

Additional Thematic Submission to the Committee on the Rights of the Child
Issues pertaining to Uganda's protection, respect and fulfilment of the rights
of Indigenous Peoples and their children in the context of conservation:

Case of Mosopisyek of Benet

Submission on behalf of Benet Mosop Community Association (BMCA) and
the Forest Peoples Programme (FPP) to the 101st CRC Session Uganda State
Party Review (1 - 28 Sep 2026)

I. Summary

This thematic submission of the Benet Mosop Community Association BMCA and Forest Peoples Programme FPP to the Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC) focuses on Uganda's protection of Indigenous Peoples' rights in the context of conservation.¹ It addresses the emblematic case of Mosopisyek of Benet Indigenous People² ("Mosopisyek") of eastern Uganda who were forcibly evicted from their customary lands for the creation of the Mount Elgon National Park (MENP). This fortress conservation model imposed by the Ugandan Wildlife Agency (UWA) on the Mosopisyek and other Indigenous Peoples has resulted in egregious and systematic human rights violations against Mosopisyek and other indigenous children denying them the enjoyment of numerous rights enshrined in the Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC).

II. Suggested questions from the Committee on the Rights of the Child to Uganda

Please explain measures taken to:

- Protect the rights of Mosopisyek children and to eradicate discrimination against them, including through official recognition of the Mosopisyek as an Indigenous People and guaranteeing their land and cultural rights and their right to transmit their culture and their lands to future generations.
- Remedy violations of the Mosopisyek Peoples' rights to land, territories and resources, and to free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) through the restitution of their lands and transitioning to an Indigenous-led human rights-based approach to conservation that guarantees children's right to enjoy their culture.
- Prevent, address and remedy the high levels of violence against Mosopisyek children and their families, including sexual violence, by state agencies such as UWA, and eliminate its root causes.³

¹ The CRC has addressed this issue in previous Concluding Observations such as CRC/C/CRI/CO/5-6, 4 March 2020 para 44(d) para 44(d).

² This submission refers to the self-identified name of the Mosopisyek of Benet who are often mischaracterised as the Benet people. "Benet" refers to a territory that is part of their ancestral lands.

³ CRC/C/GC/11, 12 February 2009, para 73 calling on States to "base preventative measures [for sexual exploitation] on studies which include documentation of the patterns of violations and analysis of root causes".

III. Introduction

1. This submission builds on questions posed by the Committee⁴ regarding Uganda's efforts to combat discrimination against indigenous children and to guarantee their collective and individual human rights.
2. Decades of systemic violations of the collective rights of the Mosopisyek to their lands and identity - compounded by their nonrecognition as an Indigenous People - has intergenerational impacts on Mosopisyek children violating their collective and individual rights articulated in the UNCRC and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), which the CRC recognises as an "authoritative framework for interpreting States parties' obligations under the Convention concerning Indigenous Peoples' rights, keeping in mind that indigenous children are also impacted by the challenges facing their families and communities."⁵
3. These include the rights to: self-determination,⁶ to lands and resources,⁷ FPIC (including for relocation from and militarisation of ancestral lands),⁸ non-discrimination,⁹ life, survival and development,¹⁰ respect for the views of the child,¹¹ freedom from violence, abuse and neglect,¹² health,¹³ a standard of living adequate for the child's physical, mental, spiritual, moral and social development,¹⁴ education,¹⁵ exercise their culture and take part in cultural activities,¹⁶ and to be protected from all forms of sexual abuse.¹⁷

⁴ CRC/C/UGA/Q/3-5, Question 12(a), 5 March 2025.

⁵ *M. E. V., S. E. V. and B. I. V. v. Finland*, CRC/C/97/D/172/2022 (2024), para. 9.12. See also Committee's General Comment No. 11 (2009), CRC/C/GC/11, 12 February 2009 which clarified that a child's rights cannot be fully realized outside of their community's collective rights, and General Comment No. 39 (2022) on Indigenous Women and Girls of the Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, CEDAW/C/GC/39, 31 October 2022.

⁶ Article 3, UNDRIP, Common Article 1 International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights and International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

⁷ Article 26, UNDRIP; CRC/C/HND/CO/4-5, 3 July 2015 para 77, 78; CRC/C/PRY/CO/4-6, 18 June 2024 para 46(a); *M. E. V., S. E. V. and B. I. V. v. Finland*, CRC/C/97/D/172/2022, 7 Oct. 2024 para 9.24.

⁸ Articles 10, 19, 28, 30, 32, UNDRIP; CRC/C/GTM/CO/5-6, 28 February 2018 para 43; CRC/C/PRY/CO/4-6, 18 June 2024 para 46(a); CRC/C/HND/CO/4-5, 3 July 2015 para 77, 78; *M. E. V., S. E. V. and B. I. V. v. Finland*, CRC/C/97/D/172/2022, 7 Oct. 2024 para 9.24 noting that "to ignore the right of Indigenous peoples to use and enjoy land rights and to refrain from taking appropriate measures to ensure respect in practice for their right to offer free, prior and informed consent whenever their rights may be affected by projects carried out in their traditional territories, constitutes a form of discrimination, as it results in nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise by Indigenous peoples, on an equal footing, of their rights to their ancestral territories, natural resources and, as a result, their identity"

⁹ Article 2, UNCRC; Article 2 UNDRIP.

¹⁰ Article 6, UNCRC; Article 7 UNDRIP.

¹¹ Article 12, UNCRC.

¹² Article 19, UNCRC.

¹³ Article 24, UNCRC; Article 17, 21, 23, 24, 29 UNDRIP.

¹⁴ Article 27, UNCRC.

¹⁵ Article 29, UNCRC; Article 14 UNDRIP.

¹⁶ Articles 30, 31, UNCRC; Articles 3, 8, 11, 14, 15 UNDRIP.

¹⁷ Article 34, UNCRC; Article 22 UNDRIP.

4. The Mosopisyek's deep historical and cultural connections with their ancestral lands at Mt. Elgon and their rights over them have been infringed since 1936, when their land was gazetted as a Crown Forest by British colonial authorities. In subsequent decades, the Ugandan state authorities systematically denied the Mosopisyek's rights and from the 1980's onwards evicted them from their ancestral lands. These lands are coextensive with MENP that was imposed without FPIC, denying Mosopisyek children's right to be heard and their rights to participation and consultation on all matters affecting them.¹⁸ The Mosopisyek were told to resettle in a small area within their lands, but much of that "resettlement area" had been appropriated by non-Mosopisyek communities and local elites.¹⁹ Displaced Mosopisyek households, including children, were forced to settle on insufficient and inadequate land, living under trees and in caves, hiding from militarized UWA park guards.
5. This dispossession of the Mosopisyek from their ancestral lands has been maintained through the violent and systematic violation of their human rights by UWA, including egregious violations of children's right to be protected from all forms of sexual abuse.²⁰ It has contributed to the erosion of the Mosopisyek's social fabric, livelihoods, culture and ways of life, preventing cultural transmission to current and future generations of children.
6. In 2024 several special procedures of the Human Rights Council invited the Government of Uganda to respond to grave allegations related to the longstanding violations of Mosopisyek rights at MENP.²¹ However, to our knowledge the government has so far failed to respond. This pattern of serious and systematic violations of the Mosopisyek's rights addressed by the Special Rapporteurs in 2024, the Human Rights Committee in 2023, the African Commission on Human and Peoples Rights in 2022, the Committee on Economic Social and Cultural Rights in 2015 and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2010, remains ongoing.

IV. The Government of Uganda must recognise the Mosopisyek as an Indigenous People with collective rights

7. The Mosopisyek people are a herder-hunter-gatherer and mountain people comprised of thirty-seven clans with an estimated population of 12,500 people. The

¹⁸ CRC/C/GC/11, 12 February 2009, para 39.

¹⁹ Adonia Kakurungu Kamukasa Bintooro and Richard Godfrey Matanda, Governance of Forests: Assessment of the Resettlement of Benet/Ndorobos Issues in the Management of Mount Elgon National Park, Uganda, *Asian Journal of Environment and Ecology* 5(2): 1-18, 2017, at 7-8.

²⁰ Article 34, UNCRC. This is consistent with the States acknowledgement that the incidence of sexual violence against children is high and violence against children is on the rise CRC/C/UGA/3-5, 5 March 2024, paras 56, 60.

²¹ Mandates of the Special Rapporteur on the rights of Indigenous Peoples; the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention; the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions; the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, and on the right to non-discrimination in this context; the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders; the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons and the Special Rapporteur on violence against women and girls, its causes and consequences, Communication reference AL UGA 1/2024.

Mosopisyek's integral customary territory, known as Mosop, comprises a portion of Mt. Elgon and spans the entire MENP. The Mosopisyek's governance system and indigenous law is administered through the Mosopisyek Council of Elders, comprised of a representative from each clan.

8. The Mosopisyek meet the international criteria for, and self-identify as, an Indigenous People, and are recognised as such by UN Special Rapporteurs and treaty bodies.²² The British colonial administration recognised them as a distinct society practising hunting, gathering, and pastoral herding over the moorland.²³ However, to date, the Mosopisyek have not been recognised by the Ugandan state as an Indigenous People with the right to the full enjoyment of collective and individual rights as articulated by international human rights law.²⁴
9. The nonrecognition of the Mosopisyek as an Indigenous People results in the denial of their economic, cultural and social rights and their collective land, self-governance and cultural rights as an Indigenous People. As members of an Indigenous People, Mosopisyek children have the right to be free from discrimination on the basis of their Indigenous identity,²⁵ the right to enjoy and inherit their culture,²⁶ and the right to an adequate standard of living,²⁷ among others. This results in de-facto discrimination against Mosopisyek children,²⁸ who enjoy a lower standard of living²⁹ are unable to enjoy and have their culture transmitted to them.³⁰ It also means that positive measures to eliminate conditions that cause discrimination are not taken.³¹
10. Recognition of the Mosopisyek as an Indigenous People would contribute to the protection of the individual rights of Mosopisyek children alongside their collective rights as members of an Indigenous People, including to their cultural identity and to the restitution of their lands taken without FPIC. Notably, the Committee has echoed calls by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination for States parties to recognize and respect Indigenous Peoples' distinct cultures, history, language and way of life³² and to return lands and resources taken without FPIC.

²² UN Special Rapporteurs Communication reference AL UGA (1.2024) and AL UGA (5.2022); CESCR Concluding Observations to Uganda (2105) UN Doc. E/C.12/UGA/CO/1 para 13; CCPR Uganda, Concluding Observations CCPR/C/UGA/CO/2, 11 September 2023 para 50, 51.

²³ In the colonial era they were referred to as the Dorobo, and subsequently as the Benet, but they now self-identify as the Mosopisyek of Benet.

²⁴ Article 1, UNDRIP; CESCR Concluding Observations to Uganda (2105) UN Doc. E/C.12/UGA/CO/1 para 9.24; CCPR, Concluding Observations to Uganda, CCPR/C/UGA/CO/2, 11 September 2023 para 50, 51.

²⁵ Article 2, UNDRIP.

²⁶ Articles 11, 12, 13, 20, 25, UNDRIP.

²⁷ Article 27, UNCRC.

²⁸ Article 2, UNCRC; Article 2, UNDRIP.

²⁹ Article 27, UNCRC.

³⁰ Articles 11, 12, 13, 20, 25, UNDRIP.

³¹ CRC/C/GC/11, 12 February 2009, para 25.

³² CRC/C/GC/11, 12 February 2009, para 18.

V. The Government of Uganda must ensure restitution of Mosopisyek lands to protect children's human rights

11. As the Committee has previously noted, Indigenous Peoples' cultural rights are intimately linked with control over traditional territories and the use of their resources.³³ The Mosopisyek's deep historical and cultural connections with their ancestral lands at Mt. Elgon are well-documented.³⁴ For example, they depend on the moorlands of Mt. Elgon for grazing, honey, and ceremonial sites, and they have traditional rules governing the management and use of their environment. However, their connection to their lands at Mt. Elgon has been forcibly ruptured, alongside their land, territory, resource, cultural, livelihood and self-determination rights due to the evictions from their lands that commenced in the 1980s and continue to the present.
12. As a consequence, the Mosopisyek people, including children, have since lived largely in poverty on the outskirts of their ancestral lands covered by the park, unable to carry out traditional cultural and spiritual practices³⁵ and subsistence activities, with inadequate access to land, resources, livelihood options, and public services, including health and education,³⁶ restricting their individual empowerment and collective self-determination.³⁷
13. The Mosopisyek's separation from their ancestral lands threatens to be further entrenched since the Government of Uganda added Mt. Elgon to UNESCO's tentative list for World Heritage site designation in 2024. The state's World Heritage tentative listing indicates that it intends to list Mt. Elgon as a natural site, rather than a mixed cultural and natural site. This designation ignores the presence of the Mosopisyek and their rights and fails to obtain their FPIC and would facilitate further erasure of the Mosopisyek's rights and attachment to their ancestral lands.
14. As the CESC, CCPR and UNSRIP have observed, the designation of the Mosopisyek ancestral land as a national park without obtaining Mosopisyek FPIC denies access to their ancestral lands and prevents them from preserving their traditional way of living and livelihoods.³⁸ This has had a particular profound impact on Mosopisyek children, as continuity of culture and traditional practices across generations require access to and control over traditional lands. Separation from their ancestral lands prevents them from enjoying their rights to education and culture, including through the transmission of Mosopisyek cultural heritage and traditional ecological knowledge and environmental stewardship central to Mosopisyek land management

³³ CRC/C/GC/11, 12 February 2009, para 16.

³⁴ See, e.g., David Karl Himmelfarb, *In the Aftermath of Displacement: A Political Ecology of Dispossession, Transformation, and Conflict on Mt. Elgon, Uganda* (2012) (citing Ehret 1971).

³⁵ Among the cultural practices are rituals that must be done at certain sites within the ancestral lands. For example, the Mosopisyek must sometimes exhume remains of ancestors who are buried within the park boundaries and relocate them to sacred caves, also within the park boundaries. Failing to carry out this ritual results in negative consequences to the well-being of family members of the deceased.

³⁶ See Amnesty International report (2021): <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/afr59/4138/2021/en/>

³⁷ CRC/C/GC/11, 12 February 2009, para 57.

³⁸ CESC Concluding Observations to Uganda (2105) UN Doc. E/C.12/UGA/CO/1 para 9.24; CCPR, Concluding Observations to Uganda CCPR/C/UGA/CO/2, 11 September 2023 para 50, 51.

practices,³⁹ denies intergenerational cultural continuity, and threatens the Mosopisyek's existence as a people.⁴⁰

15. The failure to seek and obtain the Mosopisyek's FPIC before relocating them from their ancestral lands constitutes racial discrimination, threatens their physical and cultural survival and is in violation of their right to self-determination, including the right to their own means of subsistence and to exist as a people.⁴¹ Restitution of the Mosopisyek's ancestral lands is necessary to remedy this situation and guarantee Mosopisyek children enjoyment of their rights.

VI. The Government of Uganda must cease UWA's fortress conservation approach and associated human rights violations

16. Human rights violations committed by state authorities against the Mosopisyek include those perpetrated by the militarised state agency, UWA, that manages and controls MENP under a widely discredited "fortress conservation" approach. The Mosopisyek eviction from extensive and culturally, socially and economically significant portions of their ancestral lands in the name of fortress conservation has impoverished them, criminalized subsistence activities like gathering firewood, and created a power dynamic in which UWA guards commit human rights abuses with impunity.
17. Accessing customary land is met with violent force by UWA, resulting in criminalization of community members, arbitrary arrest and imprisonment, rapes, shootings and beatings at times causing serious injury or death. Community members are also fined for entering the park and for each animal they bring into it and animals are regularly impounded. Children have particularly suffered from this pattern of violence and discrimination: for example, in 2006, Cherotich Dison (an 8-year-old boy) was shot and injured by UWA near his home and his family's cows in Sasut Village. This was reported to the police and Soroti office of the Uganda Human Rights Commission (UHRC), but no action appears to have been taken.⁴²
18. On 1st July 2026 two Mosopisyek teenage girls (aged 13 and 18), who had entered their ancestral lands with the boundaries of MENP to gather firewood for their families, were raped by UWA park rangers.⁴³ The rapes were reported to Kween central police station, however, the alleged suspects are currently being protected by UWA and as

³⁹ Article 29(e) ICRC.

⁴⁰ CRC/C/GC/11 General Comment No. 11 (2009) Indigenous children and their rights under the Convention (noting that for "indigenous children whose communities retain a traditional lifestyle, the use of traditional land is of significant importance to their development and enjoyment of culture").

⁴¹ This has been established in the jurisprudence of the CRC and the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) see for example *M. E. V., S. E. V. and B. I. V. v. Finland*, CRC/C/97/D/172/2022, 7 Oct. 2024 para 9.24; see also *Ågren v. Sweden*, CERD/C/102/D/54/2013 (2020), para. 6.7.

⁴² FPP, UOBDU, BMCA, IWGIA, & COPASCO, *Indigenous Peoples in Uganda: A Review of the Human Rights Situation of the Batwa People, the Benet People and Pastoralist Communities (Alternative report to the Fifth periodic report of the Republic of Uganda presented at the 56th Ordinary session of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights)*, April 2015 at 14.

⁴³ Such firewood collecting practices are necessary because the small parcels of land provided to some Mosopisyek families after their evictions, if any such land was provided, is insufficient to meet their basic needs, let alone to practice their traditional livelihood activities.

of 30th July 2026 had not been arrested. This has prevented the rape victims from identifying the perpetrators and is illustrative of a trend whereby perpetrators of violence are protected from prosecution and are granted impunity.

19. The case is demonstrative of UWA's efforts to suppress any acts of collective human rights defence by the communities, as well as efforts to deny justice to the survivors, their families and community. These attacks, and the inadequate response to them, are a direct result of the Government of Uganda's failure to recognize, respect, and protect the rights of the Mosopisyeke to their lands, territories, and resources. They illustrate the pattern of discrimination and violence against community members attempting to access their customary lands, as well as egregious violations of the rights of children.
20. Such violations frequently go unreported due to fear of reprisals and a lack of trust in state authorities to arrest and prosecute perpetrators. The Mosopisyeke have brought cases against UWA before the UHRC and the High Court,⁴⁴ and UWA was found guilty of torture in one case, but progress is slow in most cases. Unfortunately, as these recent rapes demonstrate, violations continue. There is mounting concern of future human rights violations due to the recent reports that UWA plans to deploy four thousand troops from the Uganda People's Defence Force (UPDF) to Mt Elgon, suggesting the use of force against the Mosopisyeke, whom they bundle together with others they classify as "encroachers", may increase.⁴⁵
21. This pattern of endemic violence against the Mosopisyeke, including children, often coincides with efforts by the community to assert their collective rights. This is not a coincidence and is instead reflective of UWA's and UPDF's attempts to suppress the voice of the Mosopisyeke people and their environmental and land rights defenders. In effect these individual human rights violations are attempts to eradicate acts of collective human rights defence in the context of a discredited fortress conservation model.
22. The Government of Uganda's conservation justification for its actions fails on multiple fronts. The African Commission and the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights have declared that the fortress conservation model based on the exclusion of Indigenous Peoples from their ancestral lands without their FPIC is inhumane, ineffective, and contrary to state obligations under the African Charter.⁴⁶ It and other

⁴⁴ See, e.g., *Kiplangat Dan Kabungu v. UWA et al.*, Misc. Cause No. 48 of 2022 (this is the only case out of several filed at the High Court that has been decided).

⁴⁵ See [War on Encroachers: UWA to Deploy 4,000 UPDF Soldiers to Secure Mt Elgon National Park | The Standard News \(Uganda\)](#) (12 June 2026).

⁴⁶ African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, *Minority Rights Group International and Environnement Ressources Naturelles et Développement on behalf of the Batwa of Kahuzi-Biega National Park, DRC v. Democratic Republic of Congo*, Communication 588/15 [merits] (Aug. 2025); *ACHPR v. Republic of Kenya*, African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights, Application No. 006/2012, Judgment, 26 May 2017, para. 130-131 (finding that the Government of Kenya violated the rights of the Mau Ogiek when it evicted them from their lands for the stated purpose of conservation).

human rights bodies have called for new models of conservation consistent with respect for Indigenous Peoples' rights and indigenous-led conservation.⁴⁷

VII. The Government of Uganda must transition to human rights-based Indigenous-led conservation models

23. As noted earlier, the current conservation model poses a serious threat to the Mosopisyek's physical and cultural survival and the rights of Mosopisyek children, including by denying the transmission of cultural knowledge and practices.⁴⁸ Human rights bodies, such as the UN Special Rapporteur on Cultural Rights, have called on states to transition from fortress conservation to rights-compliant participatory models of conservation, which not only ensure respect for human rights⁴⁹ but also have more effective outcomes than conservation areas managed by state entities. Reflective of this, states, such as Canada, are actively supporting Indigenous-led conservation, which academic research demonstrates improves outcomes in conservation areas.⁵⁰
24. The Mosopisyek have repeatedly attempted to engage state authorities to explain their unique capacity to protect the flora and fauna in their lands using their traditional land management practices that help prevent wildfires, protect elephants and biodiversity and protect indigenous forest from poachers, loggers, and charcoal burners.⁵¹ However, the state has shown no willingness to consider human rights-consistent indigenous-led conservation approaches, despite evidence of their effectiveness.⁵² Instead, it perpetuates UWA's exclusionary approach that facilitates egregious human rights violations and separates Mosopisyek communities, families and children from their lands and means of subsistence, preventing the cultural practices and transmission necessary for maintaining their identity as a people.

VIII. Recommendations

The submitting organisations respectfully suggest the following recommendations be made to the Government of Uganda:

⁴⁷ *Inter-American Court of Human Rights Case of the Kaliña and Lokono Peoples v. Suriname* Judgment of November 25, 2015, paras 171-181; Report of the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights, Nature conservation and cultural rights, A/HRC/61/49 (17 February 2026).

⁴⁸ CRC/C/GC/11, 12 February 2009, paras 60 & 62.

⁴⁹ CRC arts. 5, 13, 14, 16, 29, 30; UNDRIP arts. 3, 5, 8, 11, 12, 13, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32.

⁵⁰ [Indigenous-Led Area-Based Conservation - Canada.ca](#); [Indigenous-led conservation improves outcomes in protected areas | Nature Reviews Biodiversity](#).

⁵¹ Justin Kenrick, Tom Rowley, and Peter Kitelo, 'We Are Our Land'—Ogiek of Mount Elgon, Kenya: *Securing Community Tenure as the Key Enabling Condition for Sustaining Community Lands*. Oryx 57, no. 3 (2023): 298–312. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S003060532300008X>. On the Kenyan side of Mt. Elgon, the Ogiek have a greater degree of control over the management of their ancestral lands, and their experience has demonstrated the compatibility and complementarity of respect for customary land rights with conservation outcomes. Thus, the forced relocation of the Mosopisyek is in no way necessary to accomplish the state's conservation objectives, and in fact undermines those objectives.

⁵² J.S. Sze, L.R. Carrasco, D. Childs, & D.P. Edwards, *Reduced deforestation and degradation in Indigenous lands pan-tropically*, Nature Sustainability, 5, 123-130 (2021).

- Ensure the restitution of Mosopisyek lands, enable indigenous-led and demilitarised conservation, and guarantee respect for Mosopisyek cultural rights and cultural transmission to current and future generations of children. To realise this the State should:
 - Redesignate Mt. Elgon National Park to a new category that recognises the role of indigenous-led conservation and under which the Mosopisyek are recognized as the collective owners of the land and the management authority thereof, as agreed with them within the framework of FPIC, with the participation of Mosopisyek children and youth.
 - Enter into good-faith discussions and collaboration with the authorised representatives of the 37 Mosopisyek clans with regard to how a land dispute resolution mechanism should be structured and implemented in the context of disputes around Mosopisyek land rights and their role in conservation in Mt Elgon, drawing on lessons learned from the land dispute resolution and conservation management dialogue (the Whakatane Mechanism) between the Mt Elgon Ogiek and the Kenyan state.
- Conduct thorough, transparent and independent investigations to gather all the necessary evidence that leads to the prosecution of persons responsible for violations of Mosopisyek rights, including physical and sexual violence against Mosopisyek children and their families, and provide effective and culturally appropriate remedies to address these human rights violations.
- Initiate an independent review of UWA's practices and the structural causes for them, identifying the reforms that are necessary to transform the institutional culture causing this systematic racial discrimination and violence against the Mosopisyek. Such reform must ensure respect for individual and collective rights and accountability of UWA management and staff to Indigenous Peoples in whose territories they operate. The independent review should be conducted with the participation of the Mosopisyek and the Equal Opportunities Commission of Uganda.

Submitted by:

The Benet Mosop Community Association (BMCA)

BMCA is an NGO formed by the Mosopisyek of Benet Indigenous People in Uganda to promote respect for their human rights under the guidance of the representatives of the 37 Mosopisyek clans.

Forest Peoples Programme (FPP)

FPP is a human rights organisation working with Indigenous Peoples and forest peoples to secure their land, self-determination, self-governance and FPIC rights.