did not have funds to facilitate additional dialogues. The partners had to build good relations with the stakeholders so that previously-raised issues were not forgotten. Implementing partners established solid coordination with other stakeholders to continue contact.

MRGA postponed some activities to the following year due to lack of matching funds to support full activity implementation.

The increase in human rights information amongst Batwa community, particularly in Kabale, Uganda, also led to increased complaints from the Batwa community. AICM in particular had to empower the paralegals (who are Batwa themselves) to be independent in dealing with such problems and less reliant upon AICM.

MRGA resolved the issue on timely financial report submission internally by doing a pre-audit for 9 months (January to September) in the month of November and the last 3 months (October to December) in January of the following year. This practice has had a good impact on partners who had to follow a similar pattern and has significantly improved the audit performance of partners.

Conclusions, against the Terms of Reference, at Outcome level

The **expected Outcomes of IA3 were:** (1) The voices of marginalised groups in East and Central Africa are strengthened to advocate for their communities' human rights. (2) Marginalised groups in East and Central Africa are able to hold decision-makers accountable for actions to address discrimination

1. Where completed as planned, have activities contributed to the planned results or do they show potential to do so?

In particular, the formation of paralegal presence within communities has had a powerful impact on advocacy potential and on accountability. Evaluator observation showed dramatic improvement of potential between his visits of 2010 – when communities were fully able to engage in providing data but almost entirely unable to offer solutions – and those of 2018 where he met articulate, engaged paralegals with a clear understanding of their role and visibly and audibly appreciated by their communities. Sylvia Kokunda of BDP stated “Before we had paralegal training, the Batwa did not know how to fight for their rights, people could violate and insult them. Now we go to the community, talk to them, resolve issues, get results”. Batwa paralegal Robert Ngabirano added “We asked for and got a meeting with the Prime Minister, and we learned where decisions are made in Government; we go back to the PM, and also to the Equal Opportunities Commission and the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development”.³⁸

The term “advocacy” appears to be used loosely, however, and these meetings appear to be sometimes spontaneous and sporadic.

³⁸ AICM with support from MRG Africa organised the meeting with the Equal Opportunities Commission and the Ministry of Labour & Social Development.

Potential for future positive inter-partner collaboration is shown by IADI interest in hosting/cross-learning with Batwa and/or Benet activists, and the shared AICM-IADI-WOPU understanding of how Governments meet IPs' practical and strategic differently in Rwanda and Uganda, with scope for mutual strategizing of IA3 partners.

2. If there have been any unplanned results (positive or negative) explain what these were and how they came about.

Direct un-mediated contact between paralegals and their organisations with such high levels of government had not been anticipated but came about through spontaneous expressions of confidence and belief which would have seemed naïve before the consequences were shown to be successful. Partners took more responsibility than had been envisaged; for example, WOPU in Rwanda developed from an emerging to an existing partner role in fully taking over activities from YWCA; AICM in Uganda delivered the logistics for Year Two's regional event, bringing together participants from all 5 target countries. The Maragoli Community were never part of the plan. However, once they were co-opted as participants in the National Policy Dialogue and later became a potential new emerging partner, they have witnessed greater publicity of their issue. This has included an investigative inquiry into their issue of being denied national identification documents (and therefore recognition as citizens). The binding recommendations from the inquiry have triggered more actions towards a constitution amendment to their legal recognition as citizens of Uganda.

3. Have partners participating in the project shown improvement in their capacity to advocate for the rights of minorities (see also Conclusion "Where completed as planned...", two questions above):

The capacity strengthening of emerging partners has also produced dramatic exemplary results. After community discussions in villages, John Mark Lomeri of IADI reported "I went with 8 Iks³⁹ to Kisoro, to make the complaint, "Why are we not included in National Development Plans?" Imagine what we got.... A week later we went and signed a document with Government representatives, UWA, and the National Forest Authority".

MRGA might usefully broker such connections where partners are unable to make the links, or where they believe that guidance would be useful. This might result in meaningful dialogues with some of the most powerful encroachers (e.g. in Uganda, the UWA and the NFA) which could increase the possibilities of some future joint management of forest lands and resources potentially benefiting all stakeholders.

4. How have they used their enhanced capacity to support minorities in communities claim their rights or address leaders on minority rights issues?

Paralegals' work is shown as Appendix D.

In Rwanda, paralegals in Nyagatare, Muhanga and Gatsibo acted as mediators to domestic disputes within Batwa and non-Batwa communities. In Batwa communities in Butaro, N. Rwanda, they played a strong role as educators to Batwa settlements in Mulindi and Nyamicucu in sharing information about basic human rights and the rights of vulnerable people. Paralegals were also instrumental in bridging communication between the northern Butaro government to engage directly with the Batwa. In fact, in one of the field visits of the evaluator⁴⁰, the Head of

³⁹ This was amongst different IP representatives, not only Iks, who met in June 2018 and drafted a document (Kisoro Memorandum) which was submitted to government.

⁴⁰ Ava Batay-an

Social Affairs for Butaro participated all throughout the meeting where the Batwa openly expressed their needs “under trees” in the presence of the officer.

In Uganda, Batwa paralegals around Kabale claimed to have strengthened Batwa rights to be paid the same amount – 5,000 shillings per day for men - for manual labour as their Mukiga (non-Batwa) neighbours; this was certainly an exception in the evaluator’s last visit in 2010 but now seems to be the norm. This is attributed particularly to successful advocacy work through local radio stations. Women are paid the same amount as men for cultivation, but 4,000 shillings for manual work “because they have less energy... this will change, it will happen one day that they will be paid the same”⁴¹.

The IPs visited – Ik, Benet and Batwa - have all requested and been granted meetings with powerful stakeholders, e.g. the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM), the Equal Opportunities Commission, the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, UWA and the NRA, and all local administrative levels from LC1 to LC5.

5. Although it may still be too early to be able to see clear impacts of the work at this time, do partners or beneficiaries report any changes/improvements because of the project? II

There was no shortage of observations by partners attributing increase in confidence and access to the IA3 project. John Lokwee and John Mark Lomeri of IADI said: “we want to appreciate the... times you have brought... taxpayers’ money over here... [our] role is to amplify the Ik voice related to Government, and these discussions under trees can get things moving... The Ik of yesterday were throwing in the towel, but they have moved a long way... the situation of the Ik is far better than it used to be... The Ik see a bigger future!... When we appeared at leaders [meetings], they did not know what to do, how to talk, make reports... now they do... the LC1⁴² also know...” This confidence and articulation are shown elsewhere in this report, under Focus Group Discussions on Human Rights, and an Ik advocacy delegation to Kisoro, leading to signed agreements with Government”. We say ‘We were flushed out’ (just as the Benet were flushed out of Elgon) ... ‘are we not Ugandans who are voting for you?’ Such forums... are the success stories... “.

AICM’s Amos said “There was a Mutwa on the radio this morning, saying “Why is the Government keeping quiet about this epidemic? Why is there no medicine?”

The Smileys tool shows that communities also have limited satisfaction in their growing understanding of their human rights, albeit with potential for learning more, as demonstrated by an exchange between three women in an FGD in Ikland: “We women have the right to own property, to freedom of expression, to our own Ik language – not like before - to life. We have a basic knowledge”. “We have little knowledge! We have encroachment and insecurity! Everyone is supposed to be free from man-made problems” “We don’t know about human rights... why don’t you say that honestly? We need to be taught!”

6. In DRC, Rwanda and Uganda, to what extent have the paralegal refresher trainings enhanced knowledge and how are the trainings being used in practice on the ground, and could they be improved?

⁴¹ Paralegal, Robert Ngabirano

⁴² Local Council 1, the lowest level of local administration

RAPY in DRC claimed to have participated in three paralegal trainings, each of two days, but not yet in refresher training, apart from one delegate to a Goma workshop on 23 January 2018. However, it was not this but the inability to follow through for lack of funds or contacts which was RAPH's main complaint. They claim to have 30 documented legal cases, "One was of a Mutwa who went into the forest to collect plants for medicine. His son was killed; he was shot in the shoulder. We had documentary proof but there was no follow up. The story did not arrive to MRG London, only Kampala; that was the problem." This is a misunderstanding based on a communication gap; MRGA pointed out that it worked with other partners – not RAPH - on the case, and shared [Press Release](#). Another case involved the burning by "Bantu" of 27 Batwa homes; they scattered and have not returned, some of the girls have become sex workers." In DRC, as in Uganda, there could usefully be a closer engagement and fuller service from "human rights lawyers [who are] restricted only for sexual violence". Another case is shown in the text box.

Aline, a female paralegal, stated "I had a case of a 16-year-old Batwa girl. "Her non-Mutwa fiancé got her pregnant, denied it, and didn't want to marry her. She banged on his door; at first, he did not answer, but then he came out with a machete and raped her. He paid off the police and escaped. The discriminatory attitude was that this was only a Pygmies' issue, why bother? "We are only the parents", or the Chief saying "I have my limits; you must find the man." I was called on my mobile phone. After one week, I arrived at the place, having walked 12km. I could not do any education work because the security situation was tight; there were rebels and it was dangerous to stay. I documented the case, took a photo of the girl's wounds and scars, and gave my report to RAPH. That was two years ago, and there has been no activity. The girl has dropped out of school. The community are still bothering me "Can we get some help?"

In Rwanda, WOPU had not participated in refresher trainings as IA3 was their first engagement. They expressed the need for refresher trainings.

7. To what extent and, if so, how, has the project promoted effective collaboration and networking among partners?

There certainly have been examples of effective collaboration at planned events. For example, "WOPU (a women-led organization in Rwanda) was able to learn from PWC (women-led organization in Tanzania) through the latter's presentation..., a separate session... arranged for PWC to address capacity issues raised by women-led organizations"⁴³

The competitive factors within countries containing both Existing and Emerging Partners are outlined in the Findings section. As another example, RAPH said about Emerging Partner FDAPID: "We should not be on the same footing; we are a network of 14 organisations". This competitive attitude is not regarded as helpful; it offers potential for improved MRGI and MRGA induction, messaging, strategic planning and programme design.

⁴³ Year 2 Report to Ireland Aid

General Conclusions

Conclusion on the Whole Programme:

IA3 has generated an enormous amount of activity from credible actors, which has led to some spectacular breakthrough meetings with powerful stakeholders and some important paralegal presence and support in communities. It has met its objectives.

More focus could be achieved. The priorities of partners did not always seem to be the same as those in the IA3 programme. For example, WOPU asked evaluators to distribute soaps and buckets as part of the evaluation exercise and wanted MRG work to focus on health and on buying land; IADI's focus seemed to be mostly (and understandably) on Empowerment and Peace Committees⁴⁴ and HIV/AIDS; AICM seemed to prioritise vocational training. Under the Bursary scheme, Sylvia Kokunda said "I went to them to ask how I could help... we set up a Savings Group, with weekly deposits of 500 to 5000 a week.... I got them books, they chose the leaders... They have bought a goat, a house with equipment, mattresses... they are improving, they are eager to continue." Paralegal Charlene of RPY described herself as "more of a female indigenous leader and an educator than a paralegal" and told of her pushing in communities for school provision. All of the above are excellent initiatives, but MRG's role in them might be to continue to suggest other interested funders and disprove the cynicism of RPY's "I doubt that MRGA is really interested in putting us in touch with other donors". Much has already been done by MRGA – the linking of OPDP, WOPU BLG and others with VOICE, AICM to EU funding, and previously UOBDU with donors – and it may consider with RPY the possibilities and obstacles to its access to funds

More comprehensive induction/recap to MRG, a participative strategic planning process and improved programme design can lead to a more focused and practical advocacy programme and more positive changes in the lives of IP communities.

More network and alliance building are necessary. In Uganda, the IA3 stakeholders were limited to NGO allies and do not seem to include major government authorities like UWA and NFA. Rwanda's WOPU on the other hand has very good relations with the local government's social services department and involve them in community field visits allowing open dialogues with authorities. Human rights lawyer Marie Louise Mukashema is optimistic that paralegals in Rwanda may take on more important roles once the draft on Legal Aid becomes law.

Conclusion on Partners: the MRG model, collaboration, funding and auditing:

MRG's Kampala office has publicity with the following aims "MRG works to secure the rights of ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities, and indigenous peoples... MRG promotes cooperation and understanding between communities". The NAP Fact Sheet 2 explains one purpose of National Action Plans as "to promote co-operation among these groups" (NGOs... other members of civil society"). These are useful aspirations with ongoing work needed to put them into practice.

MRG's expansion of its partner pool through Emerging Partners and New Emerging Partners is welcomed, even if it is unpopular with Existing Partners. A sense of progression is noted, as new organisations aspire to become

⁴⁴ Particularly between the Ik and the reportedly more dominant, cattle-raiding Turkana from Kenya, but also with their closer Dodoth neighbours

mainstream partners. MRGI operates a model of low budgets – which could usefully be increased - and high commitment, which it should seek to maintain. IA3 has used a strict activity-based approach, which does not yet appear to have produced a commitment of partners which matches that of MRGI organisationally (as evidenced by continued competitive friction between some partners in the same country, by some paralegal cases being dropped because of reported lack of transport costs and by the seemingly low prioritisation in practice by some partners of this evaluation exercise).

Partners commented that they had not been invited to participate in IA3's project design – even RAPHY who described a past of “shared ideas, contribution, planning together” - but acknowledged that MRG had acknowledged these issues and tackled them in IA4. In the project design process of IA4, MRGA involved all IA3 partners (OPDP, ACC, PWC, AICM, BLG, IADI, WOPU, RAPHY and FDAPID) by getting specific partner information from the concept note phase through to the final proposal stage. This partner involvement, collaboration and understanding of MRGI's mission and focus could usefully be progressively strengthened and may be a factor in easing competitive tensions.

Partners also asked for more visits and face-to-face time with MRGA, who suggested that they could achieve much more if they had budgets for more travel. Like all the partners who expressed an opinion or were asked to suggest a budget, MRGA suggested car-hire at over \$100 per day, which is their modus-operandi for travel, and plane tickets. However, the evaluators visited far-flung areas at less than 10% of the cost using comfortable public buses and motorbikes (carrying helmets with them).

MRG should continue to relax funding from the more project-based approach of IA3 to the more one-year and multi-year approach it has started in IA4. MRG should also continue to insist on a pre-condition that auditing is not project-based, but holistically covers the entire income and expenditure of partner organisations. All opportunities should be pursued to liaise with the other funders of partner organisations on complementary approaches to all aspects of programming, including auditing.

Partnerships and engagement should be strengthened and expanded (beyond IA3) with those who have direct stakes and influence in IP concerns. In Uganda, the IMG Coalition is a solid network which casts the net wide in gaining national IP recognition and provides an effective platform in getting national support for IP advocacy campaigns. This evaluation threw up the opportunity to engage with UWA; even if its stated concerns do not currently fully include IP strategic rights, the seeming openness on practical rights, and a willingness to discuss governance, provide an opening. In Rwanda, there is a legal aid forum which is a network of NGOs working on legal aid, awareness, advocacy, research and paralegal network. In DRC, there is networking by NGOs (including the coalition of RAPHY), with other IP groups, and with lawyers. In all countries, these efforts can be extended. MRGA can explore these opportunities considering the very limited human resource capacity to travel and engage partners on a face-to-face meeting regularly.

Conclusion on Individual Partnerships:

IADI, BLG and RAPHY all felt severely constrained by funding levels; RAPHY requested MRG's further help in introducing it to other donors and may benefit from a frank, realistic exchange on compatibility with the future plans of MRG and other donors.

WOPU expressed eagerness for training and mentoring from a volunteer in organisational development, and another in financial management. WOPU operate from a 3m x 4m office without internet, but with three tables and four chairs, a desktop, two laptops and a shelf. This parallels IADI's operation from the compound of its Executive Director, which compounds potential perception of IADI – as with most of the partners met - as a one-

man or family operation. Both organisations appear to need greater institutional support and orientation on the nature of MRG and the programme.

Conclusion on Paralegal Training:

Now that MRG has a baseline to work from, a more structured paralegal course could usefully be outlined, designed from the results of Training Needs Analysis. The MRGA project coordinator should peruse a printed paralegal manual and attend his first paralegal training to give a fuller appreciation of the training and the programme.

Conclusion on Paralegals:

The paralegals interviewed in all three countries had a good understanding of their role, as indicated by Finding ‘role of paralegal’ on page 20. Most of them both showed ability and motivation for their role. They could all specify cases where they had made a practical difference, often within communities on SGBV issues. There was a common frustration that they were unable to adequately access accommodation and travel funds to extend their work; at its most extreme this was a complaint that community-based paralegals in Uganda could not adequately follow up promises made by the Prime Minister via visits to his office⁴⁵. It was also clear that some funds – travel, air-time (particularly in Rwanda) and accommodation had been made available for such work. For community-level paralegals, an expectation could be usefully set that work in nearby communities involving a reasonable walk (for example 12km one way) should not incur costs, with communities continuing to offer a counterpart of meals and, if necessary, basic accommodation. MRG might consider devolving funds, with mutually agreed guidelines on the acceptability of buying bicycles, using motorbike pillion hire⁴⁶ etc., and expect partners to prioritise ongoing paralegal activity.

Conclusion on Bursary Scheme:

This was a competitive, limited fund, to allow paralegals to travel, pursue, tackle and extend the exemplary impact of human rights cases. Bursary holders give their report, workplan and budget, report, follow-up, and receive follow-on funds. The scheme can allow bursary-holding paralegals to divide turf between them and reduce distances.

Bursaries were won by the Basongola from Kasese, Uganda, and Batwa from Uganda, Rwanda and DRC, plus one group in Tanzania. AICM’s whose leader Faith Tushabe said “We take paralegals for a day or two, we have a course outline... the content is relevant but we need to have more on board we need more funding. We need to train more.” Recipient Sylvia Kokunda said, “Irish Aid is doing great work. Through its support, we have got capacity building and advocacy so that we can speak for ourselves, raise our voices for our human rights.” Partners strongly supported the Advocacy, Paralegal and Bursary initiatives in Logframe scoring, in KIs and casual conversation. Evaluators concluded that the Bursary Scheme should be expanded.

Conclusion on Evaluation:

⁴⁵ Meeting the Prime Minister in Kampala (7-8 hrs. journey by bus) was unexpected result, and was therefore not budgeted for. The frustration of the paralegal at the boundaries placed around success is understood however; this is seen as further evidence in favour of flexible “small project funds” so that promising opportunities are always taken.

⁴⁶ “boda-boda” being the common term, and practice, in Uganda

MRG should apply for more generous evaluation budget lines. Evaluators divided their fees knowingly and gratefully and were fully satisfied with the experience and recompense, but as an example for sustainability, £2782 of the £9,000 budget was taken in expenses. Each evaluator earned around the UK minimum wage; less than the UK living wage and London living wage⁴⁷. Partners were not consistently careful to avoid incurring expense. Costs and requests multiplied, including requests of distributions of goods to participants. One further delegation of responsibility would be to include evaluation as a budget line for partners, to encourage discipline in spending. In addition, care should be taken not to incentivise evaluators to cut corners. One model would be for evaluators to continue to pay for capital city expenses (accommodation, food, transport) out of their fee, to their taste, but for partner meetings and essential evaluation activities to be taken by partners from an entirely separate budget line⁴⁸.

Recommendations

The recommendations below suggest different responsibilities at different levels. In the recommended planning strategic exercise, it is advised that MRGI and MRGA collectively allocate different tasks to make these recommendations effective.

1) Building on the Recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE).

Efforts were made to avoid repeating the interim research into “Indigenous peoples’ land rights in Tanzania and Kenya; the impact of strategic litigation and legal empowerment”. Most of the MTE’s 11 recommendations are summarised below in bold; our findings endorse and extend them as follows:

1.1 The need for both long-term and urgent-security donor support (MTE Recommendations 1 and 5):

As in strategic litigation, capacity support of indigenous representatives is a long-term pursuit. MRG has bravely and creditably sought to support practical success, cutting funds where this is not achieved within reasonable time frames, and giving opportunities to Emerging and New Emerging smaller partners with less immediate capacity but considerable potential and energy. Security support was found to be necessary where community paralegals require back-up for contentious cases; in these cases, transport costs could be awarded from MRG Kampala in response to written requests. Security support is also relevant in overall budget. Without Kidnap and Ransom insurance (which for a 7-day visit to DRC is between £3000 and £4000) being covered, DRC may continue to be only partially covered. For all of the above, it is recommended that MRG and Irish Aid jointly approach other European Government donors for extended funding.

1.2 Legal empowerment, both newly with the judiciary and continued with communities and their paralegals/lawyers; Continued litigation at the Africa Commission and elsewhere; (MTE 4 and 3):

MRG seems to be engaging mostly with allies. It can usefully extend its lobby of those allies – such as the women’s movement – to include indigenous peoples in all of their research and action. It could reach out to neutrals, such as the judiciary within individual countries and to lawyers not yet engaged in active MRG human rights work. As

⁴⁷ 6218/781 hours’ work = £7.96; UK minimum wage is £7.83, UK living wage is £8.75 and London living wage is £10.20

⁴⁸ MRGI were agreeable to splitting these costs with evaluators; the conclusion/recommendation is made for future evaluations.

evidenced by the Stakeholder Mapping, even existing lawyers in DRC⁴⁹ and Uganda are seen as distant, and paralegals in Rwanda clarified, they had their limits “We cannot deal in cases of blood or rape; those are referred to the police”. MRGA could usefully train Convenors of Clusters, MPs⁵⁰ and others identified as useful Power-Holders in the Strategic Planning exercise. And it urgently needs to reach out to those whose current practices are providing harmful or alienating to IPs – such as the UWA on the Batwa and the Benet, and the National Forest Authority on the Ik. The transcript on p.52 shows potential for engagement and trust-building; after an initial awkwardness in which UWA requested a list of questions prior to the interview schedule, the experience was positive and promising.

Successes can usefully be shared at grassroots level; communities and partners showed support for litigation when the cases of the Enderois Endorois and the Ogiek were explained to them; the Benet and the Ik appear particularly motivated to engage.

1.3 Women’s empowerment: (MTE 6)

WOPU has shown an ability to immediately switch from Emerging to Existing Partner status, as an unforeseen consequence of YWCA’s withdrawal from IA3. They have identified a significant need for organisational development and like for other partners this might include better recap/induction into MRG and Irish Aid. Other partners might benefit from MRG intervention specifically on gender and on women’s empowerment; RAPHY creditably recognises its own weakness in regard to gender strategy⁵¹, which could also be tackled in Irish Aid-wide strategic planning.

1.4 Strategic planning of partnerships / Extending African-based partnerships (MTE 10, 7 and 11)

A full strategic planning process is recommended for the programme. Clarity, unified purpose and rigorous groundwork are needed to generate genuine collaboration within countries and across borders. A spirit of competition was witnessed in DRC; elsewhere even when partners have full contact details for each other, there appears to be little tapping into that potential. Exchange visits and joint operational work are suggested within Uganda on the back of such planning, and elsewhere as requested.

1.5 Advocacy and knowledge-sharing emphasis on IP’s positive role in preserving the environment / Need for a strong media strategy (MTE 8 and 9):

This narrative can take root in E Africa, as it has in western countries’ understanding of its IPs (in Australia, Canada, New Zealand). In Uganda, UWA’s external communications fail to highlight the potential role of IPs e.g. in the conservation of gorillas⁵²; a strategy of engagement with UWA and targeted communication might set this record straight and provide a logical basis for engaging in joint IP-Government management of national parks⁵³.

⁴⁹ In DRC, with RAPHY for sexual violence cases only, and for FIDAPID on a case-by-case basis; in Uganda not actively engaged, and yet in Rwanda, a promising example to follow

⁵⁰ Both as advised by James Luyombya of HURINET; MRGA’s training role could be the start of a process to harness the influence of the Ik MP who was an IADI founder member but was believed - by IADI and community – to have “forgotten us”

⁵¹ Although it suggests this stems from illiteracy, not gender-blindness “Faible implication du Genre ‘a cause de ‘analphabetisme’: “Auto-diagnostic dans RAPHY” (Self-Evaluation of RAPHY) p.1

⁵² UWA briefings cover its “help” to Batwa, without any analysis of their eviction from forests, or their potential in conserving them

⁵³ As happens in many countries and places, including Uluru (“Ayers Rock”) in Australia

2) Recommendations directly from our own research.

MRGI might usefully:

2.1 Engage in a full, participative, induction/recap and strategic planning exercise with partners on the ongoing Irish Aid funding, ideally with involvement from Irish Aid and MRG at its different levels. This might include visioning sessions, to ensure that the programme focuses not only on the safer, easier issues of strengthening partner and community capacity, but also dares to dream how the powerful might be held accountable, and then makes the detailed collaborative plans to maximize this possibility. This might include the UN's position of "restore the land or provide alternative land" and a genuine attempt to plan the joint management of forest lands and resources potentially benefiting all stakeholders.

2.2 Possibly in the same process, increase and improve the induction/recap of partners, explore "ways of working" and re-design the programme, setting milestones and practical steps to achieving them. MRGI and MRGA should not only encourage but explicitly state that (i) partners should actively look for other donors to reduce dependency on MRG (ii) all income and expenditure from all donors should continue to be globally audited (iii) MRG will reach out to other donors⁵⁴ to ensure complementarity of approach (iv) co-operation should be expected between partners, not only across borders but within countries (v) funds should be made available for cross-visits of community paralegals and NGO staff for e.g. 3-6 months between communities, as suggested by IADI's offer to host Benet or Batwa, and giving an opportunity to DRC paralegals to see the commitment and positivity of their counterparts in Uganda and Rwanda.

2.3 MRG should maximise the motivating effect of its successes by ensuring that partners, paralegals, communities, allies and potential adversaries hear of the good examples. This might require a multimedia approach, not only using news channels, radio programmes and social media, but SMS on WhatsApp, text blast (for non-smartphone users), blanket email, popular education materials and possibly even merchandise such as t-shirts and wrist bands. Both the Ogiek and Enderois Enderois verdicts could still provide such motivating examples, and on their own would be worthy of a monthly update on FB/Twitter accounts.

2.4 Increase the amount of face-to-face contact time with partners, building on the favourable impression that most partners have of the Coordinator's⁵⁵ perceived responsiveness on email, and deepening relationships, belonging, mutual understanding and knowledge. If budgets are constrained, this travel should be conducted on public buses and motorbikes, as in this evaluation, rather than expensive hired cars and airplane tickets.

2.5 Make available to BLG the findings of 2017's visit of the former Legal Officer to explore the potential of building a new case to compel Government to implement the Benet Consent Judgment. The BLG officers and Benets are keen to receive feedback after their participation.

2.6 Take the opportunity to engage with UWA in Uganda, maximising the current stated goodwill to deliver practical rights to IPs, to explore practical, long-term, IP community-validated options for shared governance, and to seek common understanding on IP strategic rights to the land from which they have been evicted.

⁵⁴ Such as "Friends of AICM"

⁵⁵ Felicien Balikunda

2.7 Explore the draft Legal Aid Policy in Rwanda and the opportunities for paralegals when this policy is enacted in to law.

2.8 Continue to expand its partner pool through Emerging Partners and New Emerging Partners and continue to extend active relationships as a result of impactful, value-for-money work; partners not providing results should be given guidance and clear expectations so that they can re-enter at a later date into productive partnerships which provide clear value-for-money, practical benefits to indigenous communities.

2.9 Conduct Training Needs Analysis, structure, understand and extend the **paralegal training**, inviting magistrates or others where possible. Update paralegals and conduct refresher courses, particularly in Rwanda where national (land) laws and ministry orders are routinely amended, and DRC where refresher training may not have been completed. Provide more bursaries or any alternative system to ensuring that paralegals have the means, particularly transport for lengthy journeys, to engage and follow cases through. Make efforts to engage local lawyers in all countries on whichever basis is possible (currently pro bono), to form networks, to provide practical support to paralegals and ensure that MRGA is in a position to take cases to court where this is likely to provide justice and strategic benefit.

2.10 Advocate to those of its partners buying and allocating land for IP habitation that they provide leaseholds to women and men heading families, to give security and promote inward investment and development. Provide support as possible, including funding for learning from the reputed positive experience of Bwindi Mgahinga Conservation Trust.

2.11 Discuss with Irish Aid the possibilities of expanded funding, if necessary through Irish Aid/joint approaches to other European institutional donors. Partners of MRGA outside of the IA3 project in Uganda believe in MRGA's unique product and positioning as the lead authority on IP concerns. Along with the case for IPs being guardians of the environment, this should be seen as a leverage point in terms of gaining financial support from existing or new potential donors. The greatest needs appear to be for expansion of geographical coverage, more paralegal training and for follow-up paralegal work and for practical inter-partner collaboration. Sustainably excellent evaluation, to include DRC, would also be assured by more generous budget lines, possibly delegated to partners, and the incentivising of thorough community-level work.

2.12 Develop an advocacy strategy. It seems that MRG would benefit from a participative strategic planning process involving partners, and a clear, simple, brief advocacy paper, which highlights the common concerns (such as land/security) which is signed by partner representatives of all IPs. Such a paper could form the basis for rolling, or escalating, meetings with Government and other powerful stakeholders. The example, cited elsewhere, of the rolling, multi-functional petition which Batwa presented to the Prime Minister (commonly known as Gad Semajeri's petition) provides one useful model.

Appendices

Appendix A: Bibliography (only of quoted/directly used sources)

- IADI:** Basic Data of IADI (no date)
Brief Activity Report on Health Services in the Ik County, 2017
Tentative Activity Proposal: Meetings with Local Council 1 Team on their roles and responsibilities vis `a vis community members, 2017
IA3/MRG/IADI Progressive report, 2018
- RAPY:** Auto-Diagnostic dans RPY (Forces et Faiblesses Majeures): RPY, 2018
RPY Final Accountability Mechanism Proposal, 2016
- MRGI:** Year 1 Annual Report: MRG to Irish Aid, 2016
Irish Aid Year 2 Report_Final_Sept17
Irish Aid Year 3 re-budget
Kenya's Ogiek Press Coverage
- UNHCR:** "The origin of the NAP Concept" (Adapted from the 'Handbook on National Human Rights Plans of Action' Professional Training Series No.10 – UNHCR 2002
- Voice/MRGI:** Mid-Term Evaluation: "Indigenous peoples' land rights in Tanzania and Kenya; the impact of strategic litigation and legal empowerment": Couillard V, Gilbert J, Thalenko L
- Weblinks: Regional:**
Gender and Education amongst the Batwa in 4 countries http://minorityrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Evaluation_Gender-Based-Discrimination.pdf Hampson D. 2011
- DRC: Security and Governance:**
<https://www.gov.uk/foreign-travel-advice/democratic-republic-of-the-congo>
<https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2015/mar/06/eastern-drc-oxfam-report-armed-groups-corrupt-officials-congo>
- Kenya:**
Ogiek victory:
<https://www.survivalinternational.org/news/10119>
<https://intercontinentalcry.org/landmark-victory-ogiek-delivered-african-court/>
<http://minorityrights.org/2017/05/26/huge-victory-kenyas-ogiek-african-court-sets-major-precedent-indigenous-peoples-land-rights/>
https://minorityrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/MRG_Brief_Ogiek.pdf
- OPDP:** Final Accountability Mechanism Proposal, 2016
- Sylvia takes New York: UN committee invites Mutwa woman to share the plight of her people**
<https://www.kellermannfoundation.org/sylvia-takes-nyc/>

Appendix B: Pre-field visit questionnaire
for Final Evaluation of IA3 (Irish Aid-funded) project,
Realizing the Rights of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples in East and Central Africa

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
In brief, please describe us your involvement in the above-mentioned project.	Based on your role and your organization's participation to the project completion, what percentage (0 to 100 percent) do you think have you completed your part of the project?	List the things you have done well on this project.	List the things you think were not done well on this project, by you and by other partners?	How do you think others could have done better?	How do you think you/your organisation could have done better?	Looking at your activities in this project, what changes on the ground caused your plans to change?	Consider question 7, what strategies have you made to adapt to such changes?	What key activities from the project helped to achieve project goals? What stopped you from achieving project goals?	Please tell us anything you feel we should know, to help us assess the project and suggest improvements.
Isaac Masaba, Programme Coordinator, Benet Lobby Group. Coordinated, implemented, monitored project activities. In charge of mobilisation of the community beneficiaries. Wrote reports. Acted as accounting officer of the project. Supervised project assets.	I think 70 percent.	We successfully mobilised the participants for the project activities. We managed the accountability of the project well. We were able to monitor the project activities. We have good records of the project work.	The coverage was not well. Most of the areas in the community was not covered. Positive willingness/ attitude by the duty bearers to attend meetings. Involvement of the youth in some of the activities.	Adhering to the reporting timelines in the MOU. Using other approaches of persuading the duty bearers to attend the meetings Becoming inclusive in all the interventions	Adhering to the reporting timelines in the MOU Becoming inclusive in all the interventions. Frequent monitoring along with duty bearers. More capacity building to understand rights.	Meeting on access, control and ownership of the resources at family level. Community engagement with the duty bearers on access to quality service delivery at the sub county level.	Continuous dialogues though not funded. Frequent follow ups. Build good relation with the stakeholders	Reluctance of some community stakeholders to attend meetings and sending representatives who do not have knowledge of issues. Funding was very small to cover the large Benet community. We could have used other methods	The issues of rights have always been a contentious in Benet. Government's reluctance to address the issue of landlessness in Benet has contributed to a number of vulnerabilities in Benet. It is proper for you to understand from the beneficiaries and the board of governors the issues of rights to

Ensured the smooth running of the project to meet goals.		Our method of implementation has yielded positive results in the community.	Timely reporting.	for better results.	Use of other approaches for a more meaningful engagement with stake holders.	Meetings on child drop out from schools.		like radio programmes. BLG hires motorcycles when monitoring activities which proved costly. for transport purposes. It may make sense to invest in a BLG motorcycle.	land, which has become a backbone to several injustices, unfairness in service delivery and poverty in Benet.
Epiphanie Kanziza, Coordinator of WOPU. I coordinated different activities so that projects run as it was supposed to be done.	As the coordinator I tried at 96%, accountability mechanism was shifted in dates because we waited for the presence of local governments, other project was done as planned.	advocacy methodology -different trainings in (paralegal, capacity building of staff) We gained fees of office rent WOPU staff gained more knowledge in organisation capacity building - Advocacy in local government mainly in sectors which brought many changes in people life style	We identified so much more training needs but funds were not available so these were not met.	with more practice it could have been better	with more practice, more funds, and enough communication	we didn't meet changes; our project was done as planned	our strategy is that we have a very good coordination with our stakeholders	key activity that helped us is keeping a good humour or good collaboration with our stakeholders	to suggest improvements we can: -Ensure stability of funds so that plans won't meet challenges -Improvement in communication so that we work together -Addition in activities like those of health-care of beneficiaries

<p>Felicien Balikunda, In-charge of entire project implementation</p> <p>Tasks: Developed project concept notes with partners; Identified new partners; Ensured funds got to partners on time; Regular contact with partners; Ensured reports were submitted on time; Organised meetings and trainings; Monitoring visits.</p>	98%	<p>Provided time advice and guidance to partners in time of need</p> <p>Activity funds were sent to partners in time to avoid activity implementation delays</p> <p>All activities with full funds were implemented</p>	<p>By me/MRG: no initial meeting was held; Identifying new partners</p> <p>By other partners: Collision between some partners within same country; not contributing match funding</p>	<p>Open and regular communication</p> <p>Seek advice from MRG</p> <p>Contribute match-funding to IA3 project from the other projects funded by different donors</p>	<p>Use MRG existing partners/network to look for new partners prior to the start of the project</p> <p>All partners' meeting to discuss the project implementation at the very beginning</p> <p>MRG to educate/explain to partners the idea of match-funding and how it works</p>	<p>Failure to raising funds to match-fund some activities in time</p> <p>Identifying new partners in Tanzania was very difficult</p>	<p>Raising funds to match-fund some activities: some activities were pushed to the following year</p> <p>Identifying new partners in Tanzania was very difficult: Authorisation was sought to look for new partner in Uganda and we have eventually got one</p>	<p>To very extent /percentage, project goals were achieved. However, lack of full match-funding in time prevented us from achieving a 100% of project goals</p>	<p>One of our old partner withdrew from project citing such reason as being busy with another project. This could be easily be interpreted to mean that the Irish Aid project was not adding value to them or at least not attractive.</p>
<p>AICM Human Rights Focal person on Batwa HR Issues in Batwa resident communities under AICM.</p> <p>Conflict and dispute resolutions. Guide and counsel. Refer cases of human rights violations to police.</p>	<p>On my role I have done up to 95% and my organisation has done up to 95%</p>	<p>Mediation and conciliation between Batwa themselves and Batwa with None Batwa as well</p> <p>Conflicts and dispute resolution among Minority Batwa and None Batwa.</p> <p>Helped Batwa to access fair Justice in Local courts and Police</p> <p>Batwa women's rights, gender equality and</p>	<p>Batwa leadership representation in higher government levels in Councils</p> <p>Lack of a National legal Aid programme in our community (like a Justice center around)</p> <p>Processing Batwa land Titles by other partners like government</p>	<p>Bringing Batwa on Board to address their issues affecting them like on access to water sources and Batwa representation in government's higher offices.</p>	<p>Having more funding to facilitate its staff in continuous refresher /review meetings and Dialogues with mostly duty bearers to address Batwa issues and increase outreach programs.</p>	<p>Networking with other key players/partners like the Police and sub county leaderships.</p> <p>Active participation by indigenous Batwa trained paralegals in helping others access Justice and good arbitrators and mediators.</p>	<p>Good networking skills with non-Batwa leaders in Church and Police to support Batwa leadership, e.g. church wardens and crime preventer.</p> <p>Being exemplary and neutral in the community among both indigenous Batwa and non-Batwa re: use of the law.</p>	<p>Community Dialogue and sensitization meetings</p> <p>Referral pathways used.</p> <p>Role plays during trainings and workshops</p>	<p>How Batwa cases are handled by local leaders and police</p> <p>How minorities differentiate cases of different nature like a rape case and Assault cases which are common in Batwa.</p> <p>How easy to report Batwa cases to LCs courts compared to police courts</p>

		equity are now being realised and mitigated these violations.				Batwa appreciating the concept of women's rights, practicing basic laws learnt, land rights and access to Justice Some Batwa winning in National elections at LC 1 positions.	Constant guidance to Batwa on access to justice. Encouraging locals to engage with Batwa, to stop Batwa stigma and discrimination.		(referral pathways) Roles being played by trained Batwa paralegals among their fellows they stay with.
Agnes Kabajuni, I am the overall staff accountable to London in terms of results, clean financial and narrative reports, monitoring the implementation by the responsible staff at the office and following on the deadlines. Including having one on one meetings with the staff over deadlines or challenges identified. My involvement can also be beyond management and supervisory role. For example, have	I can say I have completed at least 75% of my participation	I have travelled to hadzabe indigenous group in Tanzania and was able to establish contacts with them, their issues and means to engage them. I successfully established an emerging partner in Kenya in a remote part of Lamu which had challenged us for some months and we have moved on to work with them on land rights related capacity building. I have managed to identify the Maragoli ethnic minority in Uganda that helped us divert funds that we could not spend with PWC to their cause. This has helped support them to achieve government recognition of their	We could not get the partner in Tanzania implement the accountability mechanism as either they did not grasp the concept or wanted to have freedom to use the funds for what they wanted. We could not succeed in working with the new emerging partner the Hadzabe Survival Council in Tanzania because of the barrier of reaching them through another partner given		We could have done better if we had more resources to travel to most partners in the countries covered and had assessment sessions at least once a year. This would have improved on the communication and also helping on some of the areas where we did not do well because they failed on their part as well. For Hadzabe we could have done well if for the initial meetings we had our staff	The insistence of our partner in Tanzania to use the funds for their own planned activities and not what it was intended for under IR3 and our contract with them made us change and request the donor to allow us channel the funds to newer partner that required urgent support.	We first carried out a rapid assessment of the new partner and their issues, we then consulted the donor on whether we could use the funds to carry out key capacity building and advocacy activities support the new partner with an urgent issue.	The networking directly led by partners themselves helped us create space for advocacy, information sharing and further capacity building. The Legal empowerment activity that was followed by the Bursary. The accountability mechanism was very instrumental in creating platforms for MIPs to hold	Not at the moment

directly involved in capacity building efforts with for indigenous representatives, in organising national advocacy efforts and I have also directly engaged partners where there was communication breakdown and I needed to really get them to respond.		statelessness issues and are now moving positively to resolving their identification as citizen issue. I was able to raise match-funding money from Dan Church Ai that assisted us in organising a national policy dialogue between MIPs and key parliamentary committee members and the first of its kind. It is from this dialogue that we have made lots of progress to address the issues of the Maragoli people.	their extremely low capacity.		directly implement the activities with the hadzabe, but closely work with the partner.			their leaders accountable. For example, a partner put forward a petition to the Prime Minister focusing on IPs in Uganda. The PM directed its Ministries to develop a comprehensive framework for addressing IP issues. All done within the space of four months. The draft is already in place. Identification of the Maragoli and listing them as citizens of Uganda.	
Christine Apio, Finance and Administrative MRGA Donor reporting. Liaised with partners on the management of/ and financial accounting and reporting.	I feel I have covered 90% as I am in the final touches of Irish Aid financial reporting.	In relation to partner activities, funds have been transferred to Partner accounts in a timely manner to ensure the activities are done as planned. Given guidance to new partners regarding accounting for funds. Managed all Company equipment to ensure maximum security of Assets (Asset Trucking). Petty Cash	On my part, and on rare occasions, fund transfers to partners were delayed due to overwhelming tasks. On the side of partners, some partners did not adhere to submitting reports on time. I had to keep	By planning for Audit in time which we always do and also availing all the documentation. However, the follow up is normally what brings delay especially if the Auditors have other planned	By periodically assess partner capability to handle funds for project activities with due diligence ensuring that partners as well have properly trained staff especially on the side of financial management.	Delayed accountability by some partners delayed remittance. Sometimes delayed audit report brings about delay in release of funds by donors to the organisation, hence slight delay of	The partners have been advised to account timely with accompanying narrative reports to avoid delay of subsequent tranches and reports. We now do pre-audit for 9 months (January to September) in the month of	Capacity Building for partners helped in assessment of right partners to implement the activities. Paralegal training and refresher paralegal training, Regional and country MIP	Most have been mentioned above.

		management for day to day purchases of Office Stationery and Supplies.	chasing them for results and it is very time consuming.	audit activities alongside with ours.	This therefore calls for periodic refresher training in Finance, Administration and Management.	activities, but this happened only once. However, once funds would be released, we would ensure that funds are transferred immediately to partners.	November then the last 3 months (October to December) in January of the following year. This has helped a lot to improve on Audit performance	network meetings, all contributed to achieving project goals	
I am involved at all project levels (problem identification, ToR formation, activity execution, follow-up on recommendations and/or advocacy, production, reporting	100%	<p>We look with satisfaction at the results we are still achieving</p> <p>With Batwa in N & S Kivu, DRC</p> <p>Advocacy for Batwa's right to work and anti-discrimination against children.</p> <p>Paralegal training and refreshing</p> <p>Information exchange</p> <p>Court and tribunal cases</p>	Difficulty in follow-up of recommendations due to lack of funds	Difficult to know		This project helped improve a sharing of alerts and accompaniment of human rights abuse victims. It also conscientised authorities on problems and the search for solutions, such as courts taking cases seriously.	<p>We continue to use the following strategy for the success of our activities :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participation and closeness 2. Mobilisation and sensitisation 3. Cooperation, conciliation and involvement of IPs 4. Early warning mechanisms and urgent appeals 	All went well except that the partnership philosophy did not help.	Adapt partnership contracts to one year or more instead of contracts per activity, as planning becomes difficult and some activities are rushed.

Appendix C: MRGA Non-IA3 Partners in the Region but working on IP Concerns

Name, Job Title, Previous involvement with Indigenous People's issues:	How has the environment changed for Indigenous People's land rights over the past 10 years; for the better or worse? What examples?	Has the Ogiek landmark victory in Kenya had any motivating effect on Indigenous People's elsewhere in Africa?	What are the main steps to take, to improve those land rights?	* Do you still have links with MRG, and if not, would you like to?	* If you had to choose between a programme of capacity building for IP NGOs, or a programme of legal	* Are you aware of the IA3 programme, and its partners?	* Please tell us anything you feel we should know, as evaluators of IA3 and people with a long-standing interest with indigenous rights and MRGI, to help us assess the project and suggest improvements.	* Is there anyone else you think we should speak to? If so, please can you supply their email address and/or WhatsApp?
Julien BASIMIKA ENAMIR-UWA ARAP	English translation: After 10 years lobbying/advocacy to traditional leaders, some communities are acquiring communal forests, others land to grow crops. The big problem is securing land; as communities don't possess the money, a project is needed for this.	At ARAP we are not informed of this.	We are RAPHY (RDC) members, and RAPHY works with MRGI on some programmes, but at a lower level now; each organisation works to its own capacity and skills.	ARAP was invited to a Climate Change meeting on 15/10/09 but we lacked passports; when we get them we hope to be invited to the next COP23 meeting.		We don't know its partners but would like to	We want to strengthen in fundraising, to gain skills in big meetings.	Deborah Sogers of IfE (INITIATIVE FOR EQUALITY) Twitter : www.twitter.com/IfE_Deborah
Tirwomwe Wilberforce Johnson, Project Officer – UWESO Advancing Rights & Opportunities to Education for Vulnerable	To a large extent, the environment has changed positively, mainly through enhanced awareness of the rights of indigenous peoples; however not so satisfactorily as the Batwa of Uganda and Benet that have not effectively accessed their full right to traditional ancestral land. However, cases like the Ogiek Landmark ruling give	Indeed, I am aware of the Ogiek landmark victory. I happened to have been one of the delegates representing Uganda in a regional workshop at Lukenya Gateway in Kenya but also had working visit to the Ogiek in the Naivasha region of Kenya. I then got firsthand experience of the longstanding struggle by the Ogiek to acquire rights to what they rightly deemed	1. Sensitisation of stakeholders. 2. Advocacy. 3. Persistence and unity of purpose among stakeholders. 4. Continuously engaging the powers that be.	For some time not; but I would definitely cherish the opportunity.		No I am not.	As much as possible, seek people and organizations that have vast knowledge and genuine passion on indigenous minority groups; and there are not that many.	I would recommend you talk to: - Ms Penina Zaninka and Alice Nyamihanda – (UOBDU) Dr. Scott Kellerman - founder of Kellerman

<p>(Refugee and host Communities) Children (AROC) Project in Uganda.</p> <p>Previous work on IP-related issues with CARE International; AICM. Edirisa Society Slovenia</p>	<p>hope that, perhaps, not all is gloom.</p>	<p>their ancestral land – from which they had been displaced for decades. Hence the victory of the Ogiek inspires hope in other indigenous groups that with persistence and the right approach; they can be granted their extensive rights over issues that are so dear to their cultural heritage, livelihoods, and life styles.</p>						<p>Foundation Medical Missions to Batwa Pygmies, Uganda;</p> <p>Dr. Christopher Kidd – Forest Peoples Programme.</p> <p>Batundi Freddy T. and Kemigabo Jolly - used to work with MRG. Irma Sinkovec – Slovenian Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>
<p>Willy Loyombo Esimola,</p> <p>Coordinator of the « Organisation d'Appui aux Pygmées » (OSAPY).</p> <p>Worked with IP (pygmy) since 2000</p>	<p>A.2. The land situation of indigenous peoples over the past 10 years is characterized by the eviction of their traditional lands, the grabbing of their lands for extractive activities, the drastic loss of access to natural resources.</p>	<p>A.3. The Ogiek Victory in Kenya encouraged the Pygmy Indigenous Peoples' struggle for the claim of their customary land and recognition of their traditional land rights</p>	<p>A.4. Improving the land rights of indigenous peoples must be achieved by promoting affirmative policies and legal reforms in their favor.</p>	<p>A.5. In 2005 and 2006, my OSAPY organization received financial support from MRG and MRG twice supported me to participate in the NGO Forum on the sidelines of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights in Banjul. I need to continue the link with MRG.</p>	<p>A.6. I will choose the capacity-building program of IPs and IPs NGOs since the issue of recognition of IPs' rights requires IPs themselves to have the capacity to propose legal reforms and affirmative policies in their favor.</p>			
<p>Dr. Christopher Kidd,</p>	<p>I think the threats have broadened as the demand on land has increased. 10 years ago we were mostly</p>	<p>Hugely motivating for other IPs in Africa as it provides a very rare and bright beacon of hope for the Ogiek and</p>	<p>Where to start...that's a huge question. Better policy/legislation,</p>	<p>Yes, I have worked with MRG colleagues since I first began my work in the region.</p>	<p>I think that is an unhelpful and artificial separation as</p>			

<p>Coordinator, Environmental Governance Programme, Forest Peoples Programme (FPP)</p> <p>Have spent 20 years working in IP issues in Africa.</p>	<p>focused on conservation but now this has been added to with the private sector (logging and oil palm in Congo Basin for example and oil and wind in Kenya as another) as well as continued competition for land from neighbouring peoples. And whilst we have more policy in place and in theory more recognition, (i.e. UNDRIP, FPIC etc) we are not seeing greater enjoyment of IP rights on the ground.</p>	<p>others. However like the Endorois and the fact that no cases have been fully implemented as a result of ACtHPR decisions it is yet unclear if this will provide motivation beyond the initial decision. For it to be fully motivational it would also have to be implemented on the ground.</p>	<p>better enforcement, better complaints/grievance handling...but also less greed, less power, less domination, less destruction could be an equally valid way to respond to that question.</p>		<p>neither category as you have put it can exist without the other. Both elements are integral in the enjoyment of rights and must be equally balanced in my opinion. If I had to chose one or the other I would refuse on the basis that it would be unlikely to be successful if it only focused on one of the two aspects.</p>			
---	---	--	---	--	---	--	--	--

Appendix D: What is a good Paralegal

What is a good Paralegal?

In plenary, paralegals were asked to answer “In the context of IA3, what is a good Paralegal?” and then scored and ranked their responses.

RAPY:

22%, Trained by lawyers and take their place for as long as necessary
11%, Knowledge of law
11%, Documenting cases
9%, Link between community and lawyer
8%, Answering questions
7%, Defend victims in communities
6%, No matter when, no matter where
5%, Denouncing cases
4%, Accompany lawyer in case
3%, Give verified information to villagers
3%, Be the voice of the voiceless in community

WOPU: Rwanda, Paralegals (Nyagatare, Muhanga, Gatsibo, Burera)

19%, Human rights
18%, Trained advisor
16%, Help to explain laws to neighbours
16%, Help improve mindset of communities
16%, Mediator
13% Advocate land property rights

AICM: Uganda: 3 paralegals in Kinyarushengwwe, 80km from Kabale, Uganda: (Paralegal discussions were rich with AICM hence quotes have been used as an example in this section)

27%, Paralegals are trained to fight for others’ rights:

“People can call us on our mobiles. We can walk for 2-3 hours, sometimes 20-25km. For example, a Mukiga (non-IP neighbours with greater sources of power) who did not want to pay a Mutwa for his work; in the end he paid. We tackle this on the radio also; now if a Mukiga is paid 5,000 for a day’s work, a Mutwa will also be paid 5,000; this is an enormous change. Even though children are still discouraged by insults, we adults are now proud to be Batwa. It was important that we came to know through IA3 that there were other Indigenous People, not only us, and that we all have similar problems.”

23%, Paralegals advise community in a good direction, for their benefit:

“For example, we now have many meetings with the Gender and Labour, and Equal Opportunities Departments of Government, and with the Prime Minister’s Office. We feedback information in Saturday meetings with our community.”

20%, Paralegals teach communities their rights:

E.g. “The right to go to school” or “This behaviour is bad; stop it!”

13%, Paralegals solve simple cases in community, and refer difficult cases:

“On couples fighting, we call them together with witnesses, and counsel them. But with blood or rape, we refer to the police and they are surprised that we can write and talk; they take us seriously and deal with the cases”

9%, Paralegals accompany a lawyer:

“We document; they take forward legal cases in court.”

9%, Paralegals are brave for the community:

“We all have to be brave when we talk to Mukigas about discrimination, or to men doing SGBV. But the vote is low because it is not enough to be brave, you also need knowledge and skill.”

FDAPID, DRC 5 Members of FDAPID, including two paralegals*

In the context of IA3, good Paralegals...

18%, Conscientize the community	13%, Denounce violations
14%, Accompany human rights victims	11%, Defend rights
14%, Monitor human rights violations	9%, Advocate with media and government
14%, Orientate human rights victims	6%, Conscientise authorities

*One of whom identified more as a teacher and a female Batwa leader

Appendix E: Key Informants

Democratic Republic of Congo

Name	Organisation/Location
Donatien Munyali Kacibaasa	RAPY, President
Innocent	RAPY, Paralegal trainer
Aline Wetewabe	RAPY, Paralegal
Charlene Mpangirwa	RAPY, Paralegal
Herman Tuteene	RAPY, Secretary
Leonard Malekerra	RAPY/IDJWI Paralegal
Vicar Hangi	FDAPID, Head
Rachid Mishiki Bandu	FDAPID Head of Programme
Ilasu Shamutwa	FDAPID Paralegal and NGO coordinator
Mupepa	FDAPID, President CA
Sakina Itunda Sandrine	FDAPID, Paralegal

Rwanda

Name	Organisation/Location
Epiphanie Kanziza	WOPU, Coordinator
Bella Umurerwa	WOPU, Finance and Admin
Aloys Twizeyimana	Nyagatare, Paralegal
Pacifique Uwamahoro	Nyagatare, Paralegal
R. NkuruncizaNkurunziza	Gatsibo, Paralegal
Geneveive Genevieve Nolayizigiye	Muhanga, Paralegal
Immaculee Iribagiza	Muhanga, Paralegal
Ruth Mukansanga	Muhanga, Paralegal
Pacifique Kyimanitegetse	YWCA, Muhanga
Angelique Muhakienimana	WOPU, Nyagatare
Jerome Hategekimana	Mulindi, Health Programs, Batwa
Habihana Habimana Fidele	Butaro Government, northern Rwanda, Social Affairs Officer
Beatrice	WOPU Butaro
Batwa community in Mulindi	
Batwa community in Nyamicucu	
Marie Louise Mukashema	Human Rights Lawyer, Rwanda

Uganda

Name	Organisation/Location
Agnes Kabajuni	MRGA, Africa Regional Manager
Felicien Balikunda	MRGA, Capacity Building Officer
Christine Apio	MRGA, Finance and Admin Officer
Faith Tushabe	AICM, Executive Director
Amos Tugumisirize	AICM Staff Member
Denis Mucunguzi	AICM Staff Member
Gad Semajeri	Batwa Development Organisation/ BDO Vice Chairperson, Civil Society Coalition on Indigenous Peoples / Kinyarushengye
Wilber Serusiru	Batwa Paralegal in Kinyarushengye
Robert Ngabirano	Batwa Paralegal in Kinyarushengye
Sylvia Kokunda	Batwa community in Kanungu, Bursary Programme recipient
Kenneth Turyamubona	Batwa community in Kitaliro, Kanungu
Stephen Kaberwa Twalla	Benet Lobby Group (BLG), Chairman

Jackline Chiboryot	BLG, Board Member, and District Councilor Kitawoi/Kwosir Sub counties
Isaac Masaba	BLG, Coordinator
Gilbert Kibet	BLG, Accountant
Isaac Chelimo	BLG, Support Staff
Juliet Joan Chelangat	Benet community member
Michael Yesho	Benet community member
Francis M Chemutai	Benet community member
Kenneth A. Chemutai	Benet community member
Aggrey Yesho	Benet community member
Dennis Chelangat	Benet community member
Chebet Mungech	Mt Elgon Benet Indigenous Ogiek Group, Coordinator
Yesho Alex Arapsamson	Mt Elgon Benet Indigenous Ogiek Group, Chairman
John Mark Lomeri	IADI
John Lokwee	IADI

MRGI

Name	Organisation/Location
Claire Thomas	MRGI, Deputy Director
Shobha Das	MRGI, ex-Interim Deputy Director
Lucy Claridge	Former MRG International Legal Director

Non-IA3 Key Informants

Name	Organisation/Location
Sam Mwandha	Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), Executive Director
Commissioner Julius Kanya	Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) Commissioner, Education and Communications
Petua Babirye Isabirye	EOC, Principle Education Officer in the Department of Education and Communications,
Barbra Babweteera	The Cross-Cultural Foundation of Uganda (CCFU), Deputy Executive Director
Joseph Ssuuna	Community Development Resource Network (CDRN), Executive Director
James Nkuubi	Human Rights Network Uganda HURINET-U, Prog. Coordinator
Tirwomwe Wilberforce Johnson	UWESO, Uganda, Project Officer
Willy Loyombo Esimola	Organisation d' Accompagnement et d'Appui aux Pygmées (OSAPY), Coordinator
Dr. Christopher Kidd	Environmental Governance Programme, FPP, Coordinator
Julien Basimika Enamiruwa	
Chebet Mungech	Mt Elgon Benet Indigenous Ogiek Group, Coordinator
Yesho Alex Arapsamson	Mt Elgon Benet Indigenous Ogiek Group, Chairman

Appendix F: Batwa Community Discussions on the Smiley Tool for Accountability to Affected Populations

				
How do you feel about your land situation?	62%	20%	9%	9%
		I am in need of something that I am not getting at the moment, land to cultivate. (Batwa, Rwanda) I need help, I want to be on the same standard as others. (Batwa, Rwanda)	Because I am hoping that future will be bright. I have people around me that can help me. (Batwa, Rwanda)	I hope for my future. I am happy to see people supporting me. The future is bright. (Batwa, Rwanda)
How do you feel about living in this community/village	9%	38%	38%	15%
		We still go back to the land where we were before as that was where we can cultivate. We can go there but it is quite a distance for us to walk and back. (Batwa, Rwanda)		Now, I have a mattress in my home where I sleep. We have mats to lie on. Now I know basic human rights. Knowing that I am a human being and that I can access other people. Now, our husbands are educated and they can speak English. I hope to have more education for the children so they can represent Batwa. (Batwa, Uganda)
How do you feel about your knowledge of human rights and access to them?	4%	45%	32%	20%
How do you feel about the NGO assisting you? (IA3)	0	4%	44%	53%
			Because I am grateful of WOPU's advocacy. A bit happy because I have a place to stay but nowhere	

			to cultivate. (Batwa, Rwanda)	
How do you feel about the government?	53%	29%	15%	4%
			Kids are now going to school. (Batwa, Rwanda)	

Appendix G: List of Batwa elected to LC1 positions (as provided by AICM)

Batwa centre		Parish/ Sub-county	Mutwa name	Current role
Rwamahano	1	Ikamiro- Muko S/C (Rubanda)	Nteziki Kedress	Vice Chairperson for women Rwamahano LC1
	2	Ikamiro – Muko S/C(Rubanda)	Simako Amos	Information Publicity for PWDs Rwamahano LC1
Murambo	3	Nyamilyago - Butanda S/C (Kabale)	Akandwanaho Bosco	Publicity Secretary for PWDs Murambo LC1
Makanga	4	Nyamilyago - Butanda S/C (Kabale)	Maniragaba Enock	Information Publicity for PWDs Rwamahano LC1
Kinyarushengye	5	Kashasha – Bufundi S/C (Rubanda)	Mujawimana Jackline	Vice Chairperson for women Mushanje LC1
	6	Kashasha – Bufundi S/C (Rubanda)	Baseme Phionah	Secretary for Finance Mushanje LC1
Rushekye	7	Bukimbiri- S/C – (Kisoro)	Bosco	Publicity secretary Rushekye LC1 Village.

Appendix H: Transcript of a conversation on 10 September 2018 between Sam Mwandha, UWA Executive Director and Ava Batay-an

How is UWA currently engaging with Indigenous Peoples ('ethnic minorities')?

Very difficult question. The Batwa were originally living in Bwindi, when this area became parks. They were resettled. However, they were taken advantage of by other people.

In some places, they were given land. For example, ADRA (Adventist Development Agency), helped them. But in Bwindi Buju, some of them sold their land and went back to the forest. We worked with them slowly to go out of the forest, they need to develop as a community, to access health, education, etc; they cannot develop if they remain in the forests.

Some NGOs want them to remain in the forests but they cannot access health, etc. Getting them out of the forests will help improve their livelihoods.

Again, they sold their land.

With those communities we specifically developed products, there's a big difference how they used to live before. They are now selling products. 50% of the profit goes to them. This is in Mugahinga National Park.

In Bwindi, they also have their own project, they get funding from donors, much more developed than the other IPs.

In the case of Mt. Elgon, they (Benets) were given 6000 hectares of land, some of it was cheated from them, some they sold themselves. And they ended up settling in the park, so another extra 2,500 was given above the 6,000 where they currently are.

When there was a plan to resettle the Benets, it was agreed in the '80s, 6000 hectares was given. Though this was agreed, the actual degazettement never happened. Some of them got cheated out of their land, the 6000 hectares was never marked.

It goes up to a prominent cliff. We have agreed that they can use up to 8,500. Don't go beyond. Key recommendation of the government. This 8,500 will be degazetted to the Benets. In the 6000 hectares there are schools and clinics; in the 2,500 there are no services yet.

What are your thoughts about Indigenous Peoples like the Benet in terms of having a great potential for conserving the environment that they know and are attached to?

I think what you are saying is correct but we need to be careful about that. Most of these people are getting good services.

The President has improved services, etc. Whereas we are saying IPs, we need to appreciate that development is catching up with everybody. The numbers are increasing, this will impact negatively the environment. Get out of the forest and go to school. If we leave the population, despite their best intention...

How are Indigenous Peoples ('ethnic minorities') seen in relation to conservation?

Definitely we would work with those who support conservation.

What is UWA's stand on potential joint stakeholder management of conservation areas?

We already have joint management, but done on a commercial basis. We would welcome the opportunity to work with MRGI. The number 1 issue is to protect, and the number 2 issue is that something goes back to the local community. If the numbers are increasing, the visitors that come, we can provide the resources we get out of that. Livelihood improvement. We have a policy in that regard.

Would you be willing to meet with MRGI/MRGA?

To answer your question, let me tell a bit more about myself. I worked with UWA before and left in 2010, I went to Rwanda for 2 years, came back and joined UWA. We were not working with IPs but working with communities. One of the things that we did with an international NGO, is that with all our activities, we engaged UWA. We don't go to a community without UWA. The success is due to dealing with UWA. That's why this is the story. I would appreciate for an NGO to work closely with UWA and community and local government and sit together. Listen carefully with IPs and implementing whatever is agreed. Problem with NGOs is they don't want to listen to UWA. After 3 years, they go away, and there is nobody with whom to follow up.

(ends)