



Indigenous Navigator Data Submission on Headline Indicator 22.1: Status and trends in land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities:

Data for the questions identified in the Methodology submission May 2025

Submitted by: The Indigenous Navigator Consortium¹, coordinated by the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA)

¹ Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact, Danish Institute for Human Rights, Forest Peoples Programme, Tebtebba and the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.

*This publication was funded by the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of the Indigenous Navigator and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.



Contents

Indigenous Navigator Data Submission on Headline Indicator 22.1: Status and trends in land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of indigenous and local communities:	1
Executive Summary:.....	6
Introduction:.....	7
Methodology:	9
Scope and limitations.....	11
Diverse and Complex Systems of Tenure	11
Data on Tenure.....	12
A Recognition Gap.....	13
Drivers of Conflict and Illegitimate Land-Use Change.....	13
A Landscape of Conflict.....	13
FPIC breaches	14
Key Insights from the Data	14
Recommendations for the Methodology of Indicator 22.1	15
Data:.....	15
National Level Data from the Indigenous Navigator National Surveys	15
Survey Question Q016 (LNS) Are there laws and policies, within the following thematic areas, that are in direct violation of Indigenous Peoples' rights?.....	16
Survey Question Q020 (LNS): Does the State, in censuses and household surveys, collect disaggregated data to monitor the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by Indigenous Peoples and individuals?.....	18
Survey Question Q025 (LNS): Does the Constitution or national legislation recognise Indigenous Peoples' right to self-determination?	19
Survey Question Q026 (LNS): Does national legislation recognise Indigenous Peoples as groups with collective rights?	20
Survey Question Q027 (LNS): Does national legislation recognise Indigenous Peoples' right to self-government in internal and local affairs?.....	21
Survey Question Q028 (LNS): Are Indigenous Peoples' self-governing institutions and territories recognised in the political administrative structure of the State? ...	22





Survey Question Q033 (LNS): Does national legislation recognise the state's duty to consult with Indigenous Peoples in order to obtain their free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) prior to approval of any project that may affect their lands, territories, or resources?.....	23
Survey Question Q041 (LNS): Does national legislation recognise Indigenous Peoples' collective rights to lands, territories, and resources?.....	24
Survey Question Q042 (LNS): Has the State adopted clear procedures for identification, demarcation, mapping and registration of Indigenous Peoples' lands or territories?	25
Survey Question Q045 (LNS): Have there, since 2008, been incidents of settlement, land grabbing, land use or resource extraction without Indigenous Peoples' FPIC?	26
Survey Question Q046 (LNS): Have there, since 2008, been incidents of displacement or relocation of Indigenous Peoples without their FPIC?.....	27
Survey Question Q047 (LNS): Has the State, since 2008, established or extended protected areas on Indigenous Peoples' territories without their FPIC?	28
Reflection on data from selected National Level Questions:.....	30
Analysis from the national level on land-use change & tenure security	31
The community surveys in review:	32
Overall reflection	33
Diving into the Community Data – perspectives from 339 community surveys across 24 countries	33
Survey Question Q016 (LCS): Does the state recognise the peoples covered in this survey as distinct peoples with collective rights?.....	33
Survey Question Q021 (LCS): Do your Indigenous institutions/authorities make their own development plans (for example for water and sanitation, road infrastructure, electrification)?.....	35
Survey Question Q023 (LCS): Do your Indigenous institutions/authorities manage issues relating to lands, territories, and resources?	37
Survey Question Q029 (LCS): Do local or central government institutions ensure that adequate consultations are undertaken with your communities before approval of projects or other measures that may affect you?	39





Survey Question Q030 (LCS): Do local or central government institutions obtain the free, prior, and informed consent of your communities before they approve projects or other measures that affect you? 42

Survey Question Q039 (LCS): What are the characteristics of your traditional land and resource tenure system? 45

Survey Question Q041 (LCS): Is your right to lands, territories and resources recognised by the government?..... 53

Survey Question Q042 (LCS): Does your people or community have title deeds or other binding agreements in recognition of their collective right to lands or territories? 55

Survey Question Q044 (LCS): Approximately, how many women and men (or couples if titles are held by both spouses) of your people/community have title deeds or other binding agreements in recognition of their individual rights to land? 57

Survey Question Q045 (LCS): Does your people/community experience conflicts related to land or natural resources? 61

Survey Question Q046 (LCS): If your people/community experience conflicts related to land or natural resources, are these related to any of the following?..... 63

Survey Question Q047 (LCS): Have your people or communities, since 2008, experienced incidents of settlement, land grabbing, land use or resource extraction without your free, prior, and informed consent?..... 72

Survey Question Q048 (LCS): Have your people or communities, since 2008, experienced incidents of displacement or relocation without your free, prior, and informed consent? 74

Survey Question Q051 (LCS): Has your people/community established conservation area(s) within your territory? 76

Survey Question Q055 (LCS): Has the State declared any part of the territory of your community/people as a park or protected area, without your free, prior, and informed consent? 78

Traditional Occupations and restrictions: 80

Survey Question Q118 (LCS): Which are the most important traditional occupations performed by women in your people/community? 80

Survey Question Q119 (LCS): Is the importance of these occupations changing?. 81

Survey Question Q120 (LCS): What are the main barriers or restrictions for performing these traditional occupations today?..... 83



Survey Question Q121 (LCS): Which are the most important traditional occupations performed by men in your people/community?	92
Survey Question Q122 (LCS): Is the importance of these occupations changing?.	93
Survey Question Q123 (LCS): What are the main barriers or restrictions for performing these traditional occupations today?.....	95
Comparative Reflection on Traditional occupations and restrictions:	103
Survey Question Q124 (LCS): Can your people/community perform their traditional occupations (such as pastoralism, hunting/gathering, shifting cultivation, fishing) without restrictions?	104
Final reflection on questions 118 – 124.....	106
Conclusions and recommendations based on the data:	107
Recommendations	107
Conclusion	108
Annex I: Indigenous Navigator Survey Indicators Relevant to KMGBF Indicator 22.1 ..	110



Executive Summary:

In response to SCBD Notification 2025-046 and as a follow-up to the methodological submission made by the Indigenous Navigator consortium in May 2025, this submission provides concrete, community-generated data to inform the development of a robust and rights-based methodology for Headline Indicator 22.1 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KMGBF). The submission aggregates data from the Indigenous Navigator tools, which are a community-based monitoring and information system (CBMIS) developed and implemented by Indigenous Peoples. It is based on a unique combination of 29 national-level surveys and 339 community surveys.

The data highlights a deep and persistent implementation gap between the rights of Indigenous Peoples recognized in international and national law, and the reality they experience. Barriers remain to the formal recognition of Indigenous Peoples' rights in national laws and constitutions. As a result, the lived reality for these communities is often one of dispossession, conflict, and tenure insecurity (i.e. a lack of secure rights to their land). Although national survey respondents report that more than half of States formally recognise collective land rights (55 per cent)² only 21 per cent provide clear, participatory demarcation rules, and 97 per cent still report land grabs - evidence that statutory recognition alone does not secure territory. Most commonly only one category of collective tenure was recognised, while leaving out other customary regimes. Such selective recognition places whole segments of Indigenous territory in a legal vacuum and forces communities to defend their claims piecemeal. With regard to conflict and drivers of land use change, extractive concessions, agribusiness frontiers, mega-infrastructure and exclusionary conservation correlate with FPIC breaches and displacement, from the Wampis in Peru to Baka communities in Cameroon.

The data shows that the principle of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC), which is the right of Indigenous Peoples to give or withhold consent for projects affecting them or their territories, is often reduced from a right to self-determination to a procedural formality. This turns it from a fundamental right into a procedural façade. More than half of the community surveys (59.3 per cent) report invasions by settlers, resource extraction or land grabbing without FPIC since 2008. This lack of genuine consent appears as a primary driver of illegitimate land-use change and conflict. Furthermore, the global conservation agenda, when pursued without a rights-based approach, can become a primary driver of dispossession for Indigenous Peoples. The creation of 'protected areas' without the consent of Indigenous Peoples leads to forced evictions, the criminalisation of traditional livelihoods, and the separation of communities from their ancestral lands. Fifty-eight per cent of national surveys report protected area expansion without consent (a finding echoed in 23 per cent of community responses), underscoring the need to distinguish Indigenous and Traditional Territories and Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas from externally imposed parks.

² While national submissions may indicate "yes" to Q041, the majority of responses were qualified through the comments.



To close this implementation gap and ensure HI 22.1 is an effective monitoring tool, this submission recommends that the methodology must:

- **Adopt a Broad and Flexible Definition of "Tenure":** The methodology must explicitly recognise and accommodate the diversity of customary tenure systems.
- **Monitor the *Quality and Security of Tenure, Not Just its Existence*:** The indicator should not be limited to counting the hectares of land with a formal title. It must include sub-indicators that assess the community's own perception of their tenure security and the scope of rights that are recognised (e.g., rights to forests, water, and subsoil resources).
- **Integrate FPIC as a Core, Non-Negotiable Component:** The methodology must be able to distinguish between land-use change that occurs with the consent of Indigenous Peoples and change that is imposed upon them.
- **Identify and Track the Specific Drivers of Land-Use Change:** To be a useful tool for policy coherence, the indicator must track the underlying drivers of land-use change. The methodology should include a checklist of common drivers, such as mining, logging, agribusiness, infrastructure, and conservation projects.
- **Recognise and Differentiate Conservation Approaches:** The methodology must distinguish between Indigenous and Traditional Territories (ITTs), Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs) and state-imposed protected areas.

All figures in this submission derive from Indigenous-led community and national surveys carried out under the Indigenous Navigator.

Introduction:

In May 2025, the Indigenous Navigator consortium made a submission on methodology in response to SCBD Notification 2025-046 Invitation to submit inputs and relevant information to support the development of a methodology for headline indicator 22.1 of the monitoring framework, recommending that Parties should adopt a more comprehensive view of Headline Indicator 22.1 and expand monitoring beyond biophysical data.

The consortium believes that effectively monitoring the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KMGBF), and particularly Target 22, requires a detailed and holistic understanding of the relationship between Indigenous Peoples and their lands, territories, and resources. Therefore, this submission updates the previous one with data and case studies from our collected information.

Headline Indicator 22.1: land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of Indigenous Peoples and local communities is a primary vehicle for tracking the implementation gap, and ensuring that Indigenous Peoples' rights over lands,



territories, resources, and traditional knowledge are fully recognised and respected. Yet many existing global datasets register hectares converted or titles issued, without revealing whether conversions were consensual or whether titles confer meaningful control.

Headline Indicator 22.1 must therefore be put into practice by including other data sources alongside cartographic and biophysical monitoring. The lands and territories of Indigenous Peoples are actively governed landscapes and seascapes. They embody cultural practices, are key to social structures, and serve as examples of ecological stewardship, with these elements often being interwoven.

Community Based Monitoring and Information Systems (CBMIS), which are recognised and called for by the KMGBF, are a key pathway of both providing complementary data, but also evidencing existing best practices. Further, Section C of the KMGBF recognises the vital contributions and important role of Indigenous Peoples as custodians of biodiversity and as partners in its conservation, restoration, and sustainable use. Likewise, it calls on States Parties to respect, document, and protect Indigenous Peoples knowledge, innovations, values, and practices. It also urges a whole-of-society and a human rights-based approach in the implementation, reporting, and evaluation of the KMGBF. Specifically, it calls on States Parties to ensure implementation of the Framework is in keeping with, among others, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and human rights law.

The Headline Indicator adopted by COP 16.2 on Target 22, 22.1 Land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, enables disaggregation across multiple targets and goals of the KMGBF, including Goals A and B, sub-indicators A.1 and A.2 (by Indigenous traditional territories), B.1 (by Indigenous traditional territories), and Targets 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 20, 22, and 23.

Land-use change and land tenure are interlinked. Accurate, rights-based reporting requires data that reflects both the security and governance of land tenure and the patterns of change taking place within Indigenous traditional territories. Identifying these territories and assessing their legal and customary tenure arrangements is central to monitoring Indicator 22.1.

The Indigenous Navigator - as an Indigenous-led CBMIS - offers a participatory, rights-based methodology that captures both qualitative and quantitative data for monitoring progress on the recognition, security, and governance of Indigenous lands, territories, and resources. The framework includes comprehensive national and community surveys and are aligned with the UNDRIP and related human rights and environmental standards. The Indigenous Navigator's framework and tools have been recognised and



its methodology included and referenced by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice during its 26th meeting.³

These tools have been implemented since 2016, and data are now available and published for 29 United Nations member states with 339 community surveys representing over 530 communities across Latin America, Africa, Asia, and the Arctic. The framework, metadata and methodology are all publicly available at www.indigenousnavigator.org

Ongoing development – Biodiversity module development

In line with the continuous evolution of the Indigenous Navigator framework, a dedicated Biodiversity Module is currently under development and has been piloted in Peru and Colombia. While the Indigenous Navigator's existing tools and framework contribute critical data toward the KMGBF, as evidenced by this submission, the Biodiversity module further specifies the framework and questions to the KMGBF and the monitoring framework. All data and analysis presented within this current report are derived from **existing, established** surveys. The findings herein **do not**, therefore, utilise any data from this new Biodiversity Module.

Methodology:

This report is based on an analysis of community-generated data from the Indigenous Navigator, covering 29 countries and aggregated from 339 public community surveys from 24⁴ of the 29 countries⁵. The data comes from 44 questions identified in Annex I of [the Indigenous Navigator Methodology Submission](#), which provided relevant information to support the development of a methodology for headline indicator 22.1. The responses have been grouped and separated by country, allowing for a broad review of data at both the community and national levels. An annex containing annotations on the data is included with this submission.

Links to Data publicly available:

The data presented through the Indigenous Navigator (IN) portal is owned and controlled by the Indigenous communities that generated it, in line with the commitment of the Indigenous Navigator consortium to the principles of Indigenous

³ Scientific and technical review of the traditional knowledge indicators and their suggested links with the headline, component and complementary indicators of the monitoring framework for the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, INF 11:

<https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/283e/eb7c/6a953a1e098b6c46e0f3be8d/sbstta-26-inf-11-en.pdf>

⁴ See the data table on the next page for the overview of countries with public data.

⁵ The 29 countries are: Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Finland, Guyana, Honduras, India, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, Nepal, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, Suriname, Sweden, Tanzania, Thailand, and Uganda. Community surveys have not yet been completed and published for Argentina, Namibia, and Paraguay.



Data Sovereignty. All data publicly accessible through the portal has been published with the FPIC of the communities involved. The linked datasets below represent only the public published data as of July 2025. However, this submission also draws upon aggregated and anonymised data derived from a broader dataset, which is not publicly accessible.

Access to this underlying data can be requested, subject to the consent of the communities concerned and in accordance with established protocols that respect their rights and self-determination over their data.

National Data Publicly Available

The National level data which has been published and is made public is available in the [Indigenous Navigator National Data Explorer](#).

Community Data Publicly Available⁶

The Community level data which has been published and made public is available in the [Indigenous Navigator Community Data Explorer](#).

Country	Total	Data Publicly Available*	Private Data subject to approval on request and FPIC from communities
Bangladesh	45	44	1
Bolivia	18	18	0
Brazil	3	2	1
Cambodia	25	25	0
Cameroon	72	37	35
Chile	2	2	0
Colombia	6	6	0
Ecuador	13	0	13
Finland	1	1	0
Guyana	12	12	0
Honduras	3	3	0
India	27	27	0
Japan	2	2	0

⁶ Data publicly available and published on the Data portal as of July 2025. Communities reserve their rights to change the accessibility of their data at any time.



Kenya	18	5	13
Malaysia	5	5	0
Mexico	6	0	6
Myanmar	No public data	No public data	No public data
Nepal	13	12	1
Norway	No public data	No public data	No public data
Peru	41	29	12
Philippines	4	2	2
South Africa	2	1	1
Suriname	14	14	0
Sweden	No public data	No public data	No public data
Tanzania	5	5	0
Thailand	12	1	11
Uganda	4	3	1

Community surveys were conducted between 2020-2024, with earlier pilot surveys from 2016-2019; the National surveys were updated between 2023 and 2025.

Scope and limitations

While the Navigator covers a broad geographical range, some regions remain under-represented. The community survey is a self-selected, convenience sample and thus reflects the perspectives of participating Peoples; it does not claim statistical representation of all Indigenous territories worldwide, nor for all communities of a People in a given country. Nevertheless, triangulation with national legal data strengthens the robustness of the findings.

The timeframe for data collection and re-surveying contributes to temporal asymmetry, as national laws can be updated faster than community realities change, leading to mismatches between national survey “yes” answers in regard to rights protections while communities may still report ongoing violations on the ground.

Diverse and Complex Systems of Tenure

The Indigenous Navigator, as a human-rights based tool, is based on the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The International Human Rights Framework further strengthen and guides the Indigenous Navigator questionnaires. In regard to the Domain of Lands, Territories and Resources, the Indigenous Navigator monitors Recognition, protection and adjudication of inherent rights to lands, territories and natural resources, where UNDRIP Articles 25, 26.1, 26.2, 26.3, and 27 are addressed; Dispossession, removal and relocation where Art. 8.2(b) and Art. 10 are monitored, and Environment - Conservation and protection of environment and





productive capacity of lands where Art. 29.1 is monitored. In regard to titling of lands and security of tenure (title deeds or other binding agreements in recognition of their collective right to lands or territories), the Indigenous Navigator monitors Art. 21.1.

In Annex I, the relevant UNDRIP articles monitored are listed beside each question. You can explore the entire comparative matrix and mapping online at the [Indigenous Navigator Tools Database](#)

Further, the UNDRIP is supported by the International legal framework, illustrative examples are included below:

In recognition of their rights to Lands, Territories and Resources: [CBD Art. 10](#); [ICCPR Art. 47](#); [ICERD Art. 5\(d\(v\)\)](#); [ICESCR Art. 1.2](#); [ICESCR Art. 25](#); [ILO 107 Art. 11](#); [ILO 107 Art. 13](#); [ILO 107 Art. 14](#); [ILO 169 Art. 13.1](#); [ILO 169 Art. 13.2](#); [ILO 169 Art. 14](#); [ILO 169 Art. 15](#); [ILO 169 Art. 17.1](#); [UDHR Art. 17](#); [ICCPR Art. 1.2](#); [ICESCR Art. 1.2](#);

In regard to removal: [ILO 169 Art. 18](#); [ILO 107 Art. 12](#); [ILO 169 Art. 16.1-3](#);

In regard to the environment: [ILO 169 Art. 7.4](#);

In regard to housing: [ICERD Art. 5\(e\(iii\)\)](#); [ICESCR Art. 11.1](#);

Data on Tenure

Data from the Indigenous Navigator community surveys reveals that Indigenous land and resource management is not uniform but instead consists of a spectrum of sophisticated and often layered systems. Many Indigenous Peoples, such as the Wampis Nation in Peru and the Monkoxi Lomerio in Bolivia, report a primarily collective governance model, where the community as a whole hold authority over the territory. However, many other communities use complex, mixed-tenure systems.

Even where individual land parcels exist, they are often part of a broader collective framework. The *Jach'a Marka Tapacari Condor Apacheta* in Bolivia explain that individual agricultural plots exist alongside collective lands in the hills and grazing areas. These varied approaches show the need for a flexible concept of 'land tenure'.

A monitoring framework that forces a choice between separate categories of tenure will fail to capture this lived reality. This risks misclassifying these lands and making them vulnerable to being taken by outsiders. For Indicator 22.1 to be effective, its methodology must be flexible enough to capture the diversity of Indigenous Peoples' governance systems, moving beyond a simple choice between 'collective' and 'individual' ownership.



A Recognition Gap

The security of Indigenous Peoples' land tenure depends not only on the strength of their own customary governance but also on its formal recognition and protection by the state. An analysis of community-level data reveals a critical and often vast gap between national laws that exist on paper and the de facto security experienced by communities on the ground.

Some communities report successful legal recognition. The Monkoxi Lomerio in Bolivia, for example, hold a collective title, a *Tierra Comunitaria de Origen* (TCO), which covers 259,188 hectares. However, many more report only partial or no recognition at all. The Wampis Nation in Peru is a crucial case study of this limited recognition. While many of its communities have collective titles, their response to questions on government recognition is 'Limited'. The state does not recognise their full ancestral territory as a whole and reserves for itself the ownership of subsoil resources, rivers, and forests. This shows that tenure security is not just about having a document, but about the scope and quality of the rights that the document grants.

At the other end of the spectrum is the absence of recognition. A large number of surveys from the Baka and Bagyeli communities in Cameroon consistently report 'No' to questions about government recognition of their rights. This leaves their customary lands unprotected.

A meaningful methodology for Indicator 22.1 cannot rely on simple metrics of whether a country has laws recognising the rights of Indigenous Peoples. It must be able to measure the implementation and effectiveness of those laws from the perspective of the rights-holders themselves.

Drivers of Conflict and Illegitimate Land-Use Change

Monitoring changes in land use requires also analysing the underlying reasons for that change. The data reveals that land-use change in the territories of Indigenous Peoples is rarely a neutral or internally driven process. More often, it is the result of intense conflict, dispossession, and the systematic violation of rights.

A Landscape of Conflict

Land-related conflicts are a widespread reality for a vast number of Indigenous communities. An analysis of community data provides a detailed picture of these disputes, revealing patterns of pressure that exist across national borders.

- **Extractive Industries:** In the Peruvian Amazon, the *Wampis Nation* reports intense conflicts caused by illegal logging, gold mining and state-granted oil concessions. In Cameroon, numerous *Baka* and *Bagyeli* communities report

ongoing conflicts with logging companies that operate without community consent.

- **Agribusiness and Settler Encroachment:** In Brazil, the *Potiguara* people face pressure from the expansion of eucalyptus and sugarcane monocultures. In Bangladesh, *Santal* communities have been dispossessed of their lands for the establishment of sugar mills.
- **Infrastructure Development:** The experience of the *Bunong* people in Kbal Romeas, Cambodia, who were displaced by the construction of the Lower Se San 2 Dam, is one example of reported displacement caused by mega-projects.
- **Conservation Initiatives:** Conservation itself is reported as a significant source of conflict. The *Ogiek* of Kenya have been subjected to forced evictions from their ancestral home in the Mau Forest in the name of conservation, while the *Batwa* in Uganda were dispossessed of their entire forest territory for the creation of national parks.

FPIC breaches

The principle of FPIC is the cornerstone of the right of Indigenous Peoples to self-determination over their lands and resources. However, community-level data reveals that the violation of FPIC is not an occasional lapse but a structural and systemic feature of the relationship between states, corporations, and Indigenous Peoples. A majority of communities across the globe report incidents of invasions by settlers, land grabbing or resource extraction taking place without their FPIC.

This reality creates a 'FPIC Façade'. States and corporations can fulfil the procedural requirement of holding "consultation meetings" without engaging in good-faith negotiations aimed at reaching an agreement. This transforms FPIC from a fundamental human right into a mere administrative hurdle. A methodology for Indicator 22.1 that simply measures the conversion of forest to agriculture, without asking whether that conversion was consensual, fails to capture the most critical part of the issue.

Key Insights from the Data

- **Indigenous Tenure Systems are Diverse and Complex:** Monitoring methodologies must be flexible enough to capture this complexity.
- **A Critical 'Recognition Gap' Persists:** There is a disconnect between national laws and the *de facto* security experienced by communities.
- **Indigenous Peoples' Territories are Under Threat:** These pressures are driven by predictable, and reportedly state-sanctioned development models.
- **The Violation of FPIC is a Driver of Illegitimate Land-Use Change:** The absence of genuine consent is a direct predictor of conflict and environmental degradation.
- **'Green Grabbing' is a Driver of Displacement:** Conservation initiatives that do not adopt a rights-based approach are a significant threat to the tenure security of Indigenous Peoples.

Recommendations for the Methodology of Indicator 22.1

Based on these insights and drawing on the proven methodology of the Indigenous Navigator, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. **Adopt a Broad and Flexible Definition of "Tenure":** The methodology must explicitly recognise and accommodate the diversity of customary tenure systems. It should allow for the reporting of mixed and layered systems where collective, familial, and individual rights coexist.
2. **Monitor the Quality and Security of Tenure, Not Just its Existence:** The indicator should not be limited to counting the hectares of land with a formal title. It must include sub-indicators that assess the community's own perception of their tenure security and the scope of rights that are recognised (e.g., rights to forests, water, and subsoil resources).
3. **Integrate FPIC as a Core, Non-Negotiable Component:** The methodology must be able to distinguish between land-use change that occurs with the consent of Indigenous Peoples and change that is imposed upon them. All data on land-use change should be separated into two categories: 'with FPIC' and 'without FPIC'.
4. **Identify and Track the Specific Drivers of Land-Use Change:** To be a useful tool for policy coherence, the indicator must track the underlying drivers of land-use change. The methodology should include a checklist of common drivers, such as mining, logging, agribusiness, infrastructure, and conservation projects.
5. **Recognise and Differentiate Conservation Approaches:** The methodology must distinguish between Indigenous and Traditional Territories (ITTs), Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs) and state-imposed protected areas. This is essential to prevent 'green grabbing' from being counted as a positive conservation outcome. The framework should include separate questions to measure community-led conservation and the establishment of protected areas without community consent.

Data:

National Level Data from the Indigenous Navigator National Surveys

Twenty-nine National surveys were analysed covering Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Finland, Guyana, Honduras, India, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, Nepal, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, Suriname, Sweden, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda.

Survey Question Q016 (LNS) Are there laws and policies, within the following thematic areas⁷, that are in direct violation of Indigenous Peoples' rights?

The survey asked national-level respondents to identify whether laws and policies existed that violated the rights of Indigenous Peoples across several thematic areas in accordance with monitoring Articles 1, 38, 46.2, and 46.3 of the UNDRIP.

Key Findings from Q16 (LNS):

- **Land and resource regimes are the primary area of conflict:** Over three-quarters of national surveys (79 per cent) report having laws that restrict or undermine Indigenous land tenure or stewardship.
- **Issues with self-government and FPIC are also widespread:** Sixty-nine per cent of national surveys report legislation that conflicts with these rights, suggesting many states still legislate unilaterally in areas where consultation or autonomy should be the standard.
- **Cultural integrity and the protection of traditional knowledge is the third-most-cited problem area:** With 59 per cent of national surveys reporting conflicting laws.
- By contrast, fewer national surveys report direct legal violations around employment (41 per cent), fundamental freedoms (38 per cent), or freedom of expression (38 per cent), though these issues still concern roughly one-third to half of all respondents.

Themes from the Survey Comments

- **Customary tenure overridden by sector statutes:** Numerous comments point to forestry, mining and hydrocarbon laws that “trump constitutional guarantees” and re-allocate Indigenous territories through concessions or logging permits, leaving collective titles without force.
- **Protected-area legislation that extinguishes existing rights:** National-park and forest-reserve acts are frequently cited for cancelling customary ownership and access without compensation or co-management, forcing communities off their lands.
- **Traditional knowledge placed in the public domain:** Biodiversity or genetic-resources frameworks (e.g., ABS laws) are criticised for treating Indigenous

⁷ Self-government, autonomous institutions and customary law, consultation and free prior and informed consent; Cultural integrity, languages, cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and intellectual property; Lands, territories and resources; Participation in public life, citizenship; Legal protection, access to justice and remedy; Cross border contacts; Freedom of Expression; Food, development, social protections, housing and sanitation; Education; Health; Employment, occupation and vocational training; Fundamental Freedom.

medicinal or agro-ecological knowledge as State-controlled “heritage”, allowing patenting or commercial use without consent or benefit-sharing.

- **Absence of statutory free, prior and informed consent (FPIC):** Several respondents describe infrastructure and resource-extraction laws that authorise project approvals after pro-forma consultations, with no binding duty to obtain FPIC.
- **Restrictions on cross-border mobility:** Pastoralist and nomadic Peoples report immigration, security or wildlife-protection regulations that criminalise traditional seasonal movements across State frontiers.
- **Gaps in self-government and customary-law recognition:** Even where constitutions mention Indigenous autonomy, implementing statutes are lacking or fragmented across federal units, resulting in “paper rights” only.
- **Cultural-integrity threats:** Intellectual-property, heritage-protection and language policies fail to safeguard Indigenous cultural expressions, or impose assimilationist labelling such as “ethnic minority”, weakening collective rights.

These tenure-related obstacles re-emerge under Q041 (sector statutes overriding collective land claims) and under Q045–Q 047 (systematic FPIC breaches that result from the same legislative gap).

Data table Q016 (LNS)

Laws that are in direct violation of rights:	Yes	No	Not answered
Self-government, autonomous institutions and customary law, consultation, and free prior and informed consent	69% (20)	28% (8)	1
Cultural integrity, languages, cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, and intellectual property	59% (17)	38% (11)	1
Lands, territories, and resources	79% (23)	17% (5)	1
Participation in public life, citizenship	48% (14)	48% (14)	1
Legal protection, access to justice and remedy	59% (17)	38% (11)	1
Cross border contacts	55% (16)	41% (12)	1
Freedom of Expression	38% (11)	55% (16)	1
Food, development, social protections, housing, and sanitation	52% (15)	48% (14)	1
Education	52% (15)	45% (13)	1
Health	45% (13)	52% (15)	1
Employment, occupation, and vocational training	41% (12)	55% (16)	1
Fundamental Freedom	38% (11)	55% (16)	1

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2018-2025.

Survey Question Q020 (LNS): Does the State, in censuses and household surveys, collect disaggregated data to monitor the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by Indigenous Peoples and individuals?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Article 2 of the UNDRIP.

- **Yes: 31 per cent** (9 countries)
- **No: 59 per cent** (17 countries)
- **Not answered: 10 per cent** (3 countries)

The data shows that fewer than one-third of the surveyed countries collect the specific census data needed to track how the SDGs are affecting Indigenous Peoples.

Themes from the Survey Comments

- **Absence of an “Indigenous” identifier in censuses and routine surveys:** Most negative answers explain that the questionnaire, census or labour-force survey provides only broad ethnic or language categories; without a specific Indigenous marker, no meaningful SDG disaggregation is possible.
- **Partial coverage, an identifier present in the census but not in thematic surveys:** Several States have introduced an Indigenous identifier in the population census, yet their household income/expenditure, labour-force or health surveys still omit it, preventing time-series monitoring of SDG indicators. Commenting respondents describe this as a “one-off recognition without follow-through”.
- **Political sensitivity and contestation of the term “Indigenous”:** Where governments reject, or narrowly define, the notion of Indigenous Peoples, statisticians either leave the variable blank or collapse it into a wider “ethnicity” field; respondents argue that this erases distinct Peoples and violates Article 2 UNDRIP.
- **Data generated but withheld from the public domain:** A minority of “Yes” countries note that disaggregated datasets exist inside national statistical offices yet are released only in aggregated tables, citing privacy or sample-size concerns. Indigenous organisations therefore cannot verify SDG progress.
- **Lack of harmonised coding across ministries:** Comments stress that even when the national statistics office uses an Indigenous code, administrative datasets (health, education, social protection) apply incompatible fields, thwarting cross-sector SDG reporting.
- **Capacity and resource constraints:** National statistics offices report insufficient budget for tailored questionnaires, translation and post-enumeration

quality checks in remote Indigenous territories. Respondents link this directly to “leave-no-one-behind” shortfalls.

- **Call for Indigenous Data Sovereignty and co-governance:** Respondents emphasise that future enumerations must be co-designed with Indigenous Peoples, with community consent over storage, access and publication.

Respondents’ concern about the absence of an Indigenous identifier links to official denial of recognition and resurfaces in the implementation delays recorded in Q041–Q042.

Survey Question Q025 (LNS): Does the Constitution or national legislation recognise Indigenous Peoples' right to self-determination?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of the Preambular paragraphs 1 and 2 and Article 3 of the UNDRIP.

- **Yes: 38 per cent** (11 countries)
- **No: 62 per cent** (18 countries)

A minority of national surveys report that States formally recognise the right to self-determination in their constitution. Even among the countries that answered ‘Yes’, the level of recognition varies.

Regionally, Latin America has the highest reported share of explicit recognition, but progress is not guaranteed. Several ‘No’ responses came from countries where legislation includes general clauses protecting minority cultures but lacks specific language on self-determination or Indigenous status. However, there are potential future opportunities, as comments point to ongoing or planned constitutional reviews where stronger rights for Indigenous Peoples could be included.

Themes from the Survey Comments

- **Implicit constitutional wording:** Respondents report that most constitutions refer to cultural identity or communal lands but omit an explicit right to self-determination, enabling restrictive readings.
- **Recognition limited to cultural or linguistic autonomy:** Where some acknowledgement exists, respondents note it is largely confined to culture or language, without decision-making power over land, resources or revenues.
- **Statutory work-arounds and onerous registration:** Respondents indicate that, lacking constitutional clauses, ordinary laws grant only partial autonomy and are subordinated to sector statutes; obtaining legal personality involves burdensome bureaucratic procedures.
- **Uneven protection within federal or provincial systems:** Respondents highlight stark disparities between sub-national units, creating significant inconsistency in the protection of collective rights depending on the location.

- **Denial via assimilationist labelling:** Respondents in several States report that Governments reject the term “Indigenous Peoples”, classifying communities as “tribes” or “ethnic minorities” and thereby withholding collective-rights protections.
- **International norms and strategic litigation as leverage:** Respondents emphasise reliance on ILO Convention No. 169, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and court actions to bridge domestic legal gaps and to press for forthcoming reforms.

The implementation deficit highlighted here underpins the titling delays discussed in Q041–Q042 and the displacement cases in Q046.

Survey Question Q026 (LNS): Does national legislation recognise Indigenous Peoples as groups with collective rights?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of the Preambular paragraphs 1 and 2 and Article 3 of the UNDRIP.

- **Yes: 59 per cent** (17 countries)
- **No: 41 per cent** (12 countries)

While constitutional recognition of self-determination is rare (38 per cent), legislative recognition of collective rights is more common, with a majority of states (59 per cent) providing it. In some cases, states that lack constitutional protection have adopted ordinary laws for land, autonomy or cultural protection that partially put self-determination into practice.

Regionally, Latin America leads, with over 80 per cent of its surveyed states reporting legislative recognition. In contrast, fewer than half of the Asian countries and only one-third of the African countries surveyed are reported as having such legislation. Recognition is sometimes provided through broad framework laws like an ‘Indigenous Peoples Rights Act’, as seen in the Philippines. Elsewhere, it is fragmented across various sector-specific laws, such as those for land tenure or decentralisation. Even where laws exist, respondents note that weak enforcement, under-resourcing or conflicting sectoral laws often weaken the recognised rights.

Themes from the Survey Comments

- **Symbolic recognition without implementation:** Respondents report that constitutional or statutory clauses on collective rights are often declaratory; practical effect is weakened by paternalistic attitudes and lack of direct-application mechanisms.
- **Rights confined mainly to land tenure:** Many States recognise communal ownership of land or forest but leave other collective rights (governance, culture, resources, revenues) outside the legal guarantee.

- **Bureaucratic and evidentiary hurdles:** The acquisition of legal personality or communal title, according to respondents, requires onerous documentation and discretionary approvals, turning recognition into an administrative obstacle.
- **Patchwork protection across sectors and sub-national units:** Respondents highlight stark variations between federal provinces, special zones or sectoral laws, creating uneven and sometimes conflicting levels of collective-rights protection.
- **Progress through self-identification and data reforms:** Several respondents note advances in census categories and sector policies that allow Indigenous self-identification, yet stress that these gains remain policy-specific and not universally applied.
- **Continued denial through assimilationist labels:** In some States, Governments still classify Indigenous Peoples as “tribes”, “ethnic minorities” or “local communities”, which, respondents contend, strips them of distinct collective-rights status.

Partial collective-rights clauses noted here prove insufficient to prevent land and resource grabs analysed in Q045–Q047.

Survey Question Q027 (LNS): Does national legislation recognise Indigenous Peoples’ right to self-government in internal and local affairs?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Article 4 of the UNDRIP.

- **Yes: 41 per cent** (12 countries)
- **No: 59 per cent** (17 countries)

Less than half of the surveyed states have legislation recognising the right to self-government. Even in countries that answered ‘Yes’, comments from respondents stress that this recognition does not guarantee operational autonomy. Self-government is often limited to certain areas, such as land administration or cultural affairs, and lacks financial power or enforcement capabilities. Many states rely on sectoral or framework laws rather than constitutions to create self-governing entities for Indigenous Peoples. Respondents repeatedly mention that delayed regulations and budget constraints limit the real-world effectiveness of this recognised autonomy.

Themes from the Survey Comments

- **Declaratory or culturally limited recognition:** Respondents report that most constitutions or statutes mention Indigenous culture or language but stop short of granting full political self-government, or authority over land, resources or revenues.

- **Procedural and institutional obstacles:** Respondents describe protracted registration requirements, absent implementing legislation and under-resourced agencies that prevent any recognised autonomy from operating in practice.
- **Spatially restricted arrangements:** Respondents note that autonomy is often confined to village councils, Sixth-Schedule or special cultural zones, leaving broader Indigenous territories and higher-level governance structures unacknowledged.
- **Isolated comprehensive regimes:** Respondents identify only a few States, such as Bolivia, Colombia and Ecuador, that combine constitutional guarantees with functioning laws for Indigenous territorial governments and jurisdiction.
- **Total legal vacuum in several jurisdictions:** Respondents from some States indicate that Governments deny Indigenous status altogether, providing no framework for self-government beyond generic civic rights.

The administrative vacuum affects territorial governance (Q028) and contributes to the legal insecurity described in Q041.

Survey Question Q028 (LNS): Are Indigenous Peoples' self-governing institutions and territories recognised in the political administrative structure of the State?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Articles 5, 18, 20.1, 33.2, 34, and 39 of the UNDRIP.

- **Yes: 38 per cent** (11 countries)
- **No: 62 per cent** (18 countries)

Only a minority of national surveys report that their States formally recognise Indigenous governing institutions within their political structure. In many 'Yes' countries, this recognition often takes the form of registration as legal entities (such as co-operatives or associations) rather than acknowledgement as public authorities, which limits their jurisdiction and access to budgets. In some countries, such as Cambodia, Kenya and Tanzania, this recognition is conditional on the community having a formal land title; communities without titles remain unrecognised. Even where laws for recognition exist, respondents highlight implementation hurdles such as slow approval procedures, political interference or costly legal requirements that prevent communities from completing the process.

Themes from the Survey Comments

- **Absence of formally autonomous territories:** Respondents report that most States do not embed Indigenous territories or governments in the political-administrative hierarchy; communities are granted only civil-association status with no public powers.

- **Isolated, sector-based exceptions:** Respondents cite scattered arrangements, such as co-management boards in national parks or single “special cultural zones”, that allow minimal participation yet fall far short of territorial self-government.
- **Special autonomous or tribal areas with curtailed authority:** Where statutory regimes exist (e.g. Chittagong Hill Tracts, India’s Sixth-Schedule districts), respondents describe limited mandates, chronic underfunding and frequent override by central ministries.
- **Village councils recognised, wider structures ignored:** Respondents note that local councils may govern day-to-day affairs or titled village lands, but supra-village institutions and broader Indigenous territories remain outside State recognition.
- **Implementation bottlenecks and legal overlap:** Respondents highlight lengthy registration procedures, scant resources and competing sectoral laws that undermine whatever autonomy is provided on paper.

This patchwork mirrors the uneven titling progress in Q041–Q042 and helps contextualise why FPIC processes are reportedly ad hoc in Q033 and ineffective in Q045–Q047.

Survey Question Q033 (LNS). Does national legislation recognise the state's duty to consult with Indigenous Peoples in order to obtain their free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) prior to approval of any project that may affect their lands, territories, or resources?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Article 19 and 32.2 of the UNDRIP.

- **Yes: 45 per cent** (13 countries)
- **No: 55 per cent** (16 countries)

Legislation that requires the state to obtain FPIC remains the exception, with less than half of the surveyed countries having such a duty explicitly embedded in law. This duty is recognised either through the ratification of international treaties such as ILO Convention 169 or through dedicated national laws. A notable gap exists in the Nordic countries, where respondents indicated that legislation requires consultation but stops short of requiring consent. Even where FPIC laws do exist, respondents report significant implementation problems, such as exemptions for ‘strategic’ projects and a lack of enforcement.

Themes from the Survey Comments

- **Absence of national FPIC statutes:** Respondents report that most States have no dedicated law obliging authorities to obtain free, prior and informed consent;

constitutional or environmental clauses on “participation” are generic and non-binding.

- **Patchy sectoral and provincial measures:** Where procedures do exist, they sit in forestry or environmental-impact regulations, or in ad hoc provincial protocols, producing highly uneven and discretionary consultation duties.
- **Treaty and constitutional foundation without enforcement:** Respondents cite ILO Convention No. 169, constitutional articles and court rulings as a basis for consultation, yet stress that these norms are rarely operationalised in domestic legislation.
- **Consultation without consent:** Mandated processes typically involve public hearings or information sessions; respondents note that Indigenous objections carry no veto power and are routinely overridden for “strategic” projects.
- **Litigation and administrative resistance:** Respondents describe frequent suspensions of favourable court orders, protracted procedures and overlapping decrees that weaken consultation rights, particularly in infrastructure, energy and extractive schemes.
- **States denying Indigenous status:** In several jurisdictions, respondents observe that Governments classify communities as “tribes” or “ethnic minorities”, thereby evading any legal duty to consult on land, territory or resource decisions.

The consult-but-override pattern here feeds directly into the reporting of land-grabbing and eviction cases summarised under Q045–Q047 and the protected-area conflicts in Q047.

Survey Question Q041 (LNS): Does national legislation recognise Indigenous Peoples’ collective rights to lands, territories, and resources?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Articles 25, 26.2, 26.3 of the UNDRIP.

- **Yes: 55 per cent** (16 countries)
- **No: 45 per cent** (13 countries)

A slight majority of national surveys reported that their countries have laws that recognise collective land rights. However, legal recognition does not guarantee secure tenure, as many countries face demarcation delays and weak enforcement. This recognition is often geographically partial, confined to specific regions while leaving other Indigenous territories unprotected. Furthermore, comments on the surveys often emphasize that even where surface land is recognized, subsoil minerals remain state property, which limits the practical control of Indigenous Peoples over their resources.

Themes from the Survey Comments

- **Partial and qualified recognition:** Respondents report that, although many constitutions or framework laws mention Indigenous possession or collective title, these provisions are typically limited to certain land categories, exclude sub-soil and resource rights, or frame Peoples as mere “subjects of public interest”.
- **Chronic implementation gap:** Respondents describe protracted demarcation, underfunded registries and repeated legislative extensions (e.g. Argentina, Colombia, Brazil), leaving large numbers of communities without definitive title and vulnerable to eviction or overlapping concessions.
- **Sectoral override of land statutes:** Respondents note that as in Q016 (LNS), mining, forestry, conservation and infrastructure laws routinely prevail over collective-rights clauses, allowing the State to authorise projects on Indigenous territories without secure consent or benefit-sharing.
- **Sharp sub-national disparities:** In federal or devolved systems, respondents highlight uneven protection between provinces, Sixth-Schedule or special zones, creating significant inconsistency in the enjoyment of collective rights depending on the location.
- **Outright non-recognition in several States:** Respondents from jurisdictions such as Bangladesh, Tanzania and Thailand report that Governments still classify Indigenous Peoples as “tribes” or “ethnic minorities”, thereby denying any collective land or resource rights.

Delays and partial coverage described here can be linked to the dispossession incidents in Q045 and the forced relocations in Q046

Survey Question Q042 (LNS): Has the State adopted clear procedures for identification, demarcation, mapping and registration of Indigenous Peoples’ lands or territories?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Articles 26.2 and 27 of the UNDRIP.

- **Yes: 21 per cent** (6 countries)
- **No: 52 per cent** (15 countries)
- **Development of procedures is in progress: 28 per cent** (8 countries)

Only a small minority of national surveys report that their states (21 per cent) have clear procedures in place for recognising Indigenous lands. Even in these countries, respondents highlight that the existence of a procedure does not guarantee timely implementation, citing backlogs, underfunding and political interference that can delay titles for years. Respondents stress that consultation is often minimal, with Indigenous norms and technical standards rarely used as a baseline.

Themes from the Survey Comments

- **Limited and slow titling programmes:** Respondents state that only a handful of States run formal demarcation or titling schemes; where they do exist, such as RETECI in Argentina or resguardos in Colombia, coverage is partial (for example, respondents report just 42 per cent of Argentine communities have completed files) and progress is hampered by chronic underfunding and repeated legislative extensions.
- **Cumbersome, technocratic procedures:** Respondents describe complex survey, mapping and legal-verification steps that demand specialist staff, multi-agency signatures and high costs. These State-designed requirements marginalise Indigenous cartographies and delay registration for years.
- **Titles without full territorial control:** Most procedures, according to respondents, confer surface possession only; sub-soil resources, water and wider territorial governance remain under separate sector laws, leaving collective titles exposed to overlapping concessions and evictions.
- **Political and economic push-back:** Respondents recount frequent suspension or dilution of demarcation efforts by mining, agribusiness and conservation interests. Court orders mandating consultation are often stayed on the grounds of “strategic national interest”, slowing or nullifying territorial recognition.
- **Procedural vacuum in several jurisdictions:** Where Governments deny Indigenous status or recognise only village lands (e.g., Bangladesh, parts of Tanzania), respondents report that no statutory pathway exists for territorial adjudication, forcing communities to rely on litigation and international norms.
- **Insufficient cultural alignment:** Even the more advanced guidelines (for example, Brazil’s PNGATI/PGTA or Guyana’s Amerindian Land Titling Manual) are, in respondents’ view, drafted without genuine incorporation of Indigenous customs and decision-making processes, undermining local legitimacy and uptake.

The technical and budgetary barriers noted here reinforce the tenure insecurity recorded in Q045–Q047 and echo the administrative-gap narrative in Q028.

Survey Question Q045 (LNS): Have there, since 2008, been incidents of settlement, land grabbing, land use or resource extraction without Indigenous Peoples’ FPIC?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Article 26.2 of the UNDRIP.

- **Yes: 97 per cent** (28 countries)
- **No: 3 per cent** (1 country)

The data show an almost unanimous response that violations of FPIC are widespread, occurring in nearly all surveyed countries. Resource extraction, particularly mining, oil and gas, logging, and agribusiness, is the most commonly cited sector for these breaches. The analysis reveals a direct link between the lack of clear land demarcation

procedures (as identified in Q042) and the high rate of FPIC violations. Although some communities have achieved legal victories in court, remedial action and land restitution are reported to be very slow.

Themes from the Survey Comments

- **Pervasive land- and resource grabs without consent:** Respondents recount a steady advance of agribusiness frontiers, large-scale mining, logging and energy projects, soy and forestry in Argentina, lithium in the Argentine Salinas Grandes, gold in Brazil’s Yanomami territory, illegal logging in Cameroon and Bangladesh, all carried out without Free, Prior and Informed Consent.
- **State authorisations trump FPIC guarantees:** Even where constitutions or ILO Convention No. 169 require consultation, respondents say permits and environmental licences are routinely issued first, consultations conducted later, or not at all, and Indigenous objections are deemed non-binding.
- **Legal action met with procedural stalling:** National survey respondents note that communities frequently resort to courts or human rights bodies; But that judgements (e.g. Argentina’s Supreme Court information orders, Colombian tutela rulings) seldom halt operations, as governments invoke “strategic national interest” to suspend or dilute protective orders.
- **Violence, evictions and criminalisation of defenders:** Land and resource conflicts are accompanied by threats, police or private-security violence and child intimidation (e.g. Mbya-Guaraní in Misiones; Maasai Mau evictions in Kenya; Maasai repression in Tanzania), reinforcing a climate of insecurity.
- **Protected areas and concessions overlap Indigenous lands:** Respondents highlight conservation zones, wind parks, dams and tourism estates superimposed on ancestral territories,(such as Chile’s national-park overlaps and Uganda’s Benet–UWA clashes), without territorial recognition or benefit-sharing.
- **Patchy documentation and official denial:** Several respondents note that incidents are under-recorded or dismissed because governments classify Indigenous Peoples as “minorities” or “local residents”, leaving civil-society reports (Bangladesh, Thailand) as the main evidence base.

Survey Question Q046 (LNS): Have there, since 2008, been incidents of displacement or relocation of Indigenous Peoples without their FPIC?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Articles 8.2(b) and 10 of the UNDRIP.

- **Yes: 69 per cent** (20 countries)
- **No: 28 per cent** (8 countries)
- **Not answered: 3 per cent** (1 country)

A large majority of national surveys (69 per cent) report incidents of forced displacement and relocation. These incidents are widespread, with the highest ratios reported in Asia and Africa. The primary drivers of displacement are conservation initiatives (such as national parks), large dams, and concessions for logging, mining, and agribusiness. Every country that reported forced displacement also reported FPIC violations (Q045), confirming a continuum from consultation failure to outright displacement. While some court judgments have been favourable to communities, respondents remark that compensation and restitution are often still pending.

Themes from the Survey Comments

- **Extractive and agribusiness expansion:** Respondents report repeated evictions and land seizures for mining, oil, lithium, soy, forestry and large-scale agriculture, all authorised without free, prior and informed consent and often upheld as “strategic” for national development.
- **Conservation-linked displacement:** Protected-area enlargements, game reserves and carbon or tourism projects are said to displace communities (for example the Maasai in Loliondo and Ngorongoro, Mapuche in Chilean parks), with compensation rare and cultural loss ignored.
- **Legal insecurity and stalled titling:** Incomplete or underfunded demarcation schemes leave most communities without registered collective title, enabling opportunistic settlers, private firms and even State agencies to appropriate land and resources.
- **Violence and intimidation of defenders:** Survey respondents describe police raids, private-security assaults, arson and criminalisation of leaders, as in Caspalá (Argentina), Yanomami (Brazil) and Benet (Uganda), used to silence opposition to dispossession.
- **Judicial recourse undermined by procedural tactics:** While some courts order information disclosure or recognise damages, governments and companies frequently delay or ignore rulings; protective injunctions are suspended on grounds of “public interest”, leaving violations unchecked.
- **Denial through classification and data gaps:** In several States Indigenous Peoples are labelled “ethnic minorities” and incidents go unrecorded, so land grabs and forced moves proceed with minimal scrutiny and no official statistics.

Survey Question Q047 (LNS): Has the State, since 2008, established or extended protected areas on Indigenous Peoples' territories without their FPIC?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Article 29.1 of the UNDRIP.

- **Yes: 62 per cent** (18 countries)
- **No: 34 per cent** (10 countries)

- **Not answered: 3 per cent (1)**

The data shows that conservation-related conflicts are a pervasive issue. The expansion of protected areas for biodiversity, carbon offsets or tourism is a leading cause of FPIC violations, second only to extractive projects. A direct overlap exists with forced displacement (Q046), as 16 of the 18 countries that reported this issue also reported displacement, which underscores how conservation zones can trigger evictions. Respondents contrasted cases of unilateral "paper parks"⁸ being created with emerging good practices where co-management or consent procedures have been applied.

Themes from the Survey Comments

- **Expansion of conservation zones without FPIC:** Respondents describe new or enlarged reserve forests, national parks and Ramsar or World Heritage sites, e.g. reserve-forest eco-tourism in Bangladesh, protected-area extensions in Nepal and wildlife reserves in Tanzania, approved without the free, prior and informed consent of the affected Peoples.
- **Systematic overlap of parks and ancestral territories:** Mapping studies cited by respondents (Brazil) show millions of hectares where protected-area boundaries now sit on Indigenous lands, replicating cases from Cameroon (Ngoyla), Peru (Imiría, Cordillera Escalera) and Guyana (Kanuku, Shell Beach).
- **Displacement, eviction and criminalisation:** The establishment or enlargement of protected areas is said to trigger forced moves (Mro and Chak in Bangladesh; Maasai in Ngorongoro/Loliondo), police repression (Argentina's Caspalá) and repeated harassment of land defenders.
- **Conservation rules that curtail subsistence and cultural use:** Even where communities remain in situ, respondents report bans on hunting, gathering or ritual access, and strict zoning that criminalises customary livelihoods (Ainu in Shiretoko; Sámi reindeer herders facing wind-farm encroachment).
- **Patchy or token consultation processes:** While a few States cite formal consultations (Chile's park co-management pilots), respondents emphasise that these are the exception; most protected-area decisions proceed through top-down decrees or ad hoc provincial measures.
- **Data and recognition gaps sustain impunity:** Governments that deny Indigenous status (Thailand, Tanzania) or lack disaggregated monitoring can extend protected areas with minimal scrutiny, leaving civil-society reports and litigation as the main avenues for accountability.

⁸ A paper park is a protected area that exists only on paper. It has been legally proclaimed, often to help a government meet numerical conservation targets, but lacks the staffing, budget, enforcement and management planning needed to halt ecological degradation or to secure the rights and participation of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Threats to Forest Protected Areas. IUCN 1999. [Rep-1999-052-En-Summ.pdf](#)



Reflection on data from selected National Level Questions:

The Gap Between Law and Reality

The data gathered by Indigenous organisations and experts through the national surveys reveals a significant gap between legal recognition and the reality on the ground. While 45 per cent of states have an FPIC law and 55 per cent recognize collective land rights in their legislation, violations continue to be widespread. Ninety-seven per cent of respondents' report land or resource incursions in their State, and 69 per cent report forced displacement. This shows that existing statutory rights are not preventing large-scale breaches on the ground.

Procedural Weaknesses Increase Risk

Only 21 per cent of national surveys report that their states have clear and participatory procedures for demarcating Indigenous lands. The countries that lack these procedures are all among those that report violations of land rights and FPIC, which shows how tenure insecurity directly contributes to these failures.

Conservation as a Source of Conflict

Conservation has become a major point of conflict, alongside extractive industries. Sixty-two per cent of national surveys at the national level confirm that protected areas have been expanded without the consent of Indigenous Peoples. These 'green grabs' for conservation mirror the conflicts caused by mining and agribusiness, particularly in Africa and Asia.

Regional Patterns

- **Latin America:** Based on respondents' answers, this region has the strongest legal framework for Indigenous Peoples rights yet still has high violation rates. The key weakness from respondent comments is the significant backlog in enforcement and land demarcation.
- **Asia and Africa:** Based on respondents' answers, these regions appear to have fewer enabling laws, which corresponds with respondents reporting a higher incidence of FPIC breaches and displacement.

Clustered Violations and Emerging Opportunities

The data shows that rights violations tend to cluster together rather than occur in isolation, with 16 of the Indigenous Navigator national surveys reporting the full range of land grabs, displacement, and conservation-related takeovers.

Despite these challenges, there are some emerging opportunities for progress. Recent court rulings in countries like Ecuador, Kenya and Norway are establishing stronger FPIC standards, although their implementation remains slow. Similarly, participatory



demarcation pilot projects in Argentina and Kenya show promise but require scaling up and sustained funding to be effective.

Analysis from the national level on land-use change & tenure security

Legal recognition on paper does not guarantee security

While 55 per cent of national surveys report that their states have laws recognising collective rights, 97 per cent still report land grabs and other violations. The data shows that the primary obstacle is a lack of implementation, with the mapping, titling and enforcement of rights lagging far behind legislation.

Procedural gaps in land recognition invite conflict

The 21 per cent of national surveys that reported their countries have clear, participatory demarcation rules are the only ones that show any decrease in post-2008 violations. Where boundaries remain unofficial, governments and companies often treat Indigenous territories as 'open access' land for projects like mining, dams, plantations, or parks.

FPIC laws are helpful, but their effectiveness is limited by loopholes

Approximately 45 per cent of the national surveys report that their states have laws that require FPIC, and many of those laws provide exemptions for 'strategic' projects. Every country that reported experiencing all three types of violations (land grabs, displacement, and conservation takeovers) either lacks a strong FPIC law or enforces it selectively.

Conservation has become a front-line threat

Conservation initiatives have joined extractive industries as a major threat to the lands and territories of Indigenous Peoples. In 62 per cent of national surveys, protected areas were reportedly expanded without consent; this is a key emerging driver of land-use change reported. Projects related to carbon offsetting (like REDD+), wildlife corridors and tourism zones are now displacing communities in a similar way to mines or oil blocks, especially in Africa and Asia.

Insufficient data collection and constitutional backing

Only 31 per cent of national surveys report that countries capture Indigenous identity in their national census, meaning the impacts of land-use change on the well-being of Indigenous Peoples often go unmeasured. Furthermore, just 38 per cent of national surveys report that their countries include the right to self-determination in their constitution. This limits the ability of courts to challenge conflicting sectoral laws, which were reported as a problem by 79 per cent of national surveys.



The community surveys in review:

The following findings are based on data generated directly by Indigenous communities through 339 community-level surveys.

Recognition and security of Indigenous land rights remain uneven

Fewer than 40 per cent of communities report strong legal recognition of their lands, territories, and resources. Just under half possess collective title deeds or other binding agreements. Even where titles exist, respondents highlight that sub-soil resources, enforcement and boundary demarcation remain persistent problems, showing a wide gap between law and practice. Individual titles are rare and show a marked gender bias; Fifty-nine per cent of communities report that no women hold individual deeds, and titles held jointly by spouses are still limited.

Land-use change is reported to be driven by State-sanctioned activities

Commercial pressures from logging, mining, agribusiness, and infrastructure are the main drivers of conflict and land-use change that occurs without consent. Twenty-three per cent of communities have reported that part of their territories have been declared a protected area without their FPIC, while only 33 per cent report having been able to establish their own conservation zone. Nearly one in six communities (16.5 per cent) have reported relocation without FPIC since 2008, which highlights the human cost of development and conservation projects that lack proper safeguards.

Consultation and FPIC safeguards are systematically weak

Roughly three quarters (75 per cent) of communities believe consultations by state institutions are inadequate. While 69 per cent report consultation by local government inadequate. Fewer than one in ten experiences a robust FPIC process from central government before a project is approved. A majority of communities (59 per cent) have experienced settlement, land grabbing or resource extraction without their FPIC between 2008 and 2025, confirming that current safeguards are not meeting international standards.

Most tenure systems are collective yet increasingly layered

Over half of the surveyed communities practise collective management of their land and resources. These collective territories often include family or lineage plots, which reflects adaptive, mixed systems of tenure. Individual ownership is higher where national laws promote private registration, but it remains secondary to collective systems. A significant minority of communities' view land as inalienable and outside of the market, a perspective that is rarely accommodated in national laws.

Regional contrasts show the influence of national legislation

- Andean States (Bolivia, Peru) show the strongest rates of collective titling, and the lowest number of protected areas created without consent, which demonstrates the value of constitutional guarantees.
- Central and East Africa (Cameroon, Kenya) report the highest levels of conflict, pressure from logging, and FPIC breaches, reflecting weak tenure security and aggressive concession policies.
- South and South-East Asia (Bangladesh, Cambodia, India) reveal significant gender disparities and frequent displacement related to conservation, which is linked to patriarchal inheritance norms and the expansion of eco-tourism.

Overall reflection

Community generated data reveal an Indigenous world dealing with two simultaneous pressures: the incomplete legal recognition of ancestral territories and accelerating land-use change imposed without consent. Where collective rights are secure, conflict and biodiversity loss decrease; where they are not, both escalate. It is therefore essential to embed strong land-tenure safeguards, gender equality measures and Indigenous-led conservation into the CBD's implementation architecture to achieve its 2050 Vision of "living in harmony with nature".

Diving into the Community Data – perspectives from 339 community surveys across 24 countries

The following section presents a detailed analysis of the data from the Indigenous Navigator's national and community-level surveys. To ensure clarity and consistency, the findings for each survey question are organised in a standard format. Each analysis begins with the full text of the survey question. This is followed by a narrative summary that highlights the key statistical results and discusses common themes from the qualitative comments provided by respondents. Finally, where applicable, a data table provides a country-by-country breakdown of the responses, offering full transparency of the evidence that informs this submission.

Survey Question Q016 (LCS): Does the state recognise the peoples covered in this survey as distinct peoples with collective rights?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of the Preambular paragraphs 1 and 2 and Article 3 of the UNDRIP.

Although 60.2 per cent of the 339 community submissions affirm State recognition of Indigenous Peoples as collective rights-holders, qualitative evidence reveals marked geographic disparities and a persistent gap between law and practice.

Positive answers (“Yes”) frequently cite explicit constitutional or statutory provisions, for example the 2009 Constitution of the Plurinational State of Bolivia or the Indigenous Peoples’ Rights Act of the Philippines. Many of these respondents, however, also note that implementation is weak. By contrast, 38.6 per cent of communities reply “No”, indicating that they operate within jurisdictions where Governments classify Indigenous Peoples as “ethnic minorities” and deny them collective rights to land, resources, or self-governance.

Comments from “Yes” countries describe bureaucratic delays, budget constraints and conflicting sectoral laws that render formal recognition ineffective in daily life. The legal landscape is also evolving. National submissions from Cameroon and Peru mention draft bills, stalled constitutional amendments and pending litigation that could alter recognition status.

Taken together, these findings underline the uneven legal recognition of Indigenous Peoples’ collective rights across the 24 countries with public community surveys and highlight critical implementation deficits that require urgent attention.

Themes from the Survey Comments

- **Recognition on paper:** A majority of communities are formally recognised, yet the scope is often geographically or ethnically limited, and recognition rarely confers full juridical personality.
- **Classification as “minorities”:** Roughly two in five communities operate in jurisdictions that deny Indigenous status altogether, classifying them as ethnic minorities or tribal groups, thereby withholding collective-rights protections.
- **Administrative and budgetary barriers:** Even where constitutions or framework laws acknowledge collective rights, costly mapping requirements, registration fees and under-resourced land registries impede implementation.
- **Conflict of laws:** Sector statutes on forests, minerals or water routinely override constitutional guarantees, forcing communities to litigate or protest to defend their rights.

Data Table: Q016 (LCS)

Country	Total	Yes	No	Skipped: No data
Bangladesh	45	13	28	4
Bolivia	18	18	0	0
Brazil	3	3	0	0
Cambodia	25	18	7	0
Cameroon	72	34	38	0
Chile	2	0	2	0
Colombia	6	6	0	0
Ecuador	13	13	0	0

Finland	1	1	0	0
Guyana	12	11	1	0
Honduras	3	2	1	0
India	27	25	2	0
Japan	2	0	2	0
Kenya	18	17	1	0
Malaysia	5	3	2	0
Mexico	6	6	0	0
Nepal	12	1	11	0
Peru	41	27	14	0
Philippines	4	4	0	0
South Africa	1	0	1	0
Suriname	14	0	14	0
Tanzania	5	0	5	0
Thailand	1	1	0	0
Uganda	3	1	2	0
Grand Total (count)	339	204	131	4
Grand Total (%)	100	60.18	38.64	1.18

Source: *Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.*

Survey Question Q021 (LCS): Do your Indigenous institutions/authorities make their own development plans (for example for water and sanitation, road infrastructure, electrification)?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Articles 5, 18, 20.1, 33.2, 34, and 39 of the UNDRIP.

Of the 339 community questionnaires analysed, only 14.5 per cent report having either ‘Fully’ or ‘Considerable’ capacity to draw up their own plans. A further 16.2 per cent state that they have ‘Some’ ability. In contrast, 69.0 per cent indicate that their planning autonomy is ‘Limited’ or ‘Not at all’; within this group, 44.3 per cent report a complete absence of local planning authority. In sum, barely 30.7 per cent of the Indigenous communities surveyed exercise even partial control over their development agenda, while more than two thirds depend on external actors. Only 0.3 per cent of questionnaires did not answer the question.

Regional patterns

- **Andean South America** (Bolivia and Peru, together with parts of Ecuador and Colombia) records the highest incidence of genuine Indigenous-led planning: 89 per cent of Bolivian and 42 per cent of Peruvian communities report at least ‘Some’ autonomy, although implementation remains uneven.

- **South and South-East Asia** is sharply divided. Cambodia and the Philippines include communities with meaningful planning capacity (20 per cent and 50 per cent respectively), whereas Bangladesh and Nepal report virtually none.
- In **Kenya**, 89 per cent of communities state that local Indigenous authorities do not prepare their own plans, citing reliance on county-level government programmes.
- **Central Africa** (Cameroon) shows the lowest level of autonomy: 96 per cent of sampled communities rank their planning capacity as ‘Limited’ or ‘Not at all’.

Themes from Survey Comments

- **Plans on paper, money elsewhere:** Many communities that report having full planning ability stress that the financing for these plans still depends on state or donor approval, which delays their implementation.
- **Traditional councils gaining ground:** Respondents in Bolivia, Cambodia, India, Cameroon, the Philippines and parts of Malaysia describe a renewed use of customary governance bodies (such as the *ayllu*, *barangay*, or *Adat*) to draft integrated community plans.
- **Capacity gaps:** Comments from Kenya and Peru note shortages of technical staff and assistance, skills training, and baseline data, which limits the scope of plans to ‘wish-lists’ rather than actionable projects.
- **Legal uncertainty:** Respondents in Cameroon and Bangladesh argue that the absence of statutory recognition for Indigenous Peoples leaves community plans without any legal force.
- **Emerging partnerships:** Several comments from seven countries, including Cambodia and Peru highlight successful co-management arrangements with municipal authorities, especially for water schemes.

Across the 24 countries surveyed, fewer than 15 per cent of Indigenous communities exercise a high degree of control over development planning, and nearly 45 per cent have none. While Indigenous Peoples in Latin America fare comparatively better, those in Africa and South Asia fare the worst. Qualitative evidence highlights a persistent gap between having a community plan and possessing the financial resources or legal authority required to implement it. These findings suggest that strengthening national legal frameworks for Indigenous self-governance, coupled with targeted capacity-building and financing, is therefore essential if community-led development is to move beyond isolated successes.

Data Table: Q021 (LCS)

Country	Total	Fully	Considerable	Some	Limited	Not at all	Missing/ Skipped
Bangladesh	45	0	0	2	11	32	0
Bolivia	18	5	3	8	2	0	0
Brazil	3	0	0	0	0	3	0

Cambodia	25	1	4	9	9	2	0
Cameroon	72	2	0	1	4	65	0
Chile	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
Colombia	6	1	1	0	1	3	0
Ecuador	13	2	4	5	2	0	0
Finland	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Guyana	12	0	2	5	5	0	0
Honduras	3	0	0	0	1	2	0
India	27	0	2	8	5	12	0
Japan	2	0	0	1	1	0	0
Kenya	18	0	0	1	3	13	0
Malaysia	5	0	2	1	1	1	0
Mexico	6	0	2	0	3	1	0
Nepal	12	0	0	1	5	6	0
Peru	41	6	5	6	16	8	0
Philippines	4	2	0	0	2	0	0
South Africa	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Suriname	14	2	2	2	6	2	0
Tanzania	5	0	0	5	0	0	0
Thailand	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Uganda	3	0	0	0	3	0	0
Grand Total (count)	339	22	27	55	84	150	1
Grand Total (%)	100	6.49	7.96	16.22	24.78	44.25	0

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Survey Question Q023 (LCS): Do your Indigenous institutions/authorities manage issues relating to lands, territories, and resources?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Articles 5, 18, 20.1, 33.2, 34 and 39 of the UNDRIP.

Only 22.1 per cent of the 339 communities surveyed indicate that they possess fully adequate or considerable authority to manage their lands, territories, and resources, while a further 18.6 per cent report having some decision-making power. By contrast, 43.4 per cent describe their authority as limited or non-existent, and the remaining 15.9 per cent did not respond, either because the question was not applicable or because no data were available.

Regional contrasts

- **Andean South America** records the highest levels of Indigenous stewardship. In Colombia, 83.3 per cent of communities indicate strong authority (“Fully” or “Considerable”), followed by Ecuador (53.8 per cent), the Plurinational State of Bolivia (55.6 per cent) and Peru (36.6 per cent).
- **Central Africa** shows the lowest autonomy: in Cameroon, 95.8 per cent of communities fall into the “Limited”, “Not at all” or “Skipped” categories.
- **South and South-East Asia** is mixed. Cambodia reports 44.0 per cent with strong or moderate authority, whereas Bangladesh and Nepal record 22.2 per cent and 16.7 per cent, respectively.
- In **Kenya**, only 11 per cent of communities have “Fully” or “Considerable” authority, while 50.0 per cent report no authority at all.

Themes from Survey Comments

- **Customary jurisdiction in practice:** Where communities report ‘Fully’ or ‘Considerable’ control, comments describe traditional councils or elders allocating land, regulating forest use, and settling disputes under customary law.
- **Law–practice gap:** Many respondents who answered ‘Limited’ note that their councils may be consulted, but state agencies keep the final decision-making power, especially regarding extractive permits or resettlement.
- **Absence of legal title:** Comments from Bangladesh, Cameroon and Kenya, underline that a lack of formal land titles prevents Indigenous institutions from exercising authority beyond conflict mediation.
- **Ongoing struggles for recognition:** Communities in Peru, Colombia and Thailand refer to active processes to secure territorial recognition through legal instruments like *resguardos* or community forest titles.
- **Resource stewardship roles:** Even where their legal powers are weak, some councils organise game scouts, forest patrols or grazing rules to protect communal resources.
- **Landlessness and encroachment:** A minority of communities, notably in South Asia, report that being landless or subject to encroachment makes any local management impossible.

Taken together, the findings show that formal recognition of collective land rights does not automatically translate into effective control on the ground. Fewer than one community in four exercises strong authority over its lands and resources, while nearly half depend on external actors for crucial decisions. Strengthening statutory tenure security and building the capacity of customary governance bodies remain the principal pathways to effective Indigenous stewardship.

Data table Q023 (LCS)

Country	Total	Fully	Considerable	Some	Limited	Not at all	Skipped: Not in scope
Bangladesh	45	5	5	4	9	22	0

Bolivia	18	9	1	3	3	2	0
Brazil	3	0	0	1	1	1	0
Cambodia	25	8	3	8	4	2	0
Cameroon	72	0	0	6	5	26	35
Chile	2	0	0	1	0	1	0
Colombia	6	2	3	0	0	1	0
Ecuador	13	4	3	4	1	1	0
Finland	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Guyana	12	0	0	5	7	0	0
Honduras	3	0	0	0	1	2	0
India	27	0	4	11	6	6	0
Japan	2	0	0	0	1	1	0
Kenya	18	1	1	6	6	3	1
Malaysia	5	2	1	1	1	0	0
Mexico	6	1	4	1	0	0	0
Nepal	12	0	0	2	4	6	0
Peru	41	12	3	9	8	3	6
Philippines	4	0	0	1	2	1	0
South Africa	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Suriname	14	2	0	0	0	0	12
Tanzania	5	0	0	0	3	2	0
Thailand	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Uganda	3	0	0	0	3	0	0
Grand Total (count)	339	46	29	63	67	80	54
Grand Total (%)	100	13.57	8.55	18.58	19.76	23.6	15.94

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Survey Question Q029 (LCS): Do local or central government institutions ensure that adequate consultations are undertaken with your communities before approval of projects or other measures that may affect you?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Articles 19 and 32.2 of the UNDRIP.

Across the 24 States surveyed through the community surveys, consultation mechanisms fall markedly short of international standards for FPIC. The data reveals a failure at both levels of government. Only 1.2 per cent of the 339 communities report that central Government institutions conduct consultations “Fully”, and a further 3.5 per cent consider such engagement “Considerable”. At the local-government level the results are only marginally better, with 1.5 per cent of communities rating consultations as “Fully” adequate and 5.0 per cent as “Considerable”.



When “Some” consultation is included, the proportion rises to 8.6 per cent for central and 14.8 per cent for local authorities; yet most communities still find official engagement insufficient.

In respect of central Government, 75.2 per cent describe consultation as “Limited” or “None”, while 69.0 per cent say the same of local authorities. Missing or “not in scope” replies account for roughly 16 per cent at each level. The gap between local and central government performance is narrow, which suggests the shortcomings are systemic rather than purely administrative. Comments from respondents describe a persistent pattern of late-stage, one-way information sessions rather than genuine dialogue, a problem that is made worse by linguistic, cultural and gender barriers. The findings suggest a need for stronger statutory consultation duties, dedicated budgets for participatory processes, and the empowerment of Indigenous representative bodies to co-design project frameworks.

Themes from Survey Comments

- **Tokenistic or retro-active consultations:** Many respondents report that government agencies present projects as a ‘fait accompli’ (a decision that has already been made), inviting comments only after the fact.
- **Scale matters:** Large-scale infrastructure or extractive projects are more likely to trigger formal hearings (but not always, as reported by Bolivian and Bangladeshi respondents), while smaller initiatives often proceed with minimal or no dialogue.
- **Representation gaps:** Respondents frequently note that customary leaders or women’s groups are excluded from meetings, which are often conducted in majority languages without interpretation.
- **Role of NGOs:** In Cambodia, Kenya, Guyana, Peru, and Uganda several communities report that meaningful consultation happens only when civil-society organisations are able to broker meetings and provide technical advice.
- **Legal vacuum:** Where national law does not guarantee FPIC, or where enforcement budgets are low, government agencies tend to treat consultation as voluntary rather than mandatory.

This reality on the ground reflects the reported national-level legal landscape, where a majority of States (55 per cent) were reported to have no dedicated law obliging authorities to obtain FPIC before approving projects.

Collectively, these results underscore that while national legal frameworks may exist, tangible state commitment and institutional follow-through remain inconsistent and insufficient. This highlights a persistent implementation gap that requires focused national policy reforms and increased accountability at central levels of government.

Data Table: Q029 (LCS): Central Government

Country	Total	Fully	Considerable	Some	Limited	None	Missing/Skipped
Bangladesh	45	0	0	0	0	43	2
Bolivia	18	0	3	1	3	11	0
Brazil	3	0	0	1	1	1	0
Cambodia	25	0	3	0	2	20	0
Cameroon	72	0	2	1	10	24	35
Chile	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
Colombia	6	0	0	1	1	4	0
Ecuador	13	2	1	1	3	6	0
Finland	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Guyana	12	0	0	1	5	6	0
Honduras	3	0	0	0	1	2	0
India	27	0	0	2	2	23	0
Japan	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
Kenya	18	0	0	3	6	9	0
Malaysia	5	1	0	1	2	1	0
Mexico	6	0	2	0	0	4	0
Nepal	12	0	0	0	0	12	0
Peru	41	0	1	1	6	28	5
Philippines	4	0	0	0	0	4	0
South Africa	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Suriname	14	0	0	0	1	1	12
Tanzania	5	0	0	0	5	0	0
Thailand	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Uganda	3	0	0	0	2	1	0
Grand Total (count)	339	4	12	13	52	203	55
Grand Total (%)	100	1.18	3.54	3.83	15.34	59.88	15.93

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Data Table: Q029 (LCS): Local Government

Country	Total	Fully	Considerable	Some	Limited	None	Missing/Skipped
Bangladesh	45	0	0	1	7	35	2
Bolivia	18	0	3	1	5	9	0
Brazil	3	0	1	1	0	1	0
Cambodia	25	1	3	1	1	19	0
Cameroon	72	0	1	5	13	18	35
Chile	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
Colombia	6	0	1	1	0	4	0
Ecuador	13	1	3	3	5	1	0

Finland	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Guyana	12	0	0	2	7	3	0
Honduras	3	0	0	0	1	2	0
India	27	0	0	2	2	23	0
Japan	2	0	0	1	1	0	0
Kenya	18	0	2	3	7	6	0
Malaysia	5	1	0	1	2	1	0
Mexico	6	1	1	0	0	4	0
Nepal	12	0	0	0	0	12	0
Peru	41	0	2	1	9	24	5
Philippines	4	0	0	0	0	4	0
South Africa	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Suriname	14	0	0	0	1	1	12
Tanzania	5	0	0	5	0	0	0
Thailand	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Uganda	3	0	0	0	2	1	0
Grand Total (count)	339	5	17	28	63	171	55
Grand Total (%)	100	1.47	5.01	8.26	18.58	50.44	16.22

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Survey Question Q030 (LCS): Do local or central government institutions obtain the free, prior, and informed consent of your communities before they approve projects or other measures that affect you?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Articles 19 and 32.2 of the UNDRIP.

Across the 24 States covered by the community survey, obtaining free, prior, and informed consent remains the exception rather than the norm. Only 7.96 per cent of communities report that central Government “Always” or “Mostly” seeks their consent, while the corresponding figure for local authorities is 11.50 per cent. A further 7.96 per cent (central) and 10.32 per cent (local) state that consent is secured “Sometimes”. By contrast, 69.03 per cent of communities say central Government “Never” obtains consent, with an additional 14.16 per cent indicating that it does so only “Rarely”, and 61.95 per cent give the same “Never” response for local authorities.

Qualitative comments depict interactions that are perfunctory, conducted at a late stage and hindered by linguistic, cultural and gender barriers, underscoring the urgent need for stronger statutory safeguards and independent oversight of consent obligations.

Themes from Survey Comments

- **Consent in name only:** Similar to Q029 (LCS), many respondent comments describe “information meetings” that are held after a decision has already been made, where projects are presented as a ‘fait accompli’. In these cases, consent is neither prior nor freely negotiated.
- **Scale bias:** Large-scale extractive or infrastructure projects will occasionally trigger formal FPIC procedures, while smaller works often proceed with no consultation at all.
- **Role of intermediaries and NGOs:** Meaningful consent processes often occur only when civil-society organisations or faith groups are able to broker dialogue and provide legal or technical support to communities.
- **Language and representation gaps:** Consultations are frequently held in majority languages and exclude women, youth, or customary leaders, which undermines their legitimacy.
- **Legal ambiguity:** Where domestic law does not guarantee FPIC or where enforcement is minimal, officials tend to treat obtaining consent as optional rather than mandatory.
- **Positive exceptions:** A handful of Bolivian and Peruvian communities report municipal ordinances that embed FPIC in local development plans, though they note that implementation remains uneven.

As with Q029 (LCS), this reality on the ground reflects the national-level legal landscape, where a majority of States (55 per cent) are reported to have no dedicated law obliging authorities to obtain FPIC before approving projects.

Altogether, the results point to a significant credibility gap. National governments continue to fall short of their responsibility to protect the collective rights of Indigenous Peoples in practice. This demonstrates an urgent need for stronger institutional accountability and more frequent, transparent engagement.

Data Table: Q030 (LCS): Central Government

Country	Total	Always	Mostly	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Missing/Skipped
Bangladesh	45	0	0	0	1	42	2
Bolivia	18	0	4	0	4	10	0
Brazil	3	0	0	1	1	1	0
Cambodia	25	1	2	0	2	19	1
Cameroon	72	0	6	13	14	39	0
Chile	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
Colombia	6	0	0	2	0	4	0
Ecuador	13	1	1	3	2	6	0
Finland	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Guyana	12	0	0	1	7	4	0
Honduras	3	0	0	0	0	3	0
India	27	0	1	0	4	22	0

Japan	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
Kenya	18	0	0	4	3	11	0
Malaysia	5	1	1	1	1	1	0
Mexico	6	1	1	0	0	4	0
Nepal	12	0	0	0	0	12	0
Peru	41	2	0	2	5	32	0
Philippines	4	0	0	0	0	4	0
South Africa	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Suriname	14	3	1	0	1	9	0
Tanzania	5	0	0	0	3	2	0
Thailand	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Uganda	3	0	0	0	0	3	0
Grand Total (count)	339	10	17	27	48	234	3
Grand Total (%)	100	2.95	5.01	7.96	14.16	69.03	0.88

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Data Table: Q030 (LCS): Local Government

Country	Total	Always	Mostly	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Missing/Skipped
Bangladesh	45	0	0	1	4	38	2
Bolivia	18	0	4	0	4	10	0
Brazil	3	1	0	0	1	1	0
Cambodia	25	2	2	0	3	18	0
Cameroon	72	1	9	16	9	37	0
Chile	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
Colombia	6	0	1	1	0	4	0
Ecuador	13	0	5	2	4	2	0
Finland	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Guyana	12	0	0	2	8	2	0
Honduras	3	0	0	0	1	2	0
India	27	0	1	0	4	22	0
Japan	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
Kenya	18	0	1	5	4	8	0
Malaysia	5	1	1	1	1	1	0
Mexico	6	2	0	0	0	4	0
Nepal	12	0	0	0	1	11	0
Peru	41	2	1	4	6	27	1
Philippines	4	0	0	0	0	4	0
South Africa	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Suriname	14	3	1	0	2	8	0
Tanzania	5	0	0	3	0	2	0
Thailand	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Uganda	3	0	0	0	0	3	0

Grand Total (count)	339	13	26	35	52	210	3
Grand Total (%)	100	3.83	7.67	10.32	15.34	61.95	0.88

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Survey Question Q039 (LCS): What are the characteristics of your traditional land and resource tenure system?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Articles 25, 26.1, 26.3 of the UNDRIP.

The survey data shows that Indigenous tenure systems are complex, adaptive, and multi-layered. Just over half of the communities responding (51 per cent) state that their lands and resources are managed collectively by the whole community; however, this collective stewardship frequently coexists with family, clan, or lineage arrangements (34 per cent) and with individual parcels (35 per cent). A further 15 per cent describe non-proprietary systems in which land is regarded as inalienable, a view reported most often in Central Africa and South Asia. Other tenure formulations account for 4 per cent of replies. This shows that plural tenure is the norm, with over half the communities combining collective territorial rights with family or individual plots for cultivation or housing.

Spiritual, non-proprietary conceptions of land, where land is considered inalienable, also persist, particularly in Central Africa and South Asia. These worldviews are under pressure where States convert customary lands into public or private property.

Regional patterns persist, with the strongest collective tenure reported in the Andean countries, while South-East Asia and Kenya exhibit highly layered systems and Bangladesh, India and Cameroon register a stronger emphasis on family or individual control.

These findings underscore the need for statutory recognition of both collective and mixed forms of tenure if the land and resource rights of Indigenous Peoples are to be secured in practice.

(Note: The following percentages add up to more than 100 per cent as communities could select multiple characteristics)

Tenure Element Selected	Communities Selecting	Share of Total Replies
Collective management by the whole community	174	51 %

Held / managed by families, clans, or lineages	114	34 %
Individual ownership / management	118	35 %
Land/resources are not property and cannot be sold	49	15 %
Other formulations	15	4 %
Not answered / no data	73	22 %

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Themes from Survey Comments

- **Nested rights:** Respondents described how a collective territory often surrounds household plots, while rivers, forests and grazing areas remain communal.
- **Legal recognition drives security:** Bolivian and Peruvian respondents cite community titles as a defence against encroachment, while South-Asian Peoples note the refusal of states to register their customary holdings. This finding is further supported by Q042-44 (LCS).
- **Spiritual / non-proprietary land:** This was noted especially among the Baka (Cameroon) and some Indian Peoples, who explained that land is ancestral and cannot be sold, though use-rights may be allocated.
- **State reclassification:** Comments from Bangladesh and Nepal describe communal forests being re-labelled as ‘reserve’ or ‘khas’ land, which curtails Indigenous control.⁹

Data Table: Q039 (LCS)

Bangladesh	Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	8	18
	Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	2
	Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Other	1	2
	Land and resources are held and managed individually	13	29
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community	9	20

⁹ This practice of administratively re-designating land mirrors the process of establishing protected areas without consent, a key source of conflict identified in the analysis of Q055 (LCS)

	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	2	4
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	2	4
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities	1	2
	Other	4	9
	Skipped: No data	2	4
	Skipped: Not relevant	2	4
	Total	45	100
Bolivia	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community	1	6
	Missing	17	94
	Total	18	100
Brazil	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	1	33
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities	1	33
	Other	1	33
	Total	3	100
Cambodia	Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	4
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community	11	44
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	2	8
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	5	20
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	3	12
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	4
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	4
	Other	1	4
	Total	25	100

Cameroon	Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	2	3
	Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	1
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community	4	6
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	4	6
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	5	7
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	3	4
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities	3	4
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	1	1
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	1
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Land and resources are held and managed individually; Other	1	1
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community	2	3
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	6	8
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	1

	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually; Other	1	1
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	2	3
	Skipped: Not in scope	35	49
	Total	72	100
Chile	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	1	50
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities	1	50
	Total	2	100
Colombia	Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	17
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community	4	67
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community	1	17
	Total	6	100
Ecuador	Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	2	15
	Land and resources are held and managed individually	6	46
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community	2	15
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	1	8
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	8
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities	1	8
	Total	13	100
Finland	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the	1	100

	community		
	Total	1	100
Guyana	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community	2	17
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	5	42
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community	1	8
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	4	33
	Total	12	100
Honduras	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community	2	67
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Other	1	33
	Total	3	100
India	Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	7	26
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community	2	7
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	10	37
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities	1	4
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	5	19
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	2	7
	Total	27	100

Japan	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	2	100
	Total	2	100
Kenya	Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	1	6
	Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	3	17
	Land and resources are held and managed individually	2	11
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community	2	11
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	4	22
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Other	1	6
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	4	22
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities	1	6
	Total	18	100
Malaysia	Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	1	20
	Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	20
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	20
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually; Other	1	20
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community	1	20
	Total	5	100

Mexico	Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	17
	Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	17
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	3	50
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	17
	Total	6	100
Nepal	Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	1	8
	Land and resources are held and managed individually	7	58
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	8
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	8
	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Land and resources are held and managed individually	2	17
	Total	12	100
Peru	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community	25	61
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	7	17
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	2
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Other	3	7
	Skipped: Not in scope	5	12
	Total	41	100
Philippines	Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	25
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	2	50

	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	1	25
	Total	4	100
South Africa	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	1	100
	Total	1	100
Suriname	Lands and resources are not considered property and cannot be held by people or communities; Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community	2	14
	Skipped: Not in scope	12	86
	Total	14	100
Tanzania	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed individually	5	100
	Total	5	100
Thailand	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	1	100
	Total	1	100
Uganda	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community	2	67
	Lands and resources are held and managed collectively by the community; Land and resources are held and managed by families, clans or other groups within the community	1	33
	Total	3	100

Source: *Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.*

Survey Question Q041 (LCS): Is your right to lands, territories and resources recognised by the government?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Articles 25, 26.1, 26.3 of the UNDRIP.

Legal recognition of the land and resource rights of Indigenous Peoples remains uneven across the globe. Only 24.8 per cent of the 339 communities surveyed report strong statutory protection (“Fully” or “Considerable”), whereas 17.1 per cent enjoy partial recognition and 42.5 per cent have either limited or no recognition at all. The remaining 15.6 per cent provided no information.

Regional contrasts are marked. In the Plurinational State of Bolivia, 88.9 per cent of communities record high-level recognition, reflecting the country’s constitutional guarantees. Kenya shows 61.1 per cent with at least some recognition, although 16.7 per cent still lack any protection. By comparison, Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, and Peru cluster at around 26–34 per cent high recognition, and Cameroon reports virtually none. Several communities add that, even where statutes acknowledge collective tenure, forests, water bodies and sub-surface resources often remain outside Indigenous control. These findings highlight the need for stronger legislation, consistent administrative practice, and dedicated enforcement mechanisms to close the recognition gap.

Summary of Recognition Levels (Global - n = 339 community questionnaires)

Recognition level	Communities	Share of replies †
High – “Fully” + “Considerable”	84	24.8 %
Partial – “Some”	58	17.1 %
Low / none – “Limited” + “No”	144	42.5 %
Not answered / not in scope	53	15.6 %

Source: *Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.*

Themes from Survey Comments

- **Communal titles versus sub-soil rights:** Positive responses typically cite collective titles, but stress that minerals, water, or sub-soil resources often remain state property.
- **Piecemeal recognition:** Many communities hold deeds only for parts of their territory, such as house plots or village centres, while their wider customary lands remain unregistered.
- **Law–practice gap:** Respondents describe how overlapping concessions, weak enforcement and bureaucratic delays make legal recognition meaningless in daily life.¹⁰
- **Corporate encroachment:** Negative answers often blame agribusiness, logging or mining concessions that have been legally issued over ancestral lands.
- **Conservation-driven exclusion (so-called “green grabs”)** : Approximately 15 per cent of comments invoke protected areas or REDD+ projects established without consent;
- **Pending titling processes:** Some communities that answered ‘Partial’ noted that they are in the middle of ongoing land-claim procedures or that draft legislation could strengthen their status in the future. However in Suriname, the responses noted a “legal vacuum” leading to a “No” response.

¹⁰ This illustrates the 'chronic implementation gap' identified in the national surveys, where protracted demarcation processes and the overriding of land statutes by sectoral laws undermine tenure security.

Overall, while some countries show progress in formally recognising the rights of Indigenous Peoples to lands, territories and resources, the results highlight persistent gaps. There is a clear need for stronger, more consistent implementation to close this recognition deficit worldwide.

Data Table: Q041 (LCS)

Country	Total	Fully	Considerable	Some	Limited	No	Missing/ Skipped
Bangladesh	45	12	2	8	7	15	1
Bolivia	18	16	2	0	0	0	0
Brazil	3	2	0	1	0	0	0
Cambodia	25	4	5	3	3	10	0
Cameroon	72	1	0	4	12	20	35
Chile	2	0	0	0	1	1	0
Colombia	6	0	0	3	2	1	0
Ecuador	13	2	4	6	1	0	0
Finland	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Guyana	12	0	0	5	7	0	0
Honduras	3	1	0	1	0	1	0
India	27	2	3	5	11	6	0
Japan	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
Kenya	18	8	3	2	2	3	0
Malaysia	5	1	0	2	0	2	0
Mexico	6	3	1	1	1	0	0
Nepal	12	0	0	0	1	11	0
Peru	41	8	2	12	13	1	5
Philippines	4	2	0	0	1	1	0
South Africa	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Suriname	14	0	0	0	0	2	12
Tanzania	5	0	0	5	0	0	0
Thailand	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Uganda	3	0	0	0	1	2	0
Grand Total (count)	339	62	22	58	63	81	53
Grand Total (%)	100	18.29	6.49	17.11	18.58	23.89	15.63

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Survey Question Q042 (LCS): Does your people or community have title deeds or other binding agreements in recognition of their collective right to lands or territories?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Article 21.1 of the UNDRIP.

The survey reveals that formal recognition through collective title deeds or binding agreements is advancing, but it remains highly uneven across the globe. Only 39.5 per cent of the 339 communities surveyed hold a valid collective title deed or other binding agreement that recognises their territorial rights, whereas 54.9 per cent have no such document and 5.6 per cent did not provide information.

The regional contrasts are stark. In the Plurinational State of Bolivia every community surveyed possesses formal title, and in Kenya 83.3 per cent do so following the 2016 Community Land Act. By comparison, fewer than 15 per cent of communities in Bangladesh, India and Cameroon enjoy documentary recognition, and Suriname reports virtually none.

Even where titles exist, many respondents note that they exclude forests, water, or sub-soil resources and that enforcement remains weak. The results therefore underline an urgent need for Governments to accelerate collective titling programmes, extend them to cover the full bundle of territorial rights, and ensure effective implementation and dispute-resolution mechanisms in line with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

This lack of formal documentation at the community level can be correlated with the procedural failures identified in the national surveys, where only 21 per cent of States have adopted clear and effective procedures for demarcating and registering Indigenous lands.

Response	Communities	Share of replies
Yes – a valid collective title or binding agreement is in hand	134	39.5 %
No – no such document exists	186	54.9 %
Not answered / “Not in scope”	19	5.6 %

Source: *Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.*

Themes from Survey Comments

- **Collective titles, but only surface rights:** Respondents from Bolivia and Peru praise their community titles but note that sub-soil resources remain under state control.
- **Partial or patchy documentation:** Communities in Kenya and Cambodia often possess deeds only for their village centres, while wider customary territories remain unregistered.
- **Lost or obsolete papers:** Several communities in Bangladesh and India state that historic leases or permits have been lost or made invalid by later legislation.

- **Pending claims:** Many ‘No’ answers from Cameroon refer to applications for titles that are stalled in administrative or judicial processes.
- **Encroachment despite titles:** Even communities that hold deeds describe ongoing land grabbing by loggers, ranchers, or agribusinesses in areas where enforcement is weak.

Data Table: Q042 (LCS)

Country	Total	Yes	No	Missing/Skipped
Bangladesh	45	6	37	2
Bolivia	18	18	0	0
Brazil	3	2	1	0
Cambodia	25	13	12	0
Cameroon	72	5	67	0
Chile	2	1	1	0
Colombia	6	5	1	0
Ecuador	13	8	5	0
Finland	1	0	1	0
Guyana	12	7	5	0
Honduras	3	3	0	0
India	27	3	24	0
Japan	2	0	2	0
Kenya	18	15	3	0
Malaysia	5	1	4	0
Mexico	6	6	0	0
Nepal	12	1	11	0
Peru	41	34	2	5
Philippines	4	2	2	0
South Africa	1	1	0	0
Suriname	14	0	2	12
Tanzania	5	3	2	0
Thailand	1	0	1	0
Uganda	3	0	3	0
Grand Total (count)	339	134	186	19
Grand Total (%)	100	39.53	54.87	5.6

Source: *Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.*

Survey Question Q044 (LCS): Approximately, how many women and men (or couples if titles are held by both spouses) of your people/community have title deeds or other binding agreements in recognition of their individual rights to land?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Article 21.1 of the UNDRIP.

Among the 339 community questionnaires, 50 per cent report that no men hold individual title deeds or comparable binding agreements, while the figure rises to 59 per cent for women and 63 per cent for couples. Only 9 per cent of communities state that every man possesses a title (“Five out of five”), compared with 3 per cent for women and 5 per cent for couples. Intermediate coverage levels remain modest: for men, the combined “Four out of five” and “Three out of five” categories together account for 17 per cent; for women, the equivalent share is 6 per cent, and for couples it is 9 per cent.

Response category	Men	Women	Couples
None (0 %)	169 (50 %)	199 (59 %)	213 (63 %)
One / Five (≈ 20 %)	25 (7 %)	48 (14 %)	30 (9 %)
Two / Five (≈ 40 %)	18 (5 %)	21 (6 %)	7 (2 %)
Three / Five (≈ 60 %)	26 (8 %)	16 (5 %)	16 (5 %)
Four / Five (≈ 80 %)	30 (9 %)	4 (1 %)	12 (4 %)
Five / Five (≈ 100 %)	31 (9 %)	10 (3 %)	17 (5 %)

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

These data confirm a marked gender disparity in secure land ownership: individual titles for women and joint spousal titles are still rare, whereas men benefit more frequently from formal documentation, though even their coverage is far from universal.

Themes from Survey Comments

- **Collective-first systems:** Respondents in the Andes stressed that individual titling is foreign to their worldview, as land remains communally owned.
- **Gendered barriers:** In Bangladesh, India and Cameroon, patrilineal inheritance and dowry customs were cited as reasons for low land ownership among women, even in communities where men hold titles.
- **Legal reforms matter:** Kenya’s 2016 Community Land Act and donor-backed pilot programmes in Cambodia are beginning to generate joint husband-and-wife titles, though their reach is still limited.
- **Patchy uptake:** Where individual registration is voluntary, communities often prioritise only a subset of household plots, which explains the high number of ‘One’ or ‘Two out of five’ answers.
- **Enforcement doubts:** Several communities where all men hold titles note that while the paperwork exists, boundary disputes and encroachment continue to be a problem.

Data Table: Q044 (LCS) - Titles held by Couples:

Country	Total	Five/5	Four/5	Three/5	Two/5	One/5	None	Missing/Skipped
Bangladesh	45	2	1	1	2	9	26	4
Bolivia	18	0	0	0	0	0	18	0

Brazil	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Cambodia	25	3	3	6	0	1	11	1
Cameroon	72	0	0	0	2	1	68	1
Chile	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Colombia	6	0	1	0	0	1	3	1
Ecuador	13	3	1	5	1	2	1	0
Finland	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Guyana	12	0	0	0	0	0	12	0
Honduras	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
India	27	1	0	0	0	2	12	12
Japan	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kenya	18	1	1	2	0	2	12	0
Malaysia	5	1	0	0	0	0	4	0
Mexico	6	0	0	0	2	1	3	0
Nepal	12	0	0	0	0	5	7	0
Peru	41	4	5	0	0	2	21	9
Philippines	4	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
South Africa	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Suriname	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	12
Tanzania	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	1
Thailand	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Uganda	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	0
Grand Total (count)	339	17	12	16	7	30	213	44
Grand Total (%)	100	5.01	3.54	4.72	2.06	8.85	62.83	12.97

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Data Table Q044 (LCS) – Titles held by Men:

Country	Total	Five/5	Four/5	Three/5	Two/5	One/5	None	Missing/ skipped
Bangladesh	45	18	2	4	5	9	5	2
Bolivia	18	0	0	0	0	0	18	0
Brazil	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Cambodia	25	2	0	5	2	2	13	1
Cameroon	72	0	1	1	1	1	67	1
Chile	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Colombia	6	0	1	1	0	0	3	1
Ecuador	13	0	4	4	2	3	0	0
Finland	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Guyana	12	0	0	0	0	0	12	0
Honduras	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	0
India	27	2	1	0	0	2	10	12
Japan	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0

Kenya	18	1	7	7	1	0	2	0
Malaysia	5	2	0	0	0	0	3	0
Mexico	6	1	3	0	1	0	1	0
Nepal	12	0	9	0	2	0	1	0
Peru	41	1	0	1	1	3	26	9
Philippines	4	0	0	2	0	1	1	0
South Africa	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Suriname	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	12
Tanzania	5	0	2	0	2	1	0	0
Thailand	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Uganda	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Grand Total (count)	339	31	30	26	18	25	169	40
Grand Total (%)	100	9.14	8.85	7.67	5.31	7.37	49.85	11.79

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Data Table Q044 (LCS) – Titles held by Women:

Country	Total	Five/5	Four/5	Three/5	Two/5	One/5	None	Missing/Skipped
Bangladesh	45	2	1	2	3	8	27	2
Bolivia	18	0	0	0	0	0	18	0
Brazil	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
Cambodia	25	2	1	3	3	4	11	1
Cameroon	72	0	0	1	2	1	67	1
Chile	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Colombia	6	0	1	0	0	1	3	1
Ecuador	13	0	0	6	3	3	1	0
Finland	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Guyana	12	0	0	0	0	0	12	0
Honduras	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
India	27	1	0	0	0	2	12	12
Japan	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kenya	18	1	1	2	1	8	5	0
Malaysia	5	1	0	0	0	0	4	0
Mexico	6	0	0	0	1	4	1	0
Nepal	12	0	0	1	0	10	1	0
Peru	41	1	0	0	2	2	26	10
Philippines	4	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
South Africa	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Suriname	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	12
Tanzania	5	0	0	0	3	2	0	0
Thailand	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Uganda	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	0



Grand Total (count)	339	10	4	16	21	48	199	41
Grand Total (%)	100	2.95	1.18	4.72	6.19	14.16	58.7	12.08

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Survey Question Q045 (LCS): Does your people/community experience conflicts related to land or natural resources?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Article 26.2 of the UNDRIP.

Conflict over land and natural resources is widespread. Of the 339 Indigenous communities surveyed, 283 – or 83.5 per cent – report experiencing conflicts, while only 56 communities – 16.5 per cent – state that they do not. Respondents emphasise that “conflict” encompasses legal battles, bureaucratic stalemates, and gradual encroachment, as well as overt violence. This broad understanding of conflict directly reflects the 'chronic implementation gap' identified in the national-level analysis, where bureaucratic hurdles and weak enforcement, rather than just overt action, are primary sources of tension for communities.

Across all regions, competing claims from extractive industries, commercial agriculture, conservation schemes and settlement expansion are the principal triggers. The data shows that where governments have not secured collective titles, clarified boundaries, and enforced FPIC, these pressures result in persistent disputes that undermine livelihoods, cultural integrity and, in many cases, physical security.

The findings show that strengthening statutory land tenure, ensuring robust environmental and social safeguards, and establishing inclusive dispute-resolution mechanisms are critical for reducing these conflicts and upholding the rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Response	Communities	Share of replies
Yes	283	84 %
No	56	16 %

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Themes from Survey Comments

- **Resource extraction:** Examples include logging concessions in Cambodia and Suriname; artisanal and industrial mining in Peru and Finland; and oil exploration blocks that overlap community land in Kenya.
- **Agribusiness and plantations:** This includes sugarcane and rubber estates in Cambodia and oil-palm expansion in Cameroon.

- **Encroachment by settlers or pastoralists:** This includes the in-migration of smallholders in Bangladesh’s Chittagong Hill Tracts and cross-border herding in northern Kenya.
- **Protected areas & conservation projects:** This refers to the expansion of national parks in Cameroon and India, which restricts subsistence hunting, fishing, and gathering.
- **Boundary disputes:** These conflicts often occur between neighbouring villages or clans and are made worse by unclear or overlapping state maps.
- **Water and megaproject conflicts:** Examples include hydropower dams in Cambodia and Peru and irrigation schemes in Kenya and India that divert or pollute essential rivers.

Many comments underline that their “Yes” response does not necessarily mean open violence; it spans legal battles, bureaucratic deadlock, and slow-moving encroachment as well as physical confrontations.

Overall, the results highlight persistent tensions over land rights and resource control in most surveyed communities. This emphasises the need for secure recognition of rights, effective conflict resolution mechanisms, and the protection of the territorial integrity of Indigenous Peoples.

Data Table: Q045 (LCS)

Country	Total	Yes	No
Bangladesh	45	33	12
Bolivia	18	14	4
Brazil	3	3	0
Cambodia	25	24	1
Cameroon	72	57	15
Chile	2	2	0
Colombia	6	5	1
Ecuador	13	13	0
Finland	1	1	0
Guyana	12	9	3
Honduras	3	3	0
India	27	22	5
Japan	2	2	0
Kenya	18	18	0
Malaysia	5	4	1
Mexico	6	6	0
Nepal	12	12	0
Peru	41	34	7
Philippines	4	4	0
South Africa	1	1	0
Suriname	14	7	7

Tanzania	5	5	0
Thailand	1	1	0
Uganda	3	3	0
Grand Total (count)	339	283	56
Grand Total (%)	100	83.48	16.52

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Survey Question Q046 (LCS): If your people/community experience conflicts related to land or natural resources, are these related to any of the following?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Article 26.2 of the UNDRIP.

Data Table: Q046(LCS) – Conflict drivers (communities could select multiple drivers, the column sums to more than 100 per cent).¹¹

Rank	Conflict category	Communities	Share of conflict-affected communities *
1	Illegal logging or other illegal activities	154	47.7 %
2	Disputes within or among Indigenous Peoples' communities	120	37.2 %
3	In-migration / settlers	110	34.1 %
4	Establishment of parks or protected areas	96	29.7 %
5	Extractive industries	92	28.5 %
6	Infrastructure (roads, dams, etc.)	74	22.9 %
7	Large-scale commercial agriculture	80	24.8 %
8	Other / mixed causes (e.g. tourism, sand mining)	62	19.2 %
9	Energy-related projects	48	14.9 %

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

¹¹ Percentages are calculated against the 323 communities that indicated they were affected by at least one conflict. Because several categories could be marked for each community, the column sums to more than 100 per cent.

Among the 323 communities that reported land- or resource-related conflicts, 47.7 per cent identify illegal logging or other unlawful activities as a trigger. The next most frequent drivers are disputes within or among Indigenous Peoples' communities (37.2 per cent), in-migration or settlers (34.1 per cent), and the establishment of protected areas (29.7 per cent). Extractive industries account for 28.5 per cent of cases, while infrastructure projects are cited by 22.9 per cent. Large-scale commercial agriculture, other or mixed causes such as tourism and sand mining, and energy projects are reported by 24.8 per cent, 19.2 per cent and 14.9 per cent of communities, respectively.

Regional Nuances

- In **Kenya**, conflicts are most commonly related to settlers, internal disputes, and the creation of parks.
- **Cameroon** registers the highest share of conflicts related to logging.
- **Peru** leads on conflicts related to extractive industries.
- **Cambodia** features prominently in conflicts related to logging, parks, and large-scale agriculture.
- **Energy-related** conflicts are clustered in Kenya (geothermal and wind), India (hydro-electric), and Peru (hydrocarbons).

Themes from the Survey Comments

- **Boundary or internal disputes:** Communities describe unresolved village or clan boundaries and quarrels over resource-sharing rules (e.g. “controversia por límites territoriales”).
- **Water, dams and large hydro-irrigation works:** Dams and canal schemes (Lower Sesan 2 in Cambodia, Andean irrigation projects) are singled out for triggering displacement and livelihood loss.
- **Illegal logging and other unlawful forest extraction:** Comments cite clandestine timber roads, madera ilegal and wildlife poaching as persistent, State-tolerated drivers of conflict.
- **Agribusiness and plantation expansion:** Oil-palm, rubber, sugar-cane and eucalyptus estates, often backed by economic-land concessions, are named in Cameroon, Cambodia and Brazil.
- **Infrastructure & energy corridors:** Roads, pipelines, power lines, wind and geothermal plants are reported to fragment territory or bypass Indigenous consultation duties.
- **Settlers, pastoral in-migration and small-scale encroachment:** Hill-tract settlers in Bangladesh, cross-border herders in northern Kenya and smallholder colonists in Bolivia are typical examples.
- **Protected areas and conservation projects:** National parks, forest reserves and REDD+ schemes are frequently framed as “green grabs” that ignore Indigenous free, prior and informed consent.

- **Extractive industries (mining, oil, gas, coal):** Gold and bauxite concessions in the Amazon, oil blocks in Kenya and coal leases in India are highlighted as sources of land dispossession.

The findings show that land and resource conflicts are multiplicative, meaning most communities face several simultaneous pressures. For example, respondents in countries like Bangladesh, Cambodia, Kenya, and Peru frequently selected combinations of drivers, such as extraction, agriculture, settlers, parks, and logging.

Data Table: Q046 (LCS)

Country	Q046(LCS)	Frequency	Percent
Bangladesh	Agriculture	2	4
	Agriculture; Other	1	2
	Agriculture; Parks; Logging	1	2
	Agriculture; Settlers; Other	1	2
	Agriculture; Settlers; Parks; Logging	1	2
	Agriculture; Settlers; Parks; Logging; Other	1	2
	Disputes; Other	1	2
	Energy; Logging	1	2
	Energy; Parks; Disputes	1	2
	Extraction; Agriculture	1	2
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Settlers; Logging	1	2
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Settlers; Parks; Logging	2	4
	Infrastructure; Agriculture; Energy	1	2
	Infrastructure; Agriculture; Settlers; Logging	1	2
	Infrastructure; Agriculture; Settlers; Parks; Logging	1	2
	Infrastructure; Settlers	1	2
	Infrastructure; Settlers; Other	1	2
	Logging; Disputes	1	2
	Logging; Other	2	4
	None	2	4
	Other	5	11
	Parks	3	7
	Settlers	1	2
	Settlers; Disputes	2	4
	Settlers; Other	1	2
	Settlers; Parks; Logging	2	4

	Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes	2	4
	Settlers; Parks; Other	1	2
	Skipped: No data	2	4
	Skipped: Not relevant	2	4
	Total	45	100
Bolivia	Disputes	10	56
	Extraction; Logging; Disputes	1	6
	Logging	2	11
	Logging; Disputes	1	6
	None	4	22
	Total	18	100
Brazil	Agriculture; Settlers	1	33
	Extraction; Agriculture; Settlers; Logging	1	33
	Settlers; Logging; Disputes	1	33
	Total	3	100
Cambodia	Agriculture; Logging	1	4
	Agriculture; Parks; Logging	1	4
	Agriculture; Settlers; Disputes	1	4
	Agriculture; Settlers; Logging; Disputes	1	4
	Energy	1	4
	Energy; Parks; Disputes	1	4
	Extraction; Agriculture; Energy; Settlers; Logging; Disputes	1	4
	Extraction; Agriculture; Logging; Disputes	1	4
	Extraction; Agriculture; Settlers; Logging	1	4
	Extraction; Disputes	1	4
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Energy; Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes	1	4
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Parks; Logging; Disputes	1	4
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Settlers; Logging	1	4
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes; Other	2	8
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Logging	1	4
	Extraction; Parks; Logging; Disputes	2	8
	Infrastructure; Agriculture; Energy; Settlers; Logging; Disputes	1	4

	Infrastructure; Agriculture; Settlers; Logging; Disputes	1	4
	Logging	1	4
	Other	1	4
	Settlers; Disputes	1	4
	Settlers; Logging; Disputes	1	4
	Settlers; Parks; Logging	1	4
	Total	25	100
Cameroon	Agriculture	1	1
	Agriculture; Logging	2	3
	Agriculture; Logging; Disputes	2	3
	Agriculture; Other	1	1
	Agriculture; Parks; Logging	2	3
	Agriculture; Settlers; Logging	3	4
	Agriculture; Settlers; Logging; Disputes	1	1
	Energy; Logging; Disputes	1	1
	Extraction; Agriculture; Logging; Other	1	1
	Extraction; Agriculture; Parks; Logging	1	1
	Extraction; Disputes	1	1
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Logging	2	3
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Logging; Disputes	1	1
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Parks; Logging	1	1
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Settlers; Parks; Logging	2	3
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Disputes	1	1
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Logging	2	3
	Extraction; Logging; Disputes	1	1
	Extraction; Settlers; Logging	1	1
	Extraction; Settlers; Logging; Disputes	1	1
	Infrastructure; Agriculture; Energy; Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes; Other	1	1
	Infrastructure; Parks	1	1
	Infrastructure; Parks; Logging	1	1
	Logging	16	22
	Logging; Other	1	1
	None	1	1
	Other	4	6

	Parks	1	1
	Parks; Disputes	1	1
	Parks; Disputes; Other	1	1
	Parks; Logging	7	10
	Parks; Other	1	1
	Settlers	1	1
	Settlers; Logging	1	1
	Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes	1	1
	Skipped: Not in scope	4	6
	Skipped: Not relevant	1	1
	Total	72	100
Chile	Extraction; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Energy; Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes	1	50
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Energy; Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes; Other	1	50
	Total	2	100
Colombia	Agriculture	1	17
	Energy; Parks; Disputes	1	17
	Extraction	1	17
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Settlers	2	33
	Infrastructure; Disputes	1	17
	Total	6	100
Ecuador	Agriculture; Disputes	1	8
	Disputes	3	23
	Extraction	2	15
	Extraction; Agriculture; Settlers; Parks; Logging	1	8
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes; Other	1	8
	Extraction; Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes	1	8
	Infrastructure; Disputes	1	8
	Infrastructure; Logging; Disputes; Other	1	8
	Parks	2	15
	Total	13	100
Finland	Extraction; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Energy; Settlers; Other	1	100
	Total	1	100
Guyana	Extraction	1	8
	Extraction; Disputes	1	8
	Extraction; Logging	1	8

	Infrastructure; Parks; Disputes	1	8
	Logging; Other	1	8
	None	3	25
	Parks; Disputes	1	8
	Settlers; Logging; Disputes	1	8
	Settlers; Logging; Disputes; Other	1	8
	Settlers; Parks; Logging	1	8
	Total	12	100
Honduras	Energy; Settlers	1	33
	Extraction; Energy; Settlers; Parks; Logging	1	33
	Extraction; Settlers; Logging	1	33
	Total	3	100
India	Agriculture; Energy; Settlers; Parks	4	15
	Agriculture; Logging	2	7
	Disputes	1	4
	Extraction	4	15
	Extraction; Energy	1	4
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Energy; Settlers; Logging; Disputes	2	7
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Logging; Disputes	1	4
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Settlers; Logging	1	4
	Extraction; Settlers; Logging; Disputes	1	4
	Infrastructure	2	7
	Infrastructure; Agriculture; Parks; Logging; Disputes	2	7
	Infrastructure; Energy	1	4
	Infrastructure; Logging	1	4
	None	3	11
	Settlers	1	4
	Total	27	100
Japan	Other	2	100
	Total	2	100
Kenya	Agriculture; Energy; Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes	1	6
	Agriculture; Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes	1	6
	Agriculture; Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes; Other	1	6
	Disputes	2	11
	Energy	1	6
	Energy; Settlers; Parks	1	6

	Energy; Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes	1	6
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Energy; Parks	1	6
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Energy; Settlers; Parks; Disputes; Other	1	6
	Infrastructure; Agriculture; Settlers; Disputes; Other	1	6
	Infrastructure; Disputes; Other	1	6
	Infrastructure; Energy; Parks	1	6
	Settlers	2	11
	Settlers; Parks; Logging	1	6
	Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes	2	11
	Total	18	100
Malaysia	Agriculture; Parks	1	20
	Energy; Parks	1	20
	Extraction; Agriculture; Energy; Other	1	20
	Infrastructure; Disputes; Other	1	20
	None	1	20
	Total	5	100
Mexico	Disputes	2	33
	Disputes; Other	1	17
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Logging	1	17
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Settlers; Logging; Disputes	1	17
	Extraction; Logging; Disputes	1	17
	Total	6	100
Nepal	Energy	1	8
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Settlers	2	17
	Infrastructure; Energy	2	17
	Infrastructure; Energy; Settlers	1	8
	Infrastructure; Other	1	8
	Infrastructure; Settlers	1	8
	Infrastructure; Settlers; Logging	1	8
	Parks	2	17
	Settlers; Parks; Disputes	1	8
	Total	12	100
Peru	Agriculture; Settlers; Logging	1	2
	Disputes	2	5
	Disputes; Other	1	2
	Extraction	1	2

	Extraction; Agriculture; Energy	1	2
	Extraction; Agriculture; Parks; Logging; Disputes	1	2
	Extraction; Agriculture; Settlers; Logging; Disputes	1	2
	Extraction; Agriculture; Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes	1	2
	Extraction; Energy; Logging	1	2
	Extraction; Energy; Logging; Disputes	1	2
	Extraction; Energy; Parks; Disputes; Other	1	2
	Extraction; Energy; Settlers; Logging; Disputes	2	5
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Energy; Settlers; Parks; Logging	1	2
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes	1	2
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Disputes; Other	1	2
	Extraction; Infrastructure; Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes	1	2
	Extraction; Logging	1	2
	Extraction; Other	2	5
	Extraction; Parks; Logging; Disputes	1	2
	Extraction; Parks; Logging; Disputes; Other	1	2
	Extraction; Settlers	1	2
	Extraction; Settlers; Logging; Disputes	1	2
	Infrastructure; Disputes	1	2
	Logging	1	2
	None	2	5
	Other	1	2
	Parks; Logging	1	2
	Settlers; Disputes	2	5
	Settlers; Logging; Other	1	2
	Skipped: No data	2	5
	Skipped: Not in scope	5	12
	Total	41	100
Philippines	Energy; Settlers; Other	1	25
	Infrastructure; Settlers; Other	1	25
	Settlers	1	25
	Settlers; Parks	1	25
	Total	4	100

South Africa	Agriculture; Settlers; Logging; Disputes	1	100
	Total	1	100
Suriname	Extraction; Infrastructure; Agriculture; Energy; Settlers; Logging; Other	1	7
	Extraction; Logging; Other	1	7
	Extraction; Other	1	7
	Extraction; Settlers; Parks; Logging	1	7
	Infrastructure; Logging; Other	1	7
	Logging	1	7
	Logging; Other	1	7
	Parks; Other	1	7
	Skipped: Not in scope	5	36
	Skipped: Not relevant	1	7
	Total	14	100
Tanzania	Disputes	2	40
	Disputes; Other	2	40
	Parks; Disputes	1	20
	Total	5	100
Thailand	Parks; Disputes	1	100
	Total	1	100
Uganda	Infrastructure; Energy; Parks; Disputes; Other	1	33
	Infrastructure; Energy; Parks; Logging; Disputes	1	33
	Settlers; Parks; Logging; Disputes	1	33
	Total	3	100

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Survey Question Q047 (LCS): Have your people or communities, since 2008, experienced incidents of settlement, land grabbing, land use or resource extraction without your free, prior, and informed consent?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Article 26.2 of the UNDRIP.

Since 2008, 59.3 per cent of the 339 Indigenous communities surveyed report incidents of settlement, land grabbing or resource extraction conducted without their free, prior, and informed consent, while 40.1 per cent record no such incidents and 0.6 per cent did not answer. The prevalence of these violations is particularly high in several African

and South Asian States, where it exceeds 60 per cent. Respondents emphasise that the violations range from violent expropriation and large-scale mining to administrative reclassification of customary land as State Forest and gradual encroachment tolerated by officials. The principal drivers are logging, mining, agribusiness, energy infrastructure and conservation zoning.

Although formal land titles offer some protection, they are not decisive: one-third of communities in the Plurinational State of Bolivia hold collective deeds yet still face unauthorised activities, whereas several Kenyan communities without titles report no recent incidents, attributing this to active county-level enforcement.

The data shows that even where consultations occur, they rarely result in genuine consent.

Response	Communities	Share of replies
Yes – incidents occurred	201	59.3 %
No – no such incidents	136	40.12 %
Not answered / blank	2	0.59 %

Source: *Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.*

Themes from Survey Comments

- **Commercial logging & timber roads:** This includes concessions granted over customary forests in Cameroon, Cambodia, and Peru.
- **Mining and hydrocarbon extraction:** Examples include artisanal gold mining in Peru and Suriname, and bauxite, coal and oil blocks in India and Kenya.
- **Large-scale agribusiness:** This refers to oil-palm and rubber estates in Cameroon and sugar cane plantations in Cambodia.
- **Hydropower & energy corridors:** This includes dams on the Sesan River (Cambodia) and Amazon tributaries, as well as geothermal and wind projects in northern Kenya.
- **Protected areas & conservation offsets:** This involves forced relocation or access restrictions around national parks in Kenya, Cameroon, and India.
- **Encroachment by settlers or ranchers:** Examples include in-migration onto farming lands in Bangladesh and pastoralist grazing in the Bolivian lowlands.

Data Table: Q047 (LCS)

Country	Total	Yes	No	Missing/Skipped
Bangladesh	45	27	18	0
Bolivia	18	5	13	0
Brazil	3	3	0	0
Cambodia	25	8	17	0
Cameroon	72	44	26	2

Chile	2	2	0	0
Colombia	6	3	3	0
Ecuador	13	11	2	0
Finland	1	1	0	0
Guyana	12	7	5	0
Honduras	3	3	0	0
India	27	15	12	0
Japan	2	0	2	0
Kenya	18	16	2	0
Malaysia	5	4	1	0
Mexico	6	4	2	0
Nepal	12	9	3	0
Peru	41	22	19	0
Philippines	4	4	0	0
South Africa	1	1	0	0
Suriname	14	4	10	0
Tanzania	5	5	0	0
Thailand	1	0	1	0
Uganda	3	3	0	0
Grand Total (count)	339	201	136	2
Grand Total (%)	100	59.29	40.12	0.59

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Survey Question Q048 (LCS): Have your people or communities, since 2008, experienced incidents of displacement or relocation without your free, prior, and informed consent?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Articles 8.2(b) and 10 of the UNDRIP.

Since 2008 16.5 per cent of the 339 communities surveyed (56 communities in total) report having been displaced or relocated without their free, prior, and informed consent. A further 67.6 per cent state that no such incident occurred, while 15.9 per cent did not supply information. The practice is highly localised. In Kenya 55.6 per cent of the sampled communities and in Bangladesh 37.8 per cent report forced relocation, compared with none in the Plurinational State of Bolivia and Peru and fewer than five per cent in India. Displacement is also recorded in Cameroon, Cambodia, Ecuador, and Nepal, among others, bringing the total to 16 countries.

Themes from Survey Comments

Comments from the communities that reported displacement highlight several prominent drivers:

- **Infrastructure projects:** This includes road-widening and canal works in Bangladesh, and buffer zones for wind farms in Kenya.
- **Extractive industries:** Examples include displacement for bauxite and coal blocks in India (where pressure persists even if displacement was before 2008) and gold mining in Peru.
- **Conservation & military zones:** This includes the creation or extension of national parks in Kenya and firing ranges affecting Adivasi villages in India.
- **Agribusiness estates:** This refers to land taken for oil palm in Cameroon and for rubber and sugar cane in Cambodia.
- **Settler or pastoral in-migration:** Several communities in Bangladesh, Kenya and Bolivia attribute displacement to land grabs by smallholder colonists or transhumant herders.
- **Climate / disaster relocation:** An example is the resettlement related to Cyclone Aila in coastal Bangladesh.

Respondents describe a common pattern: no genuine consent process; compensation, if any, that ignores communal resources; and renewed eviction threats at relocation sites. The consequences include loss of land, erosion of cultural ties and heightened poverty.

Data Table: Q048 (LCS)

Country	Total	Yes	No	Missing/Skipped
Bangladesh	45	17	28	0
Bolivia	18	0	18	0
Brazil	3	0	3	0
Cambodia	25	2	23	0
Cameroon	72	4	32	36
Chile	2	2	0	0
Colombia	6	1	5	0
Ecuador	13	4	9	0
Finland	1	0	1	0
Guyana	12	1	11	0
Honduras	3	2	1	0
India	27	0	27	0
Japan	2	0	2	0
Kenya	18	10	8	0
Malaysia	5	2	3	0
Mexico	6	1	5	0
Nepal	12	4	8	0
Peru	41	0	35	6
Philippines	4	2	2	0
South Africa	1	1	0	0
Suriname	14	0	2	12

Tanzania	5	2	3	0
Thailand	1	0	1	0
Uganda	3	1	2	0
Grand Total (count)	339	56	229	54
Grand Total (%)	100	16.52	67.55	15.93

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Survey Question Q051 (LCS): Has your people/community established conservation area(s) within your territory?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Article 29.1 of the UNDRIP.

Only 32.1 per cent of the 339 communities surveyed report having set aside at least one community-managed conservation area, while 52.2 per cent state that no such zone exists and 15.6 per cent did not provide information.

Community-led conservation is most common where national law recognises communal forests, conservancies, or reserves, notably in Cambodia, the Plurinational State of Bolivia, and parts of the Andes.

It is least frequent in Central Africa and parts of South Asia, where legal, technical, and financial barriers remain substantial. The findings suggest that strengthening legal frameworks, technical support and sustainable financing would allow Indigenous Peoples to expand these self-initiated conservation efforts, which would benefit both biodiversity and the collective rights of Indigenous Peoples in line with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Global distribution (339 community replies)

Response	Communities	Share of replies
Yes – at least one community-managed conservation zone exists	109	32.15 %
No – no such area has been set aside	177	52.21 %
Not answered: <i>Not in scope</i>	53	15.6%

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Themes from Survey Comments

Comments from the 109 communities that have established conservation areas highlight several types:

- **Community forests and wildlife conservancies:** For example, Indigenous Kui and Bunong villages in Cambodia manage protected forests, while Maasai groups in Kenya run community conservancies.
- **Sacred or ancestral sites:** Aymara and Quechua communities in Bolivia protect high-Andean wetlands (*bofedales*) and burial grounds, and the Wampis in the Amazon protect river headwaters as spiritual zones.
- **Integrated livelihood zones:** Mixed-use areas that combine rotational farming, hunting bans and pasture management are common in Peru, Bolivia, and parts of India.
- **Varied legal recognition:** Roughly half of the 'Yes' comments cite a state legal instrument (such as Bolivia's communal title statutes or Cambodia's Community Forestry Sub-Decree), while the remainder operate solely under customary law.
- **Climate-adaptation closures:** nine Andean and Himalayan communities explain that alpine pastures or watershed strips were fenced "to recover water sources" or "regrow páramo grasses".
- **Eco-tourism revenue & benefit sharing:** seven Kenyan and Cambodian groups note visitor levies that fund schools or ranger patrols.
- **Implementation challenges:** Respondents frequently mentioned encroachment by loggers or settlers, a lack of budget for patrols, and bureaucratic hurdles in formally registering their community reserves.
-

Data Table: Q051 (LCS)

Country	Total	Yes	No	Missing/Skipped
Bangladesh	45	7	38	0
Bolivia	18	13	5	0
Brazil	3	1	2	0
Cambodia	25	18	6	1
Cameroon	72	2	35	35
Chile	2	0	2	0
Colombia	6	5	1	0
Ecuador	13	8	5	0
Finland	1	0	1	0
Guyana	12	4	8	0
Honduras	3	3	0	0
India	27	7	20	0
Japan	2	1	1	0
Kenya	18	6	12	0
Malaysia	5	4	1	0
Mexico	6	1	5	0
Nepal	12	1	11	0
Peru	41	21	15	5
Philippines	4	0	4	0
South Africa	1	1	0	0

Suriname	14	2	0	12
Tanzania	5	2	3	0
Thailand	1	1	0	0
Uganda	3	1	2	0
Grand Total (count)	339	109	177	53
Grand Total (%)	100	32.15	52.21	15.63

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Survey Question Q055 (LCS): Has the State declared any part of the territory of your community/people as a park or protected area, without your free, prior, and informed consent?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Articles 29.1 of the UNDRIP.

Just over 23 per cent of the 339 Indigenous communities surveyed state that part of their ancestral territory has been declared a park or other protected area by the State without their free, prior, and informed consent. By contrast, 63 per cent report no such designation, and 14 per cent did not provide information. The practice is most frequently reported in Bangladesh, Cambodia, and Kenya, while respondents in the Plurinational State of Bolivia and India indicate that it is rare, reflecting stronger collective titles or other legal safeguards.

Community comments emphasise that such reclassifications are typically unilateral, curtail subsistence practices such as hunting and gathering and seldom include adequate compensation or redress.

Global snapshot (339 community replies)

Response	Communities	Share of total
Yes – declaration made without FPIC	78	23 %
No – no such declaration	214	63 %
Not answered / “Not in scope / no data”	47	14 %

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Themes from Survey Comments

- **National-park expansion:** Communities such as the Maasai and Ogiek in Kenya mentioned extensions of national parks, while the Baka in Cameroon cited the creation of the Boumba-Bek and Nki reserves.

- **Protected areas that co-exist with ongoing illegal logging.** Several Peruvian and Cameroonian entries stress that although the area is formally protected, commercial logging continues with official tolerance.
- **Wildlife or biosphere reserves:** Respondents in Bangladesh referred to several protected areas, including Madhupur Eco-Park and Lawachara National Park.
- **Lack of consultation & compensation:** Many comments stressed that there was no prior notice, that meetings were held only after maps were signed, or that compensation was limited to individual house plots and ignored the loss of communal forests, or that there was none.
- **Access restrictions & livelihoods:** Many communities complained of bans on shifting cultivation, hunting, and fishing within the new protected zones. Comments also highlight criminalisation of gathering firewood and fines imposed by forest guards.
- **Limited co-management negotiated after the fact:** A minority of respondents, particularly in Peru and Cambodia, noted that co-management agreements were negotiated after the protected area was created, but they still considered the original declaration a breach of FPIC.

This community-level experience of conservation-related dispossession corroborates the national-level finding that the expansion of protected areas without FPIC is a widespread issue, reported as occurring in 62 per cent of the surveyed countries.

The community generated data shows that while some states respect Indigenous rights in conservation, many communities continue to face unilateral state actions that undermine their self-determination and land governance.

Data Table: Q055 (LCS)

Country	Total	Yes	No	Missing/Skipped
Bangladesh	45	13	31	1
Bolivia	18	0	18	0
Brazil	3	0	3	0
Cambodia	25	6	19	0
Cameroon	72	12	23	37
Chile	2	2	0	0
Colombia	6	1	5	0
Ecuador	13	5	8	0
Finland	1	0	0	1
Guyana	12	4	8	0
Honduras	3	2	1	0
India	27	2	25	0
Japan	2	2	0	0
Kenya	18	5	13	0
Malaysia	5	2	3	0

Mexico	6	2	4	0
Nepal	12	3	7	2
Peru	41	8	28	5
Philippines	4	1	3	0
South Africa	1	1	0	0
Suriname	14	3	10	1
Tanzania	5	0	5	0
Thailand	1	1	0	0
Uganda	3	3	0	0
Grand Total (count)	339	78	214	47
Grand Total (%)	100	23.01	63.13	13.85

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Traditional Occupations and restrictions:

This section analyses questions 118 through 124, which focus on Traditional Occupations, identifying the most important occupations disaggregated by sex, trends in the practice, and restrictions or barriers. For this reason, the data is not split by country but rather presented as a whole.

The survey asks these questions in order to contribute to the monitoring of Article 20.1 of the UNDRIP.

Survey Question Q118 (LCS): Which are the most important traditional occupations performed by women in your people/community?

Women's traditional occupations remain predominantly oriented towards subsistence, household well-being and culturally specific crafts. Of the 1 329 occupation entries provided by 339 communities, 24.5 per cent refer to handicrafts and other artisanal work such as weaving, bead-work, pottery and basketry, while 21.9 per cent concern subsistence or small-scale crop farming. Domestic and care work, which encompasses cooking, water and firewood collection, child-care and laundry, accounts for 16.6 per cent of all entries. Livestock husbandry (herding, milking, poultry and small-stock keeping) represents 11.3 per cent, and the gathering of forest products a further 8.8 per cent. Fishing and hunting activities constitute 7.1 per cent, whereas trade and petty commerce and wage labour or services are reported in only 3.5 per cent and 6.3 per cent of cases, respectively.

The data therefore confirm that cash-earning roles remain marginal for Indigenous women and that their economic contribution is still centred on subsistence production, household maintenance and culturally rooted craft industries.

Broad activity group	Share of all
----------------------	--------------

	occupations listed †
Domestic & care work – cooking, fetching water or fire-wood, child-care, laundry	16.6 %
Handicrafts / artisanal work – weaving, bead-work, pottery, basketry	24.5 %
Crop agriculture – subsistence or small-scale market farming	21.9 %
Livestock husbandry – herding, milking, poultry, small-stock keeping	11.3 %
Gathering of forest products	8.8 %
Fishing & hunting	7.1 %
Trade / petty commerce	3.5 %
Wage labour & services	6.3 %

† Percentages are based on **1 329** individual occupation entries recorded under Q118 across the 339 community questionnaires. Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Survey Question Q119 (LCS): Is the importance of these occupations changing?

***Due to the volume and variety of traditional occupations reported, only the first or most important occupation is reported under Q119 (LCS), although the dataset presents all five occupations, and the trends for each.*

Only 20.6 per cent of the 339 communities report that their principal women’s occupation has gained importance since 2008, whereas 40.1 per cent note a decline and 1.5 per cent say it is no longer practised at all; the remainder consider its importance unchanged (32.2 per cent) or supply no information (5.6 per cent). Thus, for every community that records growth, roughly one and a half communities report contraction.

Country patterns vary: in Peru 39.0 per cent of communities cite increased importance, in Bangladesh the corresponding figure is 8.9 per cent, and in Cameroon 62.5 per cent report decline. Respondents attribute the downturn chiefly to climate change, shrinking access to land and forest resources and limited market opportunities, while growth cases are linked to community-based enterprise projects, niche market demand and targeted training initiatives. These findings indicate that traditional economic roles for Indigenous women are under pressure and require supportive policies, market access and resource security to remain viable.

Trend reported	Communities	Share of communities with a first-rank answer*
Increased	70	20.6 %

Same	109	32.15 %
Diminished	136	40.1 %
No importance any longer	5	1.47 %
Not covered / Missing	19	5.6 %

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Themes from Survey Comments

Comments from communities show that this decline is most frequently linked to the conversion of fields and grazing areas to commercial crops or mining, male labour migration shifting more unpaid work onto women, and climate variability making agriculture less reliable. Increases in importance are concentrated in artisanal handicrafts and petty trade, often stimulated by tourism or NGO-supported craft markets.

Data Table: Q119 (LCS) – First Occupation

Country	Total	Increased	Same	Diminished	No importance any longer	Missing/Skipped
Bangladesh	45	4	16	20	2	3
Bolivia	18	3	7	7	1	0
Brazil	3	0	0	1	1	1
Cambodia	25	3	15	5	0	2
Cameroon	72	11	11	45	0	5
Chile	2	0	1	0	0	1
Colombia	6	3	2	1	0	0
Ecuador	13	2	7	4	0	0
Finland	1	0	0	1	0	0
Guyana	12	1	10	1	0	0
Honduras	3	0	3	0	0	0
India	27	4	2	21	0	0
Japan	2	1	1	0	0	0
Kenya	18	6	6	4	0	2
Malaysia	5	0	3	1	0	1
Mexico	6	4	1	0	0	1
Nepal	12	2	4	6	0	0
Peru	41	16	13	9	0	3
Philippines	4	3	0	0	1	0
South Africa	1	0	0	1	0	0
Suriname	14	5	6	3	0	0
Tanzania	5	0	0	5	0	0
Thailand	1	0	1	0	0	0
Uganda	3	2	0	1	0	0



Grand Total (count)	339	70	109	136	5	19
Grand Total (%)	100	20.65	32.15	40.12	1.47	5.6

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Survey Question Q120 (LCS): What are the main barriers or restrictions for performing these traditional occupations today?

Scarcity of land and other natural resources constitutes the principal constraint on women’s traditional occupations, identified by 72.3 per cent of the 339 communities surveyed. Climate change, characterised by erratic rainfall, drought and floods, follows closely, affecting 68.7 per cent of communities. Restrictions imposed by State regulations, concessions or protected-area regimes are reported by 63.4 per cent, while poor market access—stemming from distance and price volatility—hampers opportunities in 57.5 per cent of cases.

Main Barriers to Women's Traditional Occupations (*Communities could select multiple barriers*)

Obstacle category	Communities selecting*	Share of total (339 community surveys reporting)
Scarcity of land / resources	245	72.3 %
Climate change (erratic rainfall, drought, floods)	233	68.7 %
Restriction on land / resources (State rules, concessions, protected areas)	215	63.4 %
Market access (distance, price volatility)	195	57.5 %
Limited relevance of traditional occupations	186	54.9 %
Access to credit	161	47.5 %

* At least one of the five ranking cells contained the category.

† Communities that ticked “Limited relevance” usually explained that women’s traditional skills are undervalued by external markets or younger generations.

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.



These barriers are the direct result of the widespread land grabbing, resource extraction, and expansion of protected areas without FPIC identified at the national level.

Just over half of the communities (54.9 per cent) consider that traditional skills have lost relevance, usually because external markets or younger generations undervalue them, and 47.5 per cent point to limited access to credit. These results confirm that environmental and tenure related pressures outweigh purely economic factors, and that most Indigenous women confront multiple, overlapping barriers that jeopardise their livelihoods and cultural knowledge.

Themes from the Survey Comments

The 339 community questionnaires allowed each respondent to rank up to five barriers and to add a free-text explanation. Percentages below refer to the share of communities that ticked a given barrier at least once; several obstacles were usually selected together, indicating cumulative pressure.

- **Shrinking access to land and natural resources (72 per cent):** Encroachment by estates, logging concessions or protected-area bans leaves women with less forest, grazing and arable land for farming, gathering and weaving materials. The comment boxes repeatedly invoke “escasez de tierra” and “restricciones de acceso”.
- **Climate variability eroding production cycles (68.7 per cent):** Droughts, erratic rains, floods and shifting seasons undermine crop yields, pasture quality and wild-food availability, reducing both subsistence output and saleable surplus. Many comments link climate stress directly to food scarcity or lost income.
- **Regulatory restrictions on land and resources (63.4 per cent):** State rules, such as permit regimes, logging bans, park regulations or seasonal closures, limit access to fibre plants, medicinal species, fish and game, even where women previously held customary rights.
- **Poor physical and economic market access (57.5 per cent):** Distance to towns, high transport costs, price volatility and dependence on middle-men make it hard to sell surplus produce or crafts profitably. Comments in Latin America often note “bajos precios en los mercados” and lack of bargaining power.
- **Perceived loss of relevance of traditional skills (54.9 per cent):** Imported textiles, factory goods and changing consumer tastes depress demand for items such as hand-woven cloth, beadwork or traditional pottery; younger women gravitate to wage work, reducing inter-generational transfer of skills.

- **Limited access to credit and start-up capital (47.5 per cent):** Comment fields cite “falta de capital económico” and collateral requirements that exclude small producers from micro-finance. This restricts investment in tools, storage and quality improvements.
- **Knowledge and skills gaps:** A minority of entries note fading know-how as elders pass away or youth migrate; some request training in climate-resilient techniques or value-addition.
- **Time poverty and care burdens:** Several communities point out that women’s unpaid care work, child-rearing, elder care, water and fuel collection, limits hours available for income-earning activities, especially where out-migration leaves fewer adult men at home.
- **Safety, mobility and cultural constraints:** Isolated comments mention harassment en route to markets, insecure travel during conflict, or social norms that restrict women’s movement beyond the village.

More than three-quarters of communities that flagged any decline also selected *three or more* of the barriers above, confirming that women’s livelihoods are hindered by **multiple, overlapping factors**, environmental, tenure related and economic, rather than by a single cause.

Data Table: Q120 (LCS) – first occupation

Country	Q120(LCS)/First most important occupation	Frequency	Percent
Bangladesh	Access to credit	1	2
	Climate change	2	4
	Market access	2	4
	Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	3	7
	Market access; Limited relevance	1	2
	Others	2	4
	Restriction land/resources	5	11
	Restriction land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit	1	2
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources	1	2
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change	2	4
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Access to credit	2	4
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	4	9

	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Limited relevance	1	2
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Limited relevance	2	4
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Market access; Access to credit	1	2
	Scarcity land/resources	8	18
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate change	1	2
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Access to credit	1	2
	Scarcity land/resources; Market access	1	2
	Skipped: No data	3	7
	Skipped: Not in scope	1	2
	Total	45	100
Bolivia	Access to credit	3	17
	Climate change	2	11
	Climate change; Market access; Limited relevance	1	6
	Limited relevance	2	11
	Market access	3	17
	Market access; Others	1	6
	Others	3	17
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate change	1	6
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Limited relevance	2	11
	Total	18	100
Brazil	Market access; Access to credit	1	33
	Restriction land/resources	1	33
	Skipped: Not in scope	1	33
	Total	3	100
Cambodia	Climate change	1	4
	Climate change; Others	1	4
	No restrictions	3	12
	Restriction land/resources	7	28
	Restriction land/resources; Limited relevance; Others	1	4
	Restriction land/resources; Not covered	1	4
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	4
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Limited relevance	1	4
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	4	16

	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance; Others; No restrictions	1	4
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Market access	1	4
	Scarcity land/resources	1	4
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate change	1	4
	Skipped: No data	1	4
	Total	25	100
Cameroon	Climate change	10	14
	Market access	4	6
	No restrictions	4	6
	Others	1	1
	Restriction land/resources	11	15
	Restriction land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	1
	Skipped: No data	5	7
	Skipped: Not in scope	35	49
	Skipped: Not relevant	1	1
	Total	72	100
Chile	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change	1	50
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit	1	50
	Total	2	100
Colombia	Limited relevance	1	17
	Market access	1	17
	Market access; Access to credit	1	17
	Others	2	33
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access	1	17
	Total	6	100
Ecuador	Access to credit	1	8
	Limited relevance	1	8
	Market access; Access to credit	1	8
	Market access; Limited relevance; Others	1	8
	No restrictions	2	15
	Not covered	1	8
	Others	2	15
	Others; No restrictions	1	8
	Restriction land/resources; Limited relevance; Not covered	1	8

	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access	1	8
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit; Others	1	8
	Total	13	100
Finland	Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Limited relevance	1	100
	Total	1	100
Guyana	Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	8
	Climate change; Access to credit	2	17
	Climate change; Market access	3	25
	Market access; Access to credit	1	8
	Restriction land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit	1	8
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change	1	8
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access	2	17
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access	1	8
	Total	12	100
Honduras	Limited relevance	1	33
	No restrictions	1	33
	Restriction land/resources	1	33
	Total	3	100
India	Climate change; Access to credit	2	7
	Climate change; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	4
	Climate change; Market access	2	7
	Climate change; Market access; Access to credit	3	11
	Climate change; Market access; Limited relevance	1	4
	Limited relevance	2	7
	Market access	2	7
	Market access; Limited relevance	3	11
	No restrictions	1	4
	Scarcity land/resources	4	15
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate change	2	7
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit	1	4
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Limited relevance	1	4
	Scarcity land/resources; Market access; Limited relevance	2	7
	Total	27	100
Japan	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources;	1	50

	Climate change; Access to credit		
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Access to credit; Limited relevance; Others	1	50
	Total	2	100
Kenya	Access to credit	1	6
	Climate change; Market access	1	6
	Market access; Access to credit	1	6
	No restrictions	4	22
	Others	1	6
	Restriction land/resources	2	11
	Restriction land/resources; Climate change; Access to credit; Limited relevance; No restrictions	1	6
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change	2	11
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Limited relevance; No restrictions	1	6
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Market access; Limited relevance	1	6
	Scarcity land/resources	1	6
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate change	1	6
	Scarcity land/resources; Market access; Access to credit; Others; No restrictions	1	6
	Total	18	100
Malaysia	Climate change; Limited relevance	1	20
	Restriction land/resources	1	20
	Restriction land/resources; Climate change; Market access	1	20
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate change	1	20
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Limited relevance	1	20
	Total	5	100
Mexico	Climate change	1	17
	Climate change; Access to credit	1	17
	Market access; Access to credit; Others	1	17
	No restrictions	1	17
	Restriction land/resources	1	17
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change	1	17
	Total	6	100
Nepal	Others	1	8
	Restriction land/resources	2	17

	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	8
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	2	17
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Market access; Access to credit	1	8
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	3	25
	Scarcity land/resources; Market access	1	8
	Scarcity land/resources; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	8
	Total	12	100
Peru	Access to credit	1	2
	Climate change	6	15
	Climate change; Access to credit	1	2
	Climate change; Limited relevance	1	2
	Limited relevance	6	15
	Market access	1	2
	Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	2
	No restrictions	6	15
	Not covered	1	2
	Others	1	2
	Restriction land/resources	1	2
	Restriction land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit	1	2
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Limited relevance	1	2
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	2
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Others	1	2
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit	1	2
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit; Others	1	2
	Skipped: No data	2	5
	Skipped: Not in scope	6	15
	Missing	1	2
	Total	41	100
Philippines	Others	1	25
	Others; No restrictions	1	25
	Restriction land/resources	1	25

	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit	1	25
	Total	4	100
South Africa	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	100
	Total	1	100
Suriname	Climate change	1	7
	Climate change; Access to credit	1	7
	Climate change; Market access	1	7
	Climate change; Market access; Access to credit	1	7
	Climate change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance; Others	1	7
	Climate change; Others	1	7
	Market access	1	7
	Market access; Limited relevance; Others	1	7
	No restrictions	2	14
	Others	1	7
	Restriction land/resources; Access to credit; Limited relevance; Others	1	7
	Restriction land/resources; Climate change; Access to credit	1	7
	Restriction land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	7
	Total	14	100
Tanzania	Climate change	5	100
	Total	5	100
Thailand	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources	1	100
	Total	1	100
Uganda	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access	1	33
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance; No restrictions	1	33
	Restriction land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate change; No restrictions	1	33
	Total	3	100

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Survey Question Q121 (LCS): Which are the most important traditional occupations performed by men in your people/community?

Men’s livelihoods remain primarily land-based. Crop farming accounts for 19.2 per cent of the 1 300 occupation entries provided, livestock herding for 10.4 per cent, hunting for 7.4 per cent and fishing for 5.7 per cent. Together, these four subsistence activities represent 42.7 per cent of all occupations reported. Gathering of forest products contributes 6.1 per cent, while handicrafts, carpentry and metal-work make up 6.2 per cent. Market-oriented roles are limited: trade and petty commerce constitute 2.3 per cent, and day or wage labour 3.5 per cent. Territorial security functions, patrolling, boundary maintenance and wildlife guarding, are identified in 0.8 per cent of entries, reflecting increasing pressure to protect community lands and resources. The remaining 38.4 per cent fall under construction, miscellaneous services, and other tasks, indicating a diversification of men’s work beyond traditional subsistence spheres.

Broad activity group *	Share of all occupation themes †
Crop agriculture / farming	19.2 %
Livestock herding / animal husbandry	10.4 %
Hunting (including game-scouting)	7.4 %
Fishing (inland & coastal)	5.7 %
Gathering / forest-product collection	6.1 %
Security & territory protection	0.8 %
Handicrafts / artisanal carpentry & metal-work	6.2 %
Trade & petty commerce	2.3 %
Day or wage labour	3.5 %
Construction, other services, and miscellaneous tasks	38.4 %

Source: *Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.*

Themes from the Survey Comments

- **Land-based food production remains the backbone:** Crop farming and shifting cultivation are the single largest cluster of activities; then livestock herding (cattle, small-stock, pigs).
- **Hunting, fishing and the gathering of forest products still matter:** Although practised less intensively than a generation ago, subsistence hunting, line-fishing and the collection of timber, fire-wood and other non-timber products are cited in roughly one comment in five.

- **Handicrafts and small-scale manufacturing provide niche income:** Weaving, bead-work, carpentry and metal-work occur in many Latin-American and South-East Asian entries; they are often linked to cultural identity as well as cash sales.
- **Ritual and cultural leadership is an occupation in its own right:** Elders who lead ceremonies, healing or conflict-resolution are repeatedly described as “very important” to community functioning.
- **Wage labour and out-migration appear, but remain secondary:** Mentions of day labour, salaried public employment or migrant work are present, signalling diversification, yet they are less frequent than land-based roles.
- **Territorial stewardship tasks are emerging:** A handful of comments refer to patrols, boundary maintenance and wildlife guarding. These are noted as new duties created by encroachment pressures.

Survey Question Q122 (LCS): Is the importance of these occupations changing?

Only 20.1 per cent of the 339 communities report that the principal traditional occupation of men has increased in importance since 2008, whereas 36.6 per cent record a decline and 3.8 per cent state that the occupation is no longer practised. A further 34.2 per cent judge that its importance is unchanged, and 5.3 per cent did not provide an answer.

Country results vary markedly. Decline is most frequent in Nepal, where 61.5 per cent of communities note reduced importance, in Cameroon (49.3 per cent) and in Peru (36.6 per cent). By contrast, increases are relatively common in Colombia (66.7 per cent of communities), Kenya (32.4 per cent) and the Plurinational State of Bolivia (28.9 per cent). Respondents attribute downturns chiefly to climate variability, shrinking resource access and limited market demand, while growth is linked to niche markets, community enterprise projects and targeted training.

The overall pattern indicates that men’s traditional livelihoods are static or contracting in almost three quarters of communities, signalling an urgent need for supportive policies, resource security and market opportunities.

Trend	Communities	Share of valid answers
Increased	68	20 %
Same	116	34.2 %
Diminished	124	36.5 %
No importance any longer	13	3.8 %
Not covered	18	5.3 %

Source: *Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.*

Themes from the Survey Comments

- **Loss of land and forest resources is the leading driver of decline:** Deforestation, estate expansion and shrinking communal areas are the most common explanations for diminished importance.
- **Climate variability compounds the downturn:** Erratic rainfall, prolonged drought and shifting seasons are blamed for lower yields in farming, fishing and hunting.
- **Market integration cuts both ways:** Long distances, low farm-gate prices and competition from industrial goods erode returns; conversely, niche demand for handicrafts and eco-tourism has increased the value of some crafts.
- **Technological change and easier consumer goods reduce labour needs:** Tractors, purchased clothing and bottled gas mean less call for traditional ploughing, weaving and fuel-wood gathering.
- **Youth migration and changing aspirations accelerate decline:** Comments cite younger men’s preference for urban jobs, education or salaried work, leaving fewer practitioners of labour-intensive occupations.
- **Government bans and conservation rules affect specific activities:** Hunting and shifting cultivation are said to have diminished where new protected-area legislation prohibits them.

Data Table: Q122 (LCS) First Occupation

Country	Total	Increased	Same	Diminished	No importance	Missing/Skipped
Bangladesh	45	4	19	16	2	4
Bolivia	18	0	7	9	2	0
Brazil	3	1	1	0	0	1
Cambodia	25	4	10	9	1	1
Cameroon	72	11	16	37	1	7
Chile	2	1	0	1	0	0
Colombia	6	4	2	0	0	0
Ecuador	13	1	7	4	0	1
Finland	1	0	0	1	0	0
Guyana	12	3	8	1	0	0
Honduras	3	0	3	0	0	0
India	27	5	12	10	0	0
Japan	2	1	1	0	0	0
Kenya	18	6	4	6	1	1
Malaysia	5	2	2	1	0	0
Mexico	6	1	2	2	0	1
Nepal	12	0	0	8	4	0
Peru	41	10	14	15	0	2
Philippines	4	4	0	0	0	0
South Africa	1	1	0	0	0	0

Suriname	14	5	7	2	0	0
Tanzania	5	3	0	2	0	0
Thailand	1	1	0	0	0	0
Uganda	3	0	1	0	2	0
Grand Total (count)	339	68	116	124	13	18
Grand Total (%)	100	20.06	34.22	36.58	3.83	5.3

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Survey Question Q123 (LCS): What are the main barriers or restrictions for performing these traditional occupations today?

Climate change, cited by 60.8 per cent of the 339 communities, is the most frequent barrier to men's traditional occupations. Scarcity of land and other resources follows at 54.3 per cent, while market access constraints such as high transport costs and volatile prices affect 50.7 per cent. Restrictions imposed by State rules, concessions or protected-area regimes are reported by 47.2 per cent of communities. Perceived loss of relevance of traditional skills is noted by 41.3 per cent, and limited access to credit by 41.0 per cent.

The findings indicate that environmental stressors and insecure tenure weigh more heavily on men's livelihoods than purely economic factors, reinforcing the need for secure land rights, climate-resilient support and improved market and financial access.

Main Barriers to Men's Traditional Occupations (*Communities could select multiple barriers*)

Obstacle category	Communities selecting	Share of total replies †
Climate change (erratic rainfall, drought, floods)	206	60.8 %
Scarcity of land / resources	184	54.3 %
Market access (distance, volatile prices)	172	50.7 %
Restrictions on land / resources (State rules, concessions, protected areas)	160	47.2 %
Limited relevance of traditional skills	140	41.3 %
Access to credit	139	41.0 %

† Percentages are calculated against the full set of 339 community questionnaires. Because each community could identify more than one barrier, the column sums to well over 100 per cent. Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

As noted in Q120 (LCS), These barriers are the direct result of the widespread land grabbing, resource extraction, and expansion of protected areas without FPIC identified at the national level.

Themes from the Survey Comments

- **Climate change impacts:** Droughts, floods and unpredictable seasons undermine crop, livestock and forest-based livelihoods.
- **Scarcity of land and resources:** Demographic pressure, logging and agribusiness concessions leave little forest, grazing or arable land.
- **Market access constraints:** Long transport routes, poor roads and volatile prices prevent profitable sales of produce and crafts.
- **Legal or administrative restrictions:** State rules, permits, concessions and protected-area regulations limit access to customary resources.
- **Perceived loss of relevance of traditional skills:** Modern consumer goods and youth preferences make certain crafts or rituals less attractive.
- **Limited access to credit or capital:** High collateral requirements and lack of adapted finance impede investment in tools, livestock or market stalls.
- **Knowledge and skills gaps:** Respondents note fading inter-generational transfer and inadequate technical training.
- **High transport costs and weak infrastructure:** Remote locations and lack of storage reduce profitability, particularly for perishables.
- **Competition and over-exploitation by outsiders:** Illegal logging, external fishers and pastoral in-migration intensify resource depletion.

Data Table: Q123 (LCS) First Occupation

Country	Q123(LCS)/First most important occupation	Frequency	Percent
Bangladesh	Climate Change	1	2
	Market access	1	2
	Others	2	4
	Restrictions land/resources	5	11
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources	3	7
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	2
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change	3	7
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Limited relevance	4	9
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit	3	7
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	3	7

	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance; Others	1	2
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit; Others	1	2
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Limited relevance	1	2
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Limited relevance	1	2
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Market access; Access to credit	1	2
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Market access; Limited relevance	1	2
	Scarcity land/resources	9	20
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change	1	2
	Skipped: No data	2	4
	Skipped: Not in scope	1	2
	Total	45	100
Bolivia	Access to credit	4	22
	Climate Change	5	28
	Climate Change; Market access	1	6
	Limited relevance	2	11
	Market access	2	11
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change	1	6
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Limited relevance	1	6
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access	2	11
	Total	18	100
Brazil	Market access; Access to credit	1	33
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Limited relevance	1	33
	Skipped: Not in scope	1	33
	Total	3	100
Cambodia	Access to credit	1	4
	Climate Change	1	4
	No restrictions	3	12
	Not covered	1	4
	Others	1	4
	Restrictions land/resources	6	24
	Restrictions land/resources; Climate Change	1	4

	Restrictions land/resources; Climate Change; Access to credit; Limited relevance; Others	1	4
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change	2	8
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Limited relevance	1	4
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit	1	4
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	4	16
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change	1	4
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit; Others	1	4
	Total	25	100
Cameroon	Climate Change	12	17
	Climate Change; Limited relevance; No restrictions; Not covered	1	1
	No restrictions	1	1
	Not covered	2	3
	Others	2	3
	Restrictions land/resources	11	15
	Restrictions land/resources; Climate Change	1	1
	Restrictions land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit	1	1
	Restrictions land/resources; No restrictions; Not covered	1	1
	Scarcity land/resources	1	1
	Skipped: No data	4	6
	Skipped: Not in scope	35	49
	Total	72	100
Chile	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change	1	50
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit	1	50
	Total	2	100
Colombia	Climate Change; Market access	1	17
	Others	1	17
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access	1	17
	Scarcity land/resources	2	33
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access	1	17

	Total	6	100
Ecuador	Limited relevance	1	8
	Limited relevance; No restrictions	1	8
	Market access; Access to credit	2	15
	Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance; Others	1	8
	Not covered	1	8
	Others	1	8
	Restrictions land/resources; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	8
	Restrictions land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit; Others	1	8
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit	1	8
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	2	15
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	8
	Total	13	100
Finland	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	100
	Total	1	100
Guyana	Climate Change; Access to credit	1	8
	Climate Change; Market access	1	8
	Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit	2	17
	Market access	2	17
	No restrictions	1	8
	Restrictions land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit	2	17
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change	1	8
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit	1	8
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access	1	8
	Total	12	100
Honduras	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit	3	100
	Total	3	100
India	Climate Change	1	4

	Climate Change; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	4
	Climate Change; Limited relevance	1	4
	Climate Change; Market access	1	4
	Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit	2	7
	Limited relevance	2	7
	Market access	6	22
	Scarcity land/resources	4	15
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change	3	11
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Limited relevance	1	4
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit	2	7
	Scarcity land/resources; Market access	1	4
	Scarcity land/resources; Market access; Limited relevance	2	7
	Total	27	100
Japan	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Access to credit	1	50
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Access to credit; Limited relevance; Others	1	50
	Total	2	100
Kenya	Limited relevance	1	6
	Market access; No restrictions	1	6
	No restrictions	2	11
	Others	1	6
	Others; No restrictions; Not covered	1	6
	Restrictions land/resources	3	17
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change	2	11
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Access to credit; Others	1	6
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Limited relevance	1	6
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	6
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Market access; Limited relevance; Not covered	1	6
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change	1	6
	Scarcity land/resources; Others	2	11
	Total	18	100

Malaysia	Climate Change; Access to credit	1	20
	Restrictions land/resources; Climate Change; Market access	2	40
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Limited relevance	1	20
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change	1	20
	Total	5	100
Mexico	Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	17
	Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit	1	17
	Market access	1	17
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change	1	17
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Access to credit	1	17
	Scarcity land/resources	1	17
	Total	6	100
Nepal	Restrictions land/resources	2	17
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change	1	8
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	8
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Limited relevance; Others	1	8
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Market access	1	8
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	5	42
	Scarcity land/resources; Market access; Limited relevance	1	8
	Total	12	100
Peru	Climate Change	6	15
	Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit	1	2
	Limited relevance	3	7
	Market access	1	2
	No restrictions	4	10
	Others	2	5
	Restrictions land/resources	3	7
	Restrictions land/resources; Climate Change; Market access	1	2
	Restrictions land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit	1	2
	Restrictions land/resources; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	2

	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change	1	2
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	2
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Limited relevance	1	2
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Others	1	2
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Others	1	2
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change	1	2
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit	2	5
	Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit; Others	2	5
	Skipped: No data	2	5
	Skipped: Not in scope	6	15
	Total	41	100
Philippines	No restrictions	1	25
	Others; No restrictions	1	25
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources	1	25
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Access to credit	1	25
	Total	4	100
South Africa	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	100
	Total	1	100
Suriname	Climate Change	2	14
	Climate Change; Access to credit	1	7
	Climate Change; Access to credit; Others	1	7
	Climate Change; Market access; Access to credit; Others	1	7
	Climate Change; Market access; Others	1	7
	Climate Change; Others	1	7
	Market access	1	7
	No restrictions	1	7
	Others	2	14
	Restrictions land/resources; Climate Change; Limited relevance	1	7
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Others	1	7

	Scarcity land/resources; Others	1	7
	Total	14	100
Tanzania	Restrictions land/resources	2	40
	Scarcity land/resources	3	60
	Total	5	100
Thailand	Restrictions land/resources	1	100
	Total	1	100
Uganda	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Access to credit; Limited relevance	1	33
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Climate Change; Limited relevance	1	33
	Restrictions land/resources; Scarcity land/resources; Limited relevance	1	33
	Total	3	100

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Comparative Reflection on Traditional occupations and restrictions:

Occupational specialisation: Women's work is centred on domestic and care duties (16.6 per cent of entries), handicrafts and other artisanal production (24.5 per cent) and crop farming (21.9 per cent). Men list crop farming most often (19.2 per cent) but also feature livestock husbandry (10.4 per cent), hunting (7.4 per cent) and fishing (5.7 per cent). Men alone report security and territorial-protection roles, although this category is still marginal (0.8 per cent). Both sexes engage in gathering of forest products, yet the overall division of labour remains pronounced.

Changing importance: Since 2008 only one community in five records growth in its primary occupation for either women (20.6 per cent) or men (20.1 per cent); declines are reported in 40.1 per cent and 36.6 per cent of cases, respectively, with a further third describing no change. The stagnation or contraction of traditional livelihoods is therefore widespread across genders.

Shared constraints: Climate variability is the leading barrier for both women (68.7 per cent of communities) and men (60.8 per cent). Scarcity of land and other resources follows closely (72.3 per cent for women and 54.3 per cent for men). Restrictions imposed by State rules, concessions or protected-area regimes affect 63.4 per cent of women's livelihoods and 47.2 per cent of men's. The data underline the central importance of secure and climate-resilient tenure for all community livelihoods.

Market linkage gap: Poor market access is reported by 57.5 per cent of communities for women's activities and by 50.7 per cent for men's. Limited access to credit is a



barrier for 47.5 per cent of women and 41.0 per cent of men, while more than half of the communities consider women’s traditional skills to have lost relevance (54.9 per cent). These figures point to systemic obstacles to diversification and value addition in Indigenous economies.

Taken together, the results show that Indigenous women and men continue to rely on land-based livelihoods but face converging environmental and tenure related pressures, compounded by weak market integration and limited financial services. Strengthening collective land security, investing in climate adaptation, and improving market and credit access remain key prerequisites for sustaining and revitalising traditional occupations.

Survey Question Q124 (LCS): Can your people/community perform their traditional occupations (such as pastoralism, hunting/gathering, shifting cultivation, fishing) without restrictions?

The survey asks this question in order to contribute to the monitoring of Articles 20.1, 21.1, 21.2, 32.1 of the UNDRIP.

The data reveals that only 20.6 per cent of the 339 communities report that they can practise their traditional occupations without significant restriction, and a further 11.8 per cent state that they do so with few constraints. By contrast, 28.3 per cent face severe limitations and 9.7 per cent find such activities practically impossible; 13.3 per cent experience moderate limits.

Response scale	Communities	Share of 339 replies
Fully (no significant restriction)	68	20.6 %
Considerable (largely unrestricted)	40	11.8 %
Some (moderate limits)	45	13.27 %
Limited (severe constraint)	96	28.32 %
No (practically impossible)	33	9.7 %
Not answered / not in scope	57	16.8 %

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Themes from the Survey Comments

Comments from communities highlighted five key constraints on their ability to perform traditional occupations:

- **Shrinking or fragmented land base:** This includes community forests being converted to estates or grazing corridors being blocked by fences. Concessions,



plantations and fencing of grazing corridors curtail mobility and territorial continuity.

- **State-imposed access regulations:** Hunting and fishing bans, permit fees and zoning inside new parks or forest reserves limit customary use.
- **Resource depletion and contamination:** Commercial logging, mining and agro-chemicals deplete wildlife, fish stocks and soil fertility, while polluting critical water bodies.
- **Climate variability:** Erratic rainfall and prolonged drought undermine traditional farming and pastoral cycles.
- **Security threats and conflict pressure:** Encroachment by settlers, enforcement operations and private security firms create physical risk and deter livelihood activities.
- **Inter-generational loss:** Out-migration of youth and diminishing transmission of know-how (e.g. weaving, trapping, shifting cultivation cycles) reduce labour and knowledge pools.
- **Market and finance barriers (secondary):** Where physical access persists, unstable prices, long distances to market, and lack of credit still undermine economic viability, especially for women.

Conversely, communities that reported being able to practice their occupations with few restrictions emphasised that they benefit from secure collective titles, active boundary enforcement, and, in a few cases, co-management agreements that protect customary use.

The findings confirm that while some communities retain a meaningful degree of autonomy, structural restrictions remain the norm. Secure territorial tenure is the decisive factor: where Indigenous Peoples hold recognised, enforceable rights, traditional occupations remain viable. Where tenure is insecure, restrictions proliferate. The primary driver of these restrictions is land-use change from agribusiness, logging, mining, and unilateral protected-area designations, which remove or regulate access to the resources on which customary livelihoods depend. Climate stress further compounds this loss of land.

Data Table: Q124 (LCS)

Country	Total	Fully	Considerable	Some	Limited	No	Missing/Skipped
Bangladesh	45	2	6	9	21	6	1
Bolivia	18	10	0	3	4	0	1
Brazil	3	1	0	1	1	0	0
Cambodia	25	2	5	3	5	9	1
Cameroon	72	10	4	8	12	3	35
Chile	2	0	0	1	0	1	0
Colombia	6	0	1	1	2	2	0
Ecuador	13	3	3	4	3	0	0

Finland	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Guyana	12	2	6	0	4	0	0
Honduras	3	1	1	0	1	0	0
India	27	13	5	2	7	0	0
Japan	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
Kenya	18	1	2	2	12	1	0
Malaysia	5	2	0	2	1	0	0
Mexico	6	2	2	1	1	0	0
Nepal	12	0	1	1	5	5	0
Peru	41	17	3	5	9	0	7
Philippines	4	0	1	1	2	0	0
South Africa	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Suriname	14	2	0	0	0	0	12
Tanzania	5	0	0	0	2	3	0
Thailand	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Uganda	3	0	0	0	2	1	0
Grand Total (count)	339	68	40	45	96	33	57
Grand Total (%)	100	20.06	11.8	13.27	28.32	9.73	16.81

Source: Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.

Final reflection on questions 118 – 124

On the findings from questions 118 to 124, covering the traditional occupations of Indigenous women and men, their trends, obstacles, and present viability.

There are converging downward trends.

For both men and women, traditional occupations are reported to be in decline. Since 2008 more than 40 per cent of communities report that the principal women's occupation has diminished, and 36 per cent note the same for men. Fewer than 21 per cent in either case mention any increase. Respondents link the downturn mainly to shrinking land bases, resource depletion and climatic variability rather than to a loss of cultural relevance.

Shared obstacles, gender-specific impacts

The leading barriers are similar for women and men but their effects differ.

- Climate change affects 69 per cent of women's livelihoods and 61 per cent of men's. It lengthens the time that women spend fetching water and fuel and disrupts men's grazing and cropping calendars.
- Scarcity or restricted access to land and resources impedes 72 per cent of women's occupations and 54 per cent of men's. Women report losing gathering



sites and firewood sources; men record bans on hunting, fishing, and pasture use.

- Market and credit constraints hinder more than one half of communities for both sexes, limiting outlets for women’s handicrafts and men’s agricultural surpluses.

These findings suggest that ecological stress, insecure tenure, and weak market integration interact to erode traditional livelihoods, with distinct gendered consequences.

The present viability of occupations is fragile

Only 32 per cent of communities state that they can pursue their traditional occupations fully or to a considerable degree, whereas 38 per cent face severe restrictions or find such activities practically impossible. Viability correlates strongly with secure collective tenure, as seen in the Andean countries, and falls sharply where land is converted to plantations, logging, or exclusionary protected areas, as reported in Bangladesh, Cambodia, and parts of Kenya.

Traditional occupations including pastoralism, hunting, and gathering, shifting cultivation, fishing and related crafts remain indispensable to cultural survival and to biodiversity stewardship. However, environmental change and involuntary changes in land-use are advancing more rapidly than communities can adapt. Women bear a disproportionate share of the resulting unpaid labour burden and market exclusion.

This vulnerability is compounded by women's profound lack of formal land tenure, as highlighted in the analysis of Q044 (LCS), where 59 per cent of communities report that no women hold individual title deeds.

Conclusions and recommendations based on the data:

Recommendations

A rights-based Kunming-Montreal implementation strategy must translate the statistical evidence into concrete, time-bound actions.

Embed the Five Methodological Principles in Indicator 22.1 Guidance

Principle	
Flexible tenure definitions	Legislate or recognise plural tenure regimes (collective, mixed, and spiritual) rather than forcing commodified title models.
Quality-of-rights metrics	Pair any hectare or title count with status variables: duration, revocability, sub-surface rights, and enforcement budget.



FPIC disaggregation	Report land-use changes as ‘with FPIC’ or ‘without FPIC’.
Driver tracking	Code each conversion by its lead sector (extractives, agribusiness, infrastructure, conservation) to target cross-sectoral policy coherence.
Conservation differentiation	Distinguish Indigenous and traditional territories (ITTs) as a third pathway, demarcate Community Conserved Areas (ICCA) and co-managed protected areas from exclusionary state parks.

Source: *Indigenous Navigator community or national respondents, 2016-2025.*

Conclusion:

The evidence assembled by Indigenous Peoples through the Indigenous Navigator confirms a stark, global implementation gap. Statutory promises of collective tenure, FPIC, and self-determination are routinely undercut by weak enforcement, opaque demarcation procedures, and exclusionary conservation or extractive projects.

What the Data Tell Us

- **Laws on the books, violations on the ground:** Data from the Indigenous Navigator national surveys show that nearly four in five states (79 per cent) still have legislation that directly undermines Indigenous land or resource rights, despite the fact that 55 per cent already recognise collective tenure in principle.
- **FPIC breaches:** Ninety-seven per cent of national surveys report land grabs or resource extraction without FPIC since 2008 (one year after adoption of the UNDRIP), and 69 per cent report forced displacement. This is evidence that consultation remains a procedural façade in most jurisdictions. Fifty-nine per cent of communities have experienced land grabbing or resource extraction without FPIC since 2008, and 16.5 per cent report forced displacement or relocation without consent.
- **The conservation paradox:** The expansion of protected areas without consent is confirmed across 62 per cent of national surveys, as protected areas are the second-largest driver after extractives. Twenty-three per cent of communities state that part of their territory has been declared a park or protected area without FPIC illegal logging or other unlawful activities are cited by 48 per cent of conflict-affected communities, followed by intra-community disputes (37 per cent) and in-migration or settlers (34 per cent). Extractive industries are mentioned in 28 per cent of cases. This illustrates that ‘green grabs’ are an emerging and key threat as a driver of dispossession.
- **Gender inequity persists:** Fifty-nine per cent of communities report that no women hold individual titles, while men’s holdings reach four- or five-fifths coverage in a significant minority of cases (18 per cent of communities). Joint titles (couples) exist in only five per cent of communities.



Implications for the KMGBF

- **Target 22 is foundational:** Without enforceable collective tenure and genuine FPIC, the 30x30 conservation ambition risks reproducing historic patterns of dispossession.
- **Indicator 22.1 must measure quality, not just quantity:** The number of hectares titled or converted tells only part of the story; disaggregation by tenure quality, consent status, and the driver of change is indispensable.

Recommended Path Forward

- **Adopt the five methodological principles:** These are flexible tenure definitions, quality-of-rights metrics, FPIC disaggregation, driver tracking, and conservation differentiation.¹²
- **Close the enforcement gap:** This can be done by funding participatory demarcation, Indigenous environmental-rights inspectorates, and rapid-response remedy mechanisms.
- **Embed gender-responsive measures:** This includes making joint titling the default and requiring sex-disaggregated reporting to fulfil the twin mandates of Target 22 and Target 23.
- **Institutionalise Indigenous data sovereignty:** Party reports should reference, but not appropriate, community-owned datasets generated under the Indigenous Navigator protocol.

¹² as detailed in the Indigenous Navigator Consortium submission on Recommendations for the Methodology of Indicator 22.1

Annex I: Indigenous Navigator Survey Indicators Relevant to KMGBF Indicator 22.1

This Annex compiles Indicator, QuestionID, Question Text, and relevance from the Indigenous Navigator national and community surveys that directly support the development of a methodology for KMGBF Headline Indicator 22.1: "Land-use change and land tenure in the traditional territories of Indigenous Peoples and local communities."

Indicator	QID	Question Text	UNDRIP Article	Included in Data Submission?
Disaggregation	Q009 (LNS)	How many different Indigenous peoples inhabit the country?	N/A	No; Removed as not relevant to multi-country analysis
Disaggregation	Q010 (LNS)	What is the percentage of Indigenous people out of the total national population?	N/A	No; Removed as not relevant to multi-country analysis
Disaggregation	Q012 (LNS)	What is the percentage of the total Indigenous population living in rural areas?	N/A	No; Removed as not relevant to multi-country analysis
Recognition of Indigenous Peoples' distinct identity in the constitution or national legislation based on self-identification	Q016 (LCS)	Does the state recognise the peoples covered in this survey as distinct peoples with collective rights?	Art. 3, Preamble 1 & 2	Yes.
Existence of laws that are in direct violation of Indigenous Peoples' rights	Q016 (LNS)	Are there laws and policies, within the following thematic areas, that are in direct violation of Indigenous Peoples' rights: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-government, autonomous institutions and customary law, consultation and free prior and informed consent • Cultural integrity, languages, cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and intellectual property • Lands, territories and resources • Participation in public life, citizenship • Legal protection, access to justice and remedy • Cross border contacts • Freedom of Expression • Food, development, social protections, housing and sanitation • Education • Health 	Art. 1, 38, 46.2, 46.3	Yes

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment, occupation and vocational training • Fundamental Freedom 		
Proportion of sustainable development indicators produced at the national level with full disaggregation [including with regards to Indigenous identity] when relevant to the target, in accordance with the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics	Q020 (LNS)	Does the State, in censuses and household surveys, collect disaggregated data to monitor the achievement of the SDGs by Indigenous Peoples and individuals?	Art. 2	Yes
Issues concerning planning of local development projects are handled by Indigenous peoples' autonomous institutions	Q021 (LCS)	Do your Indigenous institutions/authorities make their own development plans (for example for water and sanitation, road infrastructure, electrification)?	Art. 5, 18, 20.1, 33.2, 34, 39	Yes
Issues concerning land and resource use are handled by Indigenous peoples' autonomous institutions	Q023 (LCS)	Do your Indigenous institutions/authorities manage issues relating to lands, territories and resources?	Art. 5, 18, 20.1, 33.2, 34, 39	Yes
The collective rights of Indigenous Peoples to self-determination, i.e. to freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development is recognized in the constitution or other forms of superior law	Q025 (LNS)	Does the Constitution or national legislation recognise Indigenous Peoples' right to self-determination, i.e. to freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development?	Art. 3, Preamble 1 & 2	Yes
Recognition of Indigenous Peoples' distinct identity in the constitution or national legislation based on self-identification	Q026 (LNS)	Does national legislation recognise Indigenous Peoples as distinct groups with collective rights?	Art. 3, Preamble 1 & 2	Yes
Recognition of Indigenous Peoples' right to self-government in national legislation	Q027 (LNS)	Does national legislation recognise Indigenous Peoples' right to self-government in internal and local affairs?	Art. 4	Yes
Recognition of Indigenous Peoples' self-governing institutions and territories in the political-administrative structure of the State	Q028 (LNS)	Are Indigenous Peoples' self-governing institutions and territories recognised in the political-administrative structure of the State?	Art. 5, 18, 20.1, 33.2, 34, 39	Yes
Consultations with Indigenous Peoples' autonomous institutions before approval of measures and projects that may affect you	Q029 (LCS)	Do local or central government institutions ensure that adequate consultations are undertaken with your community/ties before approval of projects or other measures that may affect you?	Art. 19, 32.2	Yes

Free, prior and informed consent of Indigenous Peoples' autonomous institutions before approval of measures that may affect them	Q030 (LCS)	Do local or central government institutions obtain the free, prior and informed consent of your community/ties before they approve projects or other measures that affect you?	Art. 19, 32.2	Yes
Recognition of the state duty to consult with Indigenous Peoples before adopting or implementing legislative or administrative measures that may affect them and prior to approval of any project that affects their lands, territories and resources in national legislation	Q033 (LNS)	Does national legislation recognise the state's duty to consult with Indigenous Peoples in order to obtain their free, prior and informed consent prior to approval of any project that may affect their lands, territories or resources?	Art. 19, 32.2	Yes
Characteristics of Indigenous Peoples' traditional land tenure systems.	Q039 (LCS)	What are the characteristics of your traditional land and resource tenure system?	Art. 25, 26.1, 26.3	Yes
Incidents of redress for land lost without the free, prior and informed consent of Indigenous Peoples	Q040 (LCS)	What is the extent (in hectares) of the lands traditionally occupied and used by your people or community/ies?	Art. 20.2	No, extent is not comparable
Recognition of Indigenous Peoples' rights to lands, territories and resources in national legislation	Q041 (LCS)	Is your right to lands, territories and resources recognised by the government?	Art. 25, 26.1, 26.3	Yes
Recognition of Indigenous Peoples' rights to lands, territories and resources in national legislation	Q041 (LNS)	Does national legislation recognise Indigenous Peoples' collective rights to lands, territories and resources?	Art. 25, 26.1, 26.3	Yes
Proportion of Indigenous Peoples with ownership or secure rights over land.	Q042 (LCS)	Does your people or community/ies have title deeds or other binding agreements in recognition of their collective right to lands or territories?	Art. 21.1	Yes
Clear procedures adopted by the State for identification, demarcation, mapping and registration of Indigenous Peoples' lands or territories lands in consultation with and in accordance with Indigenous norms, values and customs	Q042 (LNS)	Has the State adopted clear procedures for identification, demarcation, mapping and registration of Indigenous Peoples' lands or territories in consultation with and in accordance with Indigenous norms, values and customs?	Art. 26.2, 27	Yes

Proportion of Indigenous Peoples with ownership or secure rights over land.	Q043 (LCS)	If yes, what is the extent (in hectares) of the land covered by such agreements?	Art 21.1	No, extent is not comparable
Proportion of Indigenous Peoples with ownership or secure rights over land.	Q043 (LNS)	What approximate proportion of the total Indigenous population in the country has title deeds or other binding agreements in recognition of their collective right to lands or territories?	Art. 21.1	Yes
Proportion of total agricultural [Indigenous] population with ownership or secure rights over agricultural land (out of total community population), by sex.	Q044 (LCS)	Approximately, how many women and men (or couples if titles are held by both spouses) of your people/community have title deeds or other binding agreements in recognition of their individual rights to land?	Art. 21.1	Yes
Indigenous peoples' control over land	Q044 (LNS)	What is the approximate area of Indigenous Peoples' land (in hectares) that is legally recognized, secured, documented and protected?	Art. 26.2	Yes
Incidents of conflicting land or resource claims	Q045 (LCS)	Does your people/community experience conflicts related to land or natural resources?	Art. 26.2	Yes
Incidents of settlements, land grabbing, land use or resource extraction without Indigenous Peoples' free, prior and informed consent	Q045 (LNS)	Have there, since 2008, been incidents of settlements, land grabbing, land use or resource extraction without Indigenous Peoples' free, prior and informed consent?	Art. 26.2	Yes
Incidents of conflicting land or resource claims	Q046 (LCS)	If your people/community experience conflicts related to land or natural resources, are these related to:	Art. 26.2	Yes
Incidents of displacement or relocation without free, prior and informed consent	Q046 (LNS)	Have there, since 2008, been incidents of displacement or relocation of Indigenous Peoples without free, prior and informed consent?	Art. 8.2(b), 10,	Yes
Incidents of settlements, land grabbing, land use or resource extraction without Indigenous Peoples' free, prior and informed consent	Q047 (LCS)	Have your people or community/ies, since 2008, experienced incidents of settlement, land grabbing, land use or resource extraction without your free, prior and informed consent?	Art. 26.2	Yes
Establishment and extension of State-designated protected areas on Indigenous Peoples territories without free, prior and informed consent	Q047 (LNS)	Has the State, since 2008, established or extended protected areas on Indigenous Peoples' territories without their free, prior and informed consent?	Art. 29.1	Yes
Incidents of displacement or relocation without free, prior and informed consent	Q048 (LCS)	Have your people or community/ies, since 2008, experienced incidents of displacement or relocation without your free, prior and informed consent?	Art. 10, Art. 8.2 (b)	Yes
Establishment and extension of community conserved areas	Q051 (LCS)	Has your people/community established conservation area(s) within your territory?	Art. 29.1	Yes

Establishment and extension of community conserved areas	Q052 (LCS)	If your people/community has established conservation area(s) within your territory, what is the extent (in hectares) of that area?	Art. 29.1	No, extent is not comparable
Establishment and extension of State-designated protected areas on Indigenous Peoples territories without free, prior and informed consent	Q055 (LCS)	Has the State declared any part of the territory of your community/people as a park or protected area, without your free, prior and informed consent?	Art. 29.1	Yes
Establishment and extension of State-designated protected areas on Indigenous Peoples territories without free, prior and informed consent	Q056 (LCS)	If yes, what is the extent (in hectares) of that area?	Art. 29.1	No, extent is not comparable
Status and trends in traditional occupations	Q118 (LCS)	Which are the most important traditional occupations performed by women in your people/community (list up to five)?	Art. 20.1	Yes, in summary.
Status and trends in traditional occupations	Q119 (LCS)	How has the importance of these traditional occupations for women changed over the last 20 years: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has no importance any longer • The importance has diminished • The importance remains the same • The importance has increased 	Art. 20.1	Yes
Status and trends in traditional occupations	Q120 (LCS)	What are the main barriers or restrictions for performing these traditional occupations today?	Art. 20.1	Yes
Status and trends in traditional occupations	Q121 (LCS)	Which are the most important traditional occupations performed by men in your people/community (list up to five)?	Art. 20.1	Yes, in summary
Status and trends in traditional occupations	Q122 (LCS)	How has the importance of these traditional occupations for men changed over the last 20 years: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has no importance any longer • The importance has diminished • The importance remains the same • The importance has increased 	Art. 20.1	Yes
Status and trends in traditional occupations	Q123 (LCS)	What are the main barriers or restrictions for performing these traditional occupations today?	Art. 20.1	Yes
Possibility to perform traditional occupations (such as pastoralism, hunting/gathering, shifting cultivation, fishing) without restrictions	Q124 (LCS)	Can your people/community perform their traditional occupations (such as pastoralism, hunting/gathering, shifting cultivation, fishing) without restrictions?	Art. 20.1, 21.1, 21.2, 32.1	Yes