INDIGENOUS PEOPLES GUIDEBOOK

FREE PRIOR INFORMED CONSENT AND CORPORATION STANDARDS





This guidebook was developed by First Peoples Worldwide (FPW), the International Indian Treaty Council (IITC) and Trillium Asset Management (Trillium). FPW is an Indigenous-led organization dedicated to strengthening Indigenous communities through the restoration of their authority and control over their assets. IITC is an organization of Indigenous Peoples working for the sovereignty and self-determination of Indigenous Peoples and the recognition and protection of Indigenous rights, treaties, traditional cultures and sacred lands. Trillium is an independent investment management firm providing equity, balanced, and fixed income portfolios dedicated solely to sustainable and responsible investing.

The organizations that collaborated on this guidebook believe that increased involvement by Indigenous Peoples in developing and implementing standards that affect them is essential in protecting their rights, lands, livelihoods and cultures.

FPW, IITC and Trillium would like to express our appreciation and thanks to those who also made important contributions to the development of the Guidebook. These include International Chief Wilton Littlechild, Chair, UN Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; Myrna Cunningham, member and former Chairperson, United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues; Veronica Slajer and Karl Ohls, North Star Group; and various participants at the 11th and 12th sessions of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues.







TABLE OF CONTENTS

	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL STANDARDS AND MECHANISMS	5
THE UNITED NATIONS	6
The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples	6
UN Conventional Mechanisms	7
The Human Rights Committee	8
The UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	9
The UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination	
UN Human Rights Council Special Procedures	11
The Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples	12
The Working Group on Human Rights and Transnational Corporations and Other Business Enterprises	13
OTHER UN BODIES AND PROCESES: ONGOING ADVANCES IN STANDARD SETTING	14
UN Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security	14
UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues and UN Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples	14
UN Global Compact	
OTHERGLOBAL PROCESSES	16
The Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)	16
REGIONAL BODIES AND PROCESSES	18
Organization Of American States: The Inter-American Commission On Human Rights and the Inter-American Court Of Human Rights •••••••	18
European Court Of Human Rights	20
The African Commission On Human and Peoples' Rights	

Association of Southeast Asian Nations	2	22
PRIVATE SECTOR STANDARD-SETTING BODIES	2	23
REPORTING	2	24
Global Reporting Initiative	2	24
LAND USE AND EXTRACTIVES		25
Bonsucro (Sugarcane)	2	25
Round Table on Responsible Soy		
Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil		
Round Table of Sustainable Biofuels		
International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association ${\scriptstyle ullet}$		
International Council on Mining and Metals		
Forest Stewardship Council		
ECOSYSTEMS		
International Union for Conservation of Nature		
Marine Stewardship Council		
FINANCE AND INVESTMENTS		
International Finance Corporation		
Equator Principles		
FAIR TRADE AND OTHERS		
FairTrade International		
Equitable Origin		
Union for Ethical BioTrade		
Responsible Jewellery Council		
Natural Resources Stewardship Circle ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••)4

INTRODUCTION

| Myrna Cunningham, Member and former Chairperson, UNPFII

Tremendous progress has been made by Indigenous peoples over the last 20 years beginning with the International Labour Organization's signing of the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention in 1989, and culminating in the adoption of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2007. Thanks to these and other successes in advancing Indigenous peoples' rights, policy makers today are much more aware of the important role that Indigenous communities play in preserving land, biodiversity, and cultural values.

But Indigenous peoples must now focus on spurring the private sector to make similar rights recognitions. By advocating the adoption of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), Indigenous Peoples are changing business practices on a huge scale. FPIC has been adopted by the International Finance Corporation and other international financial institutions. And four of the ten largest companies in the world—ExxonMobil, BP, Conoco Phillips, and Suncor have all announced policies that recognize the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. But the private sector still has a long way to go in setting standards on policies and actions that affect Indigenous peoples.

This guide is a resource for Indigenous Peoples, building on their successes, while also highlighting how to expand their voices in the standard setting processes of specific industries which impact our territories. But these steps are only the beginning—much more needs to be done to ensure that Indigenous communities obtain the legal and social rights they deserve.

This guidebook is the result of extensive collaboration among the International Indian Treaty Council, Trillium, and First Peoples Worldwide. We hope it will serve as an important road map, helping pave the way for greater international recognition of Indigenous rights by governments, NGOs, international institutions, the funding and donor communities, and corporations. We are grateful for their dedication and their commitment to Indigenous communities all over the world.

In solidarity,

Myrna Cunningham Chairperson of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII), 2011 циппини

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

нинини

Indigenous Peoples' rights tend to be viewed as local anecdotes relevant only to communities and individuals, rather than a global movement of international significance. Yet over the past several decades that has begun to change. Indigenous Peoples around the world are mobilizing and achieving unprecedented recognition by governments, corporations, and the international community. In 2007, this mobilization resulted in two landmark victories: 1) the adoption of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) by the UN General Assembly and 2) the passing of a shareholder resolution directing Newmont Mining to assess its practices and policies towards Indigenous Peoples, with support from 91.6 percent of the company's shareholders.

These two victories demonstrate how the global trajectory for Indigenous Peoples' rights is catalyzed by both the establishment of legal frameworks and pressures occurring within markets. UNDRIP resulted from over 30 years of rights-based Indigenous activism, and has come to be regarded as the flagship legal doctrine for Indigenous Peoples' rights. By contrast, the Newmont resolution was in response to patterns of community resistance to the company's activities that were generating costly lawsuits and operational holdups, as well as significant reputational damage. Newmont later became one of the first extractive companies to explicitly reference Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) in its public statements.

The Indigenous Peoples Guidebook to Free, Prior, and Informed Consent and Corporation Standards combines these two very different but equally important approaches to Indigenous Peoples' rights. The public-sector and private-sector approaches have unique strengths and challenges, but when used together they provide a range of strategies that Indigenous Peoples can choose from to secure their rights, based on what best suits their needs and talents. The first section of this Guidebook lists the **public-sector mechanisms** adopted at the international level by governments, while the second section lists the **private-sector mechanisms** adopted in response to market pressures. FPIC is key to both of these approaches.

When examining these mechanisms, it is important to note the distinction between Indigenous Peoples' rights and human rights in general. While human rights are applicable to Indigenous Peoples, they are primarily individual in nature and do not account for Indigenous Peoples' collective rights. The unique sociopolitical, economic, and cultural situations facing Indigenous Peoples require a distinct approach that accounts for cultural heritage, economic and spiritual connections to land and natural resources, economies that emphasize communal over individual property ownership, historical legacies of discrimination, and other specific factors. **Public-sector mechanisms** are developed by states in multilateral policymaking forums to define the minimum standards governments must adhere to in relation to Indigenous Peoples. These mechanisms establish internationally-recognized legal frameworks for Indigenous Peoples' rights, and are frequently referenced by legislatures and cited in court rulings to derive laws and policies at the national level. They are subject to the needs and demands of Indigenous Peoples around the world, and as Indigenous Peoples are increasingly impacted by corporations, a growing number of public-sector mechanisms are recognizing and affirming governments' obligations to protect them these impacts.

Generally, Indigenous Peoples are better represented and experienced within public-sector mechanisms. Yet globalized markets are exploiting resources on Indigenous territory faster than public-sector mechanisms can protect them, and laws and court rulings favoring Indigenous Peoples' rights are often not upheld or implemented by governments. In these situations, Indigenous Peoples are using private-sector mechanisms to influence corporations directly, and often at a quicker pace.

Private-sector mechanisms are driven by concern within the business community about the risks associated with operating on Indigenous territory without FPIC. According to a 2009 risk analysis done across the extractive industries by EIRIS, 250 large cap companies with a total market value of \$2.7 trillion have high to medium risk exposure to Indigenous Peoples. These risks take the form of lawsuits, activist campaigns, demonstrations, occupations, and in worst cases, violence. While they stem from governments' chronic failure to uphold their obligations to Indigenous Peoples' rights, they inflict more financial and reputational damage to companies, prompting shareholders to take action. In 1999, First Peoples Worldwide and the Calvert Social Investment Forum partnered to design and implement the first Indigenous Peoples investment criteria. Shareholder dialogue on Indigenous Peoples has since accelerated and produced drastic changes to corporate approaches to their interactions with Indigenous Peoples.

To meet the demands of shareholders and further bolster protections against the risks of violating Indigenous Peoples' rights, international standards are being developed by the private sector. The developers of these standards include financers seeking to mitigate their clients' risk exposure to Indigenous Peoples, industry groups seeking to improve the long-term viability of their fields, and NGOs seeking to elevate the social and environmental reporting standards for companies. These standards are effective and often underutilized alternatives to public-sector mechanisms that Indigenous Peoples can use to fill voids left by unfulfilled government commitments. Although they are voluntary, compliance may be a prerequisite for financing eligibility, organizational membership, or branding marks.

By compiling the existing public-sector and private-sector mechanisms recognizing Indigenous Peoples' rights, this Guidebook serves as a resource for Indigenous Peoples affected by business activities—whether they are negotiating with a corporation, advocating for strengthened government protections, or seeking redress for violations of their rights. The exhaustiveness of this Guidebook is indicative of the success Indigenous Peoples have had at bringing their concerns to boardrooms and global policymaking arenas—but there remains significant work to be done. By utilizing both public-sector and private-sector strategies to advocate for their rights, Indigenous Peoples can solidify FPIC as an incontestable standard of practice and pave the way for culturally-appropriate development for Indigenous communities that ensures mutual benefit and sustainable prosperity for all parties involved. PUBLIC SECTOR

MECHANISMS

The following is a list of the public-sector mechanisms developed by states in multilateral policymaking forums to define the minimum standards governments must adhere to in relation to Indigenous Peoples. They include the standard-setting mechanisms that define the minimum standards states must adhere to in relation to Indigenous Peoples' rights, as well as complaint mechanisms through which Indigenous peoples can report and seek redress for violations of their rights. These are not mutually exclusive. Grievances filed through complaint mechanisms frequently reflect existing standards, while standardsetting processes are subject to trends and patterns identified in these grievances.

These mechanisms are intended to provide recommendations or best-practice guidance to national and regional lawmakers, and serious international condemnation may result from non-compliance. The ramifications to a state for noncompliance with a UN or other international human rights standard may include public shaming, restricted participation in international initiatives or, in extreme cases, economic sanctions.

Some international organizations with State members, such as the UN and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development have long focused their energies on the policies and practices of States. Over time, however, these organizations have begun to place additional emphasis on the role of private entities, such as corporations, in protecting human rights, biodiversity, or other international sustainability goals.

pprox united nations pprox

When a State fails in its duties to monitor and assure compliance, effective international human rights mechanisms can be used to impose human rights obligations and standards on corporations including through the State's legally binding obligations. This section will detail some of the more notable international standards and structures put in place by governmental or multi-State bodies to protect Indigenous Peoples' individual and collective rights.

UNITED NATIONS DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES: The minimum standards for the survival, dignity and well-being of the Indigenous Peoples of the World | 2007

The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) was adopted by the UN General Assembly on September 13th, 2007. The rights it recognizes "constitute the minimum standards for the survival, dignity and well-being of the indigenous peoples of the world". Although four States initially voted against it, and others have expressed a qualified endorsement, no State now opposes the UNDRIP." Bolivia has adopted the UNDRIP as part of its National constitution and other States such as Belize have upheld its provisions, including land rights, in court cases. A growing number of UN bodies, processes and standard-setting activities are referencing and incorporating the rights contained in the UNDRIP.

UNDRIP explicitly affirms Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) and the obligation of States to ensure its implementation. It also recognizes a number of closely related rights including self-determination, respect for Treaties and Agreements, participation in decision making, traditional lands and natural resources, control and protection of sacred sites and cultural heritage including seeds and genetic resources, and security in subsistence and development.

The following articles affirming FPIC directly or by implication are of particular importance for the interactions of Indigenous Peoples with corporations as well as relevant State obligations:

- Article 3: Right to Self-determination
- Article 10: Indigenous Peoples shall not be forcibly removed or relocated from their lands or territories without their FPIC

- Articles 19: States shall obtain the FPIC of Indigenous Peoples before adopting legislative or administrative measures that may affect them
- Article 29: Indigenous Peoples have the right to FPIC before hazardous materials are stored or disposed of on their lands
- Article 32: States shall obtain FPIC prior to the approval of any development project
- Affecting Indigenous Peoples' lands and resources including water and minerals
- Article 37: States shall observe and respect Treaties, agreements and other constructive Arrangement and State obligation
- Article 42: States and UN agencies "shall promote respect for and full application of the provisions of this Declaration."

UNITED NATIONS CONVENTIONAL MECHANISMS

United Nations Conventional Mechanisms (called "conventional" because they result from legally-binding international human rights treaties or conventions) can also be effective in holding State parties (those which have ratified them) accountable for human rights obligations. Their recommendations may be used in domestic court proceedings and contribute to the development of customary international law. They can damage the reputation of both States and corporations identified as human rights violators, and can also be used by Indigenous Peoples and civil society to exert pressure for change.

Compliance with UN treaties, covenants, conventions and protocols are monitored by treaty monitoring bodies (TMBs) composed of independent experts elected by the participating State parties. TMBs have addressed the State's responsibility to protect human rights from third parties including corporations. TMBs cannot hold a corporation directly responsible for human rights violations, as the legal obligation for implementation of UN conventions belongs to the States parties themselves. TMBs, however, have taken note of transnational corporations' human rights abuses and have begun to leverage the State's responsibilities to help protect the human rights of Indigenous Peoples and communities against third-party violators.

TMBs review States' records and responsibilities to protect and uphold human rights through periodic examinations of compliance, typically conducted every four to six years. Some conventions and covenants also have established specific complaints procedures. For example, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) has an urgent action/early warning procedure that can be very useful to Indigenous Peoples facing encroachment, for example by mining companies and other sources of unwelcomed development.

All State parties are required to file periodic reports to TMBs as an element of their compliance with the relevant convention. The TMB also meet face to face with government officials to conduct periodic examinations and issue conclusions and recommendations, outlining steps the State should take in order to correct violations. These are made public on the TMB's UN web page, providing another source for creating awareness and pressure.

In addition to the States' reports on their own compliance, "parallel" or "shadow" reports filed by civil society, Indigenous Peoples and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), can add information or challenge the States' reports with their own assessment of compliance or violations. These reports are given a great deal of weight in the review process, and are a very important point of access that has been used effectively by

Indigenous Peoples. In some bodies such as the CERD, Indigenous Peoples are also able to directly address TMB expert members during the State's review process.

TMBs also issue general recommendations and comments on particular articles in their covenants or conventions. These present the TMB's official interpretation of the rights in their respective conventions. Many times States are directed to interpret the convention as per the interpretations found in the general comments or recommendations.

The following provide examples of guidelines, councils, or special procedures that have been developed through UN initiatives and provide protections for Indigenous Peoples' rights.

The Human Rights Committee | HRC | Treaty Monitoring Body for the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, | 1976

Membership	18 independent experts elected by State parties
Language Addressing Indigenous Peoples	General Comment 23
Scope	167 States have ratified the ICCPR. Periodic reports are required of all ratifying States. Complaints may be filed only against State parties that have ratified Optional Protocol 1.

http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrc/index.htm

The Human Rights Committee (HRC) is the TMB for the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which was adopted in 1966 and entered into legal force in 1976. The ICCPR is the multilateral treaty adopted by the United Nations General Assembly which commits its current 167 parties to respect the civil and political rights of individuals, including the right to life, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, electoral rights and rights to due process as part of the International Bill of Human Rights, which also includes the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rightsand the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The HRC has consistently interpreted the right of self-determination for all Peoples as affirmed in Article 1 in Common of the two international Covenants, to include the right to lands and natural resources, stating that the unilateral extinguishment of aboriginal title (the right of use) is inconsistent with the right of self-determination. In its General Comment 23, which interprets Article 27, the HRC requires that Indigenous Peoples have access to lands and natural resources in order to preserve their culture. These rights have been applied by the HRC to New Zealand (1995), Norway (1999), Mexico (1999), Canada (1999), Colombia (1992) and Australia (2002).

CONTRACTOR Committee in Action

In 1990, the HRC addressed a complaint submitted by the Lubicon Lake Band of Canada. It presented a number of human rights violations under ICCPR such as leases and concessions to corporations for logging, oil and mining that threatened Lubicon Lake with illnesses from pollution, as well as a deteriorated economic base from lost forests, hunting and fishing. The HRC found that Lake Band's rights had been violated under Article 27: the right to practice language, culture and religion. Canada offered to "rectify the situation" in the form of monetary compensation and land swaps. But in 2007 the HRC cited continued violations of Article 1, the right of self-determination, as well as Article 27 for Canada's ongoing failure to fairly deal with the Lubicon Lake Band. HRC recommended that Canada consult with the Band before granting licenses "for the economic exploitation of the disputed land, and ensure that in no case such exploitation jeopardizes the rights recognized under the Covenant."

The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights | CESC | Treaty Monitoring Body for the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights | 1985

www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cescr/

Membership	18
Language Addressing Indigenous Peoples	No explicit mention in the ICESC; references to Indigenous Peoples are found in its examination of periodic reports and conclusions and recommendations as well as throughout its general comments
Scope	160 States have ratified ICESC. Requires periodic reviews of State Parties. The Optional Protocol governing complaints procedures was adopted in 2008, but has not entered into force, as it requires 10 ratifications.

The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESC) monitors compliance with the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESC), which was adopted in 1966 and entered into force in 1976. This Covenant has Article 1, the right of self-determination, in common with the ICCPR. The CESC has addressed the right of self-determination and the exploitation of lands and resources in their periodic examinations of the Russian Federation (2003), Ecuador (2004), and Colombia (2001).

CESC General Comment 15 (2002) imposes on States the duty to protect the right to water from third parties such as individuals, groups, and corporations, and addresses the right of peoples not to be deprived of their means of subsistence.

In 2011, the CESC, noting serious human rights abuses by corporations both domestically and internationally, declared its intention to dedicate special attention to the responsibilities of States to protect against abuse by transnational corporations and other business enterprises.

The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination | CERD | Treaty Monitoring Body for the International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination | 1969

http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/

Membership	18 independent experts elected by States parties
Language Addressing Indigenous Peoples	General Recommendation 23
Scope	175 States have ratified ICERD. Periodic reports are required. Complaints may be filed only against State parties that have made a declaration recognizing the competence of CERD to receive such complaints. An Indigenous Nation, Tribe, group, individual or NGO may file an urgent action/early warning against any State party.

CERD is the TMB for the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD). As well as conducting periodic examinations of parties, it also has unique complaint procedures and urgent action/early warning procedures to address imminent threats and developing situations. Indigenous Peoples have used CERD effectively to address threats from mining and other forms of resource extraction.

CERD's General Recommendation 23, adopted in 1997, interprets the ways in which States are expected to implement the Convention with regards to Indigenous Peoples. It recognizes "...the fact that ...indigenous peoples have lost their land and resources to colonists, commercial companies and State enterprises" and that, "....the preservation of their culture and their historical identity has been and still is jeopardized." It calls on State parties to "provide indigenous peoples with conditions allowing for a sustainable economic and social development compatible with their cultural characteristics," and to "ensure that members of indigenous peoples have equal rights in respect of effective participation in public life and that no decisions directly relating to their rights and interests are taken without their informed consent."

CERD in Action

In 2007, during Canada's periodic review, the International Indian Treaty Council and the Confederacy of Treaty 6 First Nations submitted a joint alternative or "shadow" report addressing human rights violations, in particular FPIC violations by Canadian mining companies operating in Alaska, Nevada, Montana and Guatemala. CERD expressed concern about "adverse effects of economic activities connected with the exploitation of natural resources in States outside Canada by transnational corporations registered in Canada on the right to land, health, living environment and the way of life of indigenous peoples," and called on Canada to "explore ways to hold transnational corporations registered in Canada accountable." In its 2012 Periodic Review of Canada, the CERD

expressed concern that Canada "has not yet adopted measures with regard to transnational corporations registered in Canada whose activities negatively impact the rights of indigenous peoples outside Canada, in particular in mining activities" CERD again called upon Canada to "... take appropriate legislative measures to prevent transnational corporations registered in Canada from carrying out activities that negatively impact on the enjoyment of rights of indigenous peoples in territories outside Canada, and hold them accountable." The CERD also called upon Canada to "Implement in good faith the right to consultation and to free, prior and informed consent of Aboriginal peoples whenever their rights may be affected by projects carried out on their lands, as set forth in international standards and the State party's legislation."

UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL SPECIAL PROCEDURES

http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/SP/Pages/Welcomepage.aspx

UN Human Rights Council "Special Procedures" can be effectively used to establish human rights standards against corporate abuse and address States' responsibilities. UN Special Procedures and its system of thematic human rights investigators (usually called "rapporteurs") act on specific complaints and examine States' responsibility to protect human rights.

Many special procedures, such as the Working Group on Arbitrary Detentions, the Special Rapporteur on Extra judicial or Summary Executions and the Special Rapporteur on Human Rights Defenders, assist in requiring human rights protection from States. There are now more than 30 Special Procedures covering a wide range of human rights, which have been used effectively by Indigenous Peoples to address human rights violations including those involving the actions of corporations. Although Special Procedures' recommendations are not legally binding, they are reported to the UN Human Rights Council, which creates strong pressure on States to respond and make changes. There is generally no need for a State to ratify or sign any specific covenant or convention to be subject to investigation under these processes.

Indigenous Peoples have utilized a number of other UN Special Procedures to effectively call attention to human rights abuses that involve corporate activity, and the States' duty to protect rights including rights and access to food, housing, health and freedom of religion.



The Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples | 2001

http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/IPeoples/SRIndigenousPeoples/Pages/SRIPeoplesIndex. aspx and http://unsr.jamesanaya.org

Membership	Independent Expert on the theme of Indigenous Peoples, appointed every three years by the President of the UN Human Rights Council
Language Addressing Indigenous Peoples	UN DRIP; ILO Convention 169, Treaty Body and OAS Mechanisms jurisprudence.
Scope	The Special Rapporteur may receive communications regarding any UN member State and may make visits to these States to investigate specific situations upon their invitation.

The Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples was established by a resolution of the UN Human Rights Council 2001.

The current Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Professor James Anaya, has found that corporate consultation processes have not been carried out in accordance with international standards including FPIC and therefore pose serious challenges to the exercise of the rights of Indigenous Peoples. Special Rapporteur Anaya's study on extractive and energy industries in and near Indigenous Peoples' territories analyzes the impacts on the human rights of Indigenous Peoples and identifies good practices for respecting those rights. His final report and recommendations, reflecting input from Indigenous Peoples around the world, will be presented to the UN Human Rights Council in September 2013 and will be posted on the web page of the Special Rapporteur: http://unsr.jamesanaya.info/study-extractives/index.php/en.

Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in Action

In 2011, Special Rapporteur James Anaya filed a report on the situation of the Indigenous Peoples of Guatemala. He found a "certain degree of duty," apart from the duties of the State, on the part of corporations to respect the rights of Indigenous Peoples.

As an annex to his report he examined the violations of Indigenous Peoples' rights by Montana Exploradora de Guatemala SA, a subsidiary of the Canadian multinational Goldcorp. Montana Exploradora's Marlin open pit mine had created substantial environmental damage, posing risks to local health, lands and resources, including the subsistence of Indigenous Peoples. This situation was the cause of significant community opposition, resulting in violent repression. As a result of awareness raised by Indigenous Peoples, the Inter American Court of Human Rights, the ILO and the World Bank Group's International Finance Institution's ombudsman have all called for the suspension of mining activity by Marlin.

The Rapporteur also found that the corporation's "consultation" had not been carried out in accordance to international standards.

The Working Group on Human Rights and Transnational Corporations and other Business Enterprises | 2011

http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Business/Pages WGHRandtransnationalcorporationsandotherbusiness.aspx

Membership	5 independent experts appointed by the president of the Human Rights Council
Core Documents	The Universal Declaration of Human Rights; the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; and the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.
Language Addressing Indigenous Peoples	Reference cited in Core Documents, and UN DRIP
Scope	Communications can be sent regarding to the Working Group regarding any United Nation member State by any Indigenous Nation, Tribe or organization. Individual communications will not be accepted.

In August 2011, the United Nations Human Rights Council adopted , the "Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights developed by Professor John Ruggie, the Secretary General's Special Representative on Human Rights and Transnational Corporations and other Business Enterprises. The Council also established a new Working Group on Human Rights and Transnational Corporations and other Business Enterprises to make recommendations to States, business and other entities on the effective implementation of the Guiding Principles.

Professor Ruggie's Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights are based on three core principles: 1) States' obligation to respect, protect and fulfill human rights; 2) corporate responsibility to respect human rights; and 3) a need for effective remedies and mechanisms for corporate human rights abuses. The principles call for companies to conduct "due diligence" for "assessing actual and potential human rights impacts, integrating and acting upon the findings, tracking responses, and communicating how impacts are addressed" throughout the life of their projects.

The Working Group on the issue of Human Rights and Transnational Corporations and other Business Enterprises had its first session in January 2012. It consists of five independent experts, balanced in geographical representation, with terms for a period of three years. The Working Group conducts two State visits per year and accepts communications from all relevant sources, including Indigenous Peoples and corporations. It will also work with the numerous other Special Procedures that receive communications from Indigenous Peoples and NGOs. The creation of this new working group was significant milestone, demonstrating the growing international recognition that corporations are responsible for respecting human rights, and that States are responsible for ensuring that they do so.

OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES AND PROCESSES: ONGOING ADVANCES IN STANDARD SETTING

The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the UN Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security | 2012

http://www.fao.org/index_en.htm

The UN's "Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security" was adopted by the UN Committee on Food Security in May 2012 after the UNFAO conducted several years of negotiations on the text with participation by States and "civil society" representatives including Indigenous Peoples. The Guidelines recognize the rights of Indigenous Peoples in a number of provisions. Of note is Paragraph 9.3, which reads, in part:

> In the case of Indigenous peoples, States should meet their relevant obligations and voluntary commitments to protect, promote and implement human rights, including as appropriate from the International Labour Organization Convention (No.169) concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent States, the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

These guidelines also instruct States to assume active responsibility for the human rights compliance of transnational corporations, as well as extend direct responsibility to corporations themselves. It States: "Business enterprises should act with due diligence to avoid infringing on the human rights and legitimate tenure rights of others." The guidelines explicitly extend the guidance issued to the States regarding corporations: "Where transnational corporations are involved, their home States have roles to play in assisting both those corporations and host States to ensure that businesses are not involved inabuse of human rights and legitimate tenure rights."

Although these guidelines are identified as "voluntary" and therefore not legally enforceable, they are an important indication of the growing trajectory in a range of International processes to recognize the closely related obligations of corporations and States uphold human rights, including the rights of Indigenous Peoples.

The United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues | UNPFII | 2001

http://social.un.org/index/IndigenousPeoples.aspx

The UNPFII is made up of 16 expert members from 7 regions. 8 are appointed by States and 8 are nominated by Indigenous Peoples.

The UNPFII focusses on the concerns of Indigenous Peoples in the areas of economic and social development, culture, the environment, education, health and human rights. The UNPFII reports to the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and works directly with a number of other UN agencies and bodies. The UNPFII also provides advice and

recommendations to the UN system and UN member States for the effective implementation of the rights in the UNDRIP, including FPIC. It is charged in Article 42 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples with specific responsibility to "promote respect for and full appreciation of" the Declaration, and to "follow up the effectiveness of the Declaration."

The UNPFII is not a human rights complaints body and therefore does not usually address specific human rights situations submitted by Indigenous Peoples. However it has completed several studies and has made a number of recommendations of direct relevance to the implementation of FPIC and the impacts of corporate activities on the rights of Indigenous Peoples. These include studies on extractive industries, biofuel production and other types of business enterprises.

The United Nations Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples EMRIP | 2006

http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/IPeoples/EMRIP/Pages/EMRIPIndex.aspx

The EMRIP is another important UN body focusing specifically on Indigenous Peoples. The EMRIP, with 5 expert members, mainly Indigenous Peoples from around the world, conducts studies with the input of Indigenous Peoples and States and presents advise to the UN Human Rights Council and its member States on implementing and upholding the rights of Indigenous Peoples.

In 2012, the EMRIP carried out a study which was reported to the UN Human Rights Council, on the right of Indigenous Peoples to participate in decision-making with a focus on extractive industries. In 2012, EMRIP Chairperson Chief Wilton Littlechild also submitted a supplemental paper to the Council titled "Comment on the Human Rights Council's Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights as related to Indigenous Peoples and the Right to Participate in Decision-Making with a Focus on Extractive Industries" [A/HRC/EMRIP/2012/CRP.1].

This paper provided a detailed analysis of how the Guiding Principles can be applied to the situations of Indigenous Peoples impacted by extractive industries and strengthened by incorporating the rights affirmed in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, International Labor Organization Convention 169 and other relevant Standards. It concluded that "In all aspects of implementation of the "Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework" it is clear that the full inclusion of Indigenous peoples at all stages is the best solution." It also presents a comprehensive perspective on the right to Self-determination in this context.

Like the UNPFII, the EMRIP provides important opportunities for dialogue among Indigenous Peoples, UN agencies and States. Both these bodies continue to make significant contributions by proposing criteria for good practices, overcoming ongoing challenges, and ways forward in the effective implementation of FPIC by States, corporations and the UN System. \approx Other Global processes \approx

THE ORGANIZATION OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT | OECD | 1961

www.oecd.org http://oecdwatch.org

Membership	34 member States, including: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, and the US.
Core Documents	OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (2011); Human rights obligations of member States (e.g., ICCPR, ICERD)
Language Addressing Indigenous Peoples	General references to human rights, with language specific to Indigenous rights found in "National Contact Point Reports on Specific Instances." The NCP representatives are usually appointed by governments.
Scope	Guidelines apply to all OECD State party transnational corporations, and under the doctrine of National Treatment, to domestic corporations; the actions of a non-State party corporation that is in the supply chain or providing services to a State party corporation can also be included.

The Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) is a multi-State treaty organization. Originally comprised of developed, western nations, it now includes several developing States. Its purpose is to promote sustainable economic growth and employment, a rising standard of living, and the expansion of world trade.

In 1976, the OECD adopted Guidelines for Multinational Corporations. They were revised several times. The last revision, in 2011 incorporated a large amount of the Ruggie "Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights" (see above), including his reference to the UN DRIP. The OECD Guidelines also contain standards on the environment, corruption and labor, in addition to human rights. This revision also provided clarity on the responsibilities of National Contact Points (NCPs) who receive and follow up on complaints of guideline violations.

The OECD Voluntary Guidelines provide general standards for governments and transnational corporations covering all major areas of business ethics. These include corporate obligations to obey the law, observe internationally recognized standards, and be aware of activities that may adversely impact "individuals belonging to specific groups or populations that require particular attention." Corporations are encouraged to respect human rights regardless of a host State's observance or lack of observance of these rights.

Human rights violations can be filed as "specific instances" with the NCP. The primary goal of NCPs is to encourage meetings and communications between the parties, with

the view of settlement of the dispute. Where no settlement is possible, NCPs are to issue a public Statement "describing the issues raised," and where appropriate "make recommendations on the implementation of the Guidelines. This OECD mechanism, however, is entirely voluntary and a corporation can refuse to participate; if it does participate, it can refuse to meet with affected communities.

OECD in Action Oeconomic

In a 2008 Specific Instance the NCP concluded Vedanta Resources, a British company, had failed to put in place adequate and timely consultation mechanisms to fully engage the Dongria Kondh. This Indigenous community was directly affected by the environmental, health and safety impacts of Vedanta's plans to construct a bauxite mine. Even though the proposed activity had been approved by the Indian Supreme Court, the NCP found that Vedanta did not respect the rights and freedoms of the Dongria Kondh.

In the Specific Instance of Goldcorp's Marlin mine (see above), in 2011, the Canadian NCP reported on the failure of their efforts to mediate a meeting between the Indigenous complainants and the corporation. No comments on the additional allegations of violations of the right to property by the community, FPIC, the pollution of water sources, and other damages resulting from the mine activity were filed.

The OECD is, for now, the only international mechanism that allows for complaints directly examining corporate behavior and the behavior of suppliers, without regard to whether that behavior is legal within the host State. It cuts through the often complicated corporate structures that confuse ultimate responsibility. These investigations can be published and, possibly affect the corporation's image and reputation.



THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES: THE INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, 1959

http://www.oas.org/en/iachr/

Membership	7 independent experts serving in a personal capacity
Core Documents	Inter-American Declaration on the Rights and Duties of Man
Language Addressing Indigenous Peoples	None specifically; Indigenous Peoples addressed through jurisprudence
Scope	A complaint can be filed against any member State of the Organization of American States by Indigenous Nations, Tribes, groups or individuals.

The OAS Human Rights Mechanisms, particularly the Inter-American Court of Human Rights are effective human rights enforcement mechanisms available in particular to Indigenous Peoples in Latin America. The US and Canada have not accepted the jurisdiction of the Inter-American Court, although Indigenous Peoples in these States have also used them and had their cases accepted by the Court.

Both the Inter-American Human Rights Commission (IAHRC) and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACHR) have upheld the right of self-determination, the right to traditional lands, territories and resources, and the right to FPIC in a number of cases.

IACHR judgments are in the form of recommendations. All States of the Americas except for Cuba are OAS members. If a member State does not comply with the judgment, the IACHR can take the case to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. States may also take cases before the Court but have yet to do so.

Inter-American Court of Human Rights (1979)

http://www.corteidh.or.cr/index.cfm

Membership	7 judges elected by the OAS General Assembly, serving in a personal capacity
Core Documents	Inter-American Convention on Human Rights (1979)
Language Addressing Indigenous Peoples	By jurisprudence
Scope	States that have ratified the American Convention on Human Rights: Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Dominica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Haití, Honduras, Jamaica. México, Nicaragua, Panamá, Paraguay, Perú, República Dominicana, Suriname, Trinidad y Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela. The US, Canada, Guyana and Belize have not ratified the American Convention and are not subject to it or the Court's jurisdiction.

The Inter-American Court of Human Rights does have legally binding obligations on State parties. The Court requires States to report regularly on compliance with its judgments. The Court reports annually to the OAS General Assembly on its monitoring of compliance by the States within its judgments. It has the power to enforce its judgments on damages before the Supreme Courts of signatory States.

********** Inter-American Court of Human Rights in Action

The Court has made a number of landmark decisions supporting traditional land and resource rights of Indigenous Peoples against actions by States as well as corporations. The Case of the Mayagna (Sumo) Awas Tingni Community v. Nicaragua, in 2001. ordered Nicaragua to define and demarcate the boundaries of Indigenous lands and, pending that definition, cease any activity, including the issuance of logging permits to companies.

In 2004 the Case of the Maya Indigenous Communities of the Toledo District (Belize), established that Indigenous Peoples have the right to be protected from harm to their environment resulting from transnational activity. In 2007 the Case of the Saramaka People v. Suriname (2007), found a violation of the Indigenous right to property when the State granted mining and logging concessions to corporations without considering the environment, or impacts on other resources used by indigenous and tribal peoples for subsistence and trade.



THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS | 1959

http://www.echr.coe.int/echr/homepage_EN

Membership	One judge for each of the contacting 47 States to the European Convention on Human Rights serving a non-renewable term of 9 years. Judges are elected by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. They are organized into three sections, and each section has "Chambers." Once a case is found admissible by a single Judge "Rapporteur" it is referred to Chambers for decisions on the merits.
Core Documents	European Convention on Human Rights
Language Addressing Indigenous Peoples	None; the Court has as yet to address itself to Indigenous rights per se, even though many European States continue to hold Indigenous lands and territories overseas. There are Indigenous Peoples in Europe as well, in Norway, Finland and Sweden and the Russian Federation.
Scope	The Court accepts complaints from individuals as well as State- to-State complaints from States parties to the Convention: Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, and the United Kingdom.

The European Court of Human Rights decides complaints alleging violations of the civil or political rights under the European Convention on Human Rights. Much like the Inter-American system, its final judgments can be enforced against the 47 members of the Council of Europe States that have ratified the Convention. The European Court has applied human rights standards, primarily Article 8 of the European Convention (right to respect for private and family life), to acts of corporations damaging the environment.

The European Court has not addressed Indigenous Peoples' rights directly, even though several European States continue to hold Indigenous territories overseas. Indigenous Peoples, primarily the Saami Peoples, also live within the Nordic European States. The European court has a case before it challenging the forces removal of the Chagos Islanders from the Island of Diego Garcia by the United Kingdom in preparation for a US military base.

THE AFRICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN AND

PEOPLES RIGHTS | *ACHPR* | 1986 entry into force

http://www.achpr.org/english/_info/news_en.html

Membership	11 members serving renewable 6 year terms elected by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government
Core Documents	African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights
Language Addressing Indigenous Peoples	By its very name, The African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights expressly recognizes and protects collective rights by employing the term "peoples" in its provisions, including in its Preamble. The Charter recognized as rights of Peoples: (Article 17.3), Promotion and protec- tion of morals and traditional values recognized by the community; (Article 19), Equality of all Peoples; "Nothing shall justify the domi- nation of a people by another;" (Article 20), the right to existence, the "inalienable right of self-determination," and the right to "freely determine their political status and shall pursue their economic and social development according to the policy they have freely chosen;" (Article 21), "All peoples shall freely dispose of their wealth and natu- ral resources. This right shall be exercised in the exclusive interest of the people. In no case shall a people be deprived of it;" (Article 22), "All peoples shall have the right to their economic, social and cultural development;" (Article 23), A Peoples' right to Peace and Security; (Article 24), A Peoples right to the environment "favourable to their development."
Scope	The African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights are applicable to all States members of the Organization of African Unity, now African Union, virtually all African States.

The ACHPR receives cases concerning the 1981 African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights. In 2005 the African Commission adopted an expansive and noteworthy report entitled, "Report of the African Commission's Working Group of Experts on Indigenous Populations/Communities." The decisions of the ACHPR, although legally binding, are not enforceable, unlike the European and Inter American Court decisions that can be enforced through State party processes. Similar to UN processes, the decisions—although legallybinding and obligatory—can be, and many times are, ignored.

ACHPR in Action

In 2002 it applied seven articles of the Charter to Nigeria, a signatory, for the environmental damage caused by Shell Corporation on Ogoni Peoples' lands. Their ruling called on Nigeria to undertake a "comprehensive cleanup of lands and rivers damaged by oil operations," and to ensure that the social and environmental impact of future oil development in Nigeria does not harm local communities. Rights violated include the right to health and the right to clean environment as recognized under Articles 16 and 24 of the African Charter, as well as Article 14, the right to property, interpreted by the ACHPR as including the right to safe housing. It also found a violation of the right to food, implicit in Articles 4 (life), Article 16 (health) and Article 22 (the right to economic, social and cultural development). Most relevant to transnational corporations, the ACHPR applied Article 21, the right of Peoples to freely dispose of their wealth and natural resources. Part 5 of Article 21, provides that, "States Parties to the present Charter shall undertake to eliminate all forms of foreign economic exploitation particularly that practised by international monopolies so as to enable their peoples to fully benefit from the advantages derived from their national resources." The ACHPR noted that, "The intervention of multinational corporations may be a potentially positive force for development if the State and the people concerned are ever mindful of the common good and the sacred rights of individuals and communities."

THE ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS

ASEAN | Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights | 2009 www.aseansec.org/22769.htm

Membership	The Asian Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights is not yet fully formed. The ASEAN States was inaugurated it in 2009, and adopted its Terms of Reference in 2012.
Core Documents	An ASEAN Human Rights declaration is being drafted by a group of experts.
Language Addressing Indigenous Peoples	None yet.
Scope	As a Human Rights declaration is yet to be drafted or adopted, it is difficult to predict its scope, whether it will require ASEAN State parties to ratify, or if it will be applicable to all without ratification, like the Inter American Declaration. ASEAN State members include: Brunei Darussalam, the Kingdom of Cambodia, the Republic of Indo- nesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, the Republic of the Union of Myanmar, the Republic of the Philippines, the Republic of Singapore, the Kingdom of Thailand, and the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam.

In 2009, ASEAN inaugurated the Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights and adopted its terms of reference. An ASEAN declaration of human rights is being drafted by a group of experts, criticized recently by Asian NGOs as a secretive process without human rights NGO consultation or input.

PRIVATE SECTOR MECHANISMS

In contrast to the mechanisms developed by States, a growing number of mechanisms are being developed by the private sector. They are driven by investors who are concerned about the increasing financial and reputational risks associated with violating Indigenous Peoples' rights. The organizations developing these mechanisms include financers seeking to mitigate their clients' risk exposure to Indigenous Peoples, industry groups seeking to improve the long-term viability of their fields, and NGOs seeking to elevate the social and environmental reporting standards for companies. Although these mechanisms are voluntary, compliance may be a prerequisite for financing eligibility, organizational membership, or branding marks.

Best practices in private sector standard setting processes are promoted by the International Social and Environmental Accreditation and Labeling Alliance (ISEAL Alliance). The ISEAL Alliance has developed a Code of Good Practice for standard setting that includes:

- Identifying key stakeholders and encouraging their participation in standards development,
- Ensuring sufficient outreach and effective communication tools for stakeholder participation,
- Weighting the variety of opinions equally and following balanced decision-making,
- Conducting regular reviews of the standards
- Making sure the documents are publicly available.

Indigenous Peoples have various means to offer input to private sector standard setting mechanisms. Some processes are open to Indigenous membership on their boards and others encourage Indigenous participation on the standards setting committee. Whether led by an industry organization or NGO, all processes can accept and should encourage written comments from Indigenous Peoples. For Indigenous peoples who wish to participate in the processes that may affect their territories and livelihoods, the following is a list of private sector mechanisms and relevant contact information.



REPORTING



GLOBAL REPORTING INITIATIVE | 1997

www.globalreporting.org

Region of Operation	While any organization in the world may use the GRI, it has regional representation in the Netherlands, Australia, Brazil, China, India and the United States. An office will open in South Africa in late 2012.
Membership Size	There are more than 600 Organizational Stakeholders in over 60 States.
Member Examples	Organizational Stakeholders can be business enterprises, public and private organizations.
Membership Requirements	Organizational Stakeholders register online in a simple form. A fee is assessed according to the annual turnover of the organization.
Language Addressing IPs	The Global Reporting Initiative offers guidelines for reporting on a company's approach to Indigenous communities, in its general Guidelines as well as in sector specific supplement. Guidance includes:
	 Reporting on processes and mechanisms related to: minimization of potential adverse impacts, relocation, consultation and informed participation, implementation of development benefits, and approach for purposely isolated communities. Reporting on how Indigenous Peoples are taken into consideration in the project planning,
	• Decision-making and impact mitigation processes. (Source: Sustainability Reporting Guidelines & Oil and Gas Sector Supplement at www.globalreporting.org/resourcelibrary/OGSS- G3.1-Complete.pdf)

The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) is a nonprofit organization which encourages corporate transparency by providing a reporting framework around sustainability topics. It provides guidelines for reporting on a range of social, economic and environmental indicators. The guidelines are continuously improved through a consensus seeking, multi-stakeholder process. GRI is currently working on the development of the next generation of the Guidelines, which will be published in May 2013.

Companies and organizations wishing to use the GRI Framework are provided with reporting templates, introductory workshops, supporting publications and software certifications. More than 2,100 organizations issued sustainability reports guided by the GRI Framework in 2011.

GRI is governed by three main entities. The board of directors has final decision-making authority, a technical advisory committee oversees development of the frameworks, and a stakeholder council offers guidance on strategic issues and assesses potential changes to

the Frameworks. Stakeholder council members are nominated through an annual open call for nominations.

The GRI's Reporting Guidelines have multiple indicators which touch upon Indigenous Peoples in some way. One of the key Human Rights Performance Indicators requests corporate reporting specific to incidents involving Indigenous Peoples. Additional social performance indicators request reporting on community impact and engagement. Sector-specific frameworks for the mining and metals and the oil and gas sectors have more in-depth informational requirements, including reporting on consultation processes, relocation and benefits sharing.

Contact Details:

For inquiries regarding the Organizational Stakeholders program: os@globalreporting.org.

Eszter Vitorino Füleky Manager, Organizational Stakeholder Program Fulekyova@globalreporting.org

Global Reporting Initiative PO Box 10039 1001 EA Amsterdam Netherlands +31(0) 20 531 00 00 info@globalreporting.org www.globalreporting.org



BONSUCRO | 2005

www.bonsucro.com

Region of Operation	Global.
Membership Size	Members are organizations. There are currently 58 globally diverse members.
Member Examples	Members include NGOs (World Wildlife Fund), producers (Shell, Petrobras, North Sea Petroleum) and consumer product companies (Pepsico, Cargill, Unilever, Coca-Cola).
Membership Requirements	Potential members must submit applications, including signing the Bonsucro Code of Conduct. Details of the applicant company are posted to the Bonsucro website for 30 days and stakeholders are invited to comment.

Language Addressing IPs	The Bonsucro Production Standard is intended to function as an auditable document, not a reporting framework. The standard includes five principles, each containing key indicators. When all core criteria and 80% of the all indicators are satisfied, compliance is achieved and Bonsucro certification awarded. Principle 1 includes one indicator "to demonstrate clear title to land in accordance with national practice and law"—the right to use the land can be demonstrated and is not legitimately contested by local communities with demonstrable right. Principle 5 includes two indicators "to ensure active engagement and transparent, consultative and participatory processes with all relevant stakeholders":
	 Existence of grievance and dispute resolution processes recognized by all stakeholders. Percentage of stakeholder engagement meetings where a consensus driven process drove agreement. Companies seeking compliance must disclose whether their consultation process includes providing gender sensitive and indigenous people with information in advance of consultation. Evidence of consensus-driven negotiated agreements is to be demonstrated. (Paraphrased.) http://www.bonsucro.com/standard/continuous_improvement.html

Bonsucro's mission is to improve the social, environmental, and economic sustainability of sugarcane by promoting the use of a global metric standard. The Bonsucro Standard incorporates a set of principles, criteria, and indicators to certify producers of sugar, ethanol and its derivatives who comply with them. It also acts as a guide for companies in the sugar and ethanol value chain who wish to procure sustainable feedstock and supplies. The metric is expected to better inform those in the financial sector who wish to make more sustainable investments. Proposals to develop or review a new standard may be submitted by any interested party.

The decision to develop or review a new standard rests with the board of directors. When a revision is recommended, working groups are formed to implement the process and gather expertise. Working groups must include member(s) representing potentially affected stakeholders. The working group is charged with drafting the objectives of the work, a list of interested parties, and producing drafts of the revised standard both prior to and following stakeholder feedback, including an assessment of risks and impact of each change.

In June 2011, Brazilian ethanol producer Raizen (a joint venture between Shell and Cosan) became the first company in the world to achieve Bonsucro Certification. A year later, Raizen upheld its commitments to Bonsucro's Principles and Criteria by announcing an end to sourcing sugarcane grown on territory belonging to the Guarani Peoples of Brazil. The Guarani had entered agreements with the Brazilian government to officially demarcate their lands but the process was at a standstill, leaving companies with a vague legal framework when operating on Guarani traditional territory. Raizen's membership with Bonsucro guided the company to an outcome that respected the FPIC rights of the Guarani Peoples.

Contact Details:

Nicolas Viart, Head of Sustainability Email: Nicolas@bonsucro.com Natasha Schwarzbach, Head of Engagement Email: Natasha@bonsucro.com

Bonsucro 20 Pond Square London UK N6 6BA Tel/Fax +44 (0) 20 8341 0060 www.bonsucro.com

ROUND TABLE ON RESPONSIBLE SOY | RTRS | 2006

http://www.responsiblesoy.org

Region of Operation	RTRS certification activities currently take place in Argentina, Brazil and Paraguay, but can be applied anywhere soy is grown. Members come from all over the world, but are primarily located in Argentina, Brazil, India, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.
Membership Size	There are over 150 members, including producers (29), industry, trade and finance (73), civil society (16) and observers (32).
Member Examples	Aapresid, Bioeste, Conservation International, Cotrimaio, Desarollo Agricola del Paraguay, Gebana, The Nature Conservancy, Solidaridad, WWF
Membership Requirements	Applicants to the RTRS submit a fee and apply through a simple form on the organization's website.
Language Addressing IPs	The RTRS Production Standards requires that community rights assessments should aim to identify:
	 The collective uses and rights of traditional land users, The places and landscape conditions needed to satisfy these rights, The places/issues where there is conflict between the property rights and the traditional land use rights, Teach a solution to resolve possible conflicting land uses and/or agree to proposals for compensation.
	(Section 3.2.1 in RTRS Standard for Responsible Soy Production, Version 1.0 at http://bit.ly/AluEZ1)

The Round Table for Responsible Soy (RTRS) aims to encourage international dialogue on responsible soy production, processing and trade. Coordinating producers, industry, trade and banking representatives, NGOs and governments, it developed the RTRS "Principles and Criteria" which cover sustainability issues such as the environment, labor conditions, community relations, and agriculture practices. RTRS has created a certification scheme related to these principles for chain of custody and soy production. The first farm was certified in June 2011.

In order to receive certification, the RTRS standards require soy producers to recognize the rights of Indigenous people and small holders. Comprehensive and participatory community rights assessments must be carried out, and producers are required to document that affected communities gave their free, prior and informed consent and received proper compensation. Certification will be withheld from land where appropriate ownership and consent has not been proven.

The General Assembly is the highest decision-making body and it is comprised in three equal parts by soy producers, industry trade and finance representatives and civil society organizations. All three parts are equally represented on the Executive Board and have equal voting power. The Executive Board is elected by the General Assembly and manages operation activities and most decision making. In addition, observing members (regulatory bodies, government agencies, consultants, and academia) have equal rights to propose discussion agendas.

The FTRS website holds that public consultation is open for the next certification audits of the RTRS Production Standard. The pertinent materials have not yet been released to the public. The 7th annual RTRS conference will be held May 23–24 in the United Kingdom.

Contact Details:

Round Table on Responsible Soy Association Uruguay 1112, 3° Piso (C1016ACD) Buenos Aires Argentina +54 11 4519 8005 info@responsiblesoy.org

ROUNDTABLE ON SUSTAINABLE PALM OIL | 2004

www.rspo.org

Region of Operation	46 States
Membership Size	740 members
Member Examples	Conservation International, Oxfam, National Wildlife Federation, IKEA, Sainsbury, Boots, Royal Ahold, Tesco, Walmart, Rabobank, Cargill, ADM
Membership Requirements	"Ordinary" members are commercial enterprises. The rest of the membership is split between "affiliates" (supportive individuals or organizations), and "supply chain associates."
	Applicants must submit an online application form along with a signed Code of Conduct to the Secretariat, which is evaluated by the Executive Board; members may submit comments on the application during an open period.
Language Addressing IPs	In the Principles & Criteria for Sustainable Palm Oil, Principle 6 and its eleven criteria address the "responsible consideration of employees and of individuals and communities affected by growers and mills." They reference, for example, the "adequate consideration of the impacts on the customary or traditional rights of local communities and indigenous people, where these exist," and the right of indigenous peoples to "express their views through their own representative institutions," in "any negotiations concerning compensation for loss of legal or customary rights." (Source: http://bit.ly/J0waD8)

The RSPO works to promote the growth and use of sustainable palm oil through cooperation within the supply chain and open dialogue with its stakeholders. Its principle tasks are to:

- Research and develop definitions and criteria for sustainable production and use of palm oil,
- Undertake practical projects designed to facilitate implementation of sustainable best practices,
- Develop solutions to practical problems related to the adoption and verification of best practices for plantation establishment and management, procurement, trade and logistics,
- Acquire financial resources from private and public funds to finance projects under the auspices of RSPO
- Communicate RSPO's work to all stakeholders and to the broader public. RSPO has set up certification schemes that are audited by accredited independent parties and cut across the entire supply chain.

RSPO projects include:

- Principles & Criteria for sustainable palm oil
- National implementation and interpretation of the Principles & Criteria
- Local indicators of the P&C
- Smallholders
- Greenhouse gas working group
- HCV (high conservation value) -RSPO Indonesia working group
- RSPO procedures for new plantings
- Biodiversity conservation
- Task Group on RED (the European Commission's Renewable Energy Directive)

RSPO was originally based on an informal cooperation between a number of palm oil businesses and the World Wildlife Fund. It currently represents 50% of global palm oil production. About 70% of members are processors, traders and consumer goods makers. Palm oil producers represent about 17%, and retailers, banks and investors, and NGOs focused on the environment, society or development comprise the remaining portion. An executive board of 16 members, who are elected by a general assembly for two-year terms, manages the RSPO. NGO members have been allocated four (two social and two environmental) board seats. "This is to ensure all stakeholders have fair say in guiding the RSPO and its activities. Civil society representatives can also influence the process through active participation in RSPO projects such as the Development of Principles & Criteria for Sustainable Palm Oil."

It is seated in Zurich, with a secretariat in Kuala Lumpur, and a satellite office in Jakarta.

The governance, aims, outcomes of the RSPO have been controversial. Organizations such as Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace and Rainforest Action Network have been critical of the organization to varying degrees. A common theme that underlies their criticisms is a fear that the certified trading credits offered provide a dubious technical solution that has failed to address underlying social problems or cope with rising and unsustainable demand for palm oil products.



On December 10, the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) upheld a grievance filed by the Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA) against First Resources Limited regarding its operations in the Kutai Barat region of Indonesia. After investigating the EIA's claims, the RSPO declared that the company deforested areas of high conservation value without an environmental impact assessment, and possibly without FPIC from the Dayak Benuaq community of Muara Tae, thus violating Principles 2 and 7 of the RSPO Principles and Criteria. The RSPO ordered the company to cease operations in the region until certain conditions are met, including the production of a work plan for amicably settling land disputes with Muara Tae. If these conditions are not met, First Resources Limited risks suspension and subsequent termination of its membership with the RSPO.

Contact: RSPO Secretariat Unite A-33 A-2, Menara UOA Bangsar No. 5 Jalan Bangsar Utama 1, 5900 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia + 6012 606 1466 + 603 2201 4053 rspo@rspo.org www.rspo.org

ROUND TABLE ON SUSTAINABLE BIOFUELS

Region of Operation	Global
Membership Size	More than 130 member organizations based in more than 30 coun- tries from all continents and representing a range of stakeholders, including fuel makers, large and small farmers, oil companies, in- vestors, NGOs, UN agencies, governments and research institutes.
Member Examples	Cosmo Biofuels Group, Grupo Kuo, National Corn Growers Association, Sun Biofuels, Biofuels UK Ltd, Petrobras SA, Confederation of China Bio- energy, National Biodiesel Board, Boeing, Inter-American Development Bank, Associated Labor Unions-Trade Union Congress of the Philip- pines, Fundación Solar, Rural Amazonian Promotion and Development Center, Conservation International, Natural Resources Defense Council, Sierra Club, WWF International, UNCTAD, United Nations Environment Programme
Membership Requirements	Applicants to the RSB pay a fee and must commit to support the vision, mission, objectives, and systems of the RSB.

Language Addressing IPs	"Criterion 2a. Biofuel operations shall undertake an impact assessment process to assess impacts and risks and ensure sustainability through the development of effective and efficient implementation, mitiga- tion, monitoring and evaluation plans." This requires "Where biofuel operations will have significant social impacts, as measured during the screening exercise, a social impact assessment process shall be car- ried out using local experts to ensure that local customs, languages, practices and indigenous knowledge are respected and utilized."
	"Criterion 2b. Free, Prior & Informed Consent (FPIC) shall form the basis for the process to be followed during all stakeholder consulta- tion, which shall be gender sensitive and result in consensus-driven negotiated agreements." This requires "The ESIA facilitators shall invite all locally-affected stakeholders, local leaders, representatives of community and indigenous peoples groups and all relevant stake- holders to participate in the consultative process." "Participatory methodologies described in the RSB Impact Assessment Guidelines (RSB-GUI-01-002-01) shall be used to ensure meaningful stakeholder engagement. Special attention shall be made to ensure that women, youth, indigenous and vulnerable people can participate meaningfully in meetings and negotiations. Where the need is identified by the ESIA facilitator, there shall be informal workshops to build local understand- ing in the community of the processes that may impact them directly to aid meaningful engagement."
	Principle 5. In regions of poverty, biofuel operations shall contribute to the social and economic development of local, rural and indigenous people and communities. Criterion 5.b In regions of poverty, special measures that benefit and encourage the participation of women, youth, indigenous communities and the vulnerable in biofuel opera- tions shall be designed and implemented.
	Principle 9. Biofuel operations shall maintain or enhance the quality and quantity of surface and ground water resources, and respect prior formal or customary water rights. Criterion 9.a Biofuel operations shall respect the existing water rights of local and indigenous communities.
	http://rsb.epfl.ch/files/content/sites/rsb2/files/Biofuels/Version%202/ PCs%20V2/11-03-08%20RSB%20PCs%20Version%202.pdf

The Roundtable on Sustainable Biofuels (RSB) provides and promotes the global standard and certification scheme for sustainable production of biomass and biofuels. The RSB has developed a third-party certification system for biofuels sustainability standards, encompassing environmental, social and economic principles and criteria through an open, transparent, and multi-stakeholder process. RSB is hosted by the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Lausanne.

RSB Certificates are recognized by the European Union under the Renewable Energy Directive. The first RSB Certificate was issued at the end of January 2012. Several companies are currently at different stages of the certification process. In January 2009 the Roundtable on Sustainable Biofuels adopted a new governance structure, with open membership divided into Chambers representing the different actors along the supply chain, as well as different types of civil society and government groups. RSB Chambers each elect two members to the RSB Steering Board (usually one from the global South and one from the global North), who will make all of the decisions regarding the RSB strategy, any changes to the standards, and approve the various options for certification, with agreements reached through consensus.

Contact Details:

Sébastien Haye, Acting Executive Secretary Elisa Calcaterra, Manager, Transparency & Social Affairs Roundtable on Sustainable Biofuels EPFL - Energy Center - Station 5 CH-1015 Lausanne Switzerland +41 21 693 00 45 rsb@epfl.ch

INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM INDUSTRY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION IPIECA | 1974

Region of Operation	Global, representing over half of the world's oil production.
Membership Size	32 companies, including all six "super majors," seven national oil companies, and 14 associations.
Member Examples	Members of IPIECA include: BP, Chevron, ConocoPhilips, ExxonMobil, International Association of Oil & Gas Producers, Marathon, Petrobas, Regional Association of Oil and Natural Gas Companies in Latin America and the Caribbean, Repsol, Saudi Aramco, Shell, Statoil, Talisman Energy and the World Petroleum Council.
Membership Requirements	Corporate members must be international companies with operations in exploration, production or refining of petroleum. Association members must be oil and gas industry associations.

Language Addressing IPs	General principles of "emerging good practice" include:
	 Respect the rights of Indigenous Peoples.
	• Minimize adverse impacts.
	 Maximize the benefits resulting from a company's operations.
	(Source: Indigenous Peoples and the Oil and Gas Industry: Context, Issues and Emerging Good Practice, at http://bit.ly/ IpArMn.)

Formed in 1974, IPIECA is the oil and gas industry's international organization focused on social and environmental issues. IPIECA develops benchmarking studies of best practices, acts as an active education forum and engages with external stakeholders.

A general committee comprised of senior representatives from IPIECA member companies meets once a year to set the strategic direction and policies of the organization. An executive committee meets tri-annually to coordinate the implementation of the General Committees decisions. Within IPIECA, a number of specialist working groups, populated by members, exist. These groups address topics such as biodiversity, oil spill preparedness and social responsibility.

In 2008, IPIECA established a task force focused on Indigenous Peoples. In 2011, it published "Indigenous Peoples and the Oil and Gas Industry: Context, Issues and Emerging Good Practice," which focuses on consultation, benefits sharing, and best practices for engagement.

IPIECA has convened a number of stakeholder dialogues in the past. It requests that stakeholders contact the secretariat if they have feedback to provide on existing or planned IPIECA activities.

Contact Details:

Ms. Roper Cleland Social Responsibility project manager Roper.Cleland@ipieca.org 5th Floor, 209–215 Blackfriars Road London SE1 8NL United Kingdom Telephone: +44 (0)20 7633 2388 Facsimile: +44 (0)20 7633 2389

www.ipieca.org

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON MINING AND METALS | 2001

Region of Operation	Argentina, Colombia, Chile, Venezuela, Brazil, Peru, Canada, Mexico, USA, South Africa, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Belgium, United Kingdom, Australia
Membership Size	21 companies, 31 mining associations
Member Examples	AngloAmerican, BHP Billiton, Freeport-McMoRan, JX Nippon Mining & Metals, Mitsubishi Materials, Rio Tinto, Cámara Asomineros Andi- Colombia, Cámara Minera de México (CAMIMEX), Chamber of Mines of South Africa, Instituto Brasileiro
Membership Requirements	Commit to improving sustainability performance, report annually on progress
Language Addressing IPs	 Nine distinct commitments are made. In truncated form, these are: Acknowledging and respecting the social, economic, environmental and cultural interests. Understanding the perspectives of Indigenous Peoples regarding a project's potential impacts. Engaging with Indigenous Peoples in a fair, timely and culturally appropriate way. Building cross-cultural understanding. Encouraging governments to participate in alleviating problems faced by Indigenous Peoples. Designing projects to avoid potentially significant adverse impacts of mining. Seeking agreement with Indigenous Peoples on programs to generate net benefits. Supporting appropriate frameworks for facilitation, mediation and dispute resolution. Seek broad community support for new projects. (Source: Position Statement on Mining and Indigenous People at www.icmm.com/document/293.)

The International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) seeks to encourage sustainable development by the mining and metals industry. The organization believes that successful mining and metals operations require the support of the communities in which they operate. ICMM's objective is to "build effective and constructive relationships with IPs that are based on respect, meaningful engagement and mutual benefit."

Member companies report annually on their commitment to improve their sustainability performance. They report on the systems and approaches used by their companies to identify and prioritize sustainability risks, and the systems used to address these risks.

ICMM was formed in 2001 as the mining industry became increasingly concerned that its poor reputation was negatively impacting its ability to sustain profits, access new assets and maintain investor confidence. In 2005 the group published the "Indigenous Peoples Issues Review." In 2005 and 2008, ICMM joined with the World Conservation Union (IUCN) to host two Roundtables on Indigenous Peoples' issues. In 2008, the organization released its final "Position Statement on Mining and Indigenous Peoples" which was accompanied

by an operational handbook "Good Practice Guidance."

ICMM is governed by a Council, composed of the CEOs of all ICMM member companies, two elected members from member associations and the ICMM's President. It meets biannually. Executive Working Groups, meet four times a year, and additional Associations Coordination Group meets twice bi-annually for discussion of controversial issues. Two members from this group are elected to sit on the ICMM Council.

ICMM materials explicitly State the necessity of engaging Indigenous Peoples but as a membership organization, it can be slow to provide services to those outside of its membership.

Contact Details: Aidan Davy, Director, Community/Reporting and Assurance

International Council on Mining and Metals 35/38 Portman Square London W1H 6LR United Kingdom + 44 (0) 20 7467 5070 info@icmm.com www.icmm.com

FOREST STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL | 1993

Region of Operation	1,100+ forest management units are certified, with a total of about 125 million hectares in 80 countries, estimated to represent 5% of the world's managed forests.
Membership Size	406 individual members and 422 organizational members.
Member Examples	Members include individuals, NGOs, forestry management companies, retailers and others.
Membership Requirements	Potential members must submit applications supported by two current FSC members, describe how their organizations are structured, detail how their work supports the FSC's mission and suggest which "chamber" (social, environmental, or economic) they would like to participate in.

[
Language Addressing IPs	Principle 3 of the FSC Principles and Criteria for Forest Management addresses the legal and customary rights of Indigenous Peoples to own, use and manage their lands. Four criteria support this Principle, as paraphrased below:
	 3.1 Indigenous peoples shall control forest management on their lands unless they delegate control with free and informed consent to other agencies. 3.2 Forest management shall not diminish the resources or tenure rights of indigenous peoples. 3.3 Sites of special cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance shall be clearly identified, recognized and protected by forest managers. 3.4 Indigenous peoples shall be compensated for the application of their traditional knowledge regarding the use of forest species or management systems in forest operations.
	(http://bit.ly/9zSn5x)
	Additional policies and principles address Indigenous Peoples' rights, including the "FSC Global Strategy," "High Conservation Value Forests," "Process Requirements for the Development and Maintenance of Forest Stewardship Standards," and Principles 2, 3, and 4 of the "FSC Principles and Criteria for Forest Management."

The FSC was established to promote sustainable forestry management, offering trademark assurance and accreditation for companies, organizations and communities participating in sustainable forestry management. The FSC trademark on products indicates that they have been sourced from forests managed according to the "FSC Principles and Criteria." These criteria include compliance with laws, tenure and use rights, community relations, management planning, monitoring and Indigenous rights.

FSC accredits certification bodies which then evaluate, monitor and certify that forests are being managed to FSC standards. It offers two types of certifications, one for forest management and the other for chain of custody (or supply chains), which tracks materials from the forest through the production and manufacture process. These can be found on paper goods, furniture and other consumer products.

Originally adopted in 1994, the "FSC Principles and Criteria" underwent a four-year review process completed in January 2012. A series of five meetings were held in 2009 with representatives of Indigenous Peoples in order to revise this Principal 3 and its associated criteria. Changes to the policy included that certified operations identify and uphold legal and customary rights of indigenous peoples.

The FSC is governed by a general assembly of FSC Members, a nine-member board of directors, and a Director General. Representatives of Indigenous communities have frequently been in one or more of the directors positions. The general assembly is made up of the three membership chambers: environmental, social and economic. The social chamber is for individuals and nonprofit, academic, or technical institutions. The environmental chamber is for those institutions with an interest in environmentally viable forest stewardship. The economic chamber is for organizations and individuals with commercial forestry interests. In Canada, a fourth chamber is specific to indigenous communities and has equal representation.

Contact Details:

For general inquiries: Lori Knosalla Project Manager I.knosalla@us.fsc.org +1-612-353-4511

For membership inquiries: membership@fsc.org

FSC Canada mpatel@fsccanada.org

FSC International Charles de Gaulle Str. 5 53113 Bonn +49 228 367 660 www.fsc.org





INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR CONSERVATION OF NATURE *IUCN* | 1948

www.iucn.org

Region of Operation	160 States
Membership Size	1,200+ member organizations, including 200+ government and 900+ NGOs, as well as 11,000 scientists and experts.
Member Examples	Members can be States, government agencies, political/ economic integration organizations, and NGOs. Individuals can join the IUCN's issue-specific Commissions.
Membership Requirements	Members must demonstrate that their policies, activities and history share and support the objectives of IUCN. Organizations must demonstrate a certain level of transparency and have been in existence for three years.
Language Addressing IPs	65 policy decisions with reference to indigenous peoples have been adopted by IUCN Members. IUCN aims to adhere to the principles and provisions laid out in UNDRIP. Its mission corresponds directly to Article 29.1 and IUCN agrees that indigenous peoples "have the right to the conservation and protection of the environment and productive capacity of their lands or territories or resources." IUCN policy outlines FPIC as a fundamental component of its activities. By endorsing UNDRIP, IUCN has articulated its commitment ensuring that indigenous peoples' rights and concerns are integrated into its Programme; it identifies UNDRIP as a reference to guide engagement.

Sometimes called the World Conservation Union, the IUCN is a unique global partnership that encourages the conservation of the integrity and diversity of nature and the equitable and sustainable use of natural resources. IUCN has supervised thousands of field projects, facilitated scientific and social standards, and helped many States prepare national conservation strategies. It considers itself to be the world's oldest and largest environmental network.

Funded by governments, bilateral and multilateral agencies, foundations and member organizations, it is governed by a member-elected Council. Its work is framed by a Global Programme, developed and approved by IUCN members every four years at the World Conservation Congress.

The work of IUCN programmes on Indigenous Peoples is broad, supporting:

- Indigenous rights to land and resources in protected areas,
- Sustainable use and ecosystem management,
- Access and benefit sharing of biological resources,

- Maintenance and recognition of traditional knowledge, and,
- Indigenous rights in the context of climate change mitigation and adaptation.

Of its six commissions, the Commissions on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP), the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) and the Commission on Environmental Law (CEL) have work streams which focus on indigenous peoples. The WCPA has published a document entitled "Indigenous and Traditional Peoples and Protected Areas: Principles, Guidelines and Case Studies."

IUCN's Forest Programme has been actively involved in advocating a greater voice for Indigenous Peoples in REDD (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation), a greenhouse gas reduction attempt currently under negotiation at the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). This effort included publications entitled "Indigenous Peoples and REDD-plus" and "Indigenous and Traditional Peoples and Climate Change: Vulnerability and Adaptation."

In addition, IUCN has led an initiative to address the impact on indirect land use change and biofuels on Indigenous Peoples, organizing a workshop in 2010 which included a range of stakeholders. The workshop developed a framework to assess the selection and success of indirect land use mitigation measures.

In 2000, WCPA and CEESP created a joint theme on Indigenous Peoples, Local Communities, Equity and Protected Areas, which focuses on Indigenous Peoples and communities living within protected areas, including World Heritage Sites or national parks. In 2011, CEESP and CEL created a Specialist Group on Indigenous Peoples and Customary Law.

To address business practices and standards, IUCN has coordinated with the ICMM (see above) to create a stakeholder dialogue process with Indigenous Peoples about several aspects related to operations of the mining industries, in particular application of FPIC.

IUCN's World Conservation Congress was held in September 2012 in Korea, which included a significant number of sessions and workshops which address Indigenous Peoples issues.

Contact Details:

Gonzalo Oviedo Senior Adviser for Social Policy gonzalo.oviedo@iucn.org

Kristen Walker Initiatives relating to CEESP k.walker@conservation.org

Nigel Crawhall Chair of TILCEPA nigel.tilcepa@gmail.com

MARINE STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL | 1997

www.msc.org

Membership Size	274 fisheries worldwide are engaged in the MSC program; 148 are certified and 126 are in assessment. Annual recorded catches of fisheries certified or in assessment represent >10% of global seafood capture for human consumption.
Member Examples	Certified fisheries: Annette Island Reserve salmon (Indigenous), Bering Sea and Aleutian Island flatfish, Bristol Channel sea bass. Retailers using the MSC label: Whole Foods Market, Waitrose, Findus, and Quick Restaurants.
Membership Requirements	Compliant fisheries and their downstream customers can use the MSC eco-label.
Language Addressing IPs	None; however, the MSC Fishery Standard references "those who depend on the fishery for their livelihoods, including, but not confined to subsistence, artisanal, and fishing-dependent communities shall be addressed as part of this process." http://www.msc.org/documents/scheme-documents/msc- standards/MSC_environmental_standard_for_sustainable_fishing. pdf

MSC was established to promote sustainable wildcapture fisheries management. The overarching goals are: recognizing and rewarding sustainable fishing practices, influencing the choices people make when buying seafood, and working with partners to transform the seafood market to a sustainable basis.

The MSC standard, the Principles and Criteria for Sustainable Fishing, was drafted following consultation involving more than 300 organizations and individuals globally. The standard strives for consistency with the following international norms: The Code of Conduct for Responsible Fishing (UN FAO), Guidelines for the Ecolabeling of Fish and Fishery Products from Marine Capture Fisheries (UN FAO), The Code of Good Practice for Setting Social and Environmental Standards (ISEAL), and World Trade Organization Technical Barriers to Trade Agreement.

MSC's core program includes a standard for sustainable fishing ("The MSC Environmental Standard for Sustainable Fishing") and a standard for seafood traceability ("The MSC Chain of Custody Standard for Seafood Traceability.")

Fisheries can attain the Environmental Standard for Sustainable Fishing by appointing an independent accredited certifier to assess the fisheries against the MSC standards. Once certified, all companies upstream to the retailer that want to sell seafood from the certified fishery must undergo a detailed traceability audit to meet the MSC Chain of Custody Standard. Once approved by the MSC, the business may use its blue eco-label.

The MSC is governed by a Board of Trustees which is informed by a Technical Advisory Board and a Stakeholder Council including geographically diverse representatives from industry, science, and environmental groups. Additionally, separate working groups made up of individuals from the three governing bodies are formed when regional or topical issues require study.

The MSC Technical Advisory Board maintains the standards. Proposals to review or revise a standard may be submitted by any interested party. MSC standards are reviewed at least every five years, with the next formal review scheduled for January 2013.

The two main ways to get involved in the policy development process are to identify an issue or contribute to a program improvement under consultation.

The MSC's 100-member staff is spread across the headquarters and offices in Seattle, Sydney, Edinburgh, Berlin, The Hague, Paris, Cape Town, Tokyo, and the Baltic region.

Contact Details:

MSC (Americas) 2110 N. Pacific Street,Suite 102 Seattle, WA 98103 Email: jim.humphreys@msc.org + 1 206 691 0188

MSC (Africa, Europe and international headquarters) 3rd floor Mountbarrow House 6-20 Elizabeth Street London SW1W 9RB United Kingdom Email: info@msc.org Tel: +44(0) 20 7811 3300





INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION | 1956

www.ifc.com

Region of Operation	IFC works in more than 100 developing States.
Membership Size	Owned by 183 member States of the UN (and restricted to those States). Projects financed range from small to medium enterprises to significant infrastructure development.
Language Addressing IPs	The objectives of Performance Standard 7 requires project planners to:
	 To ensure that the development process fosters full respect for Indigenous Peoples. To anticipate and avoid adverse impacts of projects on communities, or when avoidance is not possible, to minimize and/or compensate for such impacts. To promote culturally appropriate sustainable development benefits. To maintain an ongoing relationship based on informed consultation and participation. To ensure the Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) of the affected communities, and, To respect and preserve the culture, knowledge, and practices of Indigenous Peoples.

The International Finance Corporation, a member of the World Bank Group, is the largest global development institution focused exclusively on the private sector. IFC's purpose is to create opportunity for people to escape poverty and improve their lives. IFC offers development-impact solutions through firm-level interventions (direct investments, advisory services, and the IFC Asset Management Company); by promoting global collective action; by strengthening governance and standard-setting; and through business-enabling-environment work.

Project examples include residential apartments in Papua New Guinea, pharmaceutical company support in Brazil, and waste water treatment in India.

Each IFC member State, through a Board of Governors and a Board of Directors, helps to direct IFC's programs. The Board of Governors delegates most of its powers to a 25-member Board of Directors. Voting is done on a weighted basis according to each member's share capital.

The IFC's "Performance Standards on Environmental and Social Sustainability" define clients' roles and responsibilities for managing their projects, and their requirements for receiving and retaining IFC support. They are designed to help clients avoid, mitigate and manage environmental and social risks. All IFC investments are assessed for consistency with the applicable Performance Standards. Performance Standard 7 is specific to Indigenous Peoples. It includes guidance on avoidance of adverse impacts, participation and consent, relocation, mitigation and development benefits. It was recently updated to require FPIC in certain situations.

Originally adopted in 2006, the Standards were reviewed through a public consultation process and updates became effective in January 2012. IFC clients, civil society, development institutions, donors, foundations and companies participated in this review.

Contact Details:

Vanessa Bauza Communications Officer IFC Environment, Social and Governance Department 2121 Pennsylvania Ave., NW Washington, DC 20433 Tel: +1 (202) 458-1603 Fax: +1 (202) 974-4800 Email: vbauza@ifc.org http://www.IFC.org

EQUATOR PRINCIPLES | 2003

http://www.equator-principles.com/

Region of Operation	Global.
Membership Size	76 financial institutions.
Member Examples	Arab African International Bank, Banco Bradesco S.A., Banco Comercial Portuguese, Bank of America, Bank of Montréal, Citgroup, Credit Suisse, HSBC, ING, JP Morgan Chase, Manulife Financial, Royal Bank of Scotland, TD Bank, Wells Fargo.
Membership Requirements	Members must be financial institutions that make project finance loans, credit or advisory services.

Language Addressing IPs	Principles No. 5 States: "For projects with significant adverse impacts on affected communities, the process will ensure their free, prior and informed consultation [emphasis added] and facilitate their informed participation as a means to establish, to the satisfaction of the Equator Principles Financial Institutions, whether a project has adequately incorporated affected communities' concerns." A footnote adds that FPIC must apply to the entire project. Also: "The borrower will tailor its consultation process to the language preferences of the affected communities, their decision-making processes, and the needs of disadvantaged or vulnerable groups. Consultation with Indigenous Peoples must conform to specific and detailed requirements as found in [IFC] Performance Standard 7. Furthermore, the special rights of Indigenous Peoples as recognized by host-State legislation will
	Indigenous Peoples as recognized by host-State legislation will need to be addressed." Source: http://www.equator-principles.com/index.php/the-eps-
	and-official-translations

The Equator Principles (EPs) are a credit risk management framework for finance institutions to manage environmental and social risk in project finance transactions. The EPs are adopted voluntarily by financial institutions and are applied where total project capital costs exceed \$10 million. They are primarily intended to provide a minimum standard for due diligence to support responsible risk decision-making. The EPs were launched in 2003 at the initiative of nine international banks and the IFC.

The EPs are based on the IFC Performance Standards on social and environmental sustainability (see below) and on the World Bank Group Environmental, Health, and Safety Guidelines. They are intended to serve as a common baseline and framework for each adopting institution's implementation of its own policies, procedures and standards.

Member institutions pledge to reject projects if the borrower will not or is unable to comply with policies and procedures that implement the EPs. While they are not intended to be applied retroactively, members will apply them to all project financings covering expansion or upgrade of an existing facility where changes in scale or scope may create significant environmental and/or social impacts, or significantly change the nature or degree of an existing impact.

Members are expected to report annually on the number of transactions screened, their categorization (e.g., type of finance, region, sector), and information regarding implementation of the EPs into the institution's project finance evaluation processes.

Of several ongoing working groups, NGOs and civil society provides a forum for dialogue and communication for whom the EPs are relevant. The Social Risks working group "is working to understand emerging practices in social risk management in project finance," according to the web site. Working groups on biodiversity and climate change engage with the IFC to implement that body's standards and share good practices. The Equator Principles Association is governed by a 14-member steering committee that coordinates the administration, management and development of the EPs. The Equator Principles Secretariat manages the day to day running of the EP Association.

Contact information:

Samantha Hoskins & Joanna Clark Administrators, Equator Principles Secretariat The Equator Principles Association Tel: +44 1621 853 900 Fax: +44 1621 731 483 Email: secretariat@equator-principles.com



FAIR TRADE INTERNATIONAL | 1997

www.fairtrade.net

Region of Operation	58 States.
Membership Size	25 members around the world produce or promote products that carry the FAIRTRADE Certification Mark: three producer networks, 19 labelling initiatives, two marketing organizations, and one associate member.
Member Examples	Fairtrade Africa, Fairtrade Latin America and the Caribbean, Network of Asian and Pacific Producers.
Membership Requirements	Members promote or produce products carrying the Fairtrade certification mark. Membership is open to licensing organizations and producer networks that meet relevant criteria. Among other criteria, licensing organizations must demonstrate support for civil society organizations, and enter into an agreement to license the Fairtrade label in a manner acceptable to FLO. Producer networks must demonstrate a democratic structure ensuring equal representation of, and accountability to all members.
	http://www.fairtrade.net/fileadmin/user_upload/content/2009/about_ us/documents/flo-constitution-june-2011-english.pdf
Language Addressing IPs	Specific mention of indigenous peoples' rights and cultural heritage are not found in FLO's Fairtrade Standards for small producer organizations, standards for hired labor, or the Fairtrade trade standards.
	They are referred to in "Fairtrade and Fairmined Standard for Gold From Artisanal and Small-scale Mining, Including Associated Precious Metals," a document produced with the Alliance for Responsible Mining in March 2010. The section "Multicultural Nature" reads, in part:
	Artisanal and Small-scale Mining (ASM) often develops in contexts of ethnic and cultural diversity. Where indigenous peoples or other ethnic groups are owners of the territory and are different from the miners themselves, responsible ASM organizations will undertake consultations based on the spirit of ILO Convention 169, with respect for local cultural practices in order to reach agreements with the local traditional authority and community, with regards to the impacts and benefits of mining operations and trading in that indigenous or ethnic territory.
	(http://www.fairtrade.net/fileadmin/user_upload/content/2009/ standards/documents/Gold_Standard_Mar2010_EN.pdf)
	FLO has joined Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) in a joint pilot of the FSC and FLO Standards (2009–2013). The pilot will test dual labeling as a way to improve market access for small FSC certified forest producers. A description of the project acknowledges the importance of forests to the 60 million indigenous peoples who generate their livelihoods and income from them.

FLO's mission is to promote sustainable development and reduce poverty through fair trade. Originally known as the Fairtrade Labeling Organizations International, Fairtrade International is the global umbrella group for Fairtrade producers and labeling organizations. Key to the furtherance of its mission is the development and maintenance of international Fairtrade standards, including Fairtrade minimum prices and premiums for all certified products. Fairtrade International coordinates Fairtrade labeling, organizes support for producers, and promotes trade justice.

FLO's Standards Committee (appointed by a governing board elected by the general assembly) ensures that relevant stakeholder views and alignment with FLO's mission and policy Statements are considered in any standard changes or amendments. When new Fairtrade standards are proposed, members can comment at each stage of the process. The standards committee meets four times a year.

Note: In late 2011, Fair TradeUSA left FLO after FLO determined that it could not support its plan to certify large-scale coffee plantations under its "FairTrade for All Initiative." FLO members voiced strong support for a global standard focused on securing market access on Fairtrade terms for smaller-scale farmers.

Contact Details:

Fairtrade International (FLO) Bonner Talweg 177 53129 Bonn, Germany Email: info@ fairtrade.net Email: FSC-FT-Projectmanager@ fairtrade.net (for information on the joint pilot project)

Telephone: +49 228 949230 Fax +49 228 2421713

EQUITABLE ORIGIN | 2009

www.equitableorigin.com

Region of Operation	Global; current focus on Latin America	
Membership Size	N/A; Equitable Origin is an independent social and environmental certification, certificate trading and ecolabel system.	
Member Examples	The EO100 [™] Standard is an international standard for oil and gas exploration and production that applies to individual oil and gas operations not to a company as a whole. Projects can be certified to the EO100 [™] Standard at any stage in the project-life cycle: exploration, development, production or closure.	

Membership Requirements	Sites must meet all 94 Performance Target 1 requirements under the EO100 [™] Standard which covers corporate governance & ethics, human rights, social impact, community development, fair labor & working conditions, Indigenous Peoples' rights, environmental impacts, climate change, biodiversity, and project life cycle management. Performance is verified at the site through an independent third-party certification audit.
Language	Principle 4: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' RIGHTS
Addressing IPs	 Oil and gas exploration and production activities must be carried out in ways that recognize, respect and address the specific rights, traditions and cultural implications for Indigenous Peoples whose territory or livelihoods may be affected by the project. The objectives of this Principle are: To ensure that oil and gas development projects recognize and respect the rights of Indigenous Peoples as determined
	 in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, ILO Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples, and as established by the Constitution of the country of operation; To ensure that oil and gas development projects recognize and promote the human rights, dignity, aspirations, culture, and livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples; To identify, manage and/or mitigate adverse impacts of projects on communities of Indigenous Peoples; To promote the generation of project-related benefits and opportunities for Indigenous Peoples; and To ensure Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) of affected Indigenous Peoples.
	PROVISIONS: 4.1 FREE, PRIOR & INFORMED CONSENT (FPIC): Operator shall obtain the FPIC of the affected communities of Indigenous Peoples when the proposed project is on or may affect lands traditionally owned by or under the customary use of Indigenous Peoples.
	4.2 ENGAGEMENT & PARTICIPATION: Operator shall undertake a process of fair, representative and non-discriminatory engagement and consultation with potentially affected communities of Indigenous Peoples.
	4.3 CULTURAL IMPACTS: Operator shall strive to avoid adverse impacts on critical cultural heritage that is essential to the identity and/or cultural, ceremonial, or spiritual aspects of Indigenous Peoples' lives.
	4.4 VOLUNTARY ISOLATION: Operator shall develop and implement procedures to respect the rights of Indigenous Peoples in isolation, including response mechanisms in case of incidental contact.
	4.5 USE OF TRADITIONAL NATURAL RESOURCES: Operator shall protect the traditional natural resource use by Indigenous Peoples (land, water, landscape, flora and fauna) during all project phases.

4.6 CULTURE-BASED INTELLIGENCE: Where a project proposes to use the cultural heritage including knowledge, innovations, or practices of Indigenous Peoples for commercial purposes (including project-related activities), Operator shall inform the affected communities of Indigenous Peoples of their rights under national law, the scope and nature of the proposed project, and the potential consequences of such development.
4.7 TRANSPARENCY & DISCLOSURE: Operator shall publicly report information related to its activities concerning Indigenous Peoples.

Equitable Origin's mission is to catalyze a new paradigm for the oil and gas industry where environmental and biodiversity protection is optimized, local communities benefit socially and economically.

Equitable Origin is a social enterprise governed by a Board of Directors that is responsible for ensuring that the organization meets the highest standards of good governance. For greater independence, the Equitable Origin Board of Directors created a subsidiary, Equitable Origin Standards, with a dedicated Board to govern and protect the integrity of the standards and the assurance and certification system. The Standards Board includes a representative of the Indigenous Peoples' Organization, COICA (Coordinating Body of Indigenous Communities of the Amazon Basin). Equitable Origin has also established a Regional Stakeholder Council and a Technical Committee. Equitable Origin has also signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with several Indigenous Peoples' organizations in the Amazon region.

In 2013, Equitable Origin will launch a Standard Review process that will incorporate public consultation with Indigenous Peoples and other affected stakeholders to ensure the Standard reflects community expectations for oil and gas development in their territories. FPIC and land rights will be a major focus of the review. Equitable Origin will ensure that disadvantaged stakeholders have opportunities to participate in the review process.

Equitable Origin achieved Associate Membership status with the International Social and Environmental Accreditation and Labeling (ISEAL) Alliance in December 2012.

Contact Details:

Equitable Origin 894 6th Avenue, 5th Floor New York, NY 10001 Email: smilius@equitableorigin.com Telephone: 917 677 7671 ext. 441

UNION FOR ETHICAL BIOTRADE | 2007

www.ethicalbiotrade.org

Region of Operation	Global (no members from Asia).
Membership Size	32 commercial members, 12 non-commercial.
Member Examples	Members list is available at http://www.ethicalbiotrade.org/ members/trading.html.
Membership Requirements	Membership is open to companies, trade associations, NGOs, community producers or collectors, national biotrade programs and others. Trading Members are directly involved in natural ingredient supply chains and must commit to continuous progress towards Ethical BioTrade standards for the conservation of biodiversity, respect of traditional knowledge and equitable sharing of benefits all along the supply chains. Affiliate Members support the implementation of the Ethical BioTrade standard but are not directly involved in trading.
Language Addressing IPs	 Of the seven principles in the "Ethical BioTrade standard": "Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits" includes references to respect and recognition for traditional knowledge and practices, "Respect for the Rights of Actors" reads: "Taking into account human rights and working conditions of indigenous and local communities," and, "Clarity About Land Tenure" States: "Respecting land tenure and rights over natural resources." Important to note that IPs are important stakeholders, specifically addressed in the Ethical BioTrade standard, particularly in the last revision, which addressed the UNDRIP. Ongoing work to support the integration of IPs into ethical sourcing of biodiversity.

UEBT is a nonprofit membership association that promotes the "Sourcing with Respect" of ingredients that come from biodiversity. Trading members commit to gradually ensuring that their sourcing practices comply with the Ethical BioTrade standard, promoting the conservation of biodiversity, respect for traditional knowledge and equitable sharing of benefits along supply chains. The organization manages an internationally recognized standard ("Ethical BioTrade standard") to provide orientation and independent verification of company practices. Members can use the UEBT logo to communicate their work to bring its practices in line with the Ethical BioTrade standard. The Ethical BioTrade standard cannot be used to certify products. The Ethical BioTrade standard is revised at least every five years, as stipulated by the ISEAL Code of good practices for setting social and environmental standards.

Once a company is approved for membership, it undergoes an independent audit. The operations, management system and a sample of natural ingredient supply chains of the

applicant are assessed against the Ethical BioTrade standard. Based on the audit results, the company then develops a work plan to establish a biodiversity management system and begin its implementation towards ethical sourcing of biodiversity. Audits occur every three years. A summary of audit reports is made publicly available on the UEBT website. Companies must also report annually on progress to the UEBT Secretariat.

UEBT views Indigenous communities as key stakeholders and has reached out actively for their input during the two public consultation phases of the standard revision process. In-person meetings, workshops and online consultations are three of the communications tools used.

Contact information:

Secretariat Union for Ethical BioTrade Keizersgracht, 158 1015 CX Amsterdam Netherlands mail: info@ ethicalbiotrade.org

RESPONSIBLE JEWELLERY COUNCIL

www.responsiblejewellery.com

Region of Operation	Members are in 40 States, with a high concentration in Belgium, France, and the United Kingdom.
Membership Size	RJC has 360 Members. Almost half are in diamond trading, cutting or polishing, one-fifth are in jewellery manufacturing or wholesale, and one-fifth are retailers.
Member Examples	Cartier, De Beers Group, Fair Trade Jewelry Co., Gemological Institute of America, Chanel, Jewelers of America, Rio Tinto, Piaget
Membership Requirements	Members must be actively commercially involved in the diamond, gold and/or platinum metals jewellery supply chain. They must commit to being independently audited and certified against the Code of Practices within two years of joining.

Language Addressing IPs	The Code of Practices requires RJC Members with Mining Facilities to:
	• Respect the rights of Indigenous Peoples as articulated and defined in applicable provincial, national and international laws and their social, cultural, environmental and economic interests, including their connection with lands and waters.
	 Seek to obtain broad-based support of affected Indigenous Peoples and to have this support formally documented, including partnerships and/or programs to provide benefits and mitigate impacts.
	Source: Code of Practices, URL: http://www.responsiblejewellery. com/responsible-jewellery-practices

The RJC is a non-profit organization seeking to address responsible business practices throughout the diamond and gold jewellery supply chain. Motivated by a desire to reassure consumers, the RJC's 360 member companies commit to responsible practices related to human rights, social and environmental practices. The RJC Code of Practices applies to businesses through the jewellery supply chain. Certification under the RJC system indicates that a business is operating under the Code of Practices. RJC is a part of the ISEAL Alliance, the best practices standard bearer for standards setting organizations.

The RJC is governed by a Board of Directors, which provides oversight to an Executive Committee and Management Team and a number of Committees. The Standards Committee oversees standards development and is made up of members representing the jewellery supply chain as well as NGOs, academia and other standards institutions. Up to 12 non-industry members can be appointed by the Board; these stakeholders are elected as individuals and not as representatives of any organization. At least two Standards Committee meetings are held annually.

During 2012 the RJC is planning to undertake a review of its Code of Practices, first published in 2009. Comments on the 2009 Code of Practices, and its potential to create positive impacts for Indigenous Peoples, including FPIC, will be welcome as part of the 2012 Standards Review.

The RJC is seeking to be transparent about the standards development process, and encourage and use input from a range of stakeholders. Outside of the formal review process, stakeholders submit their ideas to the RJC, which can be taken through Committees to the Board. If approved by the Board, new language is prepared by the Standards Committee and presented for 60 days of public comment. After these comments are incorporated, another draft is released and opened for another 60 day comment period. This process is followed for 3 to 4 comment periods, depending on the presence of outstanding issues.

RJC has worked with the following organizations in the Code's Development: Solidaridad, WWF, PACT, Partnership Africa Canada, Human Rights Watch, Flora and Fauna International, Alliance for Responsible Mining, Diamond Development Initiative.

Contact Details:

Fiona Solomon, Director, Standards Development Email: fiona.solomon@responsiblejewellery.com Telephone: +44 (0)20 7836 6376 Responsible Jewellery Council First Floor, Dudley House 34-38 Southampton Street London WC27HF UK



NATURAL RESOURCES STEWARDSHIP CIRCLE

Region of Operation	Global
Membership Size	21 companies in the beauty, cosmetics, fragrance and flavor industries
Member Examples	Aveda, Estee Lauder, Yves Rocher, Chanel
Membership Requirements	The Association is composed of members previously approved by the Board of Directors in accordance with the internal rules of governance. NRSC membership entails personal commitment by a company's President/Chairperson/CEO to achieve NRSC objectives and collective actions.

Language Addressing IPs	The NRSC is a collective and, as a collective, has agreed on common guidelines. These Guidelines will also serve to direct their interactions with indigenous and local communities. In testing the Guidelines, the NRSC members are committed to collective action whenever possible and to demonstrating strength in numbers toward a common purpose.
	The NRSC strives to share:
	 technical support in the production process
	 advice to accessing the market
	 an opportunity to develop new products
	 an opportunity to improve their way of life
	 a way to preserve their traditional knowledge and culture
	The NRSC members will:
	 test and apply the Guidelines of best practices
	 gain experience in dealing with indigenous and local communities
	 improve internal practices (sharing experience and practices, constraints, failures, etc.)
	 identify opportunities to develop new services
	 acquire new skills to secure their supply chains

The Natural Resources Stewardship Circle (NRSC) is a non-profit organization launched in October 2008 in France by its first members who drafted a declaration of intent. This founding text or Resolution Text was based on the principles of UNDRIP, the UN Convention on Biological Diversity, the UN Global Compact, and the International Labor Organization. The seminal document foretold the establishment of a shared best practices guideline.

These Guidelines were indeed drafted in cooperation with representatives of indigenous and local producer communities. They were signed in Paris by all members of the NRSC in October 2010. Hailed by the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity, these Guidelines were presented at the Tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in Nagoya, Japan.

Conscious of the increasing scarcity of natural resources and the impoverishment of local peoples involved in the production and supply of natural resources, and based on the agreed Resolution Text and Guidelines, the Association's objective is to act collectively:

- **to promote the Guidelines** developed using the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) as a foundation, and in cooperation with plant producers, representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities, and which define the criteria and bases for fair and sustainable cooperation between the parties while protecting the biodiversity and ecosystems of the territories concerned;

- **to become and remain informed** on the status of supply chains, territories, peoples, and savoir faire in jeopardy and seek the ways and means to respond to those challenges;

- to develop initiatives and collective projects for "ethical" sourcing in critical supply chains;

- **to support organizations** and companies which adhere to the values and practices of the Association and assist them in strengthening their commitments;

- **to develop and implement research, training,** technological, and/or industrial development programs with the intention of responding to the objectives of the founding text;

- to organize debates and discussions to bring about initiatives, create projects, develop cooperative relationships, and share experiences and know-how.

LIST OF ACRONYMS



