

Participants of a training workshop on early warning and action systems in Bajo Quimiriki, Peru. AIDESEP-Peru.

Annex 3

Advancing collective rights and livelihoods: a baseline assessment of enabling policy conditions in six countries

FULL RESULTS FOR THE BASELINE'S ENABLING POLICY TRACKING TOOL

This annex presents the full results of the baseline's enabling policy tracking tool for the six study countries: Colombia, Peru, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Nepal, Indonesia, and Brazil. For each country, five tables cover the five policy domains: infrastructure and connectivity; livelihood development and capacity building; institutional autonomy and accountability; inclusive governance and cultural respect; and tenure security.

Each table lists the domain's indicators, classified as de jure, de facto, or protection from harm, together with the question or empirical variable measured and its source. For the 13 quantitative indicators, the tables report the national value from secondary sources (A), a localized estimate for forest communities derived from key-informant interviews (B), the national performance benchmark set by the informants (C), and three gaps: the national-to-local gap (A − B), the national benchmark gap (C − B) and the cross-country benchmark gap (D − B), where D is the mean national benchmark across the comparison countries, except Indonesia (see Section 3 of the baseline for details). Unless otherwise noted, values are percentages. Statistics originally expressed in a negative direction were reverse-coded (100 − x) so that higher values consistently indicate better conditions; these are marked with † and explained in the notes below each table. The data sources, scoring and harmonization methods, and the limits on interpreting these estimates are described in the "Data treatment and analysis " section, followed by Table A1, which shows which values were treated post-collection.

Colombia

Table 1. Summary of Infrastructure and Connectivity Indicators (Domain 1) for Colombia: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Constitutional right to water [de jure][1]	Whether the right to water is recognized at the constitutional or national level	Yes	—	—	—	—	—
Access to safely managed drinking water [de facto][2]	People surveyed believe their drinking water was safe	74†	66.07	73.23	7.93	7.16	10.92
Access to mobile network [de facto][2]	People surveyed had a mobile phone for personal calls	92	83.72	86.23	8.28	2.51	-3.54
Trust in legal system [de facto][3]	Firms feel confident in the reliability and fairness of the courts	99†	88.39	64.57	10.61	-23.82	-16.63
Freedom from violent conflict [protection from harm][4]	Political stability and absence of violence/terrorism	49.3	39.79	78.43	9.51	38.64	37.29

† **Direction harmonization:** The original indicator was expressed in a negative direction. It was reverse-coded (100-x) so that higher national values consistently indicate better performance. For access to safely managed drinking water, the original indicator measured the percentage of people worried that their drinking water could cause serious harm in 2021; for trust in legal system, the original indicator measured percentage of firms identifying the functioning of courts as a major or very severe obstacle in 2023.

Table 2. Livelihood Development and Capacity Building indicators (Domain 2) for Colombia: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized Estimate (B)	National Performance Benchmark (C)	National-to-Local Gap (A-B)	National Benchmark Gap (C-B)	Cross-Country Benchmark Gap (D-B)
Ability to use collective title as collateral [de jure][5]	Whether the applicable community-based tenure regime recognizes the right to alienate or collateralize collective title	N/A — vvaries by regime. Afro-Colombian communities: no. Indigenous territories and resguardos: no. Peasant reserve zones: yes.	—	—	—	—	—
Perceived business climate [de facto][2]	Entrepreneurs believed it is a good place to start a business	72	58.73	73.57	13.27	14.84	16.43
Loan approval rate [de facto][3]	Firms that applied for a loan were approved	93.8†	79.73	45.03	14.07	-34.7	-8.59
Access to capacity building (adult and vocational training) [de facto][6]	Youth and adults (25-64 years old) participated in adult education and vocational training programs in the last 12 months	4	3.86	69.4	0.14	65.54	61.17

† **Direction harmonization:** The original indicator was expressed in a negative direction. It was reverse-coded (100-x) so that higher national values consistently indicate better performance. For loan approval rate, the original indicator measured percentage of firms whose recent loan application was rejected in 2023.

Table 3. Institutional Autonomy and Accountability Indicators (Domain 3) for Colombia: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized Estimate (B)	National Performance Benchmark (C)	National-to-Local Gap (A-B)	National Benchmark Gap (C-B)	Cross-Country Benchmark Gap (D-B)
Legal recognition of self-rule and customary governance [de jure][5]	Whether community-based tenure regimes legally recognize community self-rule and customary governance	N/A — qualitative legal indicator. Afro-Colombian communities: yes. Indigenous territories and resguardos: yes. Peasant reserve zones: no.	—	—	—	—	—
Laws that mention the existence of ombudsman and grievance mechanisms [de jure][7]	Whether laws mention the existence of ombudsman and grievance mechanisms	N/A — qualitative legal indicator (yes)	—	—	—	—	—
Anti-corruption measures [protection from harm][8]	Government success in containing corruption	50	45.07	76.26	4.93	31.19	30.99
Trust in political institutions [de facto][9]	Citizens trust the national congress	79†	83.4	79.14	-4.4	-4.26	-6.05
Reported level of corruption in government [protection from harm][10]	People accessed public services without paying a bribe in the last 12 months	80†	85.83	68.2	-5.83	-17.63	-4.51

† **Direction harmonization:** The original indicator was expressed in a negative direction. It was reverse-coded (100-x) so that higher national values consistently indicate better performance. For trust in political institutions, the original indicator measured percentage of citizens did not trust the national congress in 2024; for reported level of corruption in government, the original indicator measured percentage of public service users paid a bribe in 2019.

Table 4. Inclusive Governance and Cultural Respect indicators (Domain 4) for Colombia: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
FPIC standards acknowledged in national legislation [de jure][5]	Whether FPIC standards are acknowledged nationally and under community-based tenure regimes	Community based tenure regime; Afro-Colombian communities: yes; Indigenous territories and resguardos: yes. Peasant reserve zones: no.	—	—	—	—	—
Non-colonial languages recognized as official languages [de jure][11]	Whether non-colonial languages are recognized as official languages	Yes	—	—	—	—	—
Lethal attacks on community activists [protection from harm][12]	Number of environmental defenders killed (2012-2024)	n = 509	35.12	100	-	64.88	64.88
Rural marginalization or exclusion from decision-making [protection from harm][13]	Urban-rural distribution of political power	55.8	60.58	76.8	-4.78	16.22	13.89

Table 5. Tenure Security Indicators (Domain 5) for Colombia: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap(D-B)
Legal recognition of land and forest rights [de jure][5]	Whether land and forest rights of Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities are legally recognized	Yes	—	—	—	—	—
Completeness of the bundle of rights [de jure][5]	Completeness of the bundle of rights under each community-based tenure regime	N/A - varies by regime. Community based tenure regimes and Afro-Colombian communities: yes. Indigenous territories and resguardos: yes. Peasant reserves zones: no.	—	—	—	—	—
Share of formally recognized community forests (% of total forest land) [de facto][14]	Area designated for and owned by Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities as a percentage of total forest land	57	(N/A)	—	—	—	—
Share of formally recognized community land (% of total land) [de facto][40]	Area designated for and owned by Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities as a percentage of total land	36	(N/A)				
Protection of property rights [protection from harm][13]	Property rights security	77	84.59	83.54	-7.59	-1.05	-3.78

Peru

Table 6. Infrastructure and Connectivity Indicators (Domain 1) for Peru: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Constitutional right to water [de jure][1]	Whether the right to water is recognized at the constitutional or national level	yes	—	—	—	—	—
Access to safely managed drinking water [de facto][2]	People surveyed believe their drinking water was safe	74†	59.64	60.94	14.36	1.31	17.36
Access to mobile network [de facto][2]	People surveyed had a mobile phone for personal calls	87	71.65	66.32	15.35	-5.32	8.53
Trust in legal system [de facto][15]	Confidence in the reliability and fairness of the courts	84†	70.41	62.65	13.59	-7.76	1.35
Freedom from violent conflict [protection from harm][16]	Population perceived public security in the last 12 months	14†	12.27	65.18	1.73	52.91	64.81

† **Direction harmonization:** The original indicator was expressed in a negative direction. It was reverse-coded (100-x) so that higher national values consistently indicate better performance. For access to safely managed drinking water, the original indicator measured percentage of people worried that drinking water could cause serious harm in 2021; for trust in legal system, the original indicator measured percentage of firms identifying the functioning of the courts as a major or very severe obstacle in 2023; for freedom from violent conflict, the original indicator measured percentage of the population that perceived public insecurity in the last 12 months in 2024.

Table 7. Livelihood Development and Capacity Building Indicators (Domain 2) for Peru: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Ability to use collective title as collateral [de jure][5]	Whether the applicable community-based tenure regime recognizes the right to alienate or collateralize collective title	N/A varies by regime. Indigenous reserves: no. Native community forest lands suitable for forestry: yes. Peasant community forest lands suitable for forestry: yes. Communal reserves in forest land: no.	—	—	—	—	—
Perceived business climate [de facto][2]	Entrepreneurs believed it is a good place to start a business	71	57.84	63.24	13.16	5.39	17.32
Loan approval rate[14]	Firms that applied for a loan were approved	96.8†	75.16	61.03	21.64	-14.13	-4.02
Access to capacity building (adult and vocational training) [de facto][6]	Youth and adults (25-64 years old) participated in adult education and vocational training programs in the last 12 months	4	3.2	62.79	0.8	59.59	61.83

† **Direction harmonization:** The original indicator was expressed in a negative direction. It was reverse-coded (100-x) so that higher national values consistently indicate better performance. For loan approval rate, the original indicator measured percentage of firms whose recent loan application was rejected in 2023.

Table 8. Institutional Autonomy and Accountability Indicators (Domain 3) for Peru: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark Gap (D-B)
Legal recognition of self-rule and customary governance [de jure][5]	Whether community-based tenure regimes legally recognize community self-rule and customary governance	N/A varies by tenure regime. Indigenous Reserves: Yes; Native Community Forest Lands Suitable for Forestry: Yes; Peasant Community Forestlands Suitable for Forestry: Yes; Communal Reserves in Forest Land: No.	—	—	—	—	—
Laws that mention the existence of ombudsman and grievance mechanisms [de jure][17]	Whether laws mention the existence of ombudsman and grievance mechanisms	Present	—	—	—	—	—
Anti-corruption measures [protection from harm][8]	Government success in containing corruption	40	33.41	66.65	6.59	33.24	42.65
Trust in political institutions [de facto][9]	Citizens trust the national congress	50†	41.47	70.53	8.53	29.06	35.88
Reported level of corruption in government [protection from harm][18]	People accessed public services without paying a bribe in the last 12 months	70†	61.35	70.47	8.65	9.12	19.97

† **Direction harmonization:** The original indicator was expressed in a negative direction. It was reverse-coded (100-x) so that higher national values consistently indicate better performance. For trust in political institutions, the original indicator measured percentage of informants did not trust the national congress in 2023; for reported level of corruption in government, the original indicator measured percentage of public service users paid a bribe in 2019.

Table 9. Inclusive Governance and Cultural Respect indicators (Domain 4) for Peru: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
FPIC standards acknowledged in national legislation [de jure][5]	Whether FPIC standards are acknowledged nationally and under community-based tenure regimes	Yes	—	—	—	—	—
Non-colonial languages recognized as official languages [de jure][19]	Whether non-colonial languages are recognized as official languages	48	—	—	—	—	—
Lethal attacks on community activists [protection from harm][12]	Number of environmental defenders killed (2012-2024)	n=62	55.29	100	-	44.71	44.71
Rural marginalization or exclusion from decision-making [protection from harm][20]	Districts have a joint municipal development plan with civil society participation	25	24.78	70.03	0.22	45.25	49.69

Table 10. Tenure Security Indicators (Domain 5) for Peru: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Legal recognition of land and forest rights [de jure][5]	Whether land and forest rights of Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities are legally recognized	Yes	—	—	—	—	—
Completeness of the bundle of rights [de jure][5]	Whether the applicable community-based tenure regime recognizes the complete bundle of rights	N/A –Varies by regime. Indigenous reserves: no. Native community forest lands suitable for forestry: yes. Peasant community forest lands: yes. Communal reserves in forest land: no.					—
Share of formally recognized community forests (% of total forest land) [de facto][14]	Area designated for and owned by Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities as a percentage of total forest land	34	(N/A) **	—	—	—	—
Share of formally recognized community land (% of total land) [de facto][40]	Area designated for and owned by Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities as a percentage of total land	33	(N/A)**				
Protection of property rights [protection from harm][13]	Property rights security	80	66.35	72.79	13.65	6.44	14.46

†This question was introduced to the survey once data collection already started for Peru, therefore, about half the respondents were not asked this question. **In two cases, the respondents preferred not to answer.

✳ The Democratic Republic of the Congo

Table 11. Infrastructure and Connectivity Indicators (Domain 1) for the DRC: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Constitutional right to water [de jure][21]	Whether the right to water is recognized at the constitutional or national level	yes	—	—	—	—	—
Access to safely managed drinking water [de facto][2]	Satisfied with the quality of their water	39†	31.46	77.57	7.54	46.11	45.53
Access to mobile network [de facto][2]	People surveyed had a mobile phone for personal calls	56	43.68	74.87	12.32	31.19	36.5
Trust in legal system [de facto][22]	Firms feel confident in the reliability and fairness of the courts	59†	49.56	72.2	9.44	22.64	22.2
Freedom from Violent Conflict [protection from harm][4]	Political Stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism	5	4.55	77.97	0.45	73.42	72.53

†† **Direction harmonization:** The original indicator was expressed in a negative direction. It was reverse-coded (100-x) so that higher national values consistently indicate better performance. For trust in legal system, the original indicator measured percentage of firms identifying the functioning of the courts as a major or very severe obstacle in 2025.

Table 12. Livelihood Development and Capacity Building Indicators (Domain 2) for the DRC: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Ability to use collective title as collateral [de jure][5]	Whether the applicable community-based tenure regime recognizes the right to alienate or collateralize collective title	N/A - Local community forest concessions: yes. Community use rights within permanent production forests: no. Local population use rights within classified forest: no. Conservation concessions allocated to communities: yes.	—	—	—	—	—
Perceived business climate [de facto][2]	Entrepreneurs believed it is a good place to start a business	69	58.19	76.6	10.81	18.41	16.97
Loan approval rate [de facto][22]	Firms that applied for a loan were approved	91.4†	106.33	77.37	-14.93	-28.96	-35.19
Access to capacity building (adult and vocational training) [de facto][6]	Youth and adults (25-64 years old) participated in adult education and vocational training programs in the last 12 months	1.4	1.07	67.37	0.33	66.3	63.96

† Direction harmonization: The original indicator was expressed in a negative direction. It was reverse-coded (100-x) so that higher national values consistently indicate better performance. For loan approval rate, the original indicator measured percentage of firms whose recent loan application was rejected in 2024.

Table 13. Institutional Autonomy and Accountability Indicators (Domain 3) for the DRC: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Legal recognition of self-rule and customary governance [de jure][5]	Whether community-based tenure regimes legally recognize community self-rule and customary governance	No. Community use rights within permanent production forests: no. Local population use rights within classified forest: no. Conservation concessions allocated to communities: no.	—	—	—	—	—
Laws that mention the existence of ombudsman and grievance mechanisms [de jure][23]	Whether laws mention the existence of ombudsman and grievance mechanisms	Present	—	—	—	—	—
Anti-corruption measures [de facto][8]	Government success in containing corruption	20	16.07	68.3	3.93	52.23	60
Trust in political institutions[protection from harm][8]	Civil rights are guaranteed and protected and citizens can seek redress	30	23.5	68.6	6.5	45.1	53.85
Reported level of corruption in government [protection from harm][24]	People accessed public services without paying a bribe in the last 12 months	20†	16.33	80.8	3.67	64.47	64.98

† **Direction harmonization:** The original indicator was expressed in a negative direction. It was reverse-coded (100-x) so that higher national values consistently indicate better performance. For the reported level of corruption in government, the original indicator measured percentage of public service users paid a bribe in 2019.

Table 14. Inclusive Governance and Cultural Respect Indicators (Domain 4) for the DRC: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
FPIC standards acknowledged in national legislation [de jure][5]	Whether FPIC standards are acknowledged nationally and under community-based tenure regimes	N/A varies by tenure regime	—	—	—	—	—
Non-colonial languages recognized as official languages [de jure][21]	Whether non-colonial languages are recognized as official languages	No	—	—	—	—	—
Lethal attacks on community activists [protection from harm][12]	Number of environmental defenders killed (2012-2024)	n=78	54.98	100	-	45.02	45.02
Rural marginalization or exclusion from decision-making [protection from harm][13]	Urban-rural distribution of political power	34	28.45	68.7	5.55	40.25	46.02

Table 15. Tenure Security Indicators (Domain 5) for the DRC: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Legal recognition of land and forest rights [de jure][5]	Whether land and forest rights of Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities are legally recognized	Yes	—	—	—	—	—
Completeness of the bundle of rights [de jure][5]	Completeness of the bundle of rights under each community-based tenure regime	No. Community use rights within permanent production forests: no. Local population use rights within classified forest: no. Conservation concessions allocated to communities: no.	—	—	—	—	—
Share of formally recognized community forests (% of total forest land) [de facto][14]	Area designated for and owned by Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities as a percentage of total forest land	4	(N/A)	—	—	—	—
Share of formally recognized community land (% of total land) [de facto][40]	Area designated for and owned by Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities as a percentage of total land	<1%	(N/A)				—
Protection of property rights [protection from harm][13]	Property rights security	26	21.41	70.6	4.59	49.19	59.41

✳ Nepal

Table 16. Infrastructure and Connectivity Indicators (Domain 1) for Nepal: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Constitutional right to water [de jure][1]	Whether the right to water is recognized at the constitutional or national level	No	—	—	—	—	—
Access to safely managed drinking water [de facto][2]	People surveyed believe their drinking water was safe	80†	71.87	92.87	8.13	21	5.12
Access to mobile network [de facto][2]	People surveyed had a mobile phone for personal calls	93	86.7*	96.29	6.3	9.59	-6.52
Trust in legal system [de facto][25]	Firms feel confident in the reliability and fairness of the courts	99.9†	99.42	78.94	0.48	-20.48	-27.65
Freedom from Violent Conflict [protection from harm][4]	Political Stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism	59	57.86	86.52	1.14	28.66	19.23

† **Direction harmonization:** The original indicator was expressed in a negative direction. It was reverse-coded (100-x) so that higher national values consistently indicate better performance. For access to safely managed drinking water, the original indicator measured percentage of people very worried drinking water could cause serious harm in 2020; for trust in legal system, the original indicator measured percentage of firms identifying the functioning of the courts as a major or very severe obstacle in 2023.

*This value may be upwardly biased given that the national value given to key informants to adjust was higher (93 percent).

Table 17. Livelihood Development and Capacity Building Indicators (Domain 2) for Nepal: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Ability to use collective title as collateral [de jure][5]	Whether the applicable community-based tenure regime recognizes the right to alienate or collateralize collective title	N/A — varies by regime. Community forests: yes. Leasehold forest granted to communities: no. Religious forests transferred to communities: no. Buffer zone community forest: no. Buffer zone religious forest transferred to a community: no.	—	—	—	—	—
Perceived business climate [de facto][2]	Entrepreneurs believed it is a good place to start a business	81	68.59	96.13	12.41	27.54	6.57
Loan approval rate [de facto][25]	Firms that applied for a loan were approved	93.4†	79.09	100	14.31	20.91	-7.95
Access to capacity building (adult and vocational training) [de facto][6]	Youth and adults (25-64 years old) participated in adult education and vocational training programs in the last 12 months	3.4	3.12	71.45	0.28	68.33	61.91

† **Direction harmonization:** The original indicator was expressed in a negative direction. It was reverse-coded (100-x) so that higher national values consistently indicate better performance. For loan approval rate, the original indicator measured percentage of firms whose recent loan application was rejected in 2023.

Table 18. Institutional Autonomy and Accountability Indicators (Domain 3) for Nepal: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Legal recognition of self-rule and customary governance [de jure][5]	Whether community-based tenure regimes legally recognize community self-rule and customary governance	N/A - varies by regime. Community forests: yes. Community leasehold forest granted to communities: no. Religious forests transferred to communities: no. Buffer zone community forest: no. Buffer zone religious forest transferred to a community: no.	—	—	—	—	—
Laws that mention the existence of ombudsman and grievance mechanisms [de jure][26]	Whether laws mention the existence of ombudsman and grievance mechanisms	Yes.	—	—	—	—	—
Anti-corruption measures [de facto][8]	Government success in containing corruption	40	36.52	94.71	3.48	58.19	39.55
Trust in political institutions [protection from harm][27]	Respondents trust the effectiveness of the public service commission	96.9†	91.74	91.61	5.16	-0.13	-14.39
Reported level of corruption in government [protection from harm][28]	People accessed public services without paying a bribe in the last 12 months	88†	81.61	99.39	6.39	17.77	-0.29

† Direction harmonization: The original indicator was expressed in a negative direction. It was reverse-coded (100-x) so that higher national values consistently indicate better performance. For trust in political institutions the original indicator measured percentage of citizens did not trust the national congress in 2018. For reported level of corruption in government, the original indicator measured percentage of public service users paid a bribe in 2020.

Table 19. Inclusive Governance and Cultural Respect Indicators (Domain 4) for Nepal: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	Natio-nal-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
FPIC stan-dards ack-nowledged in national legislation [de jure][5]	Whether FPIC standards are ack-nowledged nationally and under communi-ty-based te-nure regimes	Yes- varies by regime.	—	—	—	—	—
Non-colonial languages recognized as official languages [de jure][26]	Whether non-colonial languages are recogni-zed as official languages	Yes	—	—	—	—	—
Lethal attacks on community activists [pro-tection from harm][12]	Number of environmen-tal defenders killed (2012-2024)	n=1	58.07	100	-	41.93	41.93
Rural mar-ginalization or exclusion from deci-sion-making [protection from harm][13]	Urban-rural distribution of political power	23.6	23.03	88.42	0.57	65.39	51.44

Table 20. Tenure Security Indicators (Domain 5) for Nepal: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	Natio-nal-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Legal recognition of land and forest rights [de jure] [5]	Whether land and forest rights of Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities are legally recognized	Yes	—	—	—	—	—
Completeness of the bundle of rights [de jure][5]	Completeness of the bundle of rights under each community-based tenure regime	Community forests: yes. All other four tenure regimes: no.	—	—	—	—	—
Share of formally recognized community forests (% of total forest land) [de facto][14]	Area designated for and owned by Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities as a percentage of total forest land	14.6	(N/A)	—	—	—	—
Share of formally recognized community land (% of total land) [de facto][40]	Area designated for and owned by Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities as a percentage of total land	18.2	(N/A)				
Protection of property rights [protection from harm][13]	Property rights security	73	70.53	93.23	2.47	22.7	10.29

Indonesia

Table 21. Infrastructure and Connectivity Indicators (Domain 1) for Indonesia: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	Natio-nal-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-coun-try bench-mark gap (D-B)
Constitutio-nal right to water [de jure][29]	Whether the right to water is recognized at the cons-titutional or national level	No	—	—	—	—	—
Access to safely mana-ged drinking water [de facto][2]	People surve-yed believe their drinking water was safe	89†	98.34	39.53	-9.35	-58.81	-21.35
Access to mobile network [de facto][2]	People surveyed had a mobile phone for personal calls	81	76.95	56.3	4.05	-20.65	3.23
Trust in legal system [de facto][30]	Firms feel confident in the reliability and fairness of the courts	91.1†	76.22	29.23	14.88	-46.99	-4.46
Freedom from Violent Conflict [pro-tection from harm][4]	Political Stability and Absence of Violence/Te-rrorism	55.5	47.17	31.37	8.32	-15.81	29.91

† **Direction harmonization:** The original indicator was expressed in a negative direction. It was reverse-coded (100-x) so that higher national values consistently indicate better performance. For Access to safely managed drinking water, the original indicator measured percentage of people very worried drinking water could cause serious harm in 2021; for trust in legal system, the original indicator measured percentage of firms identifying the functioning of the courts as a major or very severe obstacle in 2024.

Table 22. Livelihood Development and Capacity Building Indicators (Domain 2) for Indonesia: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Ability to use collective title as collateral [de jure][5]	Whether the applicable community-based tenure regime recognizes the right to alienate or collateralize collective title	Customary law forest: no. Rural community forest: no. Partnership: no. People plantation forest: no. Village forest: no.	—	—	—	—	—
Perceived business climate [de facto][2]	Entrepreneurs believed it is a good place to start a business	78	65.78	36.03	12.22	-29.75	9.38
Loan approval rate [de facto][31]	Rural population has availability of and access to affordable, quality, and sustainable financial products and services, in accordance with the needs and capacities of the population, with the aim of improving community welfare	75.7	62.83	39.83	12.87	-23	8.31
Access to capacity building (adult and vocational training) [de facto][6]	Youth and adults (25-64 years old) participated in adult education and vocational training programs in the last 12 months	1.2	1.1	32.3	0.1	31.2	63.93

Table 23. Institutional Autonomy and Accountability Indicators (Domain 3) for Indonesia: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Legal recognition of self-rule and customary governance [de jure][5]	Whether community-based tenure regimes legally recognize community self-rule and customary governance	Customary law forest: yes. Rural community forest: no. Partnership: no. People plantation forest: no. Village forest: no.	—	—	—	—	—
Laws that mention the existence of ombudsman and grievance mechanisms [de jure][32]	Whether laws mention the existence of ombudsman and grievance mechanisms	Yes	—	—	—	—	—
Anti-corruption measures [protection from harm][8]	Government success in containing corruption	40	34	28.37	6	-5.63	42.06
Trust in political institutions [de facto][33]	Citizens trust the national congress	39†	34.12	36.3	4.88	2.17	43.23
Reported level of corruption in government [protection from harm][34]	People accessed public services without paying a bribe in the last 12 months	70†	60.55	31	9.45	-29.55	20.77

† **Direction harmonization:** The original indicator was expressed in a negative direction. It was reverse-coded (100-x) so that higher national values consistently indicate better performance. For trust in political institutions, the original indicator measured percentage of citizens did not trust the national congress in 2020; for reported level of corruption in government, the original indicator measured percentage of public service users paid a bribe in 2024.

Table 24. Inclusive Governance and Cultural Respect Indicators (Domain 4) for Indonesia: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
FPIC standards acknowledged in national legislation [de jure][5]	Whether FPIC standards are acknowledged nationally and under community-based tenure regimes	No	—	—	—	—	—
Non-colonial languages recognized as official languages [de jure][35]	Whether non-colonial languages are recognized as official languages	Yes	—	—	—	—	—
Lethal attacks on community activists [protection from harm][12]	Number of environmental defenders killed (2012-2024)	n= 25	57.06	100	-	42.94	42.94
Rural marginalization or exclusion from decision-making [protection from harm][13]	Urban-rural distribution of political power	14.2	14.91	32.67	-0.71	17.76	59.56

Table 25. Tenure Security Indicators (Domain 5) for Indonesia: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized Estimate (B)	National Performance Benchmark (C)	National-to-Local Gap (A-B)	National Benchmark Gap (C-B)	Cross-Country Benchmark Gap (D-B)
Legal recognition of land and forest rights [de jure][5]	Whether land and forest rights of Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities are legally recognized	Yes	—	—	—	—	—
Completeness of the bundle of rights [de jure][5]	Completeness of the bundle of rights under each community-based tenure regime	Customary law forest: yes. Rural/community forest: no. Partnership: no. People plantation forest: no. Village forest: no. Communal right: no.	—	—	—	—	—
Share of formally recognized community forests (% of total forest land) [de facto][14]	Area designated for and owned by Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities as a percentage of total forest land	6.7	(N/A)	—	—	—	—
Share of formally recognized community land (% of total land) [de facto][40]	Area designated for and owned by Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities as a percentage of total land	1.5	(N/A)				
Protection of property rights [protection from harm][13]	Property rights security	67	56.06	26.77	10.94	-29.29	24.76

Brazil

Table 26. Infrastructure and Connectivity Indicators (Domain 1) for Brazil: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Constitutional right to water [de jure][36]	Whether the right to water is recognized at the constitutional or national level	Yes	—	—	—	—	—
Access to safely managed drinking water [de facto][2]	People surveyed believe their drinking water was safe	62†	51.87	80.37	10.13	28.49	25.12
Access to mobile network [de facto][2]	People surveyed had a mobile phone for personal calls	87	73.08	77.2	13.92	4.12	7.1
Trust in legal system [de facto][37]	Firms feel confident in the reliability and fairness of the courts	55†	51.7	80.47	3.3	28.77	20.06
Freedom from Violent Conflict [protection from harm][4]	Political Stability and Absence of Violence/Terrorism	57	45.6	77.33	11.4	31.73	31.48

† **Direction harmonization:** The original indicator was expressed in a negative direction. It was reverse-coded (100-x) so that higher national values consistently indicate better performance. For Access to safely managed drinking water, the original indicator measured percentage of people very worried drinking water could cause serious harm in 2021; for trust in legal system, the original indicator measured percentage of firms identifying the functioning of the courts as a major or very severe obstacle in 2009.

Table 27. Livelihood Development and Capacity Building Indicators (Domain 2) for Brazil: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	Natio-nal-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Ability to use collective title as collateral [de jure][5]	Whether the applicable community-based tenure regime recognizes the right to alienate or collateralize collective title	Extractive reserve: no. Sustainable development reserve: no. Agro-extractivist settlement project: no. Forest settlement project: no. Sustainable development project: no.	—	—	—	—	—
Perceived business climate [de facto][2]	Entrepreneurs believed it is a good place to start a business	57	46.55	66.27	10.45	19.72	28.61
Loan approval rate [de facto][37]	Firms that applied for a loan were approved	81.4†	66.21	72.27	15.19	6.06	4.93
Access to capacity building (adult and vocational training) [de facto][6]	Youth and adults (25-64 years old) participated in adult education and vocational training programs in the last 12 months	7	6.33	54.13	0.67	47.8	58.69

† **Direction harmonization:** The original indicator was expressed in a negative direction. It was reverse-coded (100-x) so that higher national values consistently indicate better performance. For loan approval rate, the original indicator measured percentage of firms whose recent loan application was rejected in 2009.

Table 28. Institutional Autonomy and Accountability Indicators (Domain 3) for Brazil: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Legal recognition of self-rule and customary governance [de jure][5]	Whether community-based tenure regimes legally recognize community self-rule and customary governance	N/A— Varies by regime. Extractive reserve: no. Sustainable development reserve: no. Agro-extractivist settlement project: no. Forest settlement project: no. Sustainable development project: no. Quilombola communities: yes. Indigenous Lands: yes.	—	—	—	—	—
Laws that mention the existence of ombudsman and grievance mechanisms [de jure][38]	Whether laws mention the existence of ombudsman and grievance mechanisms	Yes	—	—	—	—	—
Anti-corruption measures [protection from harm][8]	Government success in containing corruption	60	50.4	74.4	9.6	24	25.66
Trust in political institutions [de facto][9]	Citizens trust the national congress	79†	78.21	76.87	0.79	-1.34	-0.86
Reported level of corruption in government [protection from harm][39]	People accessed public services without paying a bribe in the last 12 months	89†	83.66	87.73	5.34	4.07	-2.34

† **Direction harmonization:** The original indicator was expressed in a negative direction. It was reverse-coded (100-x) so that higher national values consistently indicate better performance. For trust in political institutions, the original indicator measured percentage of citizens did not trust the national congress in 2023; for reported level of corruption in government, the original indicator measured percentage of public service users paid a bribe in 2019.

Table 29. Inclusive Governance and Cultural Respect Indicators (Domain 4) for Brazil: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	National-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
FPIC standards acknowledged in national legislation [de jure][5]	Whether FPIC standards are acknowledged nationally and under community-based tenure regimes	Varies case-by-case	—	—	—	—	—
Non-colonial languages recognized as official languages [de jure][36]	Whether non-colonial languages are recognized as official languages	No	—	—	—	—	—
c [de facto][12]	Number of environmental defenders killed (2012-2024)	n=413	39.48	100	58	60.52	60.52
Rural marginalization or exclusion from decision-making [protection from harm][13]	Urban-rural distribution of political power	15	12.97	68.4	2.02	55.42	61.49

Table 30. Tenure Security Indicators (Domain 5) for Brazil: Description, National Statistics, Expert-Adjusted Values, Government Performance, and Estimated Gaps.

Indicator (type)	Question / empirical variable measured	National value (A)	Localized estimate (B)	National performance benchmark (C)	Natio-nal-to-local gap (A-B)	National benchmark gap (C-B)	Cross-country benchmark gap (D-B)
Legal recognition of land and forest rights [de jure][5]	Whether land and forest rights of Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities are legally recognized	Yes	—	—	—	—	—
Completeness of the bundle of rights [de jure][5]	Completeness of the bundle of rights under each community-based tenure regime	Agro-extractivist settlement projects: no. Forest settlement projects: no. Sustainable development projects: no. National forests: no. Quilombola communities: yes. Indigenous Lands: yes.	—	—	—	—	—
Share of formally recognized community forests (% of total forest land) [de facto][14]	Area designated for and owned by Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities as a percentage of total forest land	30	(N/A)	—	—	—	—
Share of formally recognized community land (% of total land) [de facto][40]	Area designated for and owned by Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant Peoples, and local communities as a percentage of total land	18	(N/A)				
Protection of property rights [protection from harm][13]	Property rights security	81	66.42	83.9	14.58	17.48	14.39

Notes

1. Rights and Resources Initiative and Environmental Law Institute. 2020. Whose Water? A comparative analysis of national laws and regulations recognizing Indigenous Peoples', Afro-descendants', and local communities' water tenure. Available at: doi: 10.53892/DRQB6907.

2. Gallup. Gallup Analytics. Accessed June 2026 . Available at: https://analytics.gallup.com.

3. World Bank. 2023. Enterprise Surveys: Colombia 2023. World Bank. Accessed June 2026 . Available at: https://www.enterprisesurveys.org/content/dam/enterprisesurveys/documents/country/Colombia-2023.pdf.

4. World Bank. n.d. Worldwide Governance Indicators. World Bank. Accessed June 2026 . Available at: https://databank.worldbank.org/source/worldwide-governance-indicators.

5. Rights and Resources Initiative. 2025. Seeds for Reform: International Obligations and Status of Indigenous Peoples', Afro-descendant Peoples', and Local Communities' Forest Tenure Rights in National Law. Rights and Resources Initiative, Washington, DC. Available at: https://doi.org/10.53892/JRKR2627

6. UNESCO Institute for Statistics. UIS Data Browser: SDG 4 Country Profiles. Accessed June 2026 at https://databrowser.uis.unesco.org.

7. Defensoría del Pueblo de Colombia. Defensoria del Pueblo. Accessed June 2026 at www.defensoria.gov.co/.

8. Bertelsmann Stiftung. n.d. BTI Transformation Index: Global dashboard. BTI Project. Accessed June 2026 . Available at: https://bti-project.org/en/reports/global-dashboard?&cb=00000.

9. Center for Global Democracy. 2026. America's Barometer Data Playground. Vanderbilt University. Available at: https://www.vanderbilt.edu/cgd/data-playground.

10. Transparency International. 2023. Colombia: Country Profile. Accessed June 2026 Available at: https://www.transparency.org/en/countries/colombia.

11. Republic of Colombia. 1991. Constitution of Colombia. Revised 2015. Constitute Project.

12. Global Witness. 2026. In Numbers: Lethal Attacks Against Defenders Since 2012. Accessed June 2026 at https://globalwitness.org/en/campaigns/land-and-environmental-defenders/in-numbers-lethal-attacks-against-defenders-since-2012/.

13. Coppedge, Michael, et al. 2026. V-Dem Country-Year Dataset v16. Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) Project, Gothenburg, Sweden. Accessed June 2026. Available at: https://www.v-dem.net/data/the-v-dem-dataset/country-year-v-dem-fullothers-v16/.

14. Rights and Resources Initiative. 2023. Who Owns the World's Land? Global State of Indigenous, Afro-descendant, and Local Community Land Rights Recognition from 2015-2020. Rights and Resources Initiative, Washington, DC. Available at: doi: 10.53892/MHZN6595.

15. World Bank. 2023. Enterprise Surveys: Peru 2023. World Bank. Accessed June 2026. Available at: https://www.enterprisesurveys.org/en/data/exploreeconomies/2023/peru.

16. Centro Nacional de Planeamiento Estratégico (CEPLAN). 2024. Persistencia de la inseguridad ciudadana. Observatorio Nacional de Prospectiva. Accessed June 2026. Available at: https://observatorio.ceplan.gob.pe/ficha/t26.

17. Defensoría del Pueblo del Perú. n.d. Defensoria del Pueblo. Accessed June 2026. Available at: https://www.defensoria.gob.pe.

18. Transparency International. 2023. "Peru Country Profile." Accessed June 2026. Available at: https://www.transparency.org/en/countries/peru.

19. Ministerio de Cultura del Perú. n.d. Lista de lenguas indígenas u originarias. Base de Datos de Pueblos Indígenas u Originarios (BDPI). Accessed June 2026 at https://bdpi.cultura.gob.pe/lenguas.

20. Presidencia del Consejo de Ministros del Perú. Visor GeoPerú. Plataforma Nacional de Datos Geoespaciales. Accessed June 2026. Available at: https://visor.geoperu.gob.pe/.

21. Democratic Republic of the Congo. 2005. Constitution of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Revised 2011. Constitute Project.

22. World Bank. 2024. Enterprise Surveys: Democratic Republic of Congo 2024. World Bank. Accessed June 2026. Available at: https://www.enterprisesurveys.org/en/data/exploreeconomies/2024/congo-dem-rep.

23. Commission Nationale des Droits de l'Homme. n.d. Commission Nationale des Droits de l'Homme. Accessed June 2026. Available at: https://cndh.cd/.
24. Transparency International. 2023. Democratic Republic of The Congo: Country Profile. Transparency International. Accessed June 2026. Available at: https://www.transparency.org/en/countries/democratic-republic-of-the-congo.
25. World Bank. 2023. Enterprise Surveys: Nepal 2023. World Bank. Accessed June 2026. Available at: https://www.enterprisesurveys.org/content/dam/enterprisesurveys/documents/country/Nepal-2023.pdf.
26. Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal. 2015. The Constitution of Nepal.
27. The Asia Foundation. 2019. Survey of the Nepali People. The Asia Foundation, San Francisco. Available at: https://asiafoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/A-Survey-of-the-Nepali-People-2018-revised-8132019.pdf.
28. Transparency International. 2026. Nepal: Country Profile. Accessed June 2026 at https://www.transparency.org/en/countries/nepal.
29. Wily, Liz Alden, et al. 2017. Water Rights on Community Lands: LandMark's Findings from 100 Countries. Land 6, 4, no. 77 (2017). Available at: doi: 10.3390/land6040077.
30. World Bank. 2023. Enterprise Surveys: Indonesia 2023. Otoritas Jasa Jeuangan. 2025. Buku Statistik Survei Nasional Literasi dan Inklusi Keuangan (NSLIK) Tahun. Otoritas Jasa Keuangan, Jakarta, Indonesia. Available at: https://www.enterprisesurveys.org/content/dam/enterprisesurveys/documents/country/Indonesia-2023.pdf.
31. Otoritas Jasa Keuangan, Buku Statistik Survei Nasional Literasi dan Inklusi Keuangan (SNLIK) Tahun 2025, Otoritas Jasa Keuangan(Jakarta,2025). Accessed at https://ojk.go.id/id/Fungsi-Utama/Perilaku-Pelaku-Usaha-Jasa-Keuangan/SNLIK/Documents/Buku%20Statistik%20Survei%20Nasional%20Literasi%20dan%20Inklusi%20Keuangan%20%28SNLIK%29%20Tahun%202025.pdf.
32. The Ombudsman Overview. n.d. Sekilas Ombudsman. Ombudsman Overview, Indonesia. Accessed June 2026. Available at: https://ombudsman.go.id/profiles/index/pftt?lang=en.
33. The Asian Barometer Survey. 2026. Asian Barometer Survey. Asian Barometer Project Office. Accessed June 2026. Available at: https://asianbarometer.org/.
34. Transparency International. n.d. Indonesia Country Profile.. Transparency International. Accessed June 2026. Available at: https://www.transparency.org/en/countries/indonesia.

35. The Republic of Indonesia. 1945. Constitution of Indonesia. Revised 2002. The Constitute Project.

36. Brazil. 1988. Constitution of Brazil. Revised 2017. The Constitute Project.

37. World Bank. 2023. Enterprise Surveys: Brazil 2023. World Bank. Accessed June 2026. Available at: https://www.enterprisesurveys.org/content/dam/enterprise-surveys/documents/country/Brazil-2023.pdf.

38. Brazil. Presidencia da Republica. Lei nº 13.460, de 26 de junho de 2017: Dispõe sobre participação, proteção e defesa dos direitos do usuário dos serviços públicos da administração pública, Legislação Federal (2017).

39. Rights and Resources Initiative. 2015. Who Owns the World's Land? A Global Baseline of Formally Recognized Indigenous and Community Land Rights. Available at: https://rightsandresources.org/wp-content/uploads/GlobalBaseline_complete_web.pdf.