

By Re_Generation

Human Wellbeing

2.2 Indigenous Sovereignty and Reconciliation

Description

There are over 370 million Indigenous peoples living in over 90 countries around the world, comprising a majority of the world's linguistic and cultural diversity. While they account for only 5% of the world's population, they occupy 20% of the Earth's land surface and [steward an astonishing 80% of global biodiversity](#). However, due to a painful and enduring legacy of colonial oppression, many Indigenous populations remain marginalized in modern nation-states and face disadvantages that other groups do not. The dispossession of Indigenous lands is an ongoing process in settler colonial societies; in Canada, [76% of injunctions filed by corporations against First Nations are granted](#), while conversely 81% of injunctions filed by First Nations against corporations are denied. The five largest Canadian banks provided over \$49 billion in funds to Enbridge from 2016 to 2020, despite [consistent and vehement opposition](#) from numerous Indigenous communities to the company's Coastal GasLink pipeline which has not received the Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) of affected communities. To learn more about what corporations should be doing to advance reconciliation and ensure FPIC in all project developments, continue reading this PDF guide.

Acknowledgements

Written by Gareth Gransauil, Associate Director of Re_Generation, with review by some of Canada and North America's most influential sustainability leaders.

About Re_Generation

[Re_Generation](#) is a Canadian youth movement that seeks to build a regenerative, sustainable, and just economy. We aim to reimagine our schools, repurpose our careers, and remodel our companies to be aligned with regenerative principles. In particular, we provide resources for individuals to launch impact-driven careers and advocate for change within their companies and schools. We also aim to advance public policies that promote regenerative and sustainable business practices.

Our successful 'Our Future, Our Business' Manifesto campaign received the support of 65 youth organizations, 130 high-level executives, and 100 civil society organizations recognizing the need for reform in business education on sustainability. After three years of existence as the Canadian Business Youth Council for Sustainable Development, we have changed our name to Re_Generation to become more inclusive of all youth, not just business youth.

We believe that the ideal society is a [regenerative](#) one. Regeneration to us means putting human and ecological [well-being](#) at the centre of every decision. It means restoring relationships, both within nature and within society, while helping all communities to thrive. Read more about our history and vision at our [About Us](#) page.

Issue Summary

There are over 370 million Indigenous Peoples living in over 90 countries around the world, comprising a majority of the world's linguistic and cultural diversity. While they account for only 5% of the world's population, they occupy 20% of the Earth's land surface and care for [an astonishing 80% of global biodiversity](#). As protectors of nature, Indigenous Peoples are often on the front lines of the fight against extractive capitalism; it is estimated that Indigenous resistance to fossil fuel projects has [prevented 1.6 billion metric tons of CO2](#) from entering the atmosphere in the last decade alone. At the same time, due to a painful and enduring legacy of colonial oppression, many Indigenous populations remain marginalized in modern nation-states and face disadvantages that other groups do not. Indigenous Peoples [make up 15% of the world's poor](#) and one-third of the world's extremely poor, and they are much more likely to face below-average life expectancies.

Canada is a settler colonial state which continues to perpetuate systems of exploitation and oppression of the First Peoples of these lands. 89% of land in Canada is designated as 'Crown Land', a system of dispossession which gives the Canadian state sole control over Indigenous Traditional Territories. According to the Yellowhead Institute, the "[state-industry complex that motivates land alienation](#) is a major economic driver of the Canadian economy," as billions of dollars in resources are extracted from Indigenous lands every year. The Canadian state actively sanctions and cooperates in the ongoing violation of Indigenous sovereignty, as evidenced by the fact that 76% of injunctions filed by corporations against First Nations are granted, while 81% of injunctions filed by First Nations against corporations are denied. To visualize the extent of the corporate invasion of Indigenous lands in Canada, view this [mine sweeper map](#) developed by the Yellowhead Institute. To rectify these imbalances, a nation-wide '[Land Back](#)' movement has emerged advocating for Indigenous control of Indigenous Traditional Territories, as advanced in the Institute's [seminal 'Red Paper'](#).

Large Canadian banks and investors are complicit in this process. The five largest Canadian banks provided over \$49 billion in funds to Enbridge from 2016 to 2020, despite [consistent and vehement opposition](#) from Indigenous communities such as the Red Lake Nation, the White Earth Band of Ojibwe, and Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe to the company's Line 3 pipeline that violates their treaty rights. It is estimated that Line 3 will add [193 million tons of greenhouse gases](#) to the atmosphere on an annual basis. Enbridge has also secretly [bankrolled local police departments](#) in Minnesota to intimidate Indigenous land defenders and activists. In British Columbia, 26 major banks are funding [construction of the Coastal GasLink pipeline](#) despite resistance from the Traditional Hereditary Chiefs of the Wet'suwet'en people, who have not consented to the development of this project through their lands. In December 2019 the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination [called on Canada to immediately suspend construction](#) of the Coastal GasLink pipeline in response to urgent reports filed by the Wet'suwet'en, Secwepmec, and Dunne-za and Cree communities. This request went ignored.

The violation of Indigenous sovereignty is not restricted to Canada, however. Around the world, Indigenous Peoples are [facing the brunt of resource imperialism](#) and neocolonial extractivism, often reinforced by violence from local police and private security personnel. 18% of the Amazon rainforest, one of the planet's most biodiverse regions, is [currently covered with large-scale mining concessions](#), and 20% of these concessions are known to overlap with Indigenous territories. The government of Jair Bolsonaro has adopted a conscious mission to [invade as many Indigenous lands as possible](#). The global [Environmental Justice Atlas](#), a global database of mining-related conflicts, has identified over 1,500 ongoing conflicts over water, land, displacement, pollution, and a variety of other issues. Similar maps are available from [ResourceWatch](#) and [Global Forest Watch](#).

Many observers have called attention to a [global land grab](#) that is occurring [driven by agribusiness and state-sponsored resource hoarding](#), primarily affecting nations in the Global South. As demand for [resources and land rises](#) around the world, this will exacerbate pressures on Indigenous communities and the ecosystems they steward. There is also the uncomfortable reality that the global green energy transition is likely to accelerate a worldwide boom in '[green extractivism](#)' as the extraction of minerals required for electrification will accentuate threats to biodiversity, the integrity of habitats, Indigenous rights, and other issues. The World Bank estimates that the production of key minerals such as graphite, lithium and cobalt will need to increase by 500% by 2050 to meet the demand from clean energy technologies. Without concomitant safeguards for Indigenous sovereignty and community land rights, it is possible that the green transition will serve to accelerate the displacement of Indigenous communities.

Key Considerations

Many companies are beginning to realize that infringing on Indigenous sovereignty is not just an ethical violation, but also a poor business decision. An [analysis of 370 extractive sites](#) based on or near Indigenous land found that 92% of companies had poor or non-existent relationships with Indigenous Peoples, making them medium to high-risk investments. Due to increased media attention focused on Indigenous-led protests, the report found that 58% of companies had medium to high-risk exposure from negative media coverage. Activist investors are increasingly holding companies accountable for such violations; one example is the Canadian firm Tahoe Resources, which was accused of abetting human rights abuses at its Guatemalan mine (including multiple assassinations). Major investors in Tahoe Resources divested from the company due to ongoing opposition, and [Tahoe Resources' stock plummeted](#) from a high of \$27 to \$4, while the mine was ultimately suspended.

The [UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples](#) (UNDRIP) is the first framework at an international level to call for universal recognition of and respect for Indigenous sovereignty. As part of the process of atoning for Canada's horrific treatment of First Nations, Inuit and Métis, the [Truth and Reconciliation Commission of 2015](#) included in its 92nd Call to Action a call for "the corporate sector to adopt the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as a reconciliation framework and to apply its principles, norms and standards to corporate policy." In 2021, Canada adopted [Bill C-15](#), a legislative act which now binds the government to a process of ensuring that all of its policies and laws are aligned with UNDRIP. Although this represents a historic win for Indigenous rights, UNDRIP implementation should not be considered a cure-all. UNDRIP includes inherent limitations, such as the stipulation in Article 46 that nothing in the declaration should be "construed as authorizing or encouraging any action which would dismember or impair, totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of sovereign and independent States." In effect, this clause provides Canada with the legal ammunition to claim that Indigenous self-determination threatens Canada's territorial integrity. Both federal and provincial governments in Canada have announced that UNDRIP will be interpreted in accordance with Section 35 of Canada's Constitution, which implies that domestic laws will always take precedence over international principles. Such contradictions were on display in British Columbia, which passed its own law adopting UNDRIP in 2019 and yet [did not intervene to prevent the forced eviction](#) of Wet'suwet'en land defenders from their own territory.

At the centre of the debate surrounding Indigenous sovereignty is the concept of [Free, Prior, and Informed Consent](#) (FPIC), which requires that all extractive projects occurring on Indigenous land must occur with the freely given consent of affected communities as indicated before projects begin, and only once access to all necessary information has been ensured. FPIC includes three overlapping rights:

the right to be consulted; the right to participate; and the right to their lands, Traditional Territories and resources. A [comprehensive definition](#) of FPIC is provided by the Yellowhead Institute:

- Free: consent given voluntarily and without coercion, intimidation or manipulation, through a process that is self-directed by the community from whom consent is being sought, unencumbered by coercion, expectations, or timelines that are externally imposed;
- Prior: consent is sought sufficiently in advance of any authorization or commencement of activities;
- Informed: the nature of the engagement and type of information that should be provided prior to seeking consent and also as part of the ongoing consent process;
- Consent: collective decision made by the rights holders and reached through the customary decision-making processes of the communities.

The Yellowhead Institute advances on this definition by providing four additional principles that further extend the concept of FPIC and introduce new responsibilities for companies operating on Indigenous lands:

- Restorative: promotes the active and intentional centering of Indigenous models of governance and law and moving away from Western frameworks and definitions;
- Epistemic: accepts Indigenous knowledge frameworks and languages for understanding relationships to the land;
- Reciprocal: ensures that Indigenous people are not merely being asked to grant consent, but are determining the terms of consent;
- Legitimate: while community politics can be fraught, decisions about granting or withholding consent generally require representatives perceived as legitimate by the community, and with a stake in the decision (whether band council, hereditary council, youth, elders, all genders, and urban populations) to participate or be accommodated.

As the Institute has noted, existing regimes that seek to recognize Indigenous sovereignty and autonomy have [so far proved insufficient](#) to deliver on reconciliation goals. Many firms assume that merely consulting Indigenous Peoples on a proposed project is enough to prove FPIC, giving rise to the expression that “consultation is not consent.” The ‘Duty to Consult’ requirement for all Canadian federal and provincial governments does not give First Nations an ultimate veto over government actions. Additionally, many firms are inherently biased to view Indigenous consent as a means to reduce the potential costs associated with sustained legal and political battles, rather than a means to actually recognize Indigenous agency. As such, “both states and industry actors therefore [privilege a more diluted version of FPIC](#) as a participatory right, which results in a procedural obligation to seek consent through what is often technical (and symbolic) consultation rather than as a substantive obligation to recognise the decision-making authority of Indigenous peoples.”

Many firms seeking to obtain Indigenous consent to extractive projects rely on the negotiation of ‘Impact Benefit Agreements’ (IBAs), a form of compensation provided to affected communities, which has the effect of displacing discussion of whether a project should commence or not with discussion about the attractiveness of the compensation package. IBAs have been shown to [create a highly unequal environment](#) given the fact that access to legal expertise is imbalanced, negotiation details are kept confidential, communities are pressured to negotiate as quickly as possible, and discussions often focus on quantifiable, short-term economic benefits rather than long-term costs which tend to be more qualitative in nature. IBAs should only be used as a mechanism for securing FPIC if they are accompanied by a real and substantive deliberative process that engages the entire community, and if they do not erode the community’s right to veto a project after the IBA negotiation process has begun.

In Canada, another critical issue is that First Nations governance processes established through the Indian Act were essentially designed to weaken their ability to self-govern. 'Band Councils' are given quasi-municipal status on reserves, and are elected every two years, making it difficult to set and accomplish goals. The competitive election process itself can often create community tensions. Further, this system contrasts with the Traditional governance structures of Hereditary Chiefs which follow Indigenous ways of knowing and being. As such, consent from a Band Council may or may not imply real FPIC. Firms wishing to better understand forms of genuine Indigenous self-governance should review [this guide](#) from the Yellowhead Institute.

Tools

For a comprehensive introduction to the topic of indigenous rights and recommendations for firms, see [this tool](#) compiled by the Human Rights and Business Dilemmas Forum.

The [Indigenous Navigator](#) tool is the world's first framework for and by Indigenous peoples to monitor the level of recognition and implementation of their rights across the globe. It includes a regularly updated database based on self-reported information from Indigenous communities. Using this [global map of Indigenous rights](#) from the Indigenous Peoples Major Group for Sustainable Development, firms can view the status of Indigenous rights and steps towards reform in 27 different countries.

The UN has developed a [Business Reference Guide](#) for UNDRIP Implementation. The guide outlines specific guidance for firms hoping to develop a policy on Indigenous rights on pages 15-16. In order to formally obtain and document consent for a project, the UN recommends that a business should:

1. Identify and consult with Indigenous Peoples' representative institutions in order to negotiate a process for obtaining consent;
2. Document the agreed-upon negotiation process;
3. Document the outcome of the negotiation process;
4. Engage an independent and culturally-sensitive facilitator, chosen by or acceptable to the indigenous peoples concerned, to assist with negotiations;
5. Provide support (e.g., financial, logistical, etc.) to strengthen the capacity of a community's decision-making processes, being mindful that doing so does not create undue pressure to give consent;
6. Make arrangements for independent monitoring of the FPIC process and its outcomes, by engaging an independent expert chosen in consultation with the Indigenous Peoples concerned.

According to the UN guide, due diligence for Indigenous rights should include:

- The use of an internal or independent external human rights or Indigenous peoples' rights expert;
- Desk research to identify government policies, reports, treaties, arrangements with and baseline data about such Indigenous Peoples;
- Engagement with Indigenous organizations, government authorities and other relevant civil society organizations, including Indigenous organizations that may be a federation or association of individual Indigenous communities or function as a national body;
- Visits to project sites;
- Meaningful consultation and collaboration with local Indigenous communities.

The Danish Institute Human Rights has also identified a [relevant set of steps](#) for businesses undertaking due diligence related to Indigenous rights. These include:

- Identification of Indigenous Peoples that may be affected by the project, based on criteria set out

in ILO Convention No. 169, including self-identification as Indigenous Peoples, regardless of formal recognition by the state as such;

- Analysis of the strategic environment in a given country regarding the recognition and respect for Indigenous Peoples' rights, as well as the particular situation of indigenous peoples in the suggested locality;
- Analysis of the project-specific context and locality to ascertain whether the authorities of the concerned country have effectively consulted with potentially affected Indigenous peoples, including before issuing licenses or concessions to third parties;
- Initial dialogue with the Indigenous Peoples potentially affected to assess compatibility between their aspirations for development and the proposed intervention.

1. Free, Prior, and Informed Consent

Businesses looking to obtain FPIC for extractive projects should follow the criteria outlined in this [due diligence questionnaire](#) developed by First Peoples Worldwide.

A collaborative approach to FPIC [requires four prerequisites](#): all parties must agree to the process, all parties must act in good faith to find mutually acceptable solutions, Indigenous representatives must be full partners in the decision-making process, and Indigenous groups must retain the right to withhold consent throughout the duration of the consultation process.

The UN Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights has published a [long-awaited report on FPIC](#) through its Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Under the High Commissioner's guidelines criteria for establishing FPIC, the Expert Mechanism found that:

1. The context or climate of the process should be free from intimidation, coercion, manipulation and harassment, ensuring that the consultation process does not limit or restrict indigenous peoples' access to existing policies, services and rights;
2. Features of the relationship between the parties should include trust and good faith, and not suspicion, accusations, threats, criminalization, violence towards Indigenous peoples or prejudiced views towards them;
3. Indigenous Peoples should have the freedom to be represented as traditionally required under their own laws, customs and protocols, with attention to gender and representation of other sectors within indigenous communities;
4. Indigenous Peoples should have the freedom to guide and direct the process of consultation; they should have the power to determine how to consult and the course of the consultation process. This includes being consulted when devising the process of consultation per se and having the opportunity to share and use or develop their own protocols on consultation;
5. Indigenous Peoples should have the freedom to set their expectations and to contribute to defining methods, timelines, locations and evaluations.

The High Commissioner also recommends that Indigenous Peoples should be involved as early as possible, especially in the conceptualization and design phases of a given project. Additionally, the information provided to Indigenous Peoples throughout the consultation process should be provided in a manner and form that is explicitly understandable to them, conveyed in all relevant languages. The information included for the purposes of obtaining FPIC must cover:

1. The nature, size, pace, reversibility and scope of any proposed project or activity;
2. The reasons for the project;
3. The areas to be affected;
4. Social, environmental and cultural impact assessments;

5. The kind of compensation or benefit-sharing schemes involved;
6. The potential harm and impacts that could result from the proposed activity.

2. Land and Environment Defenders

In addition to obtaining FPIC, firms should include explicit reference to the protection of land and environment defenders in the policies on Indigenous rights. Indigenous Peoples [comprise 40% of the killings of land and human rights defenders](#) at a global level, of which approximately 40% are linked to the mining sector. According to the Corporate Human Rights Benchmark, [fewer than 10% of companies](#) have policy commitments related to the protection of human rights defenders, with the lowest score from the agricultural products sector.

The [Zero Tolerance Initiative](#), a global coalition led by Indigenous Peoples, is working to end violence against land and human rights defenders throughout corporate supply chains. Their [guidelines to corporations](#) include calls to:

1. Recognise and respect the human rights of Afro-descendants, peasants, human rights defenders, and the collective rights of Indigenous Peoples, and act to promote or support indigenous and/or community led development priorities;
2. Introduce human rights due diligence policies and procedures, including within environmental, social, cultural and other impact assessments, integrating mandatory requirements at the upper management as well as field levels;
3. Develop and adopt independent, effective and accessible grievance and conflict mediation mechanisms;
4. Address violations of human rights where they occur, including through acting to prevent repetition, and minimize harm, through investigating, using leverage, issuing public statements, and possible divestment. Sanctions should be applied to individuals found to have committed wrong-doing within companies;
5. Refrain from the use of private or public security forces;
6. Support and do not hinder the advancement and adoption of the UN Binding Treaty on Transnational Corporations and Human Rights.

The organization Investors for Human Rights has developed [practical guidance for investors](#) looking to reduce violence against land defenders. Firms should also check out the [responsible sourcing program](#) of Global Witness, as well as these [policy recommendations](#) from the International Working Group for Indigenous Affairs.

3. Disclosure

All firms should commit to regular disclosure of their progress on protecting Indigenous rights, while also being transparent about negative incidents that may occur. Most firms are currently far behind in their disclosure efforts; analysis by SHARE in Canada has demonstrated that [only 6% of companies explicitly commit to UNDRIP](#), while 94% make no reference. Their analysis found that only five companies out of 173 specified a commitment to FPIC.

The Global Reporting Initiative has a [global standard](#) which requires firms to report on the total number of identified incidents of violations involving the rights of Indigenous Peoples, specifying the nature of the incidents and all remediation plans under consideration or already implemented. Disclosure efforts like this aim to prevent situations like the one currently unfolding in Ontario's Ring of Fire, where mining firms such as Noront Resources make no reference about Indigenous opposition to their projects despite vocal resistance from the surrounding Neskantaga, Attawapiskat, and Fort Albany First Nations,

who unanimously [declared a moratorium](#) on all development in the region.

4. Supporting the Indigenous Economy

Firms should also commit to advancing reconciliation goals by directly supporting the Indigenous economy through procurement policies, recruitment practices, building capacity, and other means. The National Aboriginal Economic Development Board estimates that if Indigenous Canadians were given the same education, training and employment opportunities as other Canadians, their contributions could [increase Canada's GDP by \\$27.7 billion](#) annually. For more information on this topic, see the [Indigenomics Institute](#) developed by Carol Anne Hilton.

According to [analysis by SHARE](#), few firms are appropriately disclosing their contribution to the Indigenous economy. SHARE found that few companies have diversity policies or plans that address Indigenous representation among employees and corporate leadership. Of 173 companies considered, only three firms identified Indigenous heritage as a quality sought in hiring board candidates. Only 5% of companies disclosed data about their training and education activities, such as the amount of funds provided in scholarships, while only 23% of firms described specific contracting or procurement policies for Indigenous businesses. To improve this situation, more firms should make explicit plans to integrate information about diversity and leadership, employment and advancement, contracting and procurement, training and education, and community investment into their annual reporting. In addition, to attract and retain Indigenous staff, companies must consider how they need to change their corporate culture and approaches to working to best support these individuals.

Firms hoping to improve their relations with Indigenous Peoples, and advance reconciliation goals in general, should review the [best practices](#) established by the Canadian Council for Aboriginal Business in their program on Progressive Aboriginal Relations. This guide includes specific recommendations related to recruitment and retention, supply chain engagement, community investment, and customer relations.

For more information about the integration of Indigenous peoples in the economy, review [this report by the International Labour Organization](#) (ILO) on the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, as well as its work on [economic and social rights](#) for Indigenous peoples.

5. Committing to Decolonization

Beyond committing to respecting Indigenous sovereignty, all companies should partake in the ongoing work of decolonization that entails unlearning settler colonial worldviews, understanding Indigenous perspectives, and weaving decolonial practice throughout all organizations and institutions. Businesses should aim to [understand the nature of settler colonialism](#), and the ways in which colonial legacies endure today. They should also make a commitment to genuine reconciliation practices, and engage in [cultural competency training](#) exercises for Indigenous relations. All employees should be required to engage with critical texts, including the seminal book [Indigenous Relations: Insights, Tips and Suggestions](#), as well as this [Reconciliation Toolkit for Business Leaders](#) developed by the Council of Aboriginal Peoples.

Businesses must learn to appreciate and respect [Indigenous Knowledge](#), and understand how this [differs from that of Western culture](#). Firms must refrain from the [theft of Indigenous Knowledge](#), a problem that is particularly severe in the international pharmaceutical industry as well as in the work of Indigenous engagement. For guidance on this issue, see the [First Nations Principles of OCAP®](#) (Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession) of the First Nations Information Governance Centre. Businesses should also recognize that many [principles of Indigenous Knowledge](#), such as systems thinking,

relationality, and intergenerational reciprocity are principles that must underlie all theories of change that aim for genuine sustainable development, and articulate a commitment to [Indigenous environmental justice](#).

Above all, businesses should understand that [decolonization is not a metaphor](#), and that genuine decolonial practice involves a commitment to prioritizing Indigenous voices, the land back movement, reparations for colonial violence, and other forms of solidarity. For more information, see this [Decolonization Toolkit](#) as well as this [solidarity action guide](#) from the Resource Generation, as well as [this article](#) which illustrates the differences between the concepts of decolonization and Indigenization.

Case Studies

Although there are far too many examples of corporate infringement on Indigenous rights, there are also case studies in which corporate-Indigenous relations involve a respect for community decision-making processes and the articulation of FPIC. One such example comes from the [Woodfibre Natural Gas project](#) that involved the building of a liquefied natural gas processing and export facility in the heart of the traditional territory of the Squamish Nation. At the same time that the Squamish Nation was helping lead vocal opposition to the expansion of the Trans Mountain pipeline project, it was engaged in a [community-driven impact assessment process with Woodfibre LNG](#) that was funded by the company, and included a legally binding private agreement to respect the outcome of the community consultation process regardless of its result. A robust deliberative process occurred with a focus on community meetings and direct dialogue, ultimately generating 25 conditions and mitigation measures that were all unilaterally accepted by the project developer. Following this productive process, the Squamish Chiefs and Council endorsed the project and consented to an Impact and Benefits Agreement. As this example shows, it is possible for companies to obtain FPIC when consultation processes are community-driven and corporations agree to respect the rights and voice of affected stakeholders in all situations.

Organizations/Initiatives

For more information about Indigenous issues, UNDRIP, FPIC, land rights, and Indigenous environmental justice, see information from the following organizations:

Indigenous Organizations (Canada)

- [Assembly of First Nations](#)
- [Congress of Aboriginal Peoples](#)
- [Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami](#)
- [Chiefs of Ontario](#)
- [Union of BC Indian Chiefs](#)
- [Métis National Council](#)
- [Native Women's Association of Canada](#)

NGOs (Canada)

- [Yellowhead Institute](#)
- [Reconciliation Canada](#)
- [Indspire](#)
- [Indigenous Climate Action](#)
- [IISAAK OLAM](#)
- [Water First](#)
- [Raven Trust](#)
- [Canadian Council for Aboriginal Business](#)
- [Raven Indigenous Capital Partners](#)
- [Legacy of Hope Foundation](#)
- [Canadian Roots Exchange](#)
- [First Nations Child and Family Caring Society](#)
- [True North Aid](#)

Indigenous Organizations and NGOs (International)

- [International Indian Treaty Council](#)
- [United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues](#)
- [ICCA Consortium](#)
- [International Working Group for Indigenous Affairs](#)
- [Cultural Survival](#)
- [Survival International](#)
- [Grassroots International](#)
- [Indigenous Environmental Network](#)
- [Forest Peoples Programme](#)
- [Coalition for the Human Rights of Indigenous Peoples](#)
- [Minority Rights Group International](#)
- [Incomindios](#)
- [Land Rights Now](#)
- [Amazon Watch](#)
- [World Rainforest Movement](#)
- [Health of Mother Earth Foundation](#)
- [Indigenous Rising](#)
- [Rights and Resources](#)
- [Save Our Roots](#)
- [Environmental Justice Foundation](#)