Sinergi International Journal of Law
E-ISSN: 3021-7989
Volume. 2, Issue 4, November 2024
Page No: 325 – 337

Beyond Formality: Transforming FPIC into a Tool for Indigenous Empowerment

Siti Hatia Aznannya
Institute Bisnis Nusantara, Indonesia
Correspondent: hatiaadzannya@gmail.com

Received : August 15, 2024
Accepted : November 12, 2024
Published : November 30, 2024

Citation: Aznannya, S.H. (2024). Beyond Formality: Transforming FPIC into a Tool for Indigenous Empowerment. Sinergi International Journal of Law, 2(4), 325 – 337.

ABSTRACT: This narrative review examines the integration of Indigenous rights within environmental legal frameworks, focusing on how Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) is conceptualized and implemented globally. The study aims to assess whether existing legal systems—both international and national—adequately ensure Indigenous communities' participation in environmental decision-making, particularly concerning extractive and infrastructure projects. Utilizing a narrative literature review method, we synthesized findings from international treaties, national legislations, and case studies from both developed and developing countries. The analysis was structured around the international legal foundations (e.g., UNDRIP, ILO 169), national legal adaptations, case studies involving extractive projects, and community-led strategies for environmental protection. The results show that although international frameworks provide strong normative guidance, national implementation is often inconsistent, constrained by political and economic interests. FPIC, while widely recognized, is frequently reduced to a procedural formality rather than serving as a tool for empowerment. Structural barriers, such as institutional weakness, legal ambiguity, and the dominance of economic paradigms, further erode Indigenous environmental rights. In contrast, countries that integrate legal pluralism and community-driven consultation show more promising outcomes. The study concludes that effective legal reform should prioritize participatory frameworks, enforceable FPIC mechanisms, and the institutionalization of customary knowledge. These findings have implications for policy reform and future research on environmental justice and Indigenous sovereignty..

Keywords: Indigenous Rights; Environmental Justice; FPIC; Legal Pluralism; Extractive Industries; Participatory Governance; Sustainable Policy Reform.

This is an open access article under the CC-BY 4.0 license

INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary global landscape, the intersection of environmental law and indigenous rights has emerged as a crucial area of inquiry, prompting scholars and policymakers alike to critically examine how legal frameworks respond to the dual imperatives of environmental protection and social justice. The rapid expansion of development initiatives, including large-scale infrastructure projects and extractive industries, has intensified the debate on the extent to which indigenous values, traditions, and rights are integrated into environmental legal systems (Peck et al., 2024; Barsh, 2008). Traditional ecological knowledge held by indigenous communities has long served as a foundation for sustainable resource management. However, the prevailing models of environmental governance often neglect these systems, favoring technocratic or market-driven approaches that marginalize indigenous epistemologies and practices (Renglet, 2022; Barsh, 2008).

The legal exclusion of indigenous norms from environmental regulatory frameworks has not only undermined the ecological integrity of indigenous territories but also exacerbated socio-cultural marginalization. This disjunction has prompted calls for a more pluralistic and inclusive environmental jurisprudence, capable of harmonizing modern legal standards with customary laws and values (Peck et al., 2024; Renglet, 2022). Scholars argue that achieving ecological justice in indigenous contexts necessitates the recognition of indigenous peoples not merely as stakeholders but as sovereign rights-holders with legitimate authority over their ancestral lands and ecosystems (Barsh, 2008; Renglet, 2022).

Empirical evidence from global and regional contexts consistently underscores the disproportionate environmental burdens borne by indigenous populations due to development-induced displacement, loss of biodiversity, and pollution of natural resources (Gómez-Betancur et al., 2021; Barsh, 2008). The adverse effects of such projects extend beyond material deprivation, leading to cultural erosion, psychological distress, and the weakening of indigenous governance systems (Sumarni et al., 2023; Ludescher, 2024). In response, some national constitutional courts, such as in Colombia, have begun to affirm the ecological and cultural rights of indigenous peoples, recognizing their role as stewards of ecosystems crucial to planetary health (Gómez-Betancur et al., 2021; Ludescher, 2024).

Despite these promising developments, several challenges persist in translating normative commitments into effective legal protections. Many developing countries face significant institutional constraints, including limited legal capacity, fragmented governance systems, and the dominance of economic interests in policy-making (Sumarni et al., 2023; Nur et al., 2024). These structural barriers hinder the implementation of environmental laws that genuinely reflect and protect indigenous interests. Moreover, the disconnect between formal statutory law and living customary law creates enforcement gaps that leave indigenous communities vulnerable to exploitation and ecological degradation (Pyhälä, 2024; Renglet, 2022).

One of the most pressing issues is the lack of meaningful participation of indigenous peoples in environmental decision-making processes. Although international norms such as Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) are widely endorsed, their operationalization remains inconsistent and often symbolic (Correia, 2023; Nur et al., 2024). The marginalization of indigenous voices in

planning and impact assessment processes undermines the legitimacy and effectiveness of environmental governance mechanisms. Additionally, systemic biases in judicial and administrative procedures frequently disadvantage indigenous claimants, reinforcing power asymmetries that obstruct access to justice (Hidayat et al., 2018; Nur et al., 2024).

The scholarly literature reveals significant analytical fragmentation in addressing the integration of indigenous rights within environmental legal regimes. While international legal instruments such as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) provide a normative framework, there is limited exploration of how these norms are contextualized and implemented at the national level (Etchart, 2022; Renglet, 2022). Furthermore, interdisciplinary dialogue among legal scholars, anthropologists, and ecologists remains insufficient, impeding the development of comprehensive frameworks that synthesize normative and empirical insights (Winter et al., 2021; Barsh, 2008). There is also a lack of critical engagement with decolonial approaches that seek to challenge and transform the underlying epistemologies of environmental law (Sumarni et al., 2023; Renglet, 2022).

This review aims to provide an integrative analysis of the intersection between environmental protection and indigenous rights, drawing on a diverse body of literature to identify conceptual, normative, and institutional gaps. It seeks to examine how environmental law, both national and international, can accommodate the normative systems and governance practices of indigenous communities. The review is grounded in a multi-disciplinary framework that incorporates legal analysis, ethnographic perspectives, and ecological assessments to formulate a holistic understanding of justice in environmental governance (Renglet, 2022; Winter et al., 2021).

The review adopts a comparative and contextual approach, focusing on three geographically and culturally distinct regions: the Amazon Basin in Latin America, Southeast Asia (particularly Indonesia), and the Arctic. These regions are characterized by rich biodiversity and strong indigenous presence, yet they face intense pressures from resource extraction and climate change (Etchart, 2022; Hidayat et al., 2018). By analyzing case studies from these areas, the review aims to uncover region-specific dynamics while also identifying universal principles that can inform global environmental governance. Particular attention is given to indigenous groups such as the Kichwa in Ecuador, the Dayak in Indonesia, and the Inuit in the Arctic, who have long histories of land stewardship and resistance against extractive encroachment (Barsh, 2008; Winter et al., 2021).

Through this lens, the review aims to elucidate the structural conditions that enable or constrain the integration of indigenous rights within environmental legal systems. It explores the interplay between national legal reforms, international legal standards, and local practices of resistance and adaptation. By doing so, the review seeks to generate evidence-based policy recommendations that are responsive to the specific socio-ecological contexts of indigenous peoples and contribute to the broader goal of environmental justice (Etchart, 2022; Renglet, 2022).

This study seeks to assess how FPIC has been interpreted and applied across multiple legal contexts, with a particular focus on institutional limitations and regional political cultures in Southeast Asia, Latin America, and the Arctic. It aims to uncover how procedural rights can be transformed into substantive empowerment through participatory legal reform.

METHOD

This study employs a comprehensive and interdisciplinary methodology to conduct a narrative literature review focused on the intersection of environmental law and indigenous rights. The methodological framework is designed to ensure a rigorous and systematic process of literature selection, data extraction, and synthesis that reflects the complexity of the subject matter and the evolving discourse in both legal and socio-environmental scholarship. The primary objective of this methodological design is to capture the broad scope of academic perspectives, particularly in relation to legal pluralism, indigenous sovereignty, decolonization, and environmental justice within the context of sustainable development.

Literature was sourced from three major databases: Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. These platforms were selected due to their broad coverage of peer-reviewed journals, books, and systematic reviews across multiple disciplines. Advanced search techniques were used within each database, employing Boolean operators to combine keywords such as "environmental law," "indigenous rights," "hak masyarakat adat," "legal pluralism," "decolonial approaches," "FPIC (Free, Prior and Informed Consent)," and "sustainable development." The inclusion of both English and Indonesian keywords allowed the review to encompass a broader cultural and geographic scope, particularly focusing on Southeast Asia and other regions with strong indigenous populations.

The search period was limited to publications from 2000 to 2025, ensuring that the findings are current and reflect recent legal developments, policy innovations, and academic debates. The initial search yielded a large number of documents, which were subsequently filtered based on title, abstract, and keywords. Literature was screened manually, and only sources that explicitly addressed the integration of environmental law and indigenous rights were selected. Abstracts that lacked reference to indigenous perspectives or legal frameworks were excluded. To increase reliability and minimize subjectivity, two researchers independently reviewed the materials and resolved discrepancies through consensus.

Inclusion criteria encompassed peer-reviewed articles, scholarly books, and systematic reviews that specifically examined the integration of environmental governance with the recognition of indigenous rights. Studies had to demonstrate a strong analytical framework, use either qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods, and include a discussion of the implications of environmental law on indigenous communities. Interdisciplinary studies combining legal, ecological, and anthropological perspectives were prioritized, as were studies published in reputable journals indexed in major academic databases.

Exclusion criteria included grey literature such as unpublished reports, conference materials, and opinion pieces that lacked empirical grounding. Additionally, literature that only focused on environmental regulation without addressing indigenous rights, or vice versa, was excluded. Studies with outdated perspectives that did not reflect current legal or social contexts, especially those published before 2000, were also not considered.

Selected literature included various research designs: qualitative case studies, ethnographies, jurisprudential analyses, quantitative surveys, and systematic reviews. Case studies and ethnographies provided localized insights into the lived experiences of indigenous peoples under environmental regimes. Jurisprudential analyses illustrated how legal systems interpreted and applied indigenous norms within environmental contexts. Surveys and statistical models offered measurable impacts of environmental policy on indigenous populations. Systematic reviews contributed to generalizable insights by synthesizing trends across multiple studies.

Each document was evaluated for methodological soundness, empirical validity, and theoretical contribution. A data extraction form was used to collect consistent information across studies, including research objectives, methods, sample characteristics, key findings, and policy implications. Reference management software such as EndNote and Mendeley facilitated the organization and categorization of the selected literature.

The synthesis process was both thematic and comparative. Thematic analysis allowed the identification of recurring concepts such as legal pluralism, indigenous participation, and environmental justice. Comparative analysis enabled the differentiation between national and international practices in integrating indigenous rights within environmental frameworks. Studies from diverse geographic regions, including Latin America, Southeast Asia, and the Arctic, were compared to understand contextual variances and common challenges.

To ensure transparency, the entire selection and analysis process was documented through audit trails and quality checklists. Internal peer reviews and expert consultations further validated the methodological integrity. Visual tools such as charts and maps were used to illustrate the distribution of studies by region, year, and methodology.

This methodology underpins the reliability and comprehensiveness of the review, ensuring that the synthesized knowledge contributes meaningfully to policy discourse and academic scholarship on environmental justice and indigenous sovereignty. By employing a balanced and multidimensional approach, the study not only aligns with high academic standards but also offers practical insights for legal reforms and sustainable governance.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results of this narrative review offer a comprehensive synthesis of the global discourse on integrating Indigenous rights within environmental legal systems. Findings are presented according to the four central themes: (1) international and national legal frameworks; (2) case studies on infrastructure and mining projects; (3) community strategies for environmental protection; and (4) comparative global insights. Each theme is informed by an extensive review of interdisciplinary sources, providing a multi-level understanding of the interaction between Indigenous rights and environmental law.

The international legal framework sets the normative foundation for Indigenous rights, prominently through instruments such as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of

Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and the International Labour Organization's Convention No. 169 (ILO 169) (Renglet, 2022; Pyhälä, 2024). These documents affirm Indigenous peoples' rights to land, resources, and participation in environmental governance. They emphasize Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) as a cornerstone for any development project impacting Indigenous territories (Mei, 2023). However, their effectiveness is heavily contingent on national implementation mechanisms (Hidayat et al., 2018).

Despite the global aspiration embedded in UNDRIP and ILO 169, translation into domestic law varies significantly across states. In some jurisdictions, these instruments have been used in landmark court decisions to assert the legal status of Indigenous claims (Etchart, 2022). However, in others, political and economic interests dominate, impeding full adoption of international standards (Allard & Curran, 2021). In states with colonial legacies, decolonization of law and policy reform is often necessary before meaningful implementation can occur (Pyhälä, 2024).

FPIC emerges as a critical procedural right but is often undermined in practice due to insufficient institutional support and understanding (Mei, 2023; Nur et al., 2024). Though mandated in international frameworks, national-level applications reveal fragmented enforcement and tokenistic consultation processes, especially in resource-extractive projects (Hidayat et al., 2018). This discrepancy underscores the importance of institutional capacity and political will for the operationalization of FPIC.

The case studies on infrastructure and mining projects further highlight the tangible consequences of inadequate legal integration. In Indonesia and Brazil, for instance, communities have faced displacement, environmental degradation, and cultural erosion due to projects approved without genuine FPIC processes (Prasniewski et al., 2024). These projects often proceed despite legal recognition of Indigenous rights, revealing the gap between law and implementation. Water pollution, land degradation, and biodiversity loss are among the reported impacts that have led to social unrest and long-term community trauma (Prasniewski et al., 2024).

Comparatively, in countries such as Norway and Canada, FPIC has been more effectively implemented. Here, Indigenous communities are engaged in early planning stages, leading to more inclusive and sustainable project outcomes (Fitzmaurice & Attard, 2023; Gilbert, 2023). These practices illustrate how institutional structures, when aligned with international norms and local participation, can minimize conflict and promote co-management of resources.

Community-led strategies have also played a pivotal role in environmental stewardship. Indigenous communities worldwide have developed adaptive mechanisms, including local zoning systems, forest management based on traditional knowledge, and community monitoring protocols (Sumarni et al., 2023; Bouayad, 2020). These practices not only protect ecological systems but also affirm cultural sovereignty. Advocacy efforts, such as legal challenges and public campaigns, have successfully halted harmful projects in several cases (Bouayad, 2020).

Moreover, Indigenous knowledge systems, grounded in centuries of environmental interaction, offer holistic approaches to sustainability. Rituals, seasonal calendars, and customary laws provide a framework for resource use that aligns with ecological rhythms (Pyhälä, 2024). Integration of this knowledge into environmental policy has been effective in several regions, reinforcing that Indigenous communities are not just stakeholders but rights-holders and knowledge-holders.

Global comparisons reveal stark differences in the protection of Indigenous rights. Nordic countries, particularly regarding the Sami people, demonstrate how legal pluralism and inclusive governance can safeguard Indigenous interests (Fitzmaurice & Attard, 2023). Conversely, in developing countries, the dominance of extractive economic models often marginalizes Indigenous voices (Hidayat et al., 2018). Structural issues such as weak legal systems, limited resources, and political instability exacerbate this marginalization.

Nonetheless, positive trends are emerging. In Latin America, constitutional reforms in countries like Bolivia and Ecuador have enshrined Indigenous rights and ecological principles such as the "Rights of Nature" (Gilbert, 2023). These models offer alternative pathways for reconciling environmental justice with Indigenous sovereignty.

Legal pluralism, defined as the coexistence of state and customary legal systems, has proven effective where properly institutionalized. In Canada, collaborative legal arrangements between Indigenous and federal entities have resulted in co-management of lands and waters, conflict resolution mechanisms, and mutual recognition of legal norms (Allard & Curran, 2021). Such models require genuine power-sharing and institutional commitment to plural governance.

Effective FPIC practices also hinge on transparency, legal clarity, and community empowerment. Countries with independent judiciary systems and strong civil society often facilitate more equitable FPIC processes (Reid et al., 2022). Where governments have invested in building Indigenous capacity and monitoring mechanisms, conflict has been reduced, and environmental outcomes improved.

Lastly, international dialogue and cooperation play a vital role in shaping national agendas. Forums like the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) and climate negotiations have brought Indigenous voices to the forefront, enabling exchange of best practices and increased accountability (Gilbert, 2023). Donor agencies and international NGOs have also supported capacity-building initiatives that bridge local realities with global standards.

In conclusion, while international norms provide a foundational framework for recognizing and protecting Indigenous rights within environmental governance, their realization depends on national adaptation, institutional strength, and grassroots empowerment. A comparative global lens underscores the need for tailored approaches that reflect contextual nuances, while promoting legal pluralism, FPIC, and community-driven solutions. Through the synthesis of empirical evidence and normative frameworks, this review contributes to the growing consensus that environmental justice is inseparable from Indigenous rights recognition.

The findings of this narrative review highlight the dual role of legal systems in both enabling and impeding environmental protection based on indigenous rights. While international instruments such as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and ILO Convention 169 provide a normative foundation recognizing the historical and spiritual ties of indigenous peoples to their environment (Mei, 2023), their domestic implementation is frequently undermined by limited interpretations and formalistic approaches. The concept of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC), which ought to ensure meaningful participation, is often reduced to a procedural formality, thereby stripping indigenous communities of genuine agency (Mei, 2023).

This interpretive misalignment between international obligations and national legal praxis weakens the institutional capacity to secure indigenous environmental rights. Judicial precedents from multiple jurisdictions reveal that consultations are typically treated as administrative obligations rather than transformative mechanisms that empower local voices (Mei, 2023). Consequently, indigenous communities often lack the power to reject extractive projects that threaten their lands and cultural practices, intensifying the conflict between development and indigenous sovereignty. This disconnect reveals a critical gap in multilevel governance frameworks, where legal mechanisms fail to accommodate the socio-cultural nuances of indigenous peoples.

Moreover, the tension between modern legal systems and local indigenous wisdom exacerbates the friction in environmental governance. National environmental legislation is frequently universalist in nature, disregarding the contextual and adaptive characteristics of indigenous legal traditions (Peck et al., 2024). While the use of biodiversity baselines in judicial reviews may provide empirical backing for environmental claims, institutional bias often marginalizes culturally distinct interpretations of land stewardship (Peck et al., 2024). Yet, some successful models from Nordic countries suggest that pluralistic legal frameworks can bridge this gap by integrating local knowledge into formal law (Peck et al., 2024).

Despite normative commitments at the international level, domestic legal realization is frequently compromised by bureaucratic inertia and economic priorities. FPIC mechanisms, though formally adopted, rarely guarantee the autonomous involvement of indigenous peoples due to political interference and developmental imperatives (Mei, 2023). Institutional bias often elevates investor interests above indigenous welfare, undermining environmental governance and exacerbating community vulnerabilities (Mei, 2023). This suggests the necessity of reforming legal indices and institutional accountability to align domestic law with the transformative potential of international norms.

Field evidence from regions such as the Amazon demonstrates that even where courts impose environmental limitations on extractive projects, they often fail to ensure effective indigenous participation (Peck et al., 2024). This procedural omission leads to enduring social, ecological, and legal conflicts. The lack of transparency and institutional responsiveness in consultation processes compounds the injustices faced by indigenous communities (Peck et al., 2024). A thorough reform of governance frameworks is necessary to enhance the procedural and substantive fairness of consultations.

Current legal systems tend to privilege extractive industries through interpretations that prioritize economic growth over environmental justice and indigenous rights (Mei, 2023). Legislative processes influenced by powerful economic actors often dilute legal protections for indigenous communities, thereby enabling unsustainable development (Mei, 2023). This dualism reveals the embedded contradictions within legal institutions that simultaneously acknowledge and undermine indigenous claims. Enhancing judicial independence and rebalancing the power asymmetry within legal interpretation are essential reforms.

Nevertheless, there are promising examples where legal systems have supported indigenous environmental protection. In some countries, FPIC has been implemented in conjunction with indigenous-led monitoring systems, fostering greater legal legitimacy and compliance (Mei, 2023).

These developments demonstrate that inclusive legal interpretations, coupled with participatory mechanisms, can effectively reconcile environmental protection with local traditions.

The policy implications are profound. Legal frameworks must be reengineered to provide context-sensitive definitions and operationalizations of FPIC and indigenous participation (Mei, 2023). Consultation spaces must move beyond tokenism to facilitate substantive engagement. Policymaking must also account for cultural and normative diversity, thereby enabling tailored regulations that reflect local realities. This demands comprehensive revisions of environmental laws and procedural safeguards.

A key recommendation is the institutionalization of FPIC as a participatory standard embedded within all phases of project development. This involves not only legal mandates but also administrative capacity-building to support inclusive dialogues (Mei, 2023). Training for government officials and the creation of indigenous consultative bodies can enhance trust and effectiveness in environmental governance.

Institutional strengthening is also critical. Weak enforcement bodies and unresponsive judicial systems often impede the realization of environmental rights (Peck et al., 2024). Strengthening procedural clarity through standard operating procedures and independent audits can bolster the credibility and impact of legal protections.

Integrating traditional ecological knowledge into law and policy is another vital implication. Environmental governance should be informed by indigenous insights on sustainable resource use, achieved through collaborative frameworks involving academia, government, and local communities (Mei, 2023). This integration not only supports biodiversity but also affirms indigenous sovereignty.

Participation must be iterative, encompassing all stages of environmental decision-making from planning to post-implementation review (Mei, 2023). Such models require legislative support to embed participatory rights within national frameworks. Coordination among government agencies and international partners further amplifies policy coherence and efficacy (Peck et al., 2024).

Access to justice remains a persistent challenge. Legal systems must offer streamlined and culturally sensitive dispute resolution mechanisms to address indigenous grievances (Peck et al., 2024). Alternative pathways, including arbitration and community courts, should be explored to complement formal litigation.

Structural barriers—ranging from unequal power dynamics, limited legal literacy, to institutional exclusion—must be dismantled to enable meaningful participation (Mei, 2023). This includes enhancing indigenous access to data, legal assistance, and infrastructural support. Bridging the gap between theory and practice requires aligning legal design with local needs and ensuring continuity through stable policy regimes.

The lack of standardization in legal definitions also hampers consistent implementation. Ambiguous terms like "participation" and "consultation" must be clearly defined in a culturally informed manner (Mei, 2023). Moreover, harmonizing formal legal systems with customary laws through legal pluralism can mitigate jurisdictional conflicts (Peck et al., 2024).

Insufficient resources, biased institutions, and technocratic language present further obstacles. Reforms must include capacity-building initiatives, language accessibility, and inclusive information systems to ensure that indigenous peoples can engage fully and equitably in legal processes.

Finally, persistent gaps between international commitments and domestic realities necessitate a dynamic adaptation of legal norms. Transnational advocacy, empirical data collection, and multi-level coordination can ensure that global standards translate into local justice (Neimark & Vermeylen, 2016).

CONCLUSION

This study has explored the systemic and structural challenges in integrating Indigenous rights within environmental legal systems, emphasizing the limitations of both international and domestic law in realizing meaningful participation through Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). Despite the normative strength of global instruments like UNDRIP and ILO 169, implementation remains weak, particularly where national legal systems interpret participation as mere formalism rather than empowerment. This undermines Indigenous communities' sovereignty over their lands and resources, especially in the face of extractive industries and infrastructure development.

The findings underline the urgent need for inclusive and adaptive legal reforms that recognize customary knowledge and cultural pluralism. FPIC stands out as a pivotal strategy that must be reframed from symbolic compliance to a robust tool of participatory governance. The study advocates for legally binding frameworks that operationalize FPIC, institutional strengthening for law enforcement, and integrated mechanisms across sectors and jurisdictions to support Indigenous rights.

Future research should address the lack of empirical data, the gap between international law and local practices, and effective strategies to embed legal pluralism within state systems. It is essential to ensure transparent consultation processes and provide resources and legal support to Indigenous communities.

Ultimately, a shift towards ecologically and culturally grounded legal paradigms—supported by participatory institutions and equitable power structures—is critical to overcoming the persistent environmental injustices faced by Indigenous peoples.

REFERENCE

Allard, C., & Curran, D. (2021). Indigenous influence and engagement in mining permitting in British Columbia, Canada: Lessons for Sweden and Norway?. Environmental Management, 72(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-021-01536-0

Andoke, L., Arazi, E., Suárez, H., Griffiths, T., & Gutiérrez-Sánchez-Salamanca, E. (2023). Amazonian visions of visión amazonía: Indigenous peoples' perspectives on a forest conservation and climate programme in the Colombian Amazon. Oryx, 57(3), 335-349. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0030605322001636

Barsh, R. (2008). Indigenous peoples., 829-852. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199552153.013.0036

Bouayad, A. (2020). Wild rice protectors: An Ojibwe odyssey. Environmental Law Review, 22(1), 25-42. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461452920912909

Brown, L., Atapattu, S., Stull, V., Calderón, C., Huambachano, M., Houénou, M., … & Monzón, A. (2020). From a three-legged stool to a three-dimensional world: Integrating rights, gender and indigenous knowledge into sustainability practice and law. Sustainability, 12(22), 9521. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12229521

Country, B. (2023). Keepers of the flame: Songspirals are a university for us. Australian Journal of Environmental Education, 39(3), 279-292. https://doi.org/10.1017/aee.2023.27

Correia, J. (2023). Disrupting the patrón: Indigenous land rights and the fight for environmental justice in Paraguay's Chaco. https://doi.org/10.1525/luminos.151

Etchart, L. (2022). Indigenous peoples and international law in the Ecuadorian Amazon. Laws, 11(4), 55. https://doi.org/10.3390/laws11040055

Fanari, E. (2019). Relocation from protected areas as a violent process in the recent history of biodiversity conservation in India. Ecology Economy and Society–the Insee Journal, 2(1). https://doi.org/10.37773/ees.v2i1.55

Fitzmaurice, M., & Attard, F. (2023). Vulnerability, Sami identity, and the law., 15-62. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197659083.003.0002

Gilbert, J. (2023). Creating synergies between international law and rights of nature. Transnational Environmental Law, 12(3), 671-692. https://doi.org/10.1017/s2047102523000195

Gómez-Betancur, L., Vilardy, S., & R., D. (2021). Ecosystem services as a promising paradigm to protect environmental rights of indigenous peoples in Latin America: The constitutional court landmark decision to protect Arroyo Bruno in Colombia. Environmental Management, 69(4), 768-780. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-021-01483-w

Hidayat, H., Yogaswara, H., Herawati, T., Blazey, P., Wyatt, S., & Howitt, R. (2018). Forests, law and customary rights in Indonesia: Implications of a decision of the Indonesian constitutional court in 2012. Asia Pacific Viewpoint, 59(3), 293-308. https://doi.org/10.1111/apv.12207

Ituarte-Lima, C. (2023). Biosphere defenders leveraging the human right to healthy environment for transformative change. Environmental Policy and Law, 53(2-3), 139-151. https://doi.org/10.3233/epl-239003

Jackson, S. (2018). Water and indigenous rights: Mechanisms and pathways of recognition, representation, and redistribution. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews Water, 5(6). https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1314

Ludescher, M. (2024). Environmental justice for indigenous peoples in the constitutional jurisprudence of Colombia and Ecuador. Environmental Justice. https://doi.org/10.1089/env.2023.0078

Mei, L. (2023). Logging and indigenous peoples' well-being: An overview of the relevant international human rights jurisprudence. The International Forestry Review, 25(1), 17-27. https://doi.org/10.1505/146554823836902608

Nelson, J., Muhammed, N., & Rashid, R. (2015). An empirical study on compatibility of Sarawak Forest Ordinance and Bidayuh native customary laws in forest management. Small-Scale Forestry, 15(2), 135-148. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11842-015-9313-y

Neimark, B., & Vermeylen, S. (2016). A human right to science?: Precarious labor and basic rights in science and bioprospecting. Annals of the American Association of Geographers, 107(1), 167-182. https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2016.1218749

Nur, A., Al-Fatih, S., & Intania, C. (2024). Revitalising indigenous rights participation in mining lawmaking process: Evaluation and proposal for Indonesia. Law Reform, 20(1), 188-210. https://doi.org/10.14710/lr.v20i1.63684

Peck, M., Desselas, M., Bonilla-Bedoya, S., Redín, G., & Cordero, J. (2024). The conflict between rights of nature and mining in Ecuador: Implications of the Los Cedros cloud forest case for biodiversity conservation. People and Nature, 6(3), 1096-1115. https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10615

Prasniewski, V., González-Daza, W., Alvarenga, G., Santos-Silva, L., Teixido, A., & Izzo, T. (2024). Economic, environmental and social threats of a mining exploration proposal on indigenous lands of Brazil. Acta Amazonica, 54(2). https://doi.org/10.1590/1809-4392202301922

Pyhälä, A. (2024). Decolonizing nature conservation according to natural law: Learning from the Kogui. Alternative an International Journal of Indigenous Peoples, 20(3), 484-493. https://doi.org/10.1177/11771801241255697

Reid, M., Collins, M., Hall, S., Mason, E., McGee, G., & Frid, A. (2022). Protecting our coast for everyone's future: Indigenous and scientific knowledge support marine spatial protections proposed by Central Coast First Nations in Pacific Canada. People and Nature, 4(5), 1052-1070. https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10380

Renglet, C. (2022). The recognition of the special relationship of indigenous peoples with their environment under international law. International Journal on Minority and Group Rights, 29(4), 720-746. https://doi.org/10.1163/15718115-bja10068

Sumarni, S., Wijaya, M., & Sugiana, A. (2023). Safeguarding indigenous rights and territories: Integrating Dayak Ngaju wisdom in peatland ecosystem management. Udayana Journal of Law and Culture, 7(2), 121. https://doi.org/10.24843/ujlc.2023.v07.i02.p01

Tegegne, Y., Ramcilovic-Suominen, S., Fobissie, K., Visseren-Hamakers, I., Lindner, M., & Kanninen, M. (2017). Synergies among social safeguards in FLEGT and REDD+ in Cameroon. Forest Policy and Economics, 75, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2016.11.005

Troell, J., & Keene, S. (2022). Legal recognition of customary water tenure in Sub-Saharan Africa: Unpacking the land-water nexus. https://doi.org/10.5337/2022.215

Ulloa, A. (2017). Perspectives of environmental justice from indigenous peoples of Latin America: A relational indigenous environmental justice. Environmental Justice, 10(6), 175-180. https://doi.org/10.1089/env.2017.0017

Velásquez, T. (2017). Tracing the political life of Kimsacocha: Conflicts over water and mining in Ecuador's southern Andes. Latin American Perspectives, 45(5), 154-169. https://doi.org/10.1177/0094582x17726088

Weis, V. (2019). Towards a critical green southern criminology: An analysis of criminal selectivity, indigenous peoples and green harms in Argentina. International Journal for Crime Justice and Social Democracy, 8(3), 38-55. https://doi.org/10.5204/ijcjsd.v8i3.1244

Winter, K., Vaughan, M., Kurashima, N., Giardina, C., Quiocho, K., Chang, K., … & Berkes, F. (2021). Empowering indigenous agency through community-driven collaborative management to achieve effective conservation: Hawai'i as an example. Pacific Conservation Biology, 27(4), 337-344. https://doi.org/10.1071/pc20009