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Indigenous Peoples’ Human Rights Situation in Asia

The human rights situation of indigenous peoples in Asia is alarming. Monitoring shows the daily occurrence of killings, threats, intimidation, vilification, forced evacuation, arrest and detention of indigenous peoples. These violations are usually committed against indigenous leaders, their organizations and communities in the course of their collective actions and advocacy to assert their rights to land, territories, resources, self-determination and cultural integrity. Too often, indigenous peoples human rights defenders (IPHRDs) are themselves the victims of human rights violations as they work to raise awareness on indigenous peoples’ rights and to deliver basic social services to the community. Meanwhile, the perpetrators including State agents, para-military forces as well as private corporations are able to get away with these abuses under a prevailing atmosphere of fear and culture of impunity. On the other hand, indigenous peoples’ access to justice is hampered by constraints such as the lack of knowledge of rights and remedies, language barriers, remote geographic location, lack of financial resources and unaffordable legal services. This prevailing human rights situation is rooted in the non-recognition and denial by States of the existence and legal status of indigenous peoples as distinct peoples who possess collective and individual human rights as provided in various international conventions and standards.

1. The Indigenous Peoples Human Rights Defenders Network (IPHRD Net)

In response to the appalling situation of human rights among indigenous peoples in Asia, the IPHRD network was established July 30, 2010 in Phnom Penh, Cambodia as a common platform for solidarity, coordination and support among indigenous human rights defenders. The network aims to more effectively promote human rights of indigenous peoples in the different Asian countries as well as in regional and international human rights mechanisms and procedures.

Who are Indigenous Peoples’ Human Rights Defenders?

Indigenous individuals, groups, communities or organizations that individually or with others, act to promote and protect the individual and collective human rights of indigenous peoples, and seek redress for violations of these rights in a manner that does not promote or propagate violence.

The IPHRD Net serves as a:

- Mechanism for exchange of information and updates relating to human rights of indigenous peoples
- Channel for sharing information on human rights violations against indigenous peoples
- Facilitation of technical, logistical and other forms of support
- Forum for planning, capacity building and skills enhancement of network members
- Mechanism for strengthening solidarity and cooperation.

It is composed of trainees of various human rights documentation and advocacy training seminars, indigenous human rights activists, indigenous peoples organizations and support NGOs doing work on indigenous peoples rights with indigenous communities.
As of December 2013, The IPHRD Net had 131 members coming from 35 indigenous organizations and 13 support organizations in 18 countries in Asia.

The Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP) serves as the secretariat of the network, coordinating its activities and providing needed support to the members.

Providing financial support to the IPHRD Net is the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) of the European Union, through the project entitled “Strengthening the Network of Indigenous Peoples Human Rights Defenders for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights of Indigenous Peoples in Asia”. The project, covering the period September 2011 to August 2014, is a collaboration among the AIPP Regional Secretariat and AIPP members and partners in eight countries - Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Nepal, Philippines and Thailand. It supports community-based human rights defenders by building their capacity to document human rights violations and to do advocacy at the national, regional and international levels. It supports the capacity for organizational and financial management of its partner organizations. The project also has dedicated a fund to enable IPHRDs to continue their human rights work even during times of risk.

2. The Indigenous Peoples Human Rights Defenders Fund (IPHRD Fund)

One of the strategies to address the human rights situation among indigenous peoples in Asia is the IPHRD Fund, the fund dedicated for IPHRDs at risk. This was established in order to provide assistance to victims of human rights violations among indigenous human rights defenders and/or their families facing challenges due to their human rights work. The Fund provides support in the form of legal aid, counseling, medical, financial and material support to victims of arrest, detention, torture and extrajudicial killings, among others. The objectives of the IPHRD Fund are:

- To respond to immediate and urgent needs of IPHRDs and/or their families in order to alleviate their suffering and/or mitigate the consequences of the violation of their rights;
- To provide sanctuary to IPHRDs who are facing serious threats to their personal security and well-being as a consequence of their human rights work.

Those eligible to access the IPHRD Fund are IPHRDs (men and women) who are experiencing serious threats to their security and well-being because of their human rights work and have urgent need for sanctuary and/or financial assistance to increase their protection and security. Indigenous peoples evicted and displaced from their communities or who are under extreme threat due to their actions in defense of land, territories and resources and are in immediate need of legal, medical, material and/or financial support are also eligible. Indigenous women HRDs who are especially targeted because of their gender, or have become victims of violence because of their human rights work are a priority. Indigenous leaders, members of organizations or communities, who are in prison due to their human rights work and are in need of legal and other forms of assistance are likewise a priority.
II. ACCESSING THE IPHRD FUND FACTS AND FIGURES 2011-2014
1. Number of Cases Supported per Country

A total number of 74 cases were supported by the IPHRD Fund from September 2011 to August 2014. Philippines had the highest number of cases at 28 (38%), followed by India with 15 cases (20%), Indonesia and Bangladesh with 9 cases (12%) each, then Cambodia with 6 cases (8%) and Thailand with 4 cases (5%).

2. Number of Beneficiaries per Country

The total number of beneficiaries for the three years was 3,087 individuals. Philippines had the highest number of beneficiaries with 1,887 (46%), followed by Cambodia with 1,017 (25%), Indonesia with 909 (22%), India with 257 (6%) and Thailand with 31 (1%). Bangladesh, Malaysia and Nepal had less than 10 beneficiary individuals each.

3. Amount of Support Extended per Country

The total amount of support released by the Fund for iPHRDs for three years was Euro 180,222. The biggest share went to the Philippines at 38%, followed by India at 22%, Cambodia at 15%, and Indonesia at 11%.
4. Types of Human Rights Cases Responded to

The IPHRD Fund responded to ten (10) various types of cases of human rights violations in the different countries. Most of the cases involved threats, harassment and intimidation, and trumped up cases, with 17 cases each. This was followed by cases of land grabbing with 11 cases. The full list of cases responded to during the three years are found in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Human Rights Violation</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arbitrary Arrests</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforced Disappearance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrajudicial Killing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced evacuation/displacement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Grabbing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Encampment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Injuries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats, Harassment and Intimidation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumped up charges</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape/Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Number of Beneficiaries According to Gender

There were more female beneficiaries (1,695) at 55%, than male beneficiaries (1,392) at 45%.
6. Number of Cases Supported per Year

Of the total number of 74 cases, 25 were supported during the period September 2011-August 2012. This fell to 21 cases for the same period the next year. The number of cases supported then increased to 28 cases from September 2013 – August 2014.

7. Total Amount of Support Released per Year

The total amount of support extended by the IPHRD Fund was Euro 180,222 for the three years. In terms of the amount of support extended per year, this totaled Euro 53,344 released during the first year. The amount slightly increased to Euro 54,548 during the second year, and further increased to Euro 72,330 during the third year.
8. Amount of Support Extended per Year According to Type of Assistance

Out of the total assistance of Euro 180222 extended, material assistance received Euro 39869.29, legal assistance received Euro 122940.71 and sanctuary assistance received Euro 17412. Thus, most of the Fund went to legal assistance (68%), followed by material/medical assistance (22%), and then sanctuary assistance (10%).

9. Cases Referred to EIDHR Small Grant Facility

In addition to the cases directly covered by the IPHRD Fund mentioned above, there were 3 other cases referred by AIPP to the EIDHR Small Grant Facility. Two of the cases were received by AIPP but could not be supported by the IPHRD Fund because the human rights defenders are not indigenous and therefore not eligible for support under the IPHRD Fund guidelines. These cases were requests for material support and legal support for a scheduled caste in India, and for seven HRDs in Cachar, India. The third case was the case of the forcibly evacuated Matigsalug IPHRDs in Bukidnon, Philippines. This was supported under the IPHRD Fund but was further referred to the EIDHR Small Grant Facility to support the larger financial requirement needed by the victims. The total amount of support requested for these 3 cases was Euro 16,007.

10. Organizations Which Facilitated Access to the IPHRD Fund

The IPHRD Fund Guidelines define those who are qualified to seek assistance as human rights defenders from member organizations of AIPP, from indigenous communities, or those who work on human rights issues together with AIPP’s members or partner organizations in Asia. In line with this guideline, a total of 33 organizations from 8 countries were able to facilitate access to the IPHRD Fund during the three years from September 2011 to August 2014. These are the following:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philippines (18)</th>
<th>India (5)</th>
<th>Cambodia (3)</th>
<th>Bangladesh (2)</th>
<th>Nepal (1)</th>
<th>Thailand (2)</th>
<th>Malaysia (1)</th>
<th>Indonesia (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children's Rehabilitation Center-Southern Mindanao Region</td>
<td>North East Peoples Alliance (NEPA)</td>
<td>Community Legal Education Center (CLEC)</td>
<td>Kapaeeng Foundation</td>
<td>Lawyers' Association for Human Rights of Nepalese Indigenous Peoples (LAHURNIP)</td>
<td>Inter Mountain Peoples Education and Culture in Thailand (IMPECT)</td>
<td>Jaringan Orang Asal Se-Malaysia (JOAS)</td>
<td>Alliance of Indigenous peoples of the Archipelago (AMAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalumbay, Mindanao</td>
<td>Civil Society Women's Organization (CSWO)</td>
<td>Cambodia Indigenous Youth Association (CIYA)</td>
<td>HIMAWANTI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Karen Network for Culture and Environment (KNCE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalipunan ng Katutubong Mamamayan ng Pilipinas (KAMP)</td>
<td>Bindrai Institute for Research Study and Action (BIRSA)</td>
<td>Rights and Business Law Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karapatan (Alliance for the Advancement of People’s Rights) – Caraga</td>
<td>Jharkand Human Rights Movement (JHRM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Studies and Resource Center-Southern Mindanao</td>
<td>Adivasi Gothra Maha Sabha (AGMS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Missionaries of the Philippines (RMP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Lumad Advocacy and Services, Inc. (CLANS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health Education Services and Training in the Cordillera Region (CHESTCORE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordillera Human Rights Alliance (CHRA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinteg (Cordillera Indigenous Peoples Legal Center)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus for Justice and Peace-Southern Mindanao Region (EJP-SMR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahugpongan sa mga Lumad sa Halayong Habagatang Mindanao (KALUHHAMIN), Mindanao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panalipdan, Mindanao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilak [Purple Action for Indigenous Women’s Rights]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALSA-SMR, Mindanao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Farmers Association of Guinaang-Pasil Inc (IFAGPI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apo Sandawa Lumadnong Panaghiusa sa Cotabato (ALSPC), Mindanao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASAKA, Mindanao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighteen (18) organizations were able to help victims access the IPHRD Fund in the Philippines. In India, five (5) organizations facilitated victims’ access to the IPHRD Fund. Three (3) organizations in Cambodia and two (2) organizations each in Bangladesh and Thailand provided assistance to victims in accessing the IPHRD Fund. In Nepal, Malaysia and Indonesia, only 1 organization in each country accessed the Fund. AMAN and JOAS are national-level indigenous peoples alliances that cover indigenous peoples in the whole country. LAHURNIP is a national NGO, while IMPECT is a network of 10 ethnic-based sub-networks in northern Thailand. KAMP is a national federation of indigenous peoples organizations in the Philippines. Most of the facilitating organisations were NGOs of indigenous peoples or working with indigenous peoples.

Fourteen of the total 33 organisations were indigenous peoples organisations from local to national levels.
A survey questionnaire was circulated among the beneficiaries to gather their feedback on the results after accessing the IPHRD Fund. The responses to the questionnaire clearly show positive outcomes from the perspective of the beneficiaries and their support organizations.
1. Outcomes after receiving support

A. Philippines

In the Philippines, different organizations expressed that the Fund was extremely helpful for IPHRDs, their families and communities during times of threat, crisis or emergency. Many IPHRD’s families were provided with their basic needs and were able to find sanctuary in a safer place. The Fund enabled the relocation of IPHRDs and 200 families to avoid further human rights violations in the areas of risk. Families of IPHRDs were relocated from their community to the city where they rented apartments as their sanctuary. Afterwards, the Fund secured the return of IPHRDs to their community by establishing a support and protection mechanism, making them feel safe and confident enough to return. Community members and teachers were also able to overcome their fear and stand up to the military. It helped them conduct an effective lobby campaign for the safe return of IPHRDs to their community.

In addition, the Fund facilitated communication and the delivery of needed psychosocial services and counseling to the victims and their families, especially during emergency situations. For instance, communication was facilitated between the IPHRD and his family at times when he needed to be separated from them for a while. He was able to get regular updates on the situation in the community and his workplace through the procurement of

Forced Evacuation of Manobo indigenous peoples

In the early morning of August 6, 2013, a convoy of hundreds of evacuees arrived in Bankeroohan Gym, Brgy. 5-A, Davao City. The evacuees were a mixed group of mostly indigenous peoples (Agusanon Manobo) and settler peasants who sought refuge and temporary sanctuary in Davao City because of intensified militarization in Loreto, Agusan del Sur as a result of military operations against the New People’s Army (NPA). The forcible evacuation and displacement of the Ata Manobos came at a time when they were already in a precarious situation, being among the 6.2 million people affected by Super Typhoon Pablo. Through support from the IPHRD Fund, the Manobo evacuees received medical assistance and psychosocial intervention. They were also able to successfully negotiate for their safe and orderly return to their homes in Loreto, Agusan del Sur through a dialogue with the local government of Loreto and the Eastern Mindanao Command of the Armed Forces of the Philippines. They were further assured that no retaliatory action would be taken by the military against the leaders of the evacuees. On August 27, 2013, around 500 evacuees left Davao City to return home to Loreto. The Manobo evacuees were given relief packs, rice, and medicines donated by the City Government of Davao, Help Agusan Sur and AIPP.
In 2012, indigenous peoples belonging to the Save Mankayan Movement (SMM) staged a barricade to stop the drilling operation of the Goldfields Mining Corporation that threatened their ancestral homeland in Tabio, Mankayan, Benguet. The barricade, which had broad support from other sectors and surrounding communities, was successful in stopping the drilling. However, the mining company filed criminal cases at the Regional Trial Court in Buguias, Benguet against 120 community members who had conducted the barricade. The community human rights defenders

In terms of legal assistance, the Fund provided valuable resources to be able to remove the victims from risk situations so that they could press charges against the perpetrators. The Fund helped in getting the release of arrested minors, in filing charges against the perpetrators of human rights violations and in dropping trumped up charges against IPHRDs. Trumped up charges are usually criminalization of fabricated actions taken by IPHRDS and their communities. These include stealing, destruction of property, killing. Legal assistance provided to 120 individual IPHRDs charged in court for various offenses resulted in the delisting of 23 names from the charges, including women, children and even dead people. The remaining 97 charged received legal representation in their court case, and enabled them to attend hearings in court. The Fund also ensured that legal counsels were able to attend to their cases and allowed beneficiaries to keep appointments with the court and the Justice Secretary. However, most of the cases filed are not yet resolved and families have been told that these may run for years.

The Fund also enabled organizations to document human rights violations. Documentation was used for various purposes such as a report for an environmental investigative mission on a mining-affected community and a fact-finding mission. Documentation was shared with different networks, published and submitted to various human rights bodies and also informed advocacy which helped bring about visibility to issues being raised.

Sanctuary support resulted in more than just security for the victims. While in sanctuary, one IPHRD received further

Criminalization of IPHRDs defending ancestral land and resources

In 2012, indigenous peoples belonging to the Save Mankayan Movement (SMM) staged a barricade to stop the drilling operation of the Goldfields Mining Corporation that threatened their ancestral homeland in Tabio, Mankayan, Benguet. The barricade, which had broad support from other sectors and surrounding communities, was successful in stopping the drilling. However, the mining company filed criminal cases at the Regional Trial Court in Buguias, Benguet against 120 community members who had conducted the barricade. The community human rights defenders
FEEDBACK FROM THE BENEFICIARIES

William Bugatti, an indigenous human rights worker and organizer of the Cordillera Peoples Alliance in Ifugao had been listed in the Target Persons of the 86th Infantry Battalion along with other human rights and development workers in the Cordillera, Philippines. Also included in the same list of 23 names was Jude Baggo, another IPHRD and officer of the Cordillera Human Rights Alliance. Those in the list experienced intense surveillance and harassment by the military over a period of several months. William eventually became a victim of extrajudicial killing on March 25, 2014 while riding his motorcycle on his way home to his family, bringing the threats he received to reality. Through the IPHRD Fund, the family of William received funeral assistance and psychosocial counseling to help them cope with the trauma resulting from the death of William. In the case of Jude Baggo, assistance from the IPHRD Fund was used primarily to allow him to seek sanctuary in his hometown, Hungduan. While in sanctuary, Jude Baggo was also able to visit and document cases of community human rights defenders in the municipalities of Tinoc and Hungduan, Ifugao during Martial Law. These visits documented at least 35 individual cases of torture, arrest and detention, rape, frustrated murder. This documentation was a big help in providing data on the extent of violations suffered by indigenous communities during Martial Law.

Sanctuary and family support for IPHRD victims of political persecution

education and training on human rights. He was able to assist in documentation and became a spokesperson for other human rights victims. Another IPHRD, while in sanctuary, was able to document the human rights violations his community experienced during Martial Law in the 1970s. The community-based sanctuary provided relief and a relaxed atmosphere compared to the urban setting where the IPHRD was working under threat, thereby strengthening his commitment to continue protecting human rights.

continue to face the criminal case filed against them, which is still ongoing up to today. Those charged continue to experience harassment and intimidation from the company. The legal assistance provided by the AIPP helped mobilize the communities to support the 120 IPHRDs who were charged by the Goldfields Mining Company. These mobilizations provided moral support to the IPHRDs and put pressure on the court and the local government unit to take action on the case. The Fund also helped conduct meetings, focus group discussions and case conferences in the affected communities to explain and discuss the legal case and plan possible actions. Part of the assistance was also used to reproduce the voluminous documents for lawyers and advocates.
B. India

In India, IPHRDs received ample legal representation in court. With the assistance of a lawyer, the adivasis who were falsely charged as Maoists were bailed out and released from jail. In addition, IPHRDs were able to undergo medical treatment and to hire good lawyers to assist in the cases filed against them. Some of the charges are still ongoing in court.

In Jharkhand, the State Authority ruled in favor of 51 families who were excommunicated on the basis of their religion. Through the Fund, the 51 families were able to move back to their community and rebuild their houses. With the legal assistance provided, the Chief Minister of Jharkhand declared that the case filed against 14 IPHRDs in Nagri District who were charged with attempted murder of police officers would be withdrawn. In addition, 40 IPHRDs in Dumka district who have been facing several criminal charges due to their involvement in protesting forceful land acquisitions, received legal and material support and were able to get back to their normal lives and continue their human rights work. Two IPHRDs including one who went blind after the police shot them in a protest against forceful land acquisitions were able to get proper medical attention.

In Northeast India, the Fund has been beneficial in getting medical treatment for four IPHRDs who were severely injured during a protest against the Dibang Multipurpose Dam at Roing, Lower Dibang Valley, Arunachal Pradesh, India. It also helped them hire lawyers to claim compensation for the injuries they sustained during the protest. In Meghalaya the Fund enabled Agnes Karshing, an IPHRD who has been involved in helping victims of violence against indigenous women and leading protests against the ADB-funded New Shillong Township Project affecting indigenous peoples to engage the services of lawyers for her defense and release from jail on numerous defamation charges filed against her. It has helped them defend themselves against false allegations in court and physical threats to them and their families. Such support has been an encouragement and empowerment for them to continue their engagement in the protection of human rights.

C. Bangladesh

In Bangladesh, the Fund was of paramount importance for the IPHRDs and their families at risk. The Fund was used to cover legal expenses, food, accommodation, transportation, communication and education. Assistance continues to be provided to one IPHRD who was supported in 2012 to be able to get competent legal counsel for several court cases filed against him as a form of harassment. With the assistance, he was also able to file charges against leaders of land grabbers who have been continually harassing their indigenous community. Because of the Fund, IPHRDs were able to continue their legal fight, restore their normal lives and continue to advocate for indigenous peoples rights. Assisting IPHRDs at risk in Bangladesh is a risk in itself as the government is sensitive to human rights defenders and communities asserting their rights, particularly those in the CHT. This makes it difficult to deliver timely assistance when it is most needed.
D. Nepal

In Nepal, the Fund assisted to a great extent a bereaved IPHRD’s family in covering the financial costs after his death. The victim was the sole breadwinner of his family, who had died as a result of serious injuries from police gunfire during peaceful protests of indigenous Tharu peoples. The Fund assisted the family in their immediate financial needs, including payment for medical treatment of the victim and expenses for lobbying to obtain State compensation.

E. Cambodia

In Cambodia, as a result of accessing the Fund, the threat against activists was reduced, allowing them more time to work in Phnom Penh to assist indigenous women from Preah Vihear in their national advocacy. The Fund was used to ensure representation in court of more than 1000 indigenous community members who have been struggling to protect their traditional land and forest from being taken over and bulldozed by a private company. Steps were also taken to protect the security of an IPHRD, who had been threatened while assisting these communities, mobilizing local elders and raising their awareness on laws and policies concerning indigenous peoples’ human rights. Through support from the Fund, and through publicity done by national and international

The Bunong people of Orona community of Keo Sema District in Modulkiri Province is one of the eight indigenous communities in Cambodia that have received a collective land title over their territory. With the support of NGOs and donors, the villagers started the process of collective land titling in 2005 and a total of 1,800 hectares was delineated as their territory by the PLUP. However, in 2011, 643.08 hectares of this traditional Bunong territory was granted without any consultation or consent as part of the 5000 hectares ELC of the Rithy Kiriseima Company. In early 2013, they received their collective land title over what remained of their territory after land grabbing, illegal selling, and the ELC. The issuance of the collective land title to the Bunong of Orona was done by the Senior Minister of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction. However, in a visit in October 2013 by the German appraisal team from GIZ who were accompanied by the ILO Office in Cambodia and by the Ministry of Land officials, the Bunong reported serious problems related to their titled collective land. Part of their reserved land for shifting cultivation with an area of 122.93 hectares was grabbed by the District Governor and by the Police Military. The Bunong villagers have since filed a case in the Mondulkiri Provincial Court on 20 February 2014 for the return of their lands. Although all evidence are in their favour, only time will tell if the wheels of justice with roll in their favour as they are up against a system that does not favor the poor and powerless. It is hoped that the diligence of the assisting lawyer will pay off for the Orona Bunong collective land title holders.
media, action was taken by the national government enabling three communities to move forward in their registration as a legal entity to claim collective title over their land.

F. Thailand

In Thailand, the Fund enabled IPHRDs to hire a lawyer to help them with their case by preparing legal documents and representing them in court. With the presence of a lawyer, the IPHRDs became more vocal because they felt more confident to talk without fear. Through the Fund, the victims who had been charged with deforestation were able to avoid jail terms, allowing them to stay with their families and continue their work in their communities. The beneficiaries expressed that the Fund is very useful and important at a time when human right violations are increasing because many indigenous peoples or non-government organizations don’t have this kind of fund to support indigenous peoples who are criminalized for asserting and practicing their traditional livelihood practices in their territories which are usually declared in Thailand as national parks. In the well-known forced disappearance of the Billy [Pholachi Rakchongcharoen], a Karen IPHRD of of Karen communities within the Kaeng Krachan national park, the support to the family enabled them to meet immediate needs while they were working with support groups to surface Billy who until now has not been found.

G. Indonesia

In Indonesia, through the support accessed from the Fund, the indigenous Muara Tae community of Dayak were able to lodge a complaint with the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) on the violation of their rights by a the private oil palm company PT Borneo Surya Mining Jaya/First Resources (FR). The RSPO released a decision that the private company had violated the rights of the Muara Tae community.\(^1\) It ruled that the company should exclude indigenous peoples’ lands and customary conservation forests from the scope of their operations, including getting their free and prior informed consent (FPIC) if indigenous peoples lands would be affected. The district government also suspended its officers who had facilitated the land grabbing of the lands in question. However, the company never complied with the RSPO legal decision and on June 2, 2014, Muara Tae community was forced to confront the land clearing of the company. Their leader was quoted as saying, “We, the people of Muara Tae are very disappointed and angry because of this, since we have agreed before that we never welcome PT BSMJ in our land and that has been supported by legal decision under the RSPO which obligate the PT BSMJ to stop all activities within the Muara Tae area”.\(^2\)

\(^1\) An article on the decision can be found in http://news.mongabay.com/2013/0426-first-resources-land-grabbing.html and also at http://www.rspo.org/en/status_of_complaint&cpid=21


FEEDBACK FROM THE BENEFICIARIES

H. Malaysia

Support for Malaysian IPHRDs went to assist IPHRDs slapped with court cases for defending their native customary rights [NCR] lands and who were subsequently physically assaulted and jailed. The jailed IPHRDs were released. Meanwhile, Surik Anak Muntai, an Iban leader, was viciously slashed and beaten outside of his son’s school in Melikin, Sarawak, resulting to horrific injuries to his right arm and both knees that required his hospitalization. The Fund contributed for his medical expenses and to file a case against his assailant. Surik is one of the leaders of Iban communities battling with an oil palm company for 7,300 hectares of NCR land awarded to the companies under a ‘provisional lease’ by the Taib government. Surik claims he clearly saw his assailant as an executive of one of the companies they are battling with.

Jailed for reporting violation

Matek Anak Geram and his brother Tambi were released from jail six months after being arbitrarily arrested and detained in January 2013. The complainant from the logging company withdrew his complaint voluntarily. Earlier, they discovered illegal logging in their NCR land and confiscated the keys of the machines being used and turned these over to the police. The loggers retrieved the keys and continued their illegal activity despite protests from Matek’s longhouse. When the longhouse demanded compensation for disturbing their peace or cease their activities, the four leaders were instead arrested for criminal intimidation. The Fund was able to support their legal case which allowed them produce the necessary documentation and other requisites to prove their case. This was the latest arrest of Matek as he was also arrested earlier in 2009 for illegal restraint of company workers for leading the blockade of an access road to company concession.

2. Sufficiency of the fund accessed and other sources generated

In their responses to the questionnaire, most of the organizations that had accessed the Fund felt that the amount of funds received was generally sufficient to address the immediate needs of the concerned IPHRDs. However, others felt that the amount was not enough due to the numerous continuing needs of the IPHRDs and their families, such as lengthy court procedures and travel requirements to reach community beneficiaries. In some cases, organizations were able to access other sources to supplement the amount received from the Fund, while others were unable to do so. Among the other sources tapped after the IPHRD Fund had been spent were church-related groups, individual donations and program funds from other organizations and indigenous peoples advocate organizations.

See his account in this: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5G5KyBSU1AI
3. Challenges in accessing the Fund

Most of the beneficiaries expressed that the IPHRD Fund was relatively easy to access and utilization was flexible enough to respond the actual needs of the IPHRD at the time of risk or threat. Partner organizations were very willing to endorse requests and AIPP was quick to respond to the requests for support submitted.

However, some organizations also encountered challenges such as the delayed response of the IPHRD Net country committee members and AIPP to the request. It was also noted that some IPHRD cases that could have been supported are not specified in the IPHRD Fund. For example, other types of assistance aside from sanctuary, legal and material assistance are not included, such as documentation and investigation. A question was also raised on how to respond to the trend of “red-tagging” or communist labeling and political vilification of indigenous leaders, organizers and members of indigenous organizations, which could eventually lead to graver forms of human rights violations such as extrajudicial killings.

Another challenge was the difficulty in the collection of data and supporting documents required to be able to access the Fund. Since provision of funds requires adequate data and supporting documents, IPHRDs have to deal with obstacles in the collection of data from different sources. The organization in Thailand mentioned English language translation as a challenge in providing the data needed for accessing the Fund.

Some organizations also face administrative and technical constraints in complying with the requirements of the Fund. There is a felt lack of outreach about the Fund and inadequate information among relevant indigenous organizations, support groups and human rights defenders about the Fund and its application processes. There is also a lack of knowledge and skills, such as proficiency in English language or technical (computer) skills, among those who could use the support from the Fund. Particularly for India and Cambodia, the prolonged bank transaction process and time-consuming transfer of funds from AIPP to the partner organization then to the lawyer was also mentioned as a challenge.

4. Sustainability in the protection of IPHRDs

Sustainability means that IPHRDs will continue to address human rights issues even after the project has ended. One way of achieving this is through awareness raising and capability-building among communities and IPHRDs, which is being done by the partner organizations of the IPHRD Net. Most of the organizations agreed in saying that organizing, education on human rights, and advocacy campaigns to expose to the public the threats experienced were necessary strategies in sustaining the protection of IPHRDs. Empowering indigenous people through continued grassroots organizing allows them to rely on their own unity and capacity. The collective determination of entire communities to assert their rights is the most dependable form of support an IPHRD can tap. Parallel efforts by partner and support organizations to raise public awareness and pressure state agencies to act are
an added boost. But it is important for the communities themselves to take ownership of the campaigns to defend their own human rights.

Another effective means of sustainability is to build the capacity of organized communities to act as sanctuary for their own indigenous leaders or IPHRDs who are threatened. It is also possible to mobilize the community people who are in evacuation centers to take part in lobbying against ongoing military operations within and around their community. For this to happen, IPHRDs, their families and communities who are at risk need to be provided with capacity-building trainings to be able to withstand such stressful situations.

The organizations also mentioned that they have tried to tap other means of support and other possible sources of funding to protect IPHRDs, their families and communities at risk. Whenever possible and necessary, local organizations use their internal funds to support IPHRDs at risk.

IPHRDs are also raising their own funds to support their struggles. A noteworthy effort is that of the Sindhuli community in Nepal, who have established a contribution system within the community to support their struggle against the transmission line project of the World Bank in Nepal. The contributions are used to support their need for legal services and other expenditures related to their case.

Efforts have also been taken seek to external funding and resources other than the IPHRD Fund. For this, networking is seen as essential in generating broader support from other advocates of indigenous peoples and human rights. For example, networking with churches and lawyers has yielded various forms of support such as sanctuary, finance, material support and pro bono legal assistance.

In spite of and in addition to all these initiatives mentioned above, it was felt that it is still very much necessary to seek external and continued funding to respond to the great need of IPHRDs, their families and communities at risk. It is also important to look for a funding source that can help IPHRDs, their families and affected communities re-establish their economic livelihood and social activities.

5. Role of IPHRD Network

IPHRD Network members and partner organizations see the network foremost as an important opportunity for mutual support. One of its important functions is that it has been instrumental in facilitating the extension of much needed funds for sanctuary and legal needs of IPHRDs at risk by endorsing deserving indigenous organizations and IPHRDs to access the Fund. But more than that, the Network has also extended advocacy and campaign support to the members and victims by assisting in campaigns on specific human rights cases and issues, such as attacks against indigenous peoples and communities. It has provided concrete support for campaign activities, such as issuing urgent alerts, lobbying and making joint submissions to concerned human rights institutions and mechanisms.

The network has also served as a hub and channel for information sharing to raise awareness on the threats against IPHRDs. It has made the issue of human rights more visible through regular updates, alerts and appeals while providing general analysis and trends on the human rights situation of indigenous peoples in Asia. It has done joint monitoring and documentation, increased social media visibility through the website, periodic newsletters and media advocacy. One constraint is that some indigenous peoples such as those in Thailand cannot contribute regularly and actively in the information exchange because of the language barrier.
Some partner organizations are not IPHRD Net members and have only engaged with the Network to access support from the Fund. However, most of the organizations felt that the network has had a consolidating effect on them, by forging solidarity linkages with others and by giving the opportunity for them to work together. It has been a forum for sharing experiences thus building solidarity among indigenous activists, communities and organizations through holding periodic meetings, capacity-building seminars, sharing on advocacy skills, and conducting joint campaigns, lobby and advocacy. The use of social media is also seen as a means to facilitate learning and exchange of best practices and experiences in the protection of IPHRDs and indigenous peoples’ rights.
IV. ANALYSIS: INITIAL IMPACT OF THE IPHRD FUND

The impacts of the IPHRD Fund can be gauged by assessing the extent of achievement of the defined objectives of the project as seen in its outputs and outcomes for the past three years. At the level of the target groups, impacts are assessed by looking at the perceived changes in the situation of the beneficiaries, the IPHRDs, their families and communities, who were supported by the Fund.

The bulk of the funds were accessed by different organisations in the Philippines which is an indication of the gravity of human rights violations that IPHRDs and their communities are facing. Since the administration of President Aquino, 42 IPHRDs have been killed, mostly in Mindanao. The eight evacuation that were supported by the IPHRD Fund is only a part of the 16 incidences in seven provinces in Mindanao reported by human rights organisations since 2010 when the current president started his regime.

It would also be good to see whether or not there are any perceived impacts and changes in the overall human rights situation of indigenous peoples in Asia as a result of the IPHRD Fund. However, given that the Fund has only been implemented during the last three years, the long term impacts of the project on the overall human rights situation are yet to be seen.

The support for financial, medical and material assistance has very immediate impacts and the previous sections have shown this. However, there are very crucial elements of support that need to be highlighted here in the light of the experience of the beneficiaries: psychological counseling, legal assistance and sanctuary.
1. Psychosocial Counseling

The psychological well-being of victims is an important area for intervention. Trauma almost always is experienced by any victims of a violation. The Fund has been of particular importance for this service to victims especially at it needs specialized knowledge and skills. Specifically, the Fund was able to provide psychosocial counseling for the women spouses and children of the IPHRDs killed, who were all male victims. For instance, in the Philippines, the wife and children of the slain IPHRD William Bugatti were supported through counseling and other basic needs to be able to deal with the trauma and economic dislocation after the killing. This service has been crucial in strengthening the coping mechanism of the individuals and the group in the evacuation sites as the IPHRDs and communities had to suddenly adjust to abnormal living conditions and also to process the trauma they have been subjected to.

2. Legal Assistance

Access to justice is generally limited for indigenous peoples due to various reasons, including accessibility in terms of language, resources, physical distance and power. Perpetrators, especially land grabbers, have been so used to getting their way from the courts and circumventing the legal system in their favor. This increasing engagement of IPHRDs and their communities with the courts is challenging this power monopoly and is an indication of rising capacity of indigenous peoples to engage affirmatively with the justice system to confront perpetrators. That 68% of the Fund was accessed for legal assistance is a reflection of the deep need for this kind of service especially when assertions of rights is often criminalized.

Three cases in Cambodia show the strategic value of engaging the government/perpetrators in courts through mentoring in the law/court procedures and proper legal representation. Legal support enabled the IPHRDs and communities to legally access information on the cases which is often not available upon demand. In the Busra case, the seven accused villagers did not even know who charged them for destruction of private property. In Orona, engagement with the court forced the powerful land grabbers, including the District Governor and the nephew of the Provincial Head Prosecutor, to commit to return the grabbed lands in Orona Bunong villagers.
The threat of eviction of Bunong in seven villages in Bousra Commune remains high because of several ELCs and SLCs overlapping their territories undermines the collective land registration process that is underway. Although the Bousra Bunong villagers have tried in several instances to seek administrative relief from district and provincial government offices, there had been no action so far. The Fund supported the conduct of workshops on the protection aspect of the 2001 Land Law as it pertains to their on-going collective land registration. Villagers were also able to submit a complaint to the Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction (MLMUPC) for the cancellation of the ELCs and the SLC. As of date, there had been no response from the concerned ministry and the communities are prioritizing the resolution of the SLC case since this is a more sensitive issue as it pits one people against another. Technical and legal advice is constantly being provided even beyond the project period.

In Kbal Romeas, five villages peopled mostly by Bunong and Kreung indigenous are under threat of forced eviction due to the construction of the Lower Sesan II Dam. Despite the many years of work of NGOs in the area and the advances in the dam construction, there had been no response to demands from the affected communities. With technical and legal advice, they were able to submit a petition to the Steung Treng provincial government to address the issues of lack of information, consultation and clear plans for compensation and resettlement. The petition also included their proposals for a possible relocation area. The experience of the Muara Tae reinforces the strategic value of legal engagement although this may not end the problem. However, decision of the RSPO is a precedent that can be used for future cases.

Competent legal support and advice in the court processes is important not only to meet technical requirements but also it also provides immense moral support for IPHRDs facing charges and/or those who wish to file cases. Fear, limited knowledge and/or lack of trust of the courts due to negative experiences actually experienced and/or heard from others contributes to this lack of confidence. Procurement of much-needed documents, like affidavits, and the preparation of legal briefs, are usually cumbersome and need technical legal assistance.

Legal support also bolsters the confidence of the supporting lawyers. In the observation of one of the facilitating organisations in Cambodia, the lawyer adviser is getting more confident as he assists villagers in technical and legal advice, and giving legal literacy workshops. This is a very positive development as lawyers, in their individual capacity, who can take on cases for IPHRDs and their communities, are hard to find in Cambodia. There are several NGOs providing legal advice but cannot provide legal representation. This can be done by an independent lawyer. Legal representation is needed for the IPHRDs at this point when they are constrained by their lack of knowledge, language and confidence in court procedures.

3. Provision of sanctuary

There were also several cases of indigenous communities who were threatened and subjected to forcible evacuation and displacement from their homelands. On the part of the communities, support from the Fund enabled them to seek sanctuary in a safer place to avoid more harm and human rights violations. The Philippines topped the cases of evacuation, all in Mindanao island, southern Philippines, but particularly in the northern and southern regions of the island. In an increasing trend, from one in Year 1, two in Year 2 and then three in Year 3, involving the displacement and evacuation of at least 1,279 individuals [750 women and 529 men] and latest composed of 145 families. All these cases involve indigenous communities.
resisting mining operations, plantations and a ranch in their ancestral lands. Their resistance has pitted them against paramilitary groups from their own people employed as company security forces, assisted by the state military forces. The Fund helped them to seek sanctuary in neighboring villages, in another town or the provincial capital, at least temporarily. In these cases, the Fund supported their needs to normalize their lives through assistance for subsistence farming and livestock production, and to tide them over while waiting for the harvest and their safe return.

In another community where the school had to be stopped due to the harassment of teachers by the military, the community people were helped to understand better their rights and to stand up against the perpetrators of human rights violations. Since the non-formal school is the only educational facility within the vicinity of several indigenous villagers, the closure denied education for the children. Through the Fund, the villagers set up a community protection system to enable the teachers to continue teaching without fear of reprisal and the students to continue attending their classes. The protection system allowed faster communication through a hand-held radio and more efficient travel through a horse between the school and the children’s villages. This had a positive psychological effect on the teachers as well as on the community members whose security was threatened by military troops who had committed human rights violations against the teachers, leaders, communities and students.
OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES

OBJECTIVE 1. TO RESPOND TO IMMEDIATE AND URGENT NEEDS OF IPHRDS AND/OR THEIR FAMILIES IN ORDER TO ALLEVIATE THEIR SUFFERING AND/OR MITIGATE THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE VIOLATION OF THEIR RIGHTS.

A total of 74 cases were supported benefiting 3,087 individuals in 8 countries in Asia with a total amount of Euro 180,222 for 3 years. Support was given in the form of legal assistance (68%), sanctuary (10%), and material and financial support (22%), addressing the basic needs of IPHRDs and their families at risk in order to alleviate their suffering and/or mitigate the consequences of the violation of their rights. There were more female beneficiaries (55%) than male beneficiaries (45%).

OBJECTIVE 2. TO PROVIDE SANCTUARY TO IPHRDS WHO ARE FACING SERIOUS THREATS TO THEIR PERSONAL SECURITY AND WELL-BEING AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THEIR HUMAN RIGHTS WORK

In terms of outcomes, the beneficiaries expressed that the Fund was extremely helpful for them especially during times of threat, crisis or emergency. Many IPHRD’s families were evacuated to be able to find sanctuary in a safer place and to avoid further human rights violations in the areas of risk. They were provided with psychosocial counseling and services as well as support to meet their basic needs during the time that they were under risk or threat. They felt safer and gained confidence in expressing their fears as well as in addressing their problems. It helped them conduct an effective lobby campaign with support groups for their safe return to their community.

Sanctuary support resulted in more than just security for the victims. While in sanctuary, one IPHRD received further education and training, enabling him to assist in human rights documentation and to become a spokesperson for other human rights victims. Thus the commitment to continue protecting human rights had been strengthened among the beneficiaries.

Providing sanctuary reduced the threat against activists, allowing them more time to work and assist indigenous peoples in their advocacy.

The mental and psychological health of victims improved with the psycho-social counseling provided for those in sanctuary, especially women and children evacuation victims, and those who faced intimidation and threats. This helped in their coping mechanisms as they moved forward with their lives.

The assistance of legal counsel helped IPHRDs face the charges filed against them. Many of them were able get back to their normal lives and continue their human rights work. One victim recovered enough to resume her human rights work, while also being able to speak out against the threats and harassment that she had experienced. The assistance of a competent lawyer also helped one IPHRD to convince the court to dismiss several trumped charges against him. By helping them defend themselves against false allegations in court and physical threats to them and their families, the Fund served as an encouragement and empowerment for them to continue their engagement in the protection of human rights.
There is also increased confidence of communities to engage the courts because competent legal assistance is provided that helps them produce documents that can stand in the court of law. The process of filing cases in court is also empowering for the communities because their knowledge of their rights is reiterated as they learn how to meet requirements of the court case and the ways of the court. In countries where the courts are not fully independent and there is lack of competent legal advice, the IPHRD Fund was able to support competent and committed lawyers to work for the cases.

The provision of material and financial support, especially to victims of evacuation and families of victims of extra-judicial killings increased the coping mechanism of victims in a time when their source of subsistence is jeopardized.

The beneficiaries expressed that the Fund is very useful and important at a time when human right violations are increasing all over Asia. Many indigenous peoples and non-government organizations do not have this kind of fund to support victims in protecting their rights and avoiding threats.

Finally, through support accessed from the Fund, a number of favorable decisions were reached by judicial bodies to respect indigenous peoples’ rights to land, life and to free prior and informed consent. Some cases were filed and/or sanctions were imposed on those who had committed violations against indigenous peoples.

From the above, it can be concluded that the IPHRD Fund was highly successful in meeting its defined objectives, as seen in its outputs and outcomes. The Fund resulted in several positive changes in the well-being and human rights situation of the beneficiary IPHRDs, their families and their communities among the indigenous peoples in Asia. Thus, it would be highly beneficial and it is strongly recommended for AIPP to continue implementing the IPHRD Fund. It is further recommended for the Fund to extend its support to include more types of services to an even wider beneficiary base among indigenous communities all over Asia that continue to be extremely vulnerable to numerous human rights violations.
V.

SPECIFIC: RECOMMENDATIONS

For the IPHRD **FUND**:

- Enhance its outreach by using languages understandable by relevant indigenous peoples organizations, support groups and human rights defenders. Greater visibility of the Fund in social media is also recommended so that it can be accessed by other institutions providing direct support and services to indigenous peoples.

- Further simplify the application process for support from the Fund in consideration of the literacy level of the beneficiaries, including encouraging audio requests. Improve the timely response and transfer of funds.

- Address the administrative limitations of local partner organizations, particularly in documenting fund utilization and report writing.

- Improve accessibility, availability and flexibility of the Fund in order to address immediate needs such as emergency transportation and communications, basic necessities of IPHRDs and families such as food and shelter, follow-up of legal cases in the courts and other local and national offices.

- Include other categories for funding support, such as documentation, monitoring and some preventive or legal measures to safeguard the security especially of high-profile IPHRDs.

Enhance its outreach by using indigenous languages, simplify the application process, address the administrative limitations, improve accessibility, availability and flexibility of the Fund, other categories for funding support
For the IPHRD NETWORK:

- Continue community-based education on comprehensive human rights, documentation and advocacy skills.
- Highlight the issue of SLAPP cases as a form of political harassment and a major human rights issue that needs to be addressed. SLAPP stands for strategic lawsuit against public participation, which is a lawsuit that is intended to censor, intimidate, and silence critics, including human rights defenders, by burdening them with the cost of a legal defense until they abandon their criticism or opposition.
- Improve networking with local civil libertarians, local government officials and human rights advocates to assist IPHRDs at risk.
- Form Quick Reaction Teams especially in human rights hotspots where grave violations such as massive forced evacuations, killings, torture and harassment of civilians have been committed.
- File official complaints or appeals whenever possible and necessary, and to use all available processes in local government and police system in cases of threat, e.g. registering cases of human rights violations in police blotters.
- Strengthen the institutional capacity of the IPHRD network for more effective and efficient coordination through sustained interactions both off- and online, skills sharing and joint campaigns.
- Continue international advocacy for the promotion and protection of IPHRDs and their work by engaging UN country offices, submitting cases of human rights violations against IPHRDs and their communities to different UN mechanisms to all mechanisms.
- Strengthen the networking capacities of the IPHRD organizations nationally with their NHRIs, local governments, foreign embassies and UN agencies.
- Make the network more interactive and visible by optimizing information and communication technology, media, as well as person-to-person exchanges. Improve the IPHRD website with regular updates, analysis, and enhanced readability, accessibility and visibility.
ADOPT A COMMUNITY

Many indigenous communities facing human rights violations, especially those related to their land, territories and resources, have limited awareness of their rights as citizens and as indigenous peoples. Raising the level of awareness of communities on their rights had been empowering. Gaining knowledge of their rights have encouraged them to organise themselves more systematically. Several of these communities then acted for their own interests by asserting their rights. These organised communities also are able to support their IPHRDs at risk. Some also serve as sanctuaries for those from other places. You can support a community organiser, support regular community meetings, support documentation of a human rights violations towards seeking redress in the domestic courts or other remedies, support a whole community organising program, among other initiatives.

ORGANISE, JOIN AND/OR SUPPORT A LAWYERS'/PARALEGAL POOL

Legal assistance is a crucial support for IPHRDs at risk when they can have access to competent legal counsel and representation. Supporting the operational expenses of lawyers, the court fees, the procurement and production of relevant documents, all need resources. Technical assistance from those who know court processes are important in explaining to IPHRDs the risks and benefits in taking violators to court. IPHRDs at risk and their communities are often unable to do all of these. The intervention of a court can be crucial to the protection of the security of the IPHRD.

CONTRIBUTE TO THE IPHRD FUND

IPHRDs at risk and their communities have various needs that need to be addressed in a timely and efficient manner. One way to meet these needs when it is needed most is to have a fund which can easily be accessed by them. The IPHRD Fund was set up precisely to meet these needs. Apart from legal assistance, IPHRDs at risk also need financial, material, medical and sanctuary needs. In many instances, the indigenous communities that face militarization due to their assertion of their rights are in no position to document their situation and bring it to the attention of the authorities. Pooling resources through the IPHR Fund can provide the mechanism for sustained support to IPHRDs at risk and their communities.

WHAT TO DO:

Get in touch with the IPHRD Network at iphrdefender@gmail.com.
REVISED APPLICATION FORM

I. Beneficiary Profile and Assisting Organization

For individual beneficiary/ies (to be filled up only if request is being made for individual/s):

Name/s of Beneficiary:
Gender:
Age:
Ethnicity:
Nationality:
Address:
(Add more lines if beneficiary is more than one):

For Community Beneficiary (to be filled up only if request is being made for a community):

Name/s of point/focal person in the community:
Number of beneficiaries in the community:
Address of Community:

Name of Organization/Assisting Organization:
Name of Person Accountable to AIPP and the IPHRD Fund:
Address of Organization:
Telephone:
Mobile:
Email:

II. Situation

(Please provide a summary of the event that has prompted your request for assistance.)
Date of Incident:
Location of Incident:
Victim/s:
Perpetrator/s:
Short Account of the Incident (Please narrate what happened):

III. Assistance

A. What type of assistance do you need?
☐ Legal Assistance
☐ Financial and Material Assistance (including Counseling and Medical Assistance)
☐ Sanctuary Assistance

B. Requested Amount: (Please indicate currency you are using and its equivalent in EURO)

C. How will the money be used? Please provide an itemized budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost in Local Currency</th>
<th>No of Units</th>
<th>Counterpart</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Bank Account Details

In case the request for assistance is approved, please provide the Bank Account Details

Where the grant will be sent:
Name of Account:
Address of Account Holder:
Account Number:
Name of Bank:
Bank Address:
SWIFT CODE:

E. What other sources of support are available for your situation?

IV. Confidentiality. Confidentiality

Should any specific information about the request be kept confidential? AIPP does not disclose individual names and contact information to any party outside of the organization.

Signature of Beneficiary or Authorized Person with the Assisting Organization:
Date:

Please email duly accomplished form to:
IP Human Rights Defenders Network
Email: richard@aippnet.org, bernice@aippnet.org

FOR USE OF THE REGIONAL OFFICE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of receipt</th>
<th>Date completed</th>
<th>Date disbursed</th>
<th>Date acknowledge</th>
<th>Date report/s received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORTING FORM

I. Contact Details

Name/s of Beneficiary:
Address:
Name of Organization/Assisting Organization:
Name of Person Accountable to AIPP and the IPHRD Fund:
Address of Organization:
Telephone:
Mobile:
Email:

II. Update on the situation of the beneficiary/ies

(Please provide a summary of the situation since the time that the request has been made)
Date of Incident:
Location of Incident:
Victim/s:
Perpetrator/s:
Short Account of the Incident (Please narrate what happened):

III. Assistance

A. What type of assistance was provided?
- Legal Assistance
- Financial and Material Assistance (including Counseling and Medical Assistance)
- Sanctuary Assistance

B. How did the assistance make a difference to the security/risks/situation of the beneficiary/ies?

C. Amount Granted:

D. Please provide a summary/finance report on how the fund was used (use separate sheet/s if necessary).

Report Prepared by:
Signature:
Date:

Please email duly accomplished form to:
IP Human Rights Defenders Network
Email: richard@aippnet.org, bernice@aippnet.org
The emergency fund for human rights defenders at risk managed under the EIDHR allows the Commission to give direct small grants of up to 10,000 euro per grant to Human Rights Defenders (HRD), be it individuals or organisations, who are in need of urgent support.

This urgent support may take any form that is considered necessary, for instance to cover the fees for the legal representation of defenders, to cover medical expenses, to purchase security material for offices or homes, to pay for the evacuation of a HRD to another country, to support the operations of a Human Rights organisation which finds itself in a dire financial situation, etc.

AIPP can assist in the preparation of the application. For those who do not have PADOR, AIPP can also act as conduit for the fund requests.

http://www.eidhr.eu/side-panels/human-rights-defenders/small-grants

Front Line Defenders Security Grants can pay for organisational and personal provisions to improve the security and protection of a Human Rights Defenders and their organisation. Grants can pay to improve physical security of an organisation, digital security, communication security, legal fees for HRDs who are being judicially harassed. They can pay for medical fees for HRDs who have been attacked or who have suffered a medical condition as a result of their peaceful human rights activities. We can also provide family assistance for imprisoned HRDs. Grants are for amounts up to a maximum of €7,500. We fund emergency and general security grants.

http://www.frontlinedefenders.org/security-grants-programme

The Lifeline Embattled CSO Assistance Fund provides emergency financial assistance to civil society organizations (CSOs) under threat or attack and advocacy support responding to broader threats to civil society.

Lifeline supports a variety of CSOs that conduct advocacy, promote and protect human rights, and/or act in a watchdog capacity, including human rights organizations, journalist associations, student groups, labor unions, think tanks, and others.

http://www.freedomhouse.org/program/lifeline#VD-1DbCFvME
The **Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP)** is a regional organization founded in 1988 by indigenous peoples’ movements as a platform for solidarity and cooperation. AIPP is actively promoting and defending indigenous peoples’ rights and human rights; sustainable development and management of resources and environment protection. Through the years, AIPP has developed its expertise on grassroots capacity building, advocacy and networking from local to global levels and strengthening partnerships with indigenous organizations, support NGOs, UN agencies and other institutions. At present, AIPP has 47 members from 14 countries in Asia with 7 indigenous peoples’ national alliances/networks and 35 local and sub-national organizations including 16 are ethnic-based organizations, five (5) indigenous women and four (4) are indigenous youth organizations.

The **IPHRD Network** is composed of indigenous peoples human rights defenders, activists and development workers, indigenous peoples organisations, support NGOs and individuals working with indigenous peoples for the promotion and protection of their rights. Organised in 2010, it now has 131 members coming from 35 indigenous organizations and 13 support organizations in 18 countries in Asia.