

Summary of consultations by IPAF representatives with Local/Indigenous bauxite mining communities on ASI's Standards (ASI-IPAF)



Contribution of IPAF Members to the revisions of ASI standards

Date April 2021

Edited by Mark Annandale and Dr Penda Diallo

Both editors engaged by the University of the Sunshine Coast, Queensland Australia for this report

Contributing authors:

- Fr. Nicholas Barla, SVD Secretary CBCI Office for Tribal Affairs. CBCI Center, New Delhi. India.
- Louise Biswane, Organisation of Kaliña and Lokono in Marowijne (KLIM), Suriname.
- Diallo Aboubacar, Coordinateur du Comité de gestion du CECIDE. Conakry, Guinea.
- Abu Karimu, Settle Ghana, Accra, Ghana.

Executive Summary: This report summarises consultations held in various countries including Guinea, Ghana, Suriname, India, and Australia, with IPAF members, to include the voice of Indigenous communities in the next version of the ASI Performance Standard, and the ASI Chain of Custody Standards. Through the consultation, ASI plans to ensure that its standards consider Indigenous Peoples' concerns and views in bauxite mining regions.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Methodology	5
Consultation Guidance Notes	5
2.1 Guinea.....	6
2.2 Suriname.....	14
2.3 India	17
2.4 Ghana.....	21
2.5 Australia.....	23
3. Common communities' concerns, to be addressed and supported by the standards.	26
4. Conclusion	26
5. Recommendations	27

Acronyms

Acronym	Name
FPIC	Free, Prior, and Informed Consent
ASI	Aluminium Stewardship Initiative
IPAF	Indigenous Peoples Advisory Forum
AGR	Revenue Generating Activities
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
MDC	Mines for Community Development
SMB	Société Minière de Boké
COBAD	Compagnie de Bauxite de Dian-Dian (RUSAL)
CBG	Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinée
KLIM	Kalina and Lokono Indigenous of the Marowijne

1. Introduction

The Aluminium Stewardship Initiative (ASI) commenced revisions of its standards in 2020, over an 18-month period. In 2020, ASI focused on drafting the revised language of its norms and standard documents. The revised documents were made available to the public in March 2021 for first 60-day public consultation, including the Indigenous Peoples Advisory Forum's (IPAF).

The objective of the first round of discussions is to draft revisions so that ASI can receive feedback from all stakeholders, and to refine the language further, if and where necessary. With this aim, ASI provided funding to support IPAF representatives with consultations in various bauxite mining communities in their countries. The consultations' objectives were to include Indigenous communities' voices in the next version of the ASI Performance Standard and the ASI Chain of Custody Standards. ASI also offered independent and remote technical support to various IPAF country representatives.

This report covers consultation with various bauxite mining communities, including countries with a long history of bauxite mining (Guinea and Australia); others where mines have recently closed or are in care and maintenance, and communities that are struggling with post-closure challenges (Suriname and India); and countries which are at the early stages of embarking on major bauxite mining projects (Ghana).

It is only through the inclusion of Indigenous People's concerns that mining companies can contribute to the sustainable development goals and responsible mining initiatives. Through IPAF, ASI hopes to ensure that its standards consider these concerns in bauxite mining areas globally.

The Standards Committee will discuss the feedback received during the 60-day consultation and prepare new versions of the revised documents for the next and last public consultation in Q3 of 2021. See the timeline graphic below for more information.

It is important to note that during the annual IPAF meetings, IPAF member discussions at both ASI Annual General Meetings and around ASI working group meetings and from other IPAF discussions that a number of matters identified by IPAF members were logged as a record, action and for consideration in the standard review process. A number of these matters have already been included in the revisions process including the

Assurance Manual:

- A requirement that Indigenous Peoples be engaged in the audit process where they are impacted by an operation undergoing certification (Assurance Manual Section 8.4.3)
- Additional time in audits where there are Indigenous Peoples to ensure Auditors have time to engage Indigenous Peoples and evaluate respect of rights of Indigenous Peoples and Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) (section 8.6 - Table 16)
- Guidelines in the Assurance Manual on engaging Indigenous Peoples (Section 8.10.1)
- Auditors must now share public audit reports with Indigenous Peoples after the audit (Section 8.20)

Performance Standard:

- Required that legacy issues be addressed in environmental and human rights impact assessments (Criterion 2.5/2.6)
- Companies are now required to proactively disclose the requirements of the relevant components of the ASI Standard to Indigenous Peoples (9.3b)
- Bauxite companies must get FPIC prior to entering a new phase of operations and prior to altering a rehabilitation plan (the idea of continuous FPIC) (9.4b)
- Companies must demonstrate that FPIC is supported by the Indigenous community. (9.4c)
- Greater requirements for companies to demonstrate that the resettlement plan meets its objectives (the existing requirements to have plans were strengthened by putting the onus on the companies to demonstrate that the plan was effective in implementation). Both the plan and the progress against the plan are public. (9.6 c/d)
- Greater transparency throughout with plans, policies, monitoring reports being made publicly available and/or made available to Indigenous Peoples. (See Section 6 of the PS Guidance for a list of all Criteria)
- Increased requirement for consultation throughout. (See Section 7 of the PS Guidance for a list of all Criteria)
- In the Guidance, inclusion of Indigenous customary law, including Protocols, for Criterion 1.1 on Applicable Law.

2. Methodology

ASI sent an email to all IPAF members regarding the consultation process and their wish to collaborate with IPAF representatives, to include Indigenous communities' voices in the next version of the ASI Performance Standard, and the ASI Chain of Custody Standards. In response to ASI's request, several representatives answered the call, and these representatives received the support necessary to start the consultation. Each representative received an email with guidance notes, including a two-page summary of the aim of the revision process; a stakeholder engagement form, for completion before consultations; and a guideline on the outcome ASI requires from the different consultations. Prior to the consultations, members were asked to share any foreseen challenges regarding the expected delivery, and to let ASI know the outputs to which they could commit, considering their local realities.

Consultation Guidance Notes

The key questions and discussion points that guided the consultations are listed below:

1. What do you know about ASI and IPAF?
 - a. If you knew about it, what is your opinion?
2. What are the historical issues with mining in your region?
 - a. Did you get any benefits from mining?
 - b. What are the impacts of mining on the land (plants, animals, soil, water, etc.)?
3. How can those problems be fixed?
 - a. What are some solutions?
 - b. How can Indigenous People/communities be involved now, to help fix the problems?
4. What is your opinion of the mine rehabilitation?
 - a. What can be done to improve mine rehabilitation?
5. Has Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) been discussed in your communities?

ASI-IPAF-Summary of Consultations

- a. What do you know of FPIC?
 - b. What sort of information do you need, to make informed decisions?
 - c. Do you need any specialist or technical advice?
6. Has community resettlement happened because of mining? If so, what is your experience, and how could that be improved?

Before the consultations, each lead IPAF representative in charge of the in-country consultations committed to the following:

- To respect social distancing measures in-country, for all consultations, and make no compromise to their health or the health of participants during face-to-face discussions.
- Ensure that the IPAF consultation is focused on the ASI Performance Standard and the ASI Chain of Custody Standard Revision and share a summary of communities' considerations and inputs.
 - a. The consultation will not be used as an advocacy space, or a medium to discuss non-ASI-related matters.
- Undertake a minimum of five consultations where possible, which last between 2 hours to 4 hours.
- To ensure the quality of discussions, groups will not include more than ten people if face-to-face, particularly in COVID-19.
- Be inclusive, and ensure gender equity, by consulting with various community members, including women, men, youths, elderly, and disabled groups, where present.

Output - Each representative committed to delivering the following:

- A completed stakeholder engagement form.
- To complete the consultation by August 30, 2020. Due to COVID-19, the August date was extended to December 2020.
- A summary of between two and five pages to share with ASI before September 15, 2020. Due to COVID-19, this date was extended to the end of December 2020.

The documents shared by ASI served as the discussion guide. Focus group discussions were used as the main data collection methodology.

The consultation process with local communities took place between October 2020 and February 2021. Because of COVID-19, some consultations were delayed in respect of national rules regarding limitations on the movement and gathering of people across countries. Below are further details on the methodology of the consultations in the different IPAF countries.

2.1 Guinea

In Guinea, the consultations were led by the NGO-Mines for Community Development (MDC), a member of the IPAF. MDC organised several consultations in selected bauxite mining communities, to gather Indigenous communities' concerns to incorporate them into ASI's review process. The consultations took place from the 2nd to the 5th of October 2020, in Boké Prefecture, notably in Hamdallaye, M'Body Foullasso, Katougouma and Khoundindé (Boffa Prefecture).

ASI-IPAF-Summary of Consultations

To ensure the consultations' success, the executive director of the NGO-MDC held a virtual meeting, at which he explained to the NGO members the purpose, importance, and standards, of ASI-IPAF, without obscuring the purpose of the scheduled consultations.

The consultations took place in the regions where about 90% of bauxite mining activities occur. To enhance the diversity of opinions, and consider the concerns of different communities, a decision was made to diversify the locations of consultation to include communities impacted by different mining companies and at different stages of the extraction and transport chain. The consultations took place in areas of operation of four main companies, including the Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinée (CBG), Société Minière de Boké (SMB), Alufer Mining and Compagnie de Bauxite de Dian-Dian-RUSAL (COBAD-subsi-dary of RUSAL). Extractive activities are carried out at two mining locations: Hamdallaye (CBG) and MBody Foulla (COBAD-RUSAL), while the other two locations are shipping ports used by two different mining companies, Katougouma by SMB and Khoundindé by ALUFER.

Focus groups were the main methodology used in the targeted communities. Key open questions and debates guided the discussions, which were conducted in the local language of each location to ensure the effectiveness of the consultation with communities.

The findings from Guinea, Suriname, India, Australia, and Ghana are summarised. The results from Guinea are presented by location because the locations where the consultations took place are diverse. In attempting to summarise the findings without differentiation, there is a risk of losing diversity in local communities' concerns.

The consultations took place in four areas, where four different mining companies operate. There were no additional difficulties encountered during the consultations that limited discussions.

The consultations revealed a considerable gap between negative and positive impacts through the extraction value chain, from extraction to bauxite-loading into ships, for export. To minimise the negative impacts of mining activities, there is a new local content policy in place. For now, communities remain the prey of mining companies, who continue to transport bauxite without proper consideration of the social, economic, and cultural rights of impacted Indigenous communities.

Some communities claim to have heard of ASI and IPAF through the NGO-MDC previously, while for others, the consultation was their first opportunity. All participants welcomed ASI's objectives and believed that if companies that exploit their land join ASI, it could encourage them to respect Indigenous communities' rights.

Therefore, there was immense interest and significant participation from the Indigenous communities during each location's consultations. Communities have shown full support for ASI's principles and values, and of IPAF's objectives. Therefore, it will be necessary for ASI to consider communities' recommendations to meet their expectations.

Indigenous community members expressed strong gratitude for the consideration of their input toward ASI standards.

Above all, they want ASI to consider their concerns in its standards. Most importantly, they hope ASI standards protect their rights, and defend them in all its meetings, and with all aluminium client companies, and pressure local bauxite mining companies to do the same.

Communities are now eager to find out more about ASI. They want more information that will enable them to strengthen their capacity to protect their rights and environment, in the face of a destructive bauxite mining sector that harms their living conditions and destroys their livelihood activities.

First Consultation: Hamdallaye District

The District of Hamdallaye is under the Sangaredi sub-prefecture - Boké Prefecture. The Sangaredi sub-prefecture is home to several mining companies and has the most important bauxitic plateaus in the world. Hamdallaye was founded about 400 years ago, and today it is impacted by the extension of the activities of the CBG, which has relocated the village. In 2020, the Indigenous communities in Hamdallaye were resettled from their original place to a new location. After resettlement, communities kept the same name—Hamdallaye—for the new site. With a population of seven hundred (700), the communities' main activities are agriculture, livestock herding, and services characterised mainly by small trade activities.

The benefits of industrial mining, according to participants

The communities shared a list of the benefits that they received from mining companies, including:

- The construction of houses, "before, we were in huts, but today, because of the relocation, we all have new houses."
- The construction of a school.
- Transportation for school children.

While they highlighted these benefits, they also stressed that this is not sufficient, compared to what they have lost.

The impacts of mining on the land (plants, animals, soil, and water)

- Plants and soil

Participants believe that trees' production has decreased drastically, because of the dust and the impact of air pollution, and that the soil is often not rehabilitated after bauxite mining. The main concerns of participants are the loss of their fertile agricultural land and their livelihood activities. Participants stated that: "*where we have been resettled, the land is not suitable for agriculture or plant growth, let alone fruit trees*" Mamadou Lamarana Bah. Another participant added: "*the company has offered us a field next to us, to grow our vegetable crops, we started to grow crops, but a few days later many of us got sick because of the land; wherever we look, there is no arable land, and we only live on what we grow*" Mariama BAH.

- Animals

A participant explained the difficulties facing his community members, whose activities depend on livestock herding. He said: "*Everyone here knows that my father was a great breeder, but since we were resettled here, the animals refused to follow us, and our animals are stolen every day where we left, today we practically have nothing left... Mining gears kill animals, and they cannot thrive here because of a lack of grazing area. The District is almost entirely landlocked.*"

- Waters

According to participants, "*the CBG has spoiled our spring heads; all rivers are polluted.*"

The solutions to the problems caused by mining activities

To minimise the above impacts, communities have suggested the following recommendations:

- Develop the plains for agriculture (market gardening or food crops) where communities can farm.
- Create safe water supplies.
- Rehabilitate the soil after mining activities.
- Install gutters in the resettlement location.
- Install electrical connections in the resettlement area. The electricity will help communities create income-generating activities (e.g., ice sales, welding, and other socio-professional activities).
- Create employment for young people.

Free, Prior, and informed consent (FPIC)

The community confirmed that it was consulted before resettlement.

Need for specialised or technical advice.

On this issue, communities have said they would like to receive training on revenue-generating activities (RGA).

Resettlement and compensation

In Hamdallaye, the community resettlement is three (3) months old. According to participants, there is a fundamental census problem: only the male heads of families have been identified. As a result, the census process has been skewed from the outset. The inadequate census creates problems, relating to the outstanding payment of allowances for women and young people because the company has not identified them in their census. The company compensated the communities for disruption of operations for six (6) months but did not restore their livelihoods. The resettlement is done, but there remain many unresolved issues that communities would like to see resolved by the CBG.

Second Consultation: M'Body Foullasso District

The M'Body Foullasso sector falls under the Boullère District, a district of the Sangaredi sub-prefecture located approximately 23 km from the sub-prefecture. The village was created in 1875, and the population is composed of three (3) lineages, namely boubouyankés, patayankés, and guetoyankés. The population is divided into 45 heads of households, with an estimated population of 300 inhabitants. The main activities are agriculture, livestock herding, and small trade. The village is impacted by the Dian Dian Bauxite Company's activities (COBAD-RUSAL), one of whose plateaus is located only a few metres from the village (about 2 km). The company has been operating in the area since 2017. It should also be noted that the village is cumulatively impacted by two mining concessions, namely CBG and COBAD.

The benefit from mining activities

According to communities, apart from a single borehole, and the company's roads for its own activities, the community has seen no advantages from mining activities.

The impacts of mining activities

The community highlighted the following:

- Dust.
- Polluted or disoriented rivers.
- The destruction of water sources.
- The isolation of the village.
- The movement of domestic animals away from their traditional environment.
- Mining activities are taking away agricultural lands from communities.
- The destruction of wild fruit trees and traditional tree species.

The solutions to the problems caused by mining activities

According to the area manager, youths need training and job opportunities, to decrease unemployment. He adds that a framework for ongoing dialogue, between the community and mining companies, needs to be put in place to resolve mining problems and force companies to respect their commitments.

Mine rehabilitation

Communities want any mining company that operates their land to rehabilitate it, as they undertake mining activities, by growing and planting trees as they destroy them. A community member said: "*We had an inexhaustible lake here that society destroyed that was never rehabilitated,*" (Mamadou Alpha Diallo).

Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)

Indigenous community members said they had no information about mining activities. They just woke up one morning and saw the mining engines in their community.

Need for specialised or technical advice

Communities said they want to be trained in creating revenue-generating activities (RGA) such as saponification, cloth dyeing, and market gardening techniques. Also, they said that they would like to receive supervision through the creation of interest groups and the construction of a vocational training centre.

The issue of resettlement and compensation

To date, there has been no question of displacing the community. The mining company has requisitioned several agricultural estates for compensation, but it has not compensated communities for the wild fruit trees. One participant said:

"Before when I was hungry, I went to the bush to pick wild fruits and eat; now we have no fruit, the mining company has destroyed everything. I know the land belongs to the state, but when you take someone's land where he lived, you must show him where he can go to continue his life as before. If God does not help us, it's better to run away from this village," Salamata Diallo, with a heartfelt cry.

Third Consultation: Katougouma District

Located about 30 km from the Tanènè sub-prefecture and 25 km from Boké Prefecture, the District of Katougouma is home to the mineral port of the SMB. The river port construction began on March 26, 2015, and the first cargo of bauxite left the dock on July 20, 2015. Bauxite is trucked from mine to port for about thirty (30) kilometres, which releases considerable dust, on both the local communities and communities along the landing port going through the road. Katougouma has a population of about five hundred (500) inhabitants. The main livelihood activities remain agriculture, fishing, and small trade.

The mining company's actions

The actions identified include:

- The construction of a primary school.
- The construction of a health centre.
- The construction of a literacy centre.
- Construction of some roads.

The impacts of mining activities

According to participants, they include:

- Dust (which is a fundamental problem).
- Sea pollution (draining of oil and diesel on the coasts).
- Increased heat, due to the use of saltwater by cisterns in watering roads.
- Obstructions to artisanal fishing activities.
- Loss of farmland, on which communities depend for their livelihood activities.

One participant explains that: "*The problem that overwhelms us here, is access to arable land*". A participant said: "*Before mining activities, Katougouma was Boké's attic in terms of fruits, vegetables, but today we have lost everything,*" Mamadou Conté.

The solutions to the problems caused by mining activities

The communities' suggestions include:

- Train, mentor, and equip artisanal fishers.
- Plant trees (green curtains) to reduce dust.
- Improve access to water supplies.
- Involve women in the management of natural resources.
- Develop areas for agricultural activities, in place of the land lost by communities.
- Respect the national work code.

Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)

In Katougouma, there was no consultation or consent from the communities before the start of mining activities. One participant stated: "*I was in my field when I saw Chinese people along the river; I came to ask my husband, who told me he didn't know anything,*" (Hadja Toutou).

Compensation

Communities unanimously said that compensation was very poorly managed in Katougouma. According to one participant:

"The compensation procedure has not been followed. During the evaluation, people were told that their field is worth 60 million Guinean Franc (GNF), for instance, and at the time of payment, they were giving 6 million (GNF). For my specific case, after evaluating my field, I was told that I must have 35 million (GNF), but in the end, I received only a small sum. We protested, and the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the company came to meet us; we explained the reason for our demonstration, and he told us if you received the money in an envelope, it was out of dishonesty of the people who managed the compensation process".

Fourth Consultation: Koundindé District

The Koundindé District stage was the last step of the consultation that took place and was held at the location of the district chief. Koundindé was established as a district in 1975 and is located about 20 km from the local community of Doupourou. Doupourou is made up of three sectors, including Koundindé centre, Tougnifili and Tèmoutèmou. The district's population is estimated at 15,000 inhabitants. The main activities of the population are agriculture, fishing, and market gardening. The impacts on communities come from two large, joint-venture companies' activities: ALUFER and CHINA POWER INVESTISSEMENT.

The benefits of mining activities

Some of the benefits identified by participants include:

- Population growth.
- Supply of electrical power.
- Training of women on the techniques of market gardening.
- The company's purchase of local market garden products.

Impacts of mining activities

According to participants, the impacts are:

- The destruction of places of worship.
- The loss of farmland.
- The noise from the sound of machines.
- Dust.
- Pollution of waterways.
- The destruction of fishing nets by large boats.
- The ban on artisanal fishing on the high seas, due to the risk of being run over by mineral boats.

Solutions to the problems caused by mining activities

Below is a list of suggestions from participants, as actions that need to be taken by mining companies and the government:

- Purchase of boats (fishing boats) for local communities.
- Creation of a fishing port, to enable communities to continue their fishing activities.

ASI-IPAF-Summary of Consultations

- Purchase of industrial vacuums to clean impacts.
- Implementation of a system of watering that will reduce the impact of dust on plants and peoples.
- Creation of community forests.
- Protection of places of worship.
- Compensation for lost trees.
- Paving of mining roads.

Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)

Before the company's installation, the community of Koundindé was consulted, "*we held several meetings with the company. There was indeed an FPIC consultation*" (Gassim Camara).

Compensation

Everyone has been compensated, but some feel that the compensation has not been done well. Guinea does not have a well-defined compensation framework. A repository document is in development, and NGOs have formed a collective to ensure that this document is inclusive and responds to community concerns.

Need for specialised or technical advice

Communities highlighted a need for technical training in saponification (making soap), dyeing, and nursery development (e.g.: cacao, coconut, mahogany).

Recommendations from the communities consulted

- In the two categories of localities visited, the impacts are essentially the same, i.e., the communities near the shipping ports experience the same impacts as those near the mining sites. Bauxite is transported differently across the localities visited, resulting in different air pollution impacts: The CGB fully transports bauxite by train for about one hundred (100) kilometres.
- COBAD-RUSAL, which has its own trains, uses the rails used by the CBG. To date, rails belong to the Guinean state, so it is accessible to various companies. COBAD-RUSAL provides the first part of bauxite transport by vehicles, before loading it onto the train.
- The SMB extracts bauxite from two sites, including Malapouya (70km) and Kaboyé, and then transports the bauxite vehicle from the two sites to the ports. Along the way, the dust from bauxite impacts both people and the vegetation.
- ALUFER uses vehicles to transport bauxite to the port in Khoundindé for about thirty (30) kilometres.

Following consultations in these communities, several additional recommendations were made, including:

- Organise awareness/information campaigns on ASI-IPAF standards near bauxite mines.
- Expand consultations in other mining areas, including communities along mining corridors, which constitute the third component of the chain of impacts from mining activities.

- Organise advocacy initiatives within ASI-IPAF bodies, for the respect of the rights of Indigenous peoples/communities.

Recommendations from the NGO-MDC

MDC strongly recommends encouraging:

- Information, outreach, and advocacy activities, to promote community adherence to the ASI goals through IPAF.
- Communities' understanding and ownership of the concept of FPIC concept and ensure that mining companies respect it.
- Community-level capacity building on issues of resettlement standards and principles.
- Deepening analysis related to compensation - resettlement and restoration of livelihoods, activities, and environmental rehabilitation.
- Numerous resettlement issues are expected to continue to occur in Guinea. Communities need support with any resources that can assist them to benefit from fair resettlement practices.

2.2 Suriname

In Suriname, consultations were completed with 43 people in the Lower Marowijne Area/region, in the country's East and French Guyana borders. The area consists of eight Indigenous villages, two Arowak/Lokono villages, and 6 Kalina, or Carib, villages. The consultations were led by Kalina and Lokono Indigenous of the Marowijne (KLIM), an organisation with representatives from each village. The consultations had mixed participation, including elders, young people, and both men and women. The consultations took place in September 2020, in the Wane Creek area, where bauxite mining used to take place, and representatives from the KLIM stayed in the village for several days. In consideration of COVID-19 rules, consultations were taking place with a limited number of people at any one time. KLIM facilitated five consultations in the Lower Marowijne area of Suriname.

1. The first consultation took place with nine participants: mostly male elders, from Bigiston, Christiaankondre, and Langamankondre. The Indigenous group in this area is mostly Kalina, or Carib.
2. The second consultation took place with three participants; mostly elders from the Alfonsdorp village. The Indigenous group in this area are mostly Lokono or Arowak.
3. The third consultation took place with a mixed group, comprising both elders and young people; there were ten participants from Alfonsdorp and Erowarte. The Indigenous group in those two villages are Carib, or Kalina, and the Arowak, or Lokono.
4. The fourth consultation took place with a mixed group, comprising elders and young people; there were 13 participants from Marijke in total. Participants visited the Wane Creek area (the area where Suralco used to mine bauxite). The village and the Wane Creek area's Indigenous groups are the Lokono/Arowak and the Kalina/Carib.
5. The fifth consultation took place with eight participants: a mixed group comprising elders and young people from three villages, including Marijkedorp, Pierrekondre, and Tapoekoe. Participants visited the Wane Creek area.

Knowledge of ASI

Most people consulted knew nothing about ASI, except for the village councils. After introducing ASI, participants said that there is no organisation with similar objectives in Suriname. In participants'

views, an organization that sets standards for bauxite mining companies such as Suralco, and gives a voice to native communities, is useful for protecting indigenous communities' rights.

Historical issues with mining

The government granted concession rights to Suralco without the approval/consent and knowledge of the lower Marowijne Indigenous communities. There has been no community resettlement in the area. Hunters discovered mining activities during hunting trips to the bauxite mining area, and recall that, as they approached the mining areas, they could hear dynamite being fired to loosen the bauxite. Those who went daily to the Wane area to hunt and fish, discovered that miners worked there to extract bauxite. According to participants: *"at the time, there was a prohibition against hunting and fishing in the area, as well as the collection of our medicinal plants, and valuable woods, to build local camps and houses, which was a real downer for us - Indigenous Peoples ...We are a quiet people; perhaps that is why the government did not consult us at the time."*

Benefits from mining

Communities feel that they have not seen any apparent benefits from bauxite mining activities. In addition, Indigenous communities were not consulted before the start of mining activities, and at the beginning felt excluded from job opportunities in the bauxite mining company. Participants say it was only later that several people from the Indigenous community got jobs as contractors in Suralco. Those who did, got them through acquaintances, or friends, who were hired in the company. Participants said, *"instead of being favored as Indigenous People, we were left with only disadvantages."*

The impact of mining on the land (plants, animals, soil, water)

According to participants, mining has had a negative effect on biodiversity, including the fauna and flora. The mining activities seriously polluted the important creeks, especially the Wane creek, and communities have seen a reduction in their game, fish, and tree species. It is believed that the sound of the machines, and the dynamite fired to loosen the bauxite, has certainly contributed to the consequences of the negative impacts that communities witness today, including the disappearance of traditional species.

"From our parents and ancestors, we often hear the beautiful stories of the Wane area that used to be a huge supermarket (big mall) for the Indigenous People, because there they got everything they needed to survive and to provide for our livelihood. If you compare that with now, it is like a desert in the tropics, because we have been to the area a few times ourselves during this consultation, and we only had two small fishes very few (two small fish and saw one caiman, and a turtle during our three days in the Wane area. You cannot imagine that there was once so much meat and fish, flora, and fauna."

The clearing of trees for mining activities has destroyed important tree species for Indigenous communities, and the construction of new roads has also enabled illegal logging activities, making it easy for poachers to drive to forest areas and cut the wood. In the end, these activities are all harmful to the local Indigenous communities because they impact their livelihoods and wellbeing activities.

Opinion on rehabilitation in the local area

According to participants: *"a very bad rehabilitation has been done in the area"*. After reconciliation with the Bauxite Institute of Suriname, the KLIM has had an independent bauxite expert brought to Suriname, with the support of ASI, to have an investigation done and to put his findings in a report on the rehabilitation of the Wane area. Mr. Mark Annandale, the expert from the Australian University of the Sunshine Coast, confirmed in his 2018 report that the rehabilitation was not done correctly.

"We as Indigenous people are not bauxite experts, which is why we had an independent expert brought to Suriname. If you go to the mined areas yourself, you will see that the trees planted during the rehabilitation are not growing well, or not healthy. You can see that it is dying out at the top of the tree, then you do not have to be an expert to know that this rehabilitation has not been a good one. Incidentally, this report has been rejected by Suralco."

In 2018, KLIM board member Louis Biswane was invited by ASI to attend the ASI-AGM Annual meeting in the week of May 21-May 25, 2018, in Perth, Mandurah, Western Australia. During a visit to the Huntly (Myara) Bauxite mine and the Pinjara Alumina Refinery, Mr. Biswane saw a mine rehabilitation plan. He heard of the rehabilitation process in that area, including the standards used. Mr. Biswane found out through an Alcoa representative how much is spent per hectare in the rehabilitated area in Australia, and a comparison of Suriname, and Australia's rehabilitation practices by the same Parent company - Alcoa, shows that in Suriname, the investment per square hectare is 50% less than the investment in Australia. Normally, the company needs to apply the same standards globally.

Today, participants say that there is a reduction of valuable wood species, such as the "Wane" tree that they use to make boats and canoes, and to build houses. While Suralco undertook rehabilitation in certain places of the Wane areas where mining took place, the outcome is disappointing to Indigenous communities after many years. Valuable trees no longer grow in the rehabilitation areas, and trees that have grown naturally do not grow healthy. The issues concerning plants' growth are linked to the soil's condition, with nutrients being lost, and soils badly damaged by mining activities. Finally, participants concluded that:

"Speaking of advantages, the (few remaining) senior citizens find that, so far, they have not seen any advantages of these mining activities, on the contrary, only disadvantages. Everyone, both young and old, insists that before dying, they still want to see a positive development of the mined Wane area, and that they even want personal benefits from their ancestral area too!"

Solutions to the problems caused by mining activities, and recommendations

Below is a list of suggestions from participants, as actions that need to be implemented:

- Hold an open discussion with the eight villages or their representatives (KLIM) and Alcoa/Suralco, so that agreements can be made about ensuring a harmonious relationship between mining activities and Indigenous communities' needs. Alcoa/Suralco must be willing to cover all costs related to these meetings.
- Create one way in and out leading to the Wane area, and ensure that Indigenous communities oversee checking, controlling, and giving permission (or not) to people who want to access the area, to their traditional lands.
 - Make roads leading to the Wane area inaccessible and make the road from Alfonsdorp (near the school) accessible again to the Wane area and connect it to the other route from Mooiwane creek leading to the Wane area.

- People (young and old) want compensation for the damage done to the mined area, and the effects of that damage on the environment, including the fauna and flora.
 - Participants want Alcoa / Suralco to fund major 20-year projects that will benefit both the older and younger generations in the area.
- All people consulted believe it would be better to implement the Terms of Reference (TOR) in Mr. Mark Annandale's 2018 report.

Involving Indigenous People to help fix the problems caused by mining

Below are some suggestions for effective engagement of Indigenous communities in solutions:

- Implement adequate arrangements with the communities' representatives (KLIM) and ensure that they are involved in all decision-making processes from beginning to end.
- During engagements, give Indigenous Peoples the right to speak, and the right to veto what they disagree with; *"the kind of VETO law that they use at the UN."*
- FPIC discussions have only been held during internal sessions with KLIM and the village councils, but not by the bauxite mining company, Suralco. Mining companies need to ensure that they engage communities in FPIC consultations before mining starts.
 - Participants who know of FPIC believe that they must receive excellent and reliable information, before saying yes or no, but under certain conditions. In short, they think that Indigenous Peoples need to make a free and well-considered decision before any significant development takes place, in their area or any other areas, that will harm their environment and livelihood activities.

Communities need to make informed decisions and provide technical advice

Participants' needs include:

- Have advanced information on any intended project development in their areas, ahead of the start of activities.
- An assessment of social, economic, and environmental impacts of projects, before project implementations, so that communities know the potential effects of mining projects.
- Regarding mining activities, communities want a mine closure plan that includes Indigenous communities' concerns throughout the mining cycle.
 - Communities want powers to accept or reject any plans that undermine their rights and the growth of their environment.
- Participants feel that they need specialist and technical advice because they have limited resources and opportunities. According to participants: *"We do not have technical experts in our communities yet!"* Participants said that they are often unable to ensure that their children have opportunities to receive high-level education and continuing education. As a result, the technical expertise in their communities is limited.

2.3 India

In 2019 the IPAF meeting was held in Ranchi, in the state of Jharkhand, India between 25 February – 6 March. The meeting program included three days of IPAF meetings, including a one-day site visit to the bauxite mining area near Lohardaga; three days of local ASI training, attended by 32 people from three different states (Odisha, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh); and concluded with a community visit in neighbouring state Odisha.

The IPAF India standards revision consultations took place in three states impacted by bauxite mining (as well as mining of other mineral resources) including Odisha, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh. Representatives from these states participated in the 2019 IPAF meeting and were actively engaged for this consultation and mobilised to lead the consultation in the villages in their respective regions.

Communities have shown full support for ASI's principles and values, and of IPAF's objectives for proper consideration of the social, economic, and cultural rights of impacted Indigenous communities. There was positive feedback for the consideration of their input toward ASI standards.

Indigenous community members expressed strong desire for more information that will enable them to strengthen their capacity to protect their rights, the environment, and their livelihoods.

Knowledge of ASI

The 2019 IPAF meeting provided the group leaders in India knew about ASI and IPAF. To them, ASI is a globally recognised and respected certification standards organisation. Any company working in the bauxite and aluminium value chain is free to join ASI, if they are willing to abide by ASI's standards. Their understanding is that ASI believes in business ethics; protection of human rights; respect of Indigenous Peoples' rights, including respect of their territory, environment, socio-cultural values; and sustainable development in the ASI certification process.

Participants in the consultation groups have also heard of IPAF. To participants, IPAF is a group of Indigenous Peoples teams/experts from bauxite mining regions, who are protecting Indigenous rights; cultural heritage; territories; culture; and the environment, in their respective countries. Participants highlighted that IPAF advises the ASI and its members, on concerns over the protection and abuse of Indigenous Peoples' rights, and over the exploitation of the environment, directly linking to their wellbeing, livelihoods, culture, and tradition. There was also an understanding amongst participants, that IPAF advises ASI and its members on sustainable mining practices, and how companies can respect Indigenous Peoples' rights and cultures to protect their environment and create a good cohesion between indigenous communities and mining companies.

Historical issues with mining

In the region where the Indian consultations took place, there has been a long history of various mining activities, including coal, iron ore, dolomite, and bauxite mining. Now the mines are no longer active, and the mining companies have left. The communities face the consequence of mine closure, including the destruction of their traditional environment and their regular livelihood activities. According to participants, "*the local peoples have lost their lands and livelihood and are left paupers.*" India's case is an example of the consequence of mining activities that do not comply with International Best Practices standards, and do not respect Indigenous communities' rights. Indigenous communities would like to ensure that ASI certification will include companies' commitment to protect and avoid the destruction of their traditional environment and livelihood activities.

Participants highlighted that Indigenous communities have not benefited from mining activities. The various reasons are listed below:

- Mining companies extract the minerals, and process them with no respect for mining laws, rehabilitation commitments, backfilling effort, and Indigenous communities' rights.

- The widespread corruption practices, by companies and government, undermine the protection of the rights of Indigenous communities. As a result of corruption, their land is taken without their consent.
- Indigenous communities do not receive any resettlement support.
- There is often air and water pollution in the mining areas, that directly impact indigenous communities' agricultural activities and wellbeing.

"Mining companies extract the minerals, with no local development. They extract the minerals by hook and crook and make a profit for themselves. There is no benefit from mining and industries for local peoples in India, and our villages are under constant physical threat, and threat of losing our lands".

The impact of mining on the land (plants, animals, soil, water)

Below is a list of impacts highlighted by communities:

- Mining activities have led to the deforestation of large areas of land, through the clearing of forests. This has also contributed to the loss of critical biodiversity that impacts water availability, forestry, livelihood activities, and people and animals' wellbeing.
- The pollution of water and air harms plants' growth and impacts Indigenous communities' health and wellbeing. According to participants.
 - *"Many people are affected by different diseases. The plants slowly die. The animals do not grow in a healthy way and die early. The cultivable land becomes barren. All the springs and water resources get dry around mining areas. Even I have come across many people affected by new diseases, leading to constant headaches, asthma, breathing-related diseases, and sudden death. Many women give birth to deformed babies. The human span is reduced in the mining and industry areas. Many people die early."*
- There has been no adequate rehabilitation process after mining in most regions.
- Participants are not aware of any community resettlement that has taken place in their regions. Often Indigenous communities had to find their new settlements. After displacement, many Indigenous community members were forced to migrate to slums in a bigger city to find work as daily workers.
- Promoting the practice of FPIC can help communities avoid the loss of their habitations and livelihood activities.
- Standards should ensure that companies will undertake effective rehabilitation processes after mining and ensure that afforestation activities occur and backfilling where necessary.

Recommendations to fix the challenges above, and how ASI standards can support these suggestions

Below are some suggestions from participants:

- Ensure that ASI standard contains explicit text, that prevents the abuse of Indigenous communities through force.
- Commit companies to the respect of Indigenous Peoples' rights, and the protection of their environment.
- Commit companies to fair resettlement practices.

- Companies should mitigate their negative environmental impact, to prevent polluting the land and environment of Indigenous communities.
- Mining companies need to respect ASI standards, and the standards need to include strict monitoring systems to be followed for companies to meet environmental regulations.
- Corruption is a significant issue that impedes environmental legislation's respect; the standards need to prevent companies' involvement in corruption activities.
- Companies need to share open and transparent data of reports, on the impact of their activities on people, the fauna, and flora.
- Government ministry and representatives in the department, including agriculture, water, and environment, need to collaborate and deliver factual reports on the impact of mining activities.
- Human rights abuses, and violations of Indigenous communities' rights, and their environment's illegal extraction, occur regularly. Officials usually disregard complaints from Indigenous communities. To protect Indigenous communities' rights, government officials need to take these concerns seriously.

To help Indigenous People protect their rights and environment, participants came up with the following suggestions:

- Regarding FPIC: while some leaders were aware of the concept, the impacted Indigenous communities were not aware. Leaders understand that FPIC are essential steps before mining or establishing industrial activities.
- Train leaders and communities to acquire the specialist guidelines and skills needed to protect their rights and environment, and to make informed decisions.
 - Leaders should in return strengthen Indigenous communities' knowledge, through training on rules and regulations related to mining, forestry, human rights, and environmental legislation.
 - Support the training of a dedicated group who can conduct local community awareness programmes in communities impacted by mining.
- To make informed decisions, communities need to know their rights, and how to claim them and protect their wellbeing and environment.
 - Help Indigenous communities access relevant national and international legislation.
 - Communities want input into mining plans and decisions.
- Allocate funds to support Indigenous communities with sensitisation activities and awareness campaigns.
- Companies need to respect rehabilitation policies and standards. Companies that fail to adhere to these should be penalised, and their mining licenses revoked by the government. Penalties should include jail time of mine owners, and corrupt officials who allow companies to get away with poor mining practices.
- Companies should avoid planning mining activities where Indigenous communities live. Where mining activities require communities' displacement, companies should prepare for adequate resettlement solutions, including alternative livelihood activities, housing, and new infrastructure development such as roads, schools, healthcare centres, and electricity infrastructure.

Although participants have many wishes, they remain pessimistic. One of the participants suggests: *"But with the Government of India and Indian companies, I cannot expect anything."*

2.4 Ghana

In Ghana, the consultations were led by Mr Abu Karima the Executive Director of the NGO-Settle Ghana, a member of the IPAF. The Settle Ghana team organised several consultations in selected communities impacted by bauxite mining to gather Indigenous communities' views and experiences and to incorporate them into ASI's review process. The consultations took place in late September and October 2020.

In Ghana the term Indigenous People is generally not used, people are referred to as villagers or communities.

The first point of call for the consultation engagement was the Bibiani-Anhwiaso-Bekwai municipality. Specifically, the Awaso bauxite mining fringe communities. This is where currently Ghana is mining bauxite. The following communities were engaged in the Awaso areas; Sefwi Awaso, Sefwi Atronsu, Asempaneye, Subiri and Sefwi Chirano, including community leaders, the youth and women groups in the areas.

In the eastern region of Ghana, the consultation was done in the infamous Atewa area which has become a focal point not just locally but globally. This is the area where the government of Ghana has entered a barter agreement with Sinohydro of China for \$2billion dollars infrastructure projects. The Atewa forest is a 26,000 hectare area located in the Akyem Abuakwa District. It is rich in bauxite and manganese and iron. In fact, according to the US geological department the Atewa forest holds more than 960 million metric tons of bauxite reserve.

The team engaged also Indigenous people in and around the following communities: Adadietem, Asikan/pano, Adukrom and Segyimase. Like the earlier Awaso engagements, here too the Indigenous people of this areas also didn't know much about the ASI.

The consultation focused in two regions of Ghana. Indeed, Ghana has three key deposits of bauxites in three different administrative regions namely the western region, eastern region and the Ashanti region.

The consultations took place in the regions where bauxite mining activities occur. To maximise participation, the proposed communities were contacted in advance to discuss availability of a cross section of community members to ensure a diversity of opinions. In addition, it was considered important to include not only inputs from within each community but also across a number of different communities, a decision was made to diversify the locations of consultation to include communities impacted by mining at different stages of the extraction and transport chain with particular reference to communities impacted by road and rail transport corridors.

Knowledge of ASI

The participants had not heard about ASI and IPAF. When provided an overview of ASI and IPAF communities liked the principles of ASI and acknowledge it is a globally recognised and respected certification standards organisation. They considered it positive that companies working in the bauxite and aluminium value chain can join ASI, if they abide to the ASI's standards. The principles of ASI were summarised and considered very positive, i.e. ASI believes in business ethics; protection of human

rights; respect of Indigenous Peoples' rights, including respect of their territory, environment, socio-cultural values; and sustainable development in the ASI certification process.

Historical issues with community consultation including for mining

Due to the history of Indigenous People around Awaso area feeling neglected and disrespected with previous consultation and lack of knowledge about ASI, most Indigenous people were reluctant to talk stressing that nothing positive might come out of the engagement. Once the proposed topics were shared and the process, the community members were more willing to share their time and knowledge.

It is also worth mentioning that some civil society organizations have taken the government of Ghana to court in order to stop the bauxite mining in the area.

The community feedback includes six key reasons why mining bauxite in the Atewa forest must not be allowed to take place:

1. It is an important part of a water catchment that serves over 5 million people for their water.
2. It is a biodiversity hotspot and provides a diversity of ecosystem services at regional and national levels, and is the habitat to many species to over 100 endangered species.
3. It serves as an important climate change mitigation.
4. It is a key source of sustainable livelihood support for 40 communities, including food, medicinal plants and as habitat for key animal food species.
5. It supports agriculture and cocoa production.
6. It has significant cultural values and national heritage.

The communities had not previously heard of FPIC, it "*is new to their ears*". In Ghana, historically most mining communities often don't get the final say to whether a company has their support or not, these decisions are solely the prerogative of the chiefs and government.

The impact of mining

Most of the Indigenous people do not see the benefits of mining in the lands. For them whether directly or indirectly they think mining is rather a curse and not a blessing. Poor roads to their communities and lack of employment opportunities and in particular management positions in the mining companies is a major worry. The general lack of trust by the communities to the companies is evident.

Lands are destroyed, forests are destroyed, rivers are polluted due to the overflow of wastewater from around the mining sites. Destruction of our forest and livelihood.

Social impacts include disenfranchisement of communities because of lack of jobs and local business opportunities, jobs are given to other people. Other impacts include workers from other regions or overseas bringing in transmitted diseases like AIDS and syphilis.

Recommendations to fix the challenges above, and how ASI standards can support these suggestions

The consultation feedback confirmed Indigenous People want the communities to share in the benefits from mining or other developments. They want their roads fixed, they want clean potable drinking water, access to health facilities, good schools for their children to attend and equal access to decent jobs. They want their local knowledge including that on climate change respected. To quote one community leader who spoke to us says they *“want the benefits of their natural resources here on earth and not heaven.”*

Another message from the consultation includes seeking organisations such as ASI to help build community capacity, so they can be more informed, to *“be able to fight their own battles to companies and investors who do not follow international accepted standards in mining”*. *“Build our capacity on FPIC.”* Empowerment and capacity building needed to build capacity so communities can *“take their own destiny in their own hands.”*

Other recommendations:

- Government and international standards organizations need to check and put recalcitrant companies in check.
- We should sue any company that doesn't respect the protocol on land reclamation.
- Share information through community information bulletins.
- Royalties should be paid directly to the communities.
- International community should help us claim our rights to get benefits from mining.
- Stop illegal mining.
- Respect community protocols associated to environmental protection. Engaging Indigenous People and involve them in the decision-making process, including annual monitoring, evaluation and review on company performance including delivery of commitments.

2.5 Australia

The focus of the consultation in Australia includes the western Cape York Peninsula region in northern Queensland which is one of the largest bauxite production areas in the world. This region includes at least 11 Indigenous Traditional Owner groups, comprised of a mix of allied and competing clans with defined local territories and traditions, and with several distinct cultures, languages and dialects, totems and territorial affiliations. Cultural and archaeological evidence indicates the region's Indigenous Peoples have occupied the landscape and utilised its resources for many thousands of years. Traditionally, the Indigenous People lived in a subsistence economy in accordance with complex customary practices and laws, underpinned by an intrinsic connection to their country.

In recent decades, planning for mining of the western Cape York Peninsula bauxite resources with a number of companies has involved consultation with the local Indigenous People to determine their mining-related socio-economic and natural and cultural resource management needs and preferences. This consultation has involved mining companies and government departments, consultants, non-government organisations and university researchers participating in community meetings, workshops, group discussions and attending on-country field-trips. This consultation has produced various reports, plans, strategies and agreements. A detailed analysis of this data is covered in a paper currently under review for a Special Issue (on mine closure criteria) of the Journal of Environmental Management. The paper (authored by Mark Annandale, John Meadows [University of

the Sunshine Coast] and Peter Erskine [University of Queensland]) is titled – *Indigenous forest livelihoods and bauxite mining: A case-study from northern Australia*.

The methodology for the consultation in western Cape York Peninsula included a local Indigenous woman meeting within several communities in the region, including those Indigenous people where both small to medium sized bauxite mining companies and multinational mining companies are mining on their traditional country. There were significant challenges during the consultation process due to Covid lockdowns and travel restrictions and other logistical challenges. The consultation then included phone conversations with Traditional Owners in various communities and on some occasions several participants. The feedback from both the face-to-face consultations and the phone conversations was consistent. To provide further insights into communities the approach adopted for this report was to also draw on background information from previous consultations with Indigenous Peoples in the region that focused on gaining a better understanding of their experiences with bauxite mining.

Knowledge of ASI

The participants had not heard about ASI and IPAF. When provided an overview of ASI and IPAF, the communities liked the principles of ASI and acknowledged it is a globally-recognised and respected certification standards organisation. There was a positive response to the role of IPAF and the opportunity to participate in IPAF to help establish better outcomes for Indigenous People. The principles of ASI were summarised and considered very positive, i.e. that ASI believes in business ethics; the protection of human rights; and respect of Indigenous Peoples' rights, including respect of their territory, environment, socio-cultural values; and sustainable development in the ASI certification process. The feedback was positive about companies working to improve their business practices to meet the ASI's standards.

Historical issues with community consultation including for mining

The granting of mining leases to mining companies is the responsibility of the Queensland state government. Historically, this allowed mining companies to meet some government requirements and then commence mining. Increasingly over recent decades there is a requirement to consult with local communities to improve socioeconomic outcomes and reduce environmental impacts. Mining developments now require formal and binding mining agreements that detail provisions for reducing negative impacts and improving positive impacts of mining. These agreements generally align to government and regulatory approvals.

The western Cape York Peninsula region has multiple mining agreements, the oldest dating back to 1996 and others more recently agreed. Their implementation outcomes are variable and based on the relationships between the parties.

The impact of mining

The environmental impacts of bauxite mining are significant. Native forests are cleared, and then windrowed and burnt. For many Indigenous Australians, mining of their land creates much concern about biocultural, community health and livelihood impacts associated with the loss of access to traditional lands and resources, and the ability to 'care for country'.

There were a number of reported negative social impacts including disenfranchisement of communities because of a lack of jobs and local business opportunities. Any available jobs are often given to other people, including Indigenous People from other regions. It is difficult for young people to enter the workforce due to poor numeracy and literacy skills, not having work experience, not having a driver's license, and a range of socioeconomic challenges associated with poor and overcrowded housing.

A number of people raised concerns about their natural food resources such as fish, crabs or wild pigs being taken by non-Indigenous People and therefore reducing food supplies for the communities.

On the positive side, several participants stated that the mining agreements have provided some support for young people to get a better education through bursary programs.

Historically, Indigenous Peoples' expectations have rarely been adequately addressed in mine closure planning in western Cape York Peninsula, and there is limited guidance on how their expected outcomes can be monitored and evaluated for mine closure and what that land should look like after mining.

Recommendations to fix the above-noted challenges and how ASI standards can support these suggestions

It must be acknowledged that the local Indigenous People were there before mining and they will be there long after the miners are gone.

The consultation feedback confirmed Indigenous People want the communities to share in the benefits from mining or other developments. They want their children to have access to education that really supports their learning requirements, for local Indigenous People to have equal access to decent jobs, including management roles. They want their local traditional knowledge respected and included in management of their traditional lands both before and after mining, so they can play a real role.

There was a strong message that Traditional Owners need to be involved in monitoring and evaluation of impacts from mining and to decide on what their country looks like after mining – to support the future generations when mining is finished.

In sum, improved access to and use of the local Indigenous Peoples' forests before mining, to support business, and more effective mine rehabilitation that support Indigenous livelihoods, can reduce some of the negative impacts of mining and are important to Indigenous communities. The findings from the consultations in western Cape York Peninsula (as reported in the above-noted Annandale et al. paper [under review]) can inform mining policymakers, regulators and industry professionals on the design, implementation and monitoring of mine completion criteria and associated pre- and post-mining management that will improve environmental outcomes and socio-cultural benefits for Indigenous communities impacted by mining.

3. Common communities' concerns, to be addressed and supported by the standards.

Below are the key concerns that are important for all Indigenous communities, and which they hope to be considered by ASI standards and IPAF's future activities.

1. The violation of FPIC is a significant concern of Indigenous communities. Effective engagement through an open and transparent FPIC process is lacking in many areas where bauxite mining is ongoing.
2. Rehabilitation is a common concern across various consultations held with Indigenous communities - ASI standards need to ensure a strong emphasis on rehabilitation.
3. Resettlement is another concern. It must be effectively addressed within ASI standards.
 - a. Fair compensation is not implemented by most mining companies. To protect the rights of Indigenous Peoples, it is important for ASI standards to address the issues of compensation within their standards.
4. Most Indigenous communities lack the technical and specialised capacity to enable them to effectively protect their rights and environment. Support capacity-building projects that will increase knowledge and protect their environment and rights.
Establish a fund to support capacity-building efforts, training, and awareness training campaign within local communities.
5. Impose a penalty (from an ASI perspective a major non-conformance or no certification/de-certification) on companies that violate the rights of Indigenous communities and engage in corrupt practices.
6. Reinforce the commitment of mining companies and the government to engage with Indigenous communities throughout the mining cycle.

4. Conclusion

In general, Indigenous communities in mining areas are the most vulnerable and poorest households in most countries. As a result, many were negatively hit by COVID-19. During the consultations, most communities were concerned about the impact of COVID-19, and how to find alternative livelihood options. Despite these present concerns, community members were keen to participate in the consultations.

The consultations have been welcomed across all Indigenous communities impacted by bauxite mining. For most, this is the first time their views will be included in revising relevant International Best Practice standards. Communities are angry and pessimistic because of the lack of consideration from governments and bauxite mining companies. The awareness of ASI activities and IPAF's objectives offer them some hope that bauxite mining activities can be improved and negative impacts mitigated. ASI and IPAF need to maintain their engagement with local communities and help them protect their rights, and the conservation of social, cultural, and environmental heritages.

5. Recommendations

The recommendations for the Standards Revision include the Standards Committee support improvements to key criteria and or guidance including increased and active participation of Indigenous peoples and communities and with particular reference to;

- FPIC, as an ongoing process and acknowledge it is not a one-off requirement
- Closure Planning and environmental rehabilitation
- Resettlement including restoration of livelihoods and community activities
- Participation in audits that identify non-conformance related to Indigenous communities and communities
- Participation in environmental monitoring, evaluation, reporting and management

There are a number of additional matters that may be considered outside the remit of ASI, or beyond certification. In order to build a more sustainable global aluminium value chain there are opportunities for companies to better engage with Indigenous people and local communities.

The establishment of a fund to support capacity-building efforts, technical training, and awareness training that supports Indigenous peoples and communities would further assist increased participation and improve engagement between Indigenous peoples and communities with ASI members and improve the implementation of the ASI Performance Standard and the ASI Chain of Custody Standards.