



UNITED NATIONS

NATIONS UNIES

International Expert Group Meeting Indigenous peoples, business, autonomy and the human rights principles of due diligence, including free, prior and informed consent

6-10 December 2021

Background

Every year, the Indigenous Peoples Development Branch/Secretariat for the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues within the Division for Inclusive Social Development of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs organizes an international expert group meeting (EGM) on a theme identified by the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues and endorsed by the Economic and Social Council. At its 2020 session, the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues decided that the theme its next session in 2022 will be “Indigenous peoples, business, autonomy and the human rights principles of due diligence, including free, prior and informed consent”. This EGM will gather information and analysis from some of the world’s leading experts on the issue in preparation for the 2022 session of the Permanent Forum.

Many indigenous peoples occupy lands rich in natural resources and biological diversity that are valuable for business operations. A preliminary review conducted in 2014 of around 73,000 mining, agricultural, and lodging concessions in eight countries revealed that more than 93 percent of those developments involved lands inhabited by indigenous peoples and local communities.¹

According to a 2008 World Bank report, “traditional indigenous territories encompass up to 22 per cent of the world’s land surface and coincide with areas that hold 80 per cent of the planet’s biodiversity, and 11 per cent of world forest lands are legally owned by indigenous peoples and communities”.² Further, a recent report states that indigenous peoples and local communities³ customarily claim and manage over 50% of the world’s land while they legally own just 10%. As a result, at least 40% of the world’s land surface – around 5 billion hectares – remain unprotected and vulnerable to commercial pressures, including land

¹ Alforte et al. 2014. Communities as Counterparties: Preliminary Review of Concessions and Conflict in Emerging and Frontier Market Concessions. Available from: https://rightsandresources.org/wp-content/uploads/Communities-as-Counterparties-FINAL_Oct-21.pdf; Tauli-Corpuz, V. 2015. Opinion: Don’t Leave Indigenous Peoples Behind in SDGs. In Inter Press Service News. Available from <http://www.ipsnews.net/2015/05/opinion-dont-leave-indigenous-peoples-behind-in-sdgs/>

² Sobrevilla, C. 2008. The Role of Indigenous Peoples in Biodiversity Conservation: The Natural but Often Forgotten Partners. Washington, DC: The World Bank. Available from <https://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTBIODIVERSITY/Resources/RoleofIndigenousPeoplesinBiodiversityConservation.pdf>

³ There is no recognition of “local communities” under international law but they are considered to encompass communities that do not self-identify as indigenous but share similar characteristics of social, cultural, and economic conditions that distinguish them from other sections of the national community, whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions, and who have long-standing, culturally constitutive relations to lands and resources. See Indigenous + Community Response to IPCC Report, available from <https://ipccresponse.org/home-en>

grabbing by more powerful entities such as governments and corporations, as well as environmental destruction.⁴

Business-related impacts on the rights of indigenous peoples

Although the rights of indigenous peoples, inter alia, to self-determination, lands, territories and resources, and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), including in business contexts, are guaranteed in international laws and standards (see Annex) and some progress have also been made in domestic legal and policy frameworks, those rights are very often not recognized and/or effectively implemented in most countries. Even in countries, where indigenous peoples have legal recognition of their rights and also obtained title deeds to their lands and resources, those are often violated by States or business entities for projects such as mining and logging concessions, conservation, mono cropping and biofuel plantations, mega dams and other investments.

Laws and activities related to business and development (narrowly understood as economic growth) are mostly designed and implemented without meaningful participation of indigenous peoples even when those laws and projects directly affect them. Legal norms, including international investment agreements, generally privilege businesses and their profits as part of free market-based capitalist system resulting in indiscriminate exploitation of natural resources at the expense of indigenous peoples dependent on those resources. This also often leads to environmental destruction and climate change. The profound negative human rights impacts that those communities face include dispossession of their lands and resources, loss of their livelihoods, knowledge, cultures and languages, disintegration of their social bonds and erosion of their overall identity. Furthermore, these indigenous peoples often have very limited access to effective remedy or justice for those human rights violations.

Worse, when indigenous communities fight back against harmful business activities, they frequently face extreme reprisals and risks, such as harassments, attacks, disappearances and killings of indigenous leaders and human rights defenders (HRDs). In 2020, a global analysis recorded 331 killings of defenders – 69% of them working on land, indigenous peoples and environmental rights and 26% specifically on indigenous peoples' rights.⁵ Another report suggests that more than 200 environmental defenders were killed in 2020 – over a third of them indigenous, and almost 30% of the killings were reportedly linked to resource exploitation (logging, mining and large-scale agribusiness), and hydroelectric dams and other infrastructure.⁶ Similarly, over 600 attacks against HRDs working on business-related human rights issues, who are often indigenous and local community members, were documented in the year that ranged from judicial harassment to death threats and violent attacks.⁷

Indigenous peoples also face other human rights challenges such as discrimination in receiving benefits in terms of employment or other socio-economic development from business operations, or poor working conditions in those operations. At the same time, businesses and governments frequently appropriate indigenous knowledge and cultures for the commercial profits without any consultation or consent of the

⁴ Rights and Resources Initiative. 2015. Who Owns the World's Land? A global baseline of formally recognized indigenous and community land rights. Washington, DC: RRI. Available from https://rightsandresources.org/wp-content/uploads/GlobalBaseline_web.pdf

⁵ Front Line Defenders. 2021. Global Analysis 2020. Available from: https://media.business-humanrights.org/media/documents/fl_d_global_analysis_2020.pdf

⁶ Global Witness. 2021. Last Line of Defense: The industries causing the climate crisis and attacks against land and environmental defenders. Available from: <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/campaigns/environmental-activists/last-line-defence/>

⁷ Business and Human Rights Resource Centre. 2021. In the line of fire: Increased legal protection needed as attacks against business & human rights defenders mount in 2020. Available from: https://media.business-humanrights.org/media/documents/HRD_2020_Snapshot_EN_v9.pdf

concerned communities. Cultural appropriation as another form of “extractivism” of indigenous peoples, whereby companies, including in pharmaceutical, food and fashion industry, exploit their traditional wisdom and cultural creations.⁸ Although this is resisted by indigenous peoples, they seldom have the resources to do so, especially when legal and administrative frameworks, such as intellectual property rights architecture that often protects the appropriators. In a historic benefit sharing agreement in 2019, the Khoi and San people in South Africa won a successful royalty negotiation for being the first peoples to explore and preserve the ancient knowledge of the uses of the rooibos plant – the tea of which is drunk by the general population in the country and commercially exported worldwide.⁹

On the other hand, although subsistence-focused economic model is still prevalent among many indigenous peoples’ communities worldwide, indigenous peoples, particularly in Europe, North America, Australia and New Zealand, are also expanding their own businesses initiatives and enterprises. Indigenous peoples’ businesses can safeguard their rights to live with dignity, to their lands, territories and resources, as well as to their culture, languages and traditional knowledge, among others. Respecting the need to obtain FPIC would still be of critical importance even when indigenous peoples themselves exploit the resources on their lands to ensure that all sections of communities, including indigenous women, youth and persons with disabilities, participate effectively. However, while contribution of indigenous peoples’ economies to national development is not well recognized, indigenous peoples largely receive little support from States and financial institutions and face other challenges such as discrimination in access to financial services and markets when they set out on their own business activities.¹⁰

The issue of business-related impacts on the rights of indigenous peoples has further been addressed by a number of UN mechanisms, including the treaty bodies and UN bodies mandated to deal specifically with indigenous peoples (see References).

Initiatives taken by States, businesses, indigenous peoples and others

After the adoption of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs) in 2011 as the first comprehensive global standard for States and companies to prevent, address and remedy human rights abuses in business contexts, some States have formulated or are in the process of formulating National Action Plans (NAPs) for the implementation of the Guiding Principles. So far, at least 29 States have published their NAPs and more States are developing them to identify needs and practical measures for preventing and strengthening protection against human rights abuses in business contexts.¹¹ Effective involvement of indigenous peoples in the drafting of the NAPs has been rare. Nonetheless, in countries such as Chile and Kenya, indigenous peoples have been separately consulted and their representatives included in the mechanisms for the follow-up, monitoring and review of the NAPs.¹²

In Europe, three States have specifically adopted laws for mandatory human rights and environmental due diligence by businesses while there are legislative proposals or civil society actions for such laws in many

⁸ Vasquez, S, and Cojti, A. 2020. Cultural Appropriation: Another Form of Extractivism of Indigenous Communities. Available from: <https://www.culturalsurvival.org/news/cultural-appropriation-another-form-extractivism-indigenous-communities>

⁹ Ibid

¹⁰ For more on indigenous peoples’ businesses, see Study of the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Good practices and challenges, including discrimination, in business and in access to financial services by indigenous peoples, in particular indigenous women and indigenous persons with disabilities, A/HRC/36/53, <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/IPeoples/EMRIP/Pages/StudyOnGoodPracticesByIndigenousPeoples.aspx>

¹¹ See www.globalnaps.org

¹² See <https://globalnaps.org/country/chile/> and <https://globalnaps.org/country/kenya/>

other States of the region.¹³ A European Union wide legislation for mandatory human rights and environmental due diligence is also being developed. Further, since 2014, deliberations are underway among UN Member States and other stakeholders at the UN Human Rights Council to elaborate an international legally binding instrument on transnational corporations and other business enterprises with respect to human rights. The subsequent revised drafts of the binding treaty affirm that the State Parties must ensure that human rights due diligence measures by businesses, among other things, include consultations with indigenous peoples undertaken in accordance with the internationally agreed standards of FPIC.

A recent study by the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples has elaborated on a human rights-based approach to FPIC, including in business contexts (A/HRC/39/62). A UN Global Compact guide for businesses equates consent with “a formal, documented social license to operate”, noting that “indigenous peoples have the right to give or withhold consent, and in some circumstances, may revoke their consent previously given”. Other inter-governmental organizations such as the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has also issued its Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Business Conduct, which requires meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the due diligence process and also states that in some cases, such as with reference to the need to obtain the FPIC of indigenous peoples, stakeholder engagement or consultation is a right in and of itself.¹⁴

While many States in North America and Latin America have started adopted legislation, practices and guidelines on consulting with indigenous peoples to obtain their FPIC, indigenous peoples are also establishing their own FPIC protocols as tools in preparing States and other parties to engage in consultations or free, prior and informed consent process with the indigenous peoples setting out how, when, why and whom to consult. The first wave of FPIC protocols was developed by Canadian First Nations in order to regulate their interactions with mining companies in the early 2000s that was followed by bio-cultural protocols developed in Africa and Asia in late 2000s in the context of Access and Benefit-Sharing under the Convention on Biological Diversity and the most recent “autonomous FPIC protocols” are being developed primarily in Latin America – all those protocols are commonly developed in response to encroachment and failure of State authorities and businesses to respect the need to obtain FPIC of indigenous peoples.¹⁵

There are also various measures being undertaken by business enterprises, industry associations and multi-stakeholder initiatives to implement the UNGPs in general and with specific references to indigenous peoples’ rights. For example, in May 2013, the International Council on Mining and Metals adopted a policy statement on indigenous peoples, with a commitment to work to obtain the FPIC of indigenous peoples for new projects (and changes to existing projects) that are located on lands traditionally owned by or under customary use of indigenous peoples and which are likely to have significant adverse impacts on indigenous peoples.¹⁶ Similarly, the Forest Stewardship Council, the most important multi-stakeholder initiative in the forestry sector worldwide in which most businesses of the sector are involved, has updated its Principles in 2014 to include the right of indigenous peoples to FPIC prior to forest management activities that may affect them. However, the business and multi-stakeholder initiatives are laudable, there are notable limitations in their implementation and effectiveness.

¹³ European Coalition for Corporate Justice. 2021. Comparative table: Corporate due diligence laws and legislative proposals in Europe. Available at: <https://corporatejustice.org/publications/comparative-table-corporate-due-diligence-laws-and-legislative-proposals-in-europe/>

¹⁴ Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2018. OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Business Conduct. Available at: <http://mneguidelines.oecd.org/OECD-Due-Diligence-Guidance-for-Responsible-Business-Conduct.pdf>

¹⁵ See <https://fpic.enip.eu/>

¹⁶ International Council on Mining & Metals. 2013. Indigenous Peoples and Mining: Position Statement. Available at: <http://www.icmm.com/en-gb/about-us/member-requirements/position-statements/indigenous-peoples>

On accessing remedy for business-related impacts on indigenous peoples, there have been varying experiences at national and international levels. While there are still significant barriers to the State-based national judicial remedies, regional mechanisms have made set some positive jurisprudence. Similarly, engagement of indigenous peoples and their support groups with non-judicial mechanisms such as the National Human Rights Institutions has also produced positive results. For example, Guatemala's Human Rights Ombudsman has issued opinions to prevent the harmful impacts of hydroelectric dams and palm monoculture on indigenous peoples' lands and also regulations to ensure that FPIC processes are conducted prior to the approval of business operations.

Meeting objectives

The EGM will aim to:

- Identify indigenous peoples' own business initiatives and enterprises for development of their lands, territories and resources as an exercise of their self-determination and related rights
- Analyze the principles of human rights due diligence vis-à-vis the need to obtain the Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) of indigenous peoples for business operations affecting them
- Assess the situation of reprisals against indigenous communities and their defenders, including indigenous women defenders, in relation to their activism for their rights in the context of business operations
- Take stock of complimentary approaches to ensure respect of human rights in business contexts, including National Action Plans, regional initiatives and the proposed legally binding treaty, in relation to the rights of indigenous peoples
- Examine access to effective remedy, or lack thereof, for indigenous peoples negatively affected by business activities
- Share good practices on States' recognition and protection of as well as engagement of businesses and investors and works of various UN mechanisms for the rights of indigenous peoples in business contexts
- Put forward recommendations and next steps to ensure the respect for the rights of indigenous peoples in business contexts

Proposed themes for discussion

- Indigenous peoples' business enterprises and autonomies
- Indigenous peoples, FPIC and human rights due diligence
- Business operations and reprisals against indigenous peoples their defenders and the impact on indigenous women
- Addressing the implementation gap through National Action Plans, proposed treaty on business and human rights and other initiatives
- Effective remedy and redress for human rights impacts of businesses on indigenous peoples

Organization of the meeting

- The international expert group meeting will take place online from 6-10 December.
- The meeting will consist of a number of different sessions over the course of 5 days.
- Interpretation will be available in English and Spanish.

Annex

Key normative framework

The **UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP)** adopted by the General Assembly in 2007 recognizes the collective rights of indigenous peoples vested in indigenous individuals that organize themselves as peoples as well as the rights of indigenous individuals. The Declaration provides that indigenous peoples have the right to self-determination, by virtue of which they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development (art. 3). Indigenous peoples, in exercising their right to self-determination, have the right to autonomy or self-government in matters relating to their internal and local affairs, as well as ways and means for financing their autonomous functions (art. 4). The Declaration also affirms indigenous peoples' have the right to determine and develop priorities and strategies for exercising their right to development (art. 23).

Of particular relevance in business contexts are their rights to lands, territories and resources guaranteed in the Declaration. According to the Declaration, indigenous peoples have the right to lands, territories and resources which they have traditionally owned, occupied or otherwise used or acquired and States should give legal recognition and protection to these lands, territories and resources (art. 26). States should also establish and implement processes to recognize and adjudicate indigenous peoples' rights in relation to their lands, territories and resources (art. 27).

Further, the Declaration explicitly requires obtaining the Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) of indigenous peoples, which is considered a way of exercising the right to self-determination for indigenous peoples, before

- their relocation from their lands or territories, including an agreement on just and fair compensation and, where possible, with the option of return (art. 10);
- adopting and implementing legislative or administrative measures that may affect them (art. 19);
- storage or disposal of hazardous materials on their lands or territories (art. 29.2); and
- approval of any project affecting their lands or territories and other resources, particularly in connection with the development, utilization or exploitation of mineral, water or other resources (art. 32).

Further, the Declaration provides that the States shall provide redress through effective mechanisms (...) with respect to their cultural, intellectual, religious and spiritual property taken without their free, prior and informed consent (...) (art. 11.2) as well as the redress for the lands, territories and resources which they have traditionally owned or otherwise occupied or used, and which have been confiscated taken occupied, used or damaged without their free, prior and informed consent. (art. 28.1).

Further, the Declaration affirms the rights of indigenous peoples, among others, to equality and non-discrimination (art. 2), to improve their economic and social conditions (art. 21), as well as to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and manifestations of their sciences, technologies and cultures (art. 31).

The **Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention (No. 169) of the International Labour Organization, 1989** covers the rights of indigenous and tribal peoples under various issues, including land, recruitment and employment conditions, vocational training and industries, social security and health, education and means of communication and cross-border cooperation. While many provisions in the Convention are similar to those in the Declaration, particularly in relation to land rights, its provisions related to employment and industries, among other issues are also specifically relevant in business and human rights discourse.

For example, the Convention requires Governments to adopt special measures for effective protection with regard to recruitment and conditions of employment of workers belonging to indigenous peoples (art. 20), as well as ensure promotion of handicrafts, rural and community-based industries, and subsistence economy and traditional activities of indigenous peoples as important factors in the maintenance of their cultures and in their economic self-reliance and development (art. 23). Further, ILO Convention No. 111, considered as one of the fundamental ILO conventions, prohibits discrimination not only in formal employment but also against indigenous peoples' traditional occupations such as pastoralism and shifting cultivation.

The **UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs)** adopted by the Human Rights Council in 2011 provide a global normative framework for preventing and addressing the risks of human rights impacts of business activities with the objective of enhancing standards and practices with regards to business and human rights. The UNGPs are structured on a three-pillar framework:

1. **State duty to protect human rights** against abuses by third parties, including business enterprises, through appropriate policies, regulation, and adjudication.
2. **Corporate responsibility to respect human rights**, which means that business enterprises should act with due diligence to avoid infringing on the rights of others and to address adverse impacts with which they are involved.
3. Need for greater **access to effective remedy** for victims, both judicial and non-judicial.

Further, it is noted that the Guiding Principles should be implemented in a non-discriminatory manner, with particular attention to the rights and needs of, as well as the challenges faced by, individuals from groups or populations that may be at heightened risk of becoming vulnerable or marginalized, and with due regard to the different risks that may be faced by women and men. In the commentary of the Guiding Principles, indigenous peoples are recognized as one of such groups with their challenges and rights explicitly referred to as follows:

- In meeting their duty to protect, States should provide guidance to business enterprises on respecting human rights, advising on how to consider effectively issues of gender, vulnerability and/or marginalization,” recognizing the specific challenges that may be faced by indigenous peoples (among others.)”.
- Within the corporate responsibility to respect internationally recognized human rights, business enterprises, depending on circumstances, might need to consider additional human rights standards. They should, for instance, respect rights of individuals belonging to specific groups or populations that require particular attention, for which UN instruments have elaborated on the rights of indigenous peoples.
- Under access to remedy through State-based judicial mechanisms, States should take appropriate steps to ensure effectiveness of those mechanisms in addressing business-related human rights abuses, including to reduce legal barriers that can arise where certain groups such as indigenous peoples are excluded from the same level of legal protection of their rights that applies to the wider population.

Although international human rights treaties do not specifically provide for the rights of indigenous peoples in business contexts, the treaty bodies have elaborated on those rights in their general comments and recommendations. For example, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights that monitors the implementation of the **International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)**, in its General Comment No. 24 on State Obligations under the ICESCR in the Context of Business Activities, affirms that States and businesses should respect the principle of free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples in relation to all matters that could affect their rights, including to their lands, territories and resources. Further, it necessitates States to specifically incorporate impacts of business activities on indigenous peoples into human rights impact assessments and businesses to obtain the free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples in exercising human rights due diligence. Discrimination against indigenous women and girls, sharing of benefits with indigenous peoples, their right to control intellectual property over their cultural heritage and their accessibility to effective remedies and protection of indigenous leaders at risk are other issues covered in the general comment.

The **Convention on Biological Diversity** aimed at “the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources” specifically calls on States to recognize and respect indigenous and local communities with respect to traditional knowledge and practices relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity (art. 8(j)). Similarly, the International Treaty for Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture recognizes the contribution of indigenous communities to the conservation and development of plant genetic resources, which constitute the basis of food and agriculture production. The Treaty requires governments to take measures to protect, inter alia, traditional knowledge relevant to plant genetic resources for food and agriculture and farmers’ right to participate in making decisions, at the national level, on matters related to the conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture.¹⁷

Under the **Paris Agreement under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change**, the Parties to the Agreement aim to incentivize and facilitate participation of public and private entities in mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions and enhance their participation in implementation of nationally determined contributions to achieve in responding to climate change (art. 6). The Parties also acknowledge that climate change adaptation should be based on and guided by knowledge of indigenous peoples, as appropriate (art. 7.5).

Further, **regional human rights mechanisms** in Africa and the Americas have also affirmed the rights of indigenous peoples, including those over their traditional lands, territories and resources and the requirement to obtain their FPIC for development or business projects.¹⁸ For example, in 2001, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, in “the first legally binding decision by an international tribunal to uphold the collective land and resource rights of indigenous peoples in the face of a State’s failure to do so”, found that Nicaragua violated the Awas Tingni community’s rights to property and to judicial protection in granting of a forestry concession, without consultation, on lands traditionally occupied by the community and ordered Nicaragua to demarcate and provide legal title for the land. Similarly, the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights, in 2010, affirmed the rights of the Endorois people over their traditional lands in a groundbreaking ruling, which found that Kenya had violated their rights by granting a concession to mine on their land, failing to recognize their customary land tenure, and forcibly relocating them for the purposes of developing a game reserve.

Safeguard policies and guidelines of international financial institutions, investor bodies and other related organizations are also relevant for the rights of indigenous peoples in business contexts. For example, the Performance Standard 7 on Indigenous Peoples of the International Finance Corporation – the private lending arm of the World Bank Group includes, among other things, the requirement to obtain FPIC of indigenous peoples under certain circumstances in projects they finance. Likewise, the Equator Principles that constitute a risk management framework adopted by financial institutions for determining, assessing and managing social and environmental risk in projects, set requirements for projects affecting indigenous peoples, including requirements for FPIC with reference to the IFC Performance Standard 7.

In the **2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development**, which includes 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), States pledge to leave no one behind and to endeavor reaching the furthest behind first in meeting the SDGs. The 2030 Agenda is explicitly grounded on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights treaties and its overarching framework contains numerous elements relevant to indigenous peoples. More specifically, States recognize indigenous peoples recognized as one

¹⁷ Feiring, B. 2013. Indigenous peoples’ rights to lands, territories and resources”. Rome: International Land Coalition. Available from <https://www.landcoalition.org/en/resources/indigenous-peoples-rights-to-lands-territories-and-resources/>

¹⁸ Ibid

of the vulnerable groups that must be empowered and affirm that the 2030 Agenda will involve indigenous peoples together with governments, businesses and other stakeholders to ensure its success.

In relation to business and human rights, SDG 7 (affordable and clean energy), SDG 8 (decent work and economic growth), SDG 9 (industry, innovation and infrastructure) and SDG 12 (responsible consumption and production) are particularly relevant to business and human rights. In the 2030 Agenda, States acknowledge that the implementation of sustainable development will depend on the active engagement of both the public and private sectors. They also acknowledge the importance of corporate sustainability reporting and encourage companies to consider integrating sustainability information into their reporting cycle.

Additional references

Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 2018, Free, prior and informed consent: a human rights-based approach, A/HRC/39/62,

<https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/IPeoples/EMRIP/Pages/StudyFPIC.aspx>

Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 2017, Good practices and challenges, including discrimination, in business and in access to financial services by indigenous peoples, in particular indigenous women and indigenous persons with disabilities, A/HRC/36/53,

<https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/IPeoples/EMRIP/Pages/StudyOnGoodPracticesByIndigenousPeoples.aspx>

International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), 2021, The UN Guiding Principles on Business & Human Rights and Indigenous Peoples – Progress achieved, the implementation gap and challenges for the next Decade, <https://www.iwgia.org/en/resources/publications/305-books/4419-the-un-guiding-principles-on-business-human-rights-and-indigenous-peoples---progress-achieved,-the-implementation-gap-and-challenges-for-the-next-decade.html>

Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, 2018, Attacks against and criminalization of indigenous peoples defending their rights, A/HRC/39/17, <https://undocs.org/A/HRC/39/17>

Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, 2016, Impacts on indigenous peoples' rights of investments, international investment agreements and investor-State dispute settlements, A/HRC/33/42, <https://undocs.org/A/HRC/33/42>

Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, 2013, Extractive industries and indigenous peoples, A/HRC/24/41, <https://undocs.org/A/HRC/24/41>

Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples, 2011, Extractive industries operating within or near indigenous territories, A/HRC/18/35, <https://undocs.org/A/HRC/18/35>

UN Global Compact, 2013, The Business Reference Guide to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, <https://www.unglobalcompact.org/library/541>

UN Global Compact, 2014, Practical Supplement to the Business Reference Guide to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, <https://www.unglobalcompact.org/library/1451>

Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, 2016, Addressing the human rights impacts of agro-industrial operations on indigenous and local communities: State duties and responsibilities of business enterprises, A/71/291, <https://undocs.org/A/71/291>

Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, 2013, Business-related impacts on the rights of indigenous peoples, A/68/279, <https://undocs.org/A/68/279>

International Expert Group Meeting
Indigenous peoples, business, autonomy and the human rights principles of
due diligence, including free, prior and informed consent

Draft Agenda

6 December: Indigenous peoples' business enterprises and autonomies

Moderator: TBC

Speakers:

TBC

7 December: Indigenous peoples, FPIC and human rights due diligence

Moderator: TBC

Speakers:

TBC

8 December: Effective remedy and redress for human rights impacts of businesses on indigenous peoples

Moderator: TBC

Speakers:

TBC

9 December: Business operations and reprisals against indigenous peoples their defenders and the impact on indigenous women

Moderator: TBC

Speakers:

TBC

10 December: Addressing the implementation gap through National Action Plans, proposed treaty on business and human rights and other initiatives

Moderator: TBC

Speakers:

TBC