IRMA Initiative for Responsible Mining Assurance

IRMA Standard for Responsible Mining 1.0– Supplementary Guidance on Indigenous Peoples and Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC)

v202503 EN

March 2025

Contents

Associated Documents and Materials

This 'Supplementary Guidance on Indigenous Peoples and Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC)' complements the main '**IRMA Standard for Responsible Mining 1.0–Guidance Document**' (latest version available at https://responsiblemining.net/resources/#resources-standard).

Both guidance documents are applicable to the **'IRMA Standard for Responsible Mining V1.0'**, also available online, in multiple languages, at https://responsiblemining.net/resources/#resources-standard

Comments on the IRMA Standard and system are always welcome. They may be emailed to us at: comments@responsiblemining.net

Additional information about IRMA is available on our website: www.responsiblemining.net

Introduction

The IRMA Standard relies on, and acknowledges, the importance of certain globally recognized laws, standards and norms including the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People and International Labor Organization (ILO) Convention 169 for a common definition of Indigenous Peoples, Indigenous rights, and Indigenous rightsholders. Even within these global guiding references, we recognize that navigating the complex nuances and specific rights and aspirations of Indigenous Peoples is not a simple exercise.

The purpose of this guidance is to complement the existing Guidance Document for the Standard for Responsible Mining and provide more specific details on how the IRMA Standard is intended to be applied within this global context. This guidance does not change the content of the IRMA Standard for Responsible Mining; it has been prepared to address a need for further guidance that has become clear from the application of the IRMA Standard at mines in various regions of the world.

IRMA acknowledges that even with this additional guidance, there might be circumstances where determining relevancy of the chapter is not clear, or where mines and auditors interpret requirements or determinations of relevancy differently. In these cases, where parties cannot reach an agreement that is consistent with IRMA, IRMA can provide supporting dialogue and/or connect parties with external global resources for further support.

How to determine if Chapter 2.2 Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) of the IRMA Standard for Responsible Mining V1.0 is relevant to a particular site?

Chapters 1.2 and 1.3 require operating companies to demonstrate that an inclusive and participatory stakeholder and rightsholders mapping was conducted, at the level of the operational mine site,[1] by competent professionals, following a credible process/methodology, and drawing on internal and/or external relevant expertise as well as consultations with potentially affected rightsholders and stakeholders.

The requirements contained in the Criteria 1.2.1 (1.2.1.1 to 1.2.1.4), 1.2.2 (1.2.2.1 to 1.2.2.7), and 1.3.2 (1.3.2.1 to 1.3.2.5) define the actions identified in the IRMA standard that support the assessment of the presence of Indigenous Peoples and the potential for their rights to be impacted by the site under audit.

If all these requirements are **substantially or fully met and they conclude without any doubt or uncertainty** that there are no Indigenous Peoples whose legal or customary rights, or interests, may be or have been affected, directly or indirectly, by the site's exploration or mining activities or potential mine expansions, and/or associated facilities, then this documentation can be presented as evidence for Chapter 2.2 to be marked *not relevant*. Auditors will review the evidence to determine if it is robust, complete, and remains accurate and relevant for the purpose of determining Chapter 2.2 relevancy.

Where the chapter is found to be not relevant, auditors must always provide a rationale, explaining the evidence provided and the process followed in reaching that determination. This will be presented in the audit report (e.g., it can be presented in a preamble section to Chapter 2.2).

In all other situations, the Chapter should apply. This includes, but is not limited to situations where: a) the site provides evidence that their stakeholder and rightsholders mapping indicated positively that there were no potentially affected Indigenous Peoples, directly or indirectly, BUT it has not significantly met or fully met all the relevant requirements within Chapters 1.2 and 1.3, casting doubts on the quality and reliability of the company's findings; or b) the evidence provided in itself is not robust or clear enough to determine whether the quality and outcomes of the stakeholder and rightsholders mapping can be found satisfactory.

[1] i.e. not limited to desk-based/distance research (literature analysis, interviews), but with actual site-level on-the-ground work.

For the interpretation of the IRMA Standard, this Chapter, and its relevance, must note that IRMA uses a modern and inclusive understanding of "Indigenous". Therefore, operating companies and auditors should not limit their effort, engagement, and review, to groups and individuals "officially" or "legally" recognized or self-recognized as "Indigenous Peoples" (i.e. with this terminology). "Indigenous Peoples" can include any group or individual recognized, or self-recognized, as Tribal Peoples, Tribes, First Peoples, First Nations, Aboriginals, Ethnic Groups, Adivasi, Janajati, and any relevant local or national denomination that may be in use. This broad definition should be considered when determining if Chapter 2.2 is relevant.

See also the definition of "Indigenous Peoples" currently applicable to the IRMA Standard:

> *An official definition of "Indigenous" has not been adopted by the United Nations system due to the diversity of the world's Indigenous Peoples. Instead, a modern and inclusive understanding of "Indigenous" includes peoples who: identify themselves and are recognized and accepted by their community as Indigenous; demonstrate historical continuity with pre-colonial and/or pre-settler societies; have strong links and/or collective attachment to geographically distinct habitats, ancestral territories, or areas of seasonal use or occupation, as well as to the natural resources in these areas; have distinct customary cultural, economic, social, or political institutions that are distinct or separate from those of the mainstream society or culture; maintain distinct languages, dialects, cultures and beliefs; form non-dominant groups of society; resolve to maintain and reproduce their ancestral environments and systems as distinctive peoples and communities. This may include communities or groups who, during the lifetime of members of the community or group, have lost collective attachment to distinct habitats or ancestral territories in the project area because of forced severance, conflict, government resettlement programs, dispossession of their land, natural disasters, or incorporation of such territories into an urban area. In some regions, there may be a preference to use other terms such as: Tribes, First Peoples, First Nations, Aboriginals, Ethnic Groups, Adivasi and Janajati. All such terms fall within this modern understanding of "Indigenous".*
>
> *(Source: Guidance Document to the IRMA Standard for Responsible Mining, V1.3, November 2024)*

How to determine if Indigenous Peoples' rights or interests are affected, or potentially affected, by the site or its associated facilities?

It is important to note that the 'presence' of Indigenous Peoples can include actual occupation, whether permanent or temporal (e.g., nomadic uses, seasonal activities, etc.), as well as ancestral, spiritual, religious, or cultural use or occupation of territories.[2] For existing mines, project documentation (e.g., baseline study, ESIA, stakeholder map, human rights impact assessment) may already identify the potential to affect Indigenous Peoples rights. However, the operating company must ensure, through use of internal and/or external competent professionals, as well as consultations with potentially affected rightsholders and stakeholders, whether or not these studies have been sufficiently robust in their identification of Indigenous Peoples and their assessment of potential or actual impacts (past, ongoing, and/or future). The identification of Indigenous Peoples can indeed be facilitated through "consultations and gathering of information from, among others: project-affected people; relevant state entities; official registrations; qualified independent experts (e.g. academics, historians, anthropologists, civil society actors, sociologists); and the treatment of the same collectives by international organizations, tribunals, financial institutions, commissions and bodies".[3]

The Equator Principles EP4 also recommends assessments including desktop research relating to the project area and potential impacts, NGO activity relating to the project, any legal claims by Indigenous Peoples, and overall sociocultural context. However, operating companies should be aware that if efforts are not made to tap into the local knowledge of Indigenous Peoples and other resources, there is a chance that the operating company may miss some groups of Indigenous Peoples that own, occupy or otherwise use the land, territories or resources that may be affected by the mining project (e.g., those living in remote areas, those who only seasonally occupy or use lands or resources). Therefore, engagement with stakeholders and potentially affected Indigenous groups themselves is critical.

While identification of affected stakeholders is typically done as part of a rigorous project ESIA, there are requirements in other IRMA chapters that ask operating companies to identify stakeholders and rightsholders affected by mining activities, as well as the nature of those real or potential impacts. As a result, mines might present evidence of this work that was conducted for purposes other than the ESIA (e.g., cultural heritage studies, human rights impact assessments).

---

[2] As part of good risk and human rights due diligence, companies should conduct comprehensive research to understand the Indigenous communities and cultures connected to the land where they propose to operate, both historically and contemporaneously. In many countries, Indigenous Peoples were forcibly removed from their traditional lands. Official records kept by colonial administrations were often used to dispossess Indigenous Peoples of their lands. Many governments still do not recognize Indigenous Peoples within their borders.

[3] UNDP (2020). Social and Environmental Standards Guidance Note on indigenous peoples, https://info.undp.org/sites/bpps/SES_Toolkit/SES%20Document%20Library/Uploaded%20October%202016/UNDP%20SES%20Indigenous%20Peoples%20GN_Final_December%202020.pdf

The IRMA Standard upholds that Indigenous Peoples are rightsholders and therefore are in unique positions relative to other affected stakeholders (i.e., affected rightsholders are stakeholders, but stakeholders are not always rightsholders). This is why human rights impact assessments (HRIAs) are often a better source of evidence than an ESIA: HRIAs prioritize the identification of project risks to rightsholders, based on internationally recognized human rights; ESIAs do not necessarily assess impacts on human rights.[4]

The requirements below may support an identification of Indigenous Peoples and potential impacts on Indigenous Peoples' rights and interests if they applied the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP) as a framework:

- Requirement 1.2.1.1 asks that operating companies identify and analyze individuals and groups who may be affected by the Project, including Indigenous Peoples where their rights or territories may be, or are affected.
- Requirement 1.2.1.3 requires operating companies to consult with stakeholders to design engagement processes that are accessible, inclusive and culturally appropriate, and to take continuous efforts to understand and remove barriers to engagement for affected stakeholders (especially women, marginalized and vulnerable groups; which would often include Indigenous Peoples).
- Requirement 1.3.2.2 advises on the range of stakeholders that need to be engaged in order to properly assess a project's impacts on human rights, including the rights of Indigenous Peoples. Guidance on this recommends engagement with NGOs, community legal advisors, representatives of competent authorities, as well as any relevant community-based organizations.
- Requirement 1.3.2.3 specifically requires the identification of all rightsholders, an analysis of the potential differential risks and impacts on rightsholder groups (e.g., women, men, children, older persons, persons with disabilities, **Indigenous Peoples**, ethnic or religious minority groups, and other disadvantaged or vulnerable groups), and a disaggregation of results by rightsholder group.
- Requirement 1.3.2.4 requires that stakeholders and rightsholders who participated in the assessment process must have the opportunity to review draft key issues and findings that are relevant to them, and shall be consulted to provide feedback on those findings. This is essential to ensure that affected, or potentially affected, individuals and groups who self-recognize as Indigenous Peoples are given the opportunity to review whether their specific status and rights have been identified and integrated in the human rights due diligence process.
- Requirement 2.1.3.1 asks that the company carry out a scoping process to identify all potentially significant social and environmental impacts of the mining Project, and identification of all stakeholders and rightsholders is addressed in 2.1.3.2. The terms "stakeholders" and "rightsholders" are defined. The subsequent impact assessment process must also necessarily include robust engagement with rightsholders (2.1.9.1).

[4] Götzmann, Nora. 2019. Introduction to the handbook on human rights impact assessment: principles, methods and approaches. In: Götzmann N, editor. Handbook on human rights impact assessment. Cheltenham (UK): Edward Elgar Publishing; p. 2–31. doi: 10.4337/9781788970006.00008.

- As per requirement 2.1.7.3, the resulting environmental and social management plan must be revised or updated as necessary, based on monitoring results or other information. This would include information about direct, indirect, and/or cumulative impacts on Indigenous Peoples that would not have been taken into account before, or that was not available before, or that has emerged as new information (including as a result of a change in the operational, social, environmental, political, or security context).
- Requirement 2.4.1.2 asks that an assessment be done of all land acquisition to identify impacts on stakeholders and rightsholders, and that this assessment consider formal and informal private and communal / customary claims to land use and land ownership. Requirement 2.4.6.1 specifically states that land acquisition cannot occur without FPIC of Indigenous Peoples where their lands or resources are affected.
- Requirements 2.6.2.1 and 2.6.2.2 require a reclamation and closure plan to be developed in collaboration with affected communities, including affected Indigenous Peoples. This plan has to be compatible with protection of human health and the environment and must demonstrate how affected areas will be returned to a stable landscape with an agreed post-mining end use. And it must contain details on the role of affected communities in reviewing the reclamation and closure plan, and the post-mining land use and facility use agreed with affected communities (including affected Indigenous Peoples). As noted in the Standard; "ideally, this should be done at some point after the completion of the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment process in Chapter 2.1."
- Requirement 3.7.2.1 asks that operating companies screen for any potential impacts on cultural heritage, including that of Indigenous Peoples. Requirement 3.7.5.5 specifically speaks to human rights due diligence related to the potential presence of Indigenous Peoples living in Voluntary Isolation.
- Requirement 4.2.1.1 asks operating companies to identify all water users, water rightsholders, and other stakeholders that may be affected by a mine's water usage, while 4.2.1.2 further specifies that the range of potential impacts can be upstream, downstream, present or future, related to ecosystem services, contamination, fisheries, etcetera; however, impacts on cultural / spiritual / aesthetic uses of water and its related resources / functions should also be considered when determining whether or not Indigenous Peoples' rights or interests are potentially affected.
- Requirement 4.6.1.2 also asks for engagement with rights-holders and stakeholders to identify the full range of potential biodiversity impacts, including on Indigenous Peoples.

At a minimum, operating companies should consider all of the above as potential sources of information when determining whether an operating company's mining activities will have direct, indirect, and/or cumulative, impacts on the rights, interests, livelihoods or cultural heritage of Indigenous Peoples, regardless of whether they are adequately captured in the operating company's stakeholder map or impact assessments, and regardless of "official" information published and approved by the government and/or the authorities in charge.

Auditors should consider the documentation and evidence provided by the mine in response to these related requirements; in some cases there will also be an expectation to verify information and experiences directly with Indigenous rightsholders or other knowledgeable stakeholders during the execution of the audit. As a result, preliminary determinations might change as a result of audit activities.

What kind of Indigenous Peoples' rights and interests may be at risk in the context of mining?

Understanding the potential project impacts – direct, indirect, and cumulative – requires understanding how affected Indigenous Peoples use and relate to their land, territories, and resources, in terms of subsistence, livelihoods, traditional practices and knowledge, spiritual and cultural activities, and beliefs. Identification of these impacts may be found in evidence provided under the various impact assessment requirements throughout the Standard, many of which are identified above. Some additional parameters to look for are:

- Customary laws of affected people relating to land tenure / use / management
- Indigenous Peoples' use of the land and resources in accordance with customary laws, values, and traditions - this can include both ongoing and seasonal / intermittent cultural, ceremonial, or spiritual use, as well as use for livelihoods or subsistence
- Formal title to some, or all, ancestral lands
- Relevant local laws relating to identification of relevant recognitions / protections for Indigenous land claims / tenure security
- Titling given to lands / resources as well as any competing claims, as well as presence of squatting or intrusions in the area
- Indigenous claims before tribunals, relevant governmental / administrative authorities
- Interest and potential for Indigenous contributions and / or management or project activities affecting their lands / territories
- Past or ongoing court cases and decisions related to: a) Indigenous, Tribal, Traditional, lands and customs; and b) the right of affected stakeholders and/or landowners to free, prior, and informed consent for mining-related or other industrial activities.

Therefore, to determine which Indigenous Peoples' rights and interests are at risk due to the mining operation, the operating company should consider the following:

- Determinations about whether affected communities are Indigenous must consider a broad range of potential indicators (formal / government recognition is not a prerequisite nor a limitation)—more below.
- Determinations about presence or absence of Indigenous Peoples in the area affected by the Project should not be based solely on a definition of Project Area (as defined by an ESIA) but rather consider the full range of potential –direct, indirect, and cumulative– impacts on rights identified in this guidance (see 2.1.3.3, 2.1.5.1, 2.1.6.1, and 2.2.3.2).
- Determinations of presence of / impacts upon Indigenous Peoples must be made by competent professionals (see 1.3.2.2.b).
- Determinations must be backed with documentation of the methodology or criteria for defining Indigenous Peoples, a list of studies undertaken, information reviewed, and interviews conducted to identify whether there are Indigenous Peoples impacted by project activities (see 1.3.2.2.a, 1.3.2.2.c, 1.3.2.3.a, 1.3.2.3.b, and 1.3.2.3.c).

- Determinations must be made through inclusive and collaborative discussion and decision-making with representatives of Indigenous Peoples, in a manner that is inclusive of different genders, ages, and any potentially underserved and/or marginalized groups or individuals within Indigenous communities (see 1.3.2.3.e, 2.2.3.1, 2.2.3.2, and 2.2.3.3).
- As a result of the above, determinations as to relevance of Chapter 2.2 can only be *tentatively* made prior to Phase 2 of the audit; such determinations have to be confirmed during the on-site audit via the above means.

There will be situations where Chapter 2.2 cannot be marked "not relevant", but it will be confirmed that the operating company and Indigenous Peoples have mutually agreed that the site (project, operation, or expansion/modification) does not affect any of those Indigenous Peoples' rights or interests. In such cases, some requirements could be exempted from the assessment (i.e. 2.2.1.2, 2.2.2.2, 2.2.2.3, 2.2.2.4, 2.2.4.1, 2.2.4.2, 2.2.4.3, 2.2.5.1, 2.2.5.2, 2.2.5.3, 2.2.6.1, 2.2.7.1). To do so, claims must be based on engagement with potentially or already identified Indigenous Peoples themselves and their representatives, and should incorporate their views where necessary.

What is expected of companies that operate in a country that does not 'recognize' any Indigenous Peoples or does not recognize their specific individual or collective rights?

Formal recognition of Indigenous Peoples by countries of production is one source of determining whether there are Indigenous Peoples likely to be affected by a site (project or operation or expansion/modification); but this **is neither a necessary nor sufficient condition** for a company to determine whether any affected community or group should be considered Indigenous. There may be Indigenous Peoples who are not recognized as such by the state. For example, very few African states officially recognize Indigenous Peoples in their constitutions and domestic laws, yet there are dozens of groups within Africa who self-identify as Indigenous Peoples.[5] Moreover, there may be Indigenous Peoples who do not hold formal legal title to land and resources, or whose specific individual and/or collective rights are not recognized by the State; however, Indigenous Peoples' rights to lands and resources need to be respected whether or not they are explicitly recognized by a national government. For example:

- In 2002, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights re-stated that "where property and user rights of Indigenous Peoples arise from rights existing prior to the creation of a state, recognition by that state of the permanent and inalienable title of Indigenous Peoples relative thereto and to have such title changed only by mutual consent between the state and respective Indigenous Peoples when they have full knowledge and appreciation of the nature or attributes of such property. This also implies the right to fair compensation in the event that such property and user rights are irrevocably lost."[6]
- In 2004, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights acknowledged that property rights are not only those that are "already recognized by states or defined by domestic law", but rather that the right of Indigenous and Tribal peoples and their members to property "has an autonomous meaning in International Human Rights Law".[7]
- The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (2006) and the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights (2010) both concluded that, "traditional possession of land by Indigenous Peoples has the equivalent effect as that of a state-granted full property title."[8]

---

[5] Working Group on Indigenous Populations/Communities in Africa (WGIP/CA). Oct. 2012. Intersession Report of the Working Group. 52nd Ordinary Session of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights. Para.46. http://www.achpr.org/sessions/52nd/intersession-activity-reports/indigenous-populations/ and African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR). 2006. indigenous people in Africa: The Forgotten Peoples? pp. 15, 16. http://www.achpr.org/mechanisms/indigenous-populations/wg-report-summary/

[6] Mary and Carrie Dann v. United States, Case 11.140, Report No. 75/02 (Report released in 2002, http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/cases/75-02a.html)

[7] Maya indigenous community of the Toledo District v. Belize, Case 12.053 (Report released in 2004, http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/cases/40-04.html)

[8] Case of the Sawhoyamaxa Indigenous Community v. Paraguay (Report released in 2006, https://www.corteidh.or.cr/docs/casos/articulos/seriec_146_ing.pdf); Case 276 / 2003 – Centre for Minority Rights Development

- The International Finance Corporation requires companies to obtain FPIC from Indigenous Peoples under various situations including if there are impacts on lands and natural resources subject to traditional ownership or under customary use. "Customary use of land and resources refers to patterns of long-standing community land and resource use in accordance with Indigenous Peoples' customary laws, values, customs, and traditions, including seasonal or cyclical use, rather than formal legal title to land and resources issued by the state."[9] IFC Performance Standard 7 adopts the following definition of Indigenous Peoples:

  "In this Performance Standard, the term "Indigenous Peoples" is used in a generic sense to refer to a distinct social and cultural group possessing the following characteristics in varying degrees:
  - *Self-identification as members of a distinct indigenous cultural group and recognition of this identity by others;*
  - *Collective attachment to geographically distinct habitats or ancestral territories in the project area and to the natural resources in these habitats and territories;*
  - *Customary cultural, economic, social, or political institutions that are separate from those of the mainstream society or culture; or*
  - *A distinct language or dialect, often different from the official language or languages of the country or region in which they reside."*

- Even though the Canadian government does not officially recognize an Indigenous right to FPIC, in three landmark land rights decisions –Delgamuukw[10], Haida Nation[11] and Tsilhqot'in[12]– the Supreme Court of Canada clearly established that Indigenous consent is already part of Canadian constitutional law. The Court affirmed that consent is a key component of Indigenous title and rights and part of the spectrum of state obligations necessary to ensure federal, provincial and territorial governments don't "run roughshod" over Indigenous peoples' rights pending resolution of outstanding land and title disputes.

As expressed in the IRMA definition of Indigenous Peoples, the IRMA Standard follows the lead of the United Nations' Permanent Forum on Indigenous Peoples, the ILO Convention 169, and others that hold the view that **self-identification** by a people, rather than the state, is a fundamental criterion (although not sufficient in itself) for the identification of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples. According to UNDRIP, Indigenous Peoples have the right to determine their own identity or membership based on their own customs, traditions, and decision making (art. 33). Other characteristics that *may be* determinant of whether a community or group is Indigenous include:

(Kenya) and Minority Rights Group International on behalf of Endorois Welfare Council v Kenya (Report published in 2010, https://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/related_material/2010_africa_commission_ruling_0.pdf)

[9] International Finance Corporation (IFC). 2012. Guidance Note on Performance Standard 7: indigenous peoples. GN42. https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/50eed180498009f9a89bfa336b93d75f/Updated_GN7-2012%20pdf?MOD=AJPERES

[10] Delgamuukw v. British Columbia, [1997] 3 S.C.R. 1010

[11] Haida Nation v. British Columbia (Minister of Forests), [2004] 3 S.C.R. 511, 2004 SCC 73.

[12] Tsilhqot'in Nation v. British Columbia, 2014 SCC 44, [2014] 2 S.C.R. 256.

- Ancient historical ties with respect to living in and using a specific territory (land-based culture)
- Voluntary cultural distinctiveness that is handed down through generations (may include language, special organization, religious or spiritual values, livelihoods, laws and institutions)
- Experience (ongoing or historical) subjugation, marginalization, dispossession, exclusion, or discrimination
- Traditional governance systems
- Presence on lands (land rights) prior to colonization or occupation by other dominant groups[13]
- Duration of time using lands, and whether present on them for reasons of displacement or resettlement
- Distinctly reflected in a census or other sociological data
- Indications that peoples may be unaware of the rights attached to determination of a group as 'Indigenous' and / or unwillingness to use the term for political / social / economic reasons[14]

In short, there is no one-size-fits-all formula to determine which or how many of these characteristics should be demonstrated. Auditors are expected to review the evidence presented by the operating company along with information gained from public sources, stakeholders, and rightsholders. An entity should provide evidence of what steps it has taken to map and identify all potentially impacted Indigenous Peoples, their rights, and describe which sources (surveys, interviews, impact assessments, etc.). Sources should include Indigenous Peoples, and other independent experts (anthropologists). Any mapping must adopt an inclusive approach, considering land uses within and outside of "official" territorial boundaries; between formally recognized groups and those that are not formally recognized. This collective evidence will allow a well-informed determination of chapter relevancy.

[13] In the African context, see Barume, Albert Kwokwo (2010) Land Rights of Indigenous Peoples in Africa – with special focus on Central, Eastern and Southern Africal, International Working Group on Indigenous Affairs (IWIGA), Copenhagen. https://iwgia.org/images/publications/0002_Land_Rights_of_Indigenous_Peoples_In_Africa.pdf

[14] List adapted from: Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). 2016. FPIC: An indigenous peoples' right and a good practice for local communities. https://www.fao.org/policy-support/tools-and-publications/resources-details/en/c/1410915/, and UNDP (2020). Social and Environmental Standards Guidance Note on indigenous peoples, https://info.undp.org/sites/bpps/SES_Toolkit/SES%20Document%20Library/Uploaded%20October%202016/UNDP%20SES%20Indigenous%20Peoples%20GN_Final_December%202020.pdf