

Asserting First Nations expectations on Free, Prior and Informed Consent and co-management of mine closure: learnings from the Banjima People in Western Australia's Pilbara region

Jon Crosbie ^{a,*}, Darren Murphy ^b, Mark Gregson ^c, Jane Dunne ^c, Emily Stanton-Clements ^c,
Johanne Parker ^d

^a Crosbie ESG Pty Ltd, Australia

^b Murco Post Mining Services, Australia

^c Banjima Native Title Aboriginal Corporation, Australia

^d Banjima Traditional Owner, Australia

Abstract

The Banjima People have occupied their homelands in the Central Pilbara region of Western Australia for at least 45,000 years. A native title determination was secured in 2013.

Mining tenements cover the Banjima native title determination area. There are currently 6 large-scale operational iron ore mines, numerous smaller mines (e.g. MinRes) and several major development projects (BHP's Ministers North and HanRoy's Mulga Downs). These mines collectively produce approximately 325 million tonnes of iron ore per annum – almost one third of Australia's total annual iron ore production.

Through 6 decades of mining; extensive land and water degradation, and destruction of cultural heritage, has occurred, resulting in increasing negative cumulative impacts. There has been very minimal successful and progressive rehabilitation, mine closure or healing of Country.

In response to this poor track record, the Banjima developed their own closure principles, with the objective that: land disturbed by mining is returned to the Banjima People in a condition that restores Native Title Rights and Healthy Country, and enables sustainable economic development for future generations.

The objective statement is supported by clear and detailed expectations on closure principles (behaviours) and closure outcomes (end-state values), and requires mining proponents to seek the Banjima's Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) for their mine closure plans prior to their submission to the regulators. A key part of the FPIC process is the co-design of the mine closure plans, providing the Banjima with more involvement in the assessment of closure options and decision-making.

This paper outlines the development process of the Banjima closure principles, how they have been and are utilised within a traditional owner-defined engagement and co-management approach with miners, and how Banjima monitors compliance against them for each mine on Country. Having the Banjima clearly asserting their expectations for mine closure has already contributed to improvements in some proponents' mine closure plans and has set precedents for how conscientious-minded miners engage with traditional owners. These FPIC and co-management learnings could be applied to other First Nations engagement to help reduce the long-term effects of mining on the physical landscape and cultural heritage, and to facilitate traditional owner-led decision-making, governance and closure outcomes on their Country.

* Corresponding author. Email address: jon@crosbieesg.com.au

Keywords: *First Nations, co-management, closure, mine closure, traditional owners, Pilbara, Free, Prior and Informed Consent*

1 The Banjima People and Banjima Country

The Banjima People have occupied their homelands in the Central Pilbara region of Western Australia (WA) for at least 45,000 years (Parmington & Canning 2025). Since the 1800s they have experienced intergenerational and collective trauma from being removed from their land, forced to work on pastoral stations under harsh conditions and then removed again in the 1960s when Aboriginal station workers were laid off en masse after achieving citizenship and equal pay rights (Parmington & Canning 2025). These events and experiences are still strongly felt today.

After many years of fighting back and legal battles, a native title determination was secured in 2013 [Banjima People versus State of Western Australia (No 2) [2013] FCA 868], with the Banjima Native Title Aboriginal Corporation (BNTAC) being formed to represent the collective interests of Banjima People as the native title prescribed body corporate.

Mining and exploration tenements cover the Banjima native title determination area. There are currently 6 large-scale operational iron ore mines (i.e. Rio Tinto's Yandicoogina, Hope Downs and Gudai-Darri; and BHP's Yandi, Mining Area C and South Flank), numerous smaller mines (e.g. MinRes's Lamb Creek) and several major development projects (BHP's Ministers North and HanRoy's Mulga Downs). The operating mines collectively produce approximately 325 million tonnes of iron ore per annum – almost one third of Australia's total annual production (Parmington & Canning 2025).

The infamous, unrehabilitated Wittenoom asbestos mine is also situated on Banjima Country, and 60 years after its operations ceased it is the largest contaminated site in the southern hemisphere, with a government-mandated exclusion zone of 46,000 ha. More than 2,000 people have died to date from exposure to asbestos from Wittenoom, including many Banjima People.

As these mines have developed over the 6 six decades, the Banjima have largely been excluded from access to their land. It is only recently, when several Banjima Elders were flown in a helicopter over several large mines, that the full extent of mining's impact and the destruction of the land have become evident. The realisation caused significant distress and sadness amongst the Elders.

The impact and destruction observed by the Elders, including extensive land and water degradation, and destruction of cultural heritage (Holcombe 2021; Oliveri et al. 2024; Benkert et al. 2025), is common across the Pilbara and is increasingly being documented (Environmental Protection Authority 2014; McCullough 2024; Shi et al. 2024; Garlett & Holcombe 2023).

A number of these mines are now approaching closure, and mining companies have begun to ramp up their closure planning and rehabilitation programs. Based on closure schedules presented within mine closure plans (MCPs), the Banjima can expect that at least one mine will close every 5–10 years for the next 60 years. The Banjima have had limited visibility on existing closure strategies and progressive rehabilitation. This, combined with the understanding that there has been minimal successful progressive rehabilitation, mine closure or healing of Country to date (Gregory et.al. 2022), causes further distress and sadness to the Banjima, as the health of the landscape is inseparable from their connection to Country, cultural identity and ancestral presence.

The Banjima, however, see the closure of these mines as a potential catalyst for redefining, and a platform with which to redefine, how they engage with the mining industry and how they can actively participate in, and guide, restoration and return of Country to a healthy condition for future generations.

2 Banjima experiences with miners and regulators

Over the 6 decades of mining, the Banjima have experienced mixed interactions with miners and regulators. These experiences appear common across Australia, and even internationally.

2.1 Miners

The Banjima have lived experience of the large power imbalance that exists between mining companies and Indigenous communities, particularly regarding mine closure planning, and which has been well documented (Reeves et al. 2025a; Wall 2026), with ‘communities holding limited leverage to influence decisions at the time of closure’ (Wall 2024). This imbalance is evidenced by some companies believing that, ‘most, if not all, statutory approval commitments can be amended’ (Bagnall 2018), or that they can simply execute their preferred closure strategies, even without a regulator-approved MCP (Reeves et al. 2025b).

Further to the power imbalance, the Banjima have also been frustrated by the observed operational gaps against mining company corporate commitments on various ‘soft law’ international instruments on human rights, the environment and sustainability, including the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). It is the Banjima experience that mining companies do not ‘walk the talk’. While cultural heritage management has certainly improved since the outrage over the lawful destruction of Juukan Gorge in 2020 on the lands of the Puutu Kunti Kurrama and Pinikura people (Australian Government 2022), these frustrations remain prevalent for general engagement processes and the result. There is also growing published evidence, supporting the Banjima experience, of non-truth-telling, greenwashing and misrepresentation by mining companies (Zharfpeykan 2021; Australian Government 2022; Kaur et al. 2025).

While it is true that traditional owners[†] may receive compensation if native title is in place through a legal determination, limited rights and tight confidentiality clauses have been, and are still, common across Australia (O’Faircheallaigh 2021). This again is reflective of Banjima experience. Historically, the Banjima have negotiated compensation with mining proponents through several Indigenous Land Use Agreements (ILUAs). These agreements, however, are outdated and do not facilitate Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). The Banjima are currently renegotiating many of these agreements through modernisation processes but, while there have been some improvements, the power imbalance remains, leaving the Banjima still without equity in decision-making on impacts on their own Country – including for mine closure.

FPIC has been included as a key principle of UNDRIP (United Nations 2007), with the intention that nation states formally adopt it into legislation. While the Australian Government endorsed UNDRIP in 2009, it has yet to be ratified into legislation at the federal or state level in Australia. The definition of what FPIC means has been debated and expanded on in multitudes of documents. For instance, ANTAR, formerly Australians for Native Title and Reconciliation, (ANTAR 2024) comment that, ‘FPIC is often conflated or confused with the duty to consult, but the requirements and conceptual underpinning of FPIC goes further than consultation’ and the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS) states that ‘a central element of FPIC is genuine inclusion, disclosure, and respect for Indigenous Peoples’ decision-making processes’ (AIATSIS 2020).

DCCEEW (2025) provide a simple and clear interpretation of what FPIC is defined as:

- Free: engagement should be free from force, intimidation, manipulation and coercion
- Prior: no decisions should be expected of a community before they have had sufficient time to consider the proposal
- Informed: engagement should be informed by accessible and comprehensible information

[†] The term ‘traditional owner’ is defined for this paper’s context as an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person or group possessing a distinct, enduring cultural and spiritual connection to a specific area of land or water. Where the term is used to refer to Banjima People, it has been clearly prefixed as such with Banjima.

- Consent: collective decisions are made by rightsholders and reached through a customary decision-making process.

In terms of requesting FPIC, and applying it to engagement on mine closure planning, the Banjima have been stating their concerns and expectations to mining companies for some time but have experienced recurrences of the same issues (with some rare exceptions) The failure of mining companies to listen and learn is considered by the Banjima as disrespectful and has led to further erosion of trust and a deterioration in proponent relationships.

2.2 Regulators

Like their lived experience with mining companies, the Banjima have historically lacked confidence in the government and its regulatory agencies. In effect, they have learned that they cannot rely on regulators to regulate nor protect Country.

The Banjima have seen firsthand where regulators have failed to both enforce approval condition implementation and resolve ongoing non-compliances. Specifically, for the Banjima:

- They have also witnessed the Pilbara Environmental Offsets Fund (PEOF) being mostly ineffective for them, with miners of multiple large disturbed areas in Banjima Country owing payment into the PEOF as a condition of that disturbance yet no offsets have been secured to date for remedial work on Banjima Country.
- They have experienced cumulative negative impacts to their Country by relevant acts not being identified or assessed, and frustratingly waited as it took the WA Government 7 years to include cumulative impact assessment within the *WA Environment Protection Act* (Government of WA 2021a) and 12 years to release the Cumulative Impact Assessment Guidelines [Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) (WA) 2026]; after the WA EPA's recommendation to do this in 2014 [EPA (WA) 2014].
- They have been frustrated by the government's lack of strategy on threatened ecological communities (Office of the Auditor General 2025) and the Minister for the Environment's recent request to the EPA to provide advice on the cumulative impacts on water abstraction from the Millstream aquifer in West Pilbara [EPA (WA) 2025], which is outside of Banjima Country, but failing to conduct a similar assessment in East Pilbara, including Banjima Country, where over 10 times the amount of groundwater extraction occurs.

These frustrations with regulatory processes and deficiencies are not unique to the Banjima, with similar experiences documented across Australia (Australian Government 2022; Unger et al. 2025), Canada (Boulet & Collins 2023) and elsewhere (O'Faircheallaigh 2023). Despite the frustrations, however, there have been some recent improvements, such as the latest update to the Guidelines for Preparing Mine Closure Plans (DMPE 2025) which now requires traditional owners to be 'actively engaged throughout the life of mine', and that the engagement strategy 'should be discussed with and agreed to by stakeholders to ensure their needs are met'. However, the term FPIC is still absent, and also remains absent from the WA Aboriginal Empowerment Strategy (Government of WA 2021b).

3 Banjima expectations on Free, Prior and Informed Consent and co-management of mine closure

As indicated, the Banjima see the closure of mines on their Country as a potential catalyst for redefining, and a platform to redefine, how they engage with the mining industry and how they can actively participate in, and guide, the restoration and return of Country to a healthy condition for future generations.

A key frustration has been the misalignment of closure visions, objectives and post-mining land use presented by mining companies in their MCPs with the Banjima expectations as native title rightsholders. This frustration was exacerbated by further misalignment and inconsistency across MCPs, even within the same mining company.

Notwithstanding these misalignments, it is clear to the Banjima that these companies see the MCPs as exit strategies which seek to expedite the closure process and absolve the company of their liabilities at the least cost. To the Banjima, these MCPs are in fact re-entry strategies which should seek to reinstate native title rights and transition the land back to traditional use and future economic use. The Banjima understand that there will be risk and uncertainty associated with such transitions, and that there needs to be openness, transparency and a just transfer of liabilities and responsibilities.

It has been the Banjima experience that mining companies are yet to fully understand the concepts of FPIC and co-management, and that they will cling to the power imbalance and their weak rhetoric for as long as they can. While there are key individuals and practitioners within these companies who strive to achieve best practice, it is evident that there is continued ignorance and resistance within middle management and the C-suite to acknowledge the need for change. This has been particularly true for any engagement with a mining company that is not publicly listed and has no apparent ESG reputation or score to be concerned about. To bring the challenge to these companies and to move towards a stronger and more equitable position, the Banjima have developed their own closure principles, engagement position and view of FPIC. This includes a proactive approach to engagement which will assert their expectations to both mining proponents and the government.

3.1 Development of the Banjima closure principles and outcomes

The closure principles and outcomes were developed through a series of collaborative workshops with broad Elder and other Banjima traditional owner representation, facilitated by an independent mine closure practitioner and informed by decades of experience working with mining companies. After several document iterations and reviews, an overall final closure objective was defined as:

Land disturbed by mining is returned to the Banjima People in a condition that restores Native Title Rights and Healthy Country, and enables sustainable economic development for future generations.

This objective statement is supported by clear and detailed expectations on closure principles (behaviours) and closure outcomes (end-state values) as per Table 1. Also, mining proponents must seek Banjima FPIC for their MCPs prior to making their submission to the government regulators. The concepts, definitions and framework used to develop these principles and outcomes are presented in Malan & Murphy (2024).

Table 1 Banjima closure principles and outcomes

Closure principles/behaviours	Closure outcomes (end-state values)
Mutual recognition of expertise and knowledge	No saline or toxic pit lakes
Equity in assessment of options and decision-making	No ex-pit storage of tailings
Open and transparent communication of risks and liabilities	Repatriation of cultural materials
Shared commitment to agreed closure objectives and outcomes	Restored vegetation must be resilient to fire
Mutual recognition of interest and rights in respect of the closure vision	Restoration of access to sites of cultural significance

Closure principles/behaviours	Closure outcomes (end-state values)
Equity of capacity and opportunity to engage in closure planning and execution	Restoration of environmental diversity and condition
Consideration of cumulative impacts and opportunities within the Banjima native title determination area	Return of Mandu (bushmeats), medicine plants and bush tucker (plants)
Prioritisation of repurposing existing disturbed land for future development rather than disturbance of new land	No post-relinquishment restrictions on land use under the <i>Contaminated Sites Act</i>
Willingness to engage all relevant stakeholders	Flexibility of land capability to support future economic development for the Banjima
Shared endorsement of mine closure plans prior to submission to state	Culturally sensitive sites will be restored to their pre-mining function and condition
Shared support for creation of future economic opportunities	Quantification of residual risks and funding of post-relinquishment land management
Transparency of long-term planning for mining operations	Treatment and elimination of all hazardous materials including PAF (no above-watertable encapsulation within backfill or waste rock dumps)
	No ex-pit storage of mineralised waste rock or overburden
	No loss of visual amenity across the surrounding landscape
	Surface water must be pure and fit for drinking by humans
	Removal of all imported materials (you brought it in, you take it out)
	Unconstrained and safe access along songlines and cultural pathways
	No post-relinquishment restrictions to land access for traditional land use

The Banjima closure principles and outcomes do not just assert the Banjima expectations to mining proponents and government; they also ensure their native title rights (Banjima People versus State of Western Australia 2013) are able to be exercised post closure. These rights include being able to:

- access and move about the land and waters of the determination area, be present on the land and waters, live on the land in camps and shelters, and engage in cultural activities on the land and waters, including conducting and participating in ceremonies and meetings
- hunt and take fauna, gather and take flora, and take fish, stones, timber, ochre and water
- access, maintain and protect places and areas of importance on or in the land and waters of the determination area, including rock art, engraving sites, stone arrangements and the like.

3.2 The Banjima view of Free, Prior and Informed Consent and co-management

Soon after the development of the closure principles and outcomes, a larger collaborative process was undertaken to define a Banjima engagement and co-management position. Again, this was undertaken to document and clearly assert Banjima's expectations to mining proponents and the government, with the overall objective to:

Facilitate the delivery of improved socio-economic and cultural outcomes for Banjima people through the protection, preservation and promotion of Banjima country, culture and heritage.

This engagement and co-management position document includes a bespoke view of what FPIC means for Banjima, and that it is not a once-off decision at the project development phase. It is continuous and iterative, and may be revisited during the life of mine should the project or the miner's behaviour change. The Banjima engagement and co-management position documents Banjima's expectations on FPIC and co-management of mining project development, approvals, operations and collaborative engagement. Importantly, it also documents Banjima's expectations for FPIC as it relates to mine closure, which is critical for healing Country, and facilitating the return of healthy Country to the Banjima traditional owners.

While co-management approaches have been developed and are in use by others, these have typically focused solely on cultural heritage protection and financial compensation, with limited traditional owner input on other areas. Banjima have designed their engagement and co-management position to be more progressive than this and it is being utilised to inform a range of processes including ILUA modernisation negotiations, environmental approval submissions, cumulative impact assessments, day-to-day operational engagement and, of course, mine closure planning. This includes a strong focus on co-design of management plans and monitoring programs for cultural heritage, water, flora/fauna and mine closure.

Similarly, FPIC, although having a widely accepted definition, has not actually been implemented as such by the miners. Various interpretations or policies exist to 'strive to obtain FPIC' or 'recognise FPIC as an important process', yet do not actually practice FPIC at all. Also, they are usually only applied at the approvals stage. These hollow public commitments are disrespectful to traditional owners and should be more transparently communicated as Free, Prior and Informed Consultation, with the final decision always being made by the miner's senior leadership, then the regulator (or sometimes a court). They are also not always 'free', with consent at times sought through coercion with financial benefits or threats to lessen these benefits.

3.3 Use of the closure principles in a co-management approach with miners

An essential part of the FPIC process is the co-design of MCPs, providing Banjima with earlier and deeper involvement in the identification and assessment of closure options and in final decision-making. The key to successful FPIC is the integration of closure engagement processes with closure study milestones to deliver a collaboratively and progressively co-designed mine closure plan, instead of the standard industry practice of using a draft mine closure plan, completed largely without any traditional owner consultation, as the trigger to begin the mine closure consultation.

For example, Banjima now expect to be more involved in co-defining the closure vision, post-mining land use (PMLU) options and closure completion criteria, and then expect to play a more collaborative role in the identification and evaluation of closure strategies for each domain, trade-off studies, risk assessments, monitoring programs, and the definition of residual risks and liabilities.

While a key element of this process is for Banjima to evaluate options against its closure outcomes and principles, it is acknowledged that the required outcomes and principles of the mining company and other stakeholders must also be integrated to achieve bespoke objectives and outcomes for each site. This ensures that proponent MCPs are more fit for purpose, deliver an agreed and achievable PMLU, and allow Banjima to exercise their native title rights post closure. It also provides the government and relevant regulatory agencies with the confidence to expedite statutory approvals.

To be proactive and demonstrate leadership, BNTAC, on behalf of Banjima, have implemented an initiative to assess the MCP of each mine for its compliance with Banjima closure principles and outcomes. The assessment takes the format of a visual 'traffic light' dashboard of compliance with each line item, with green demonstrating compliance; red, non-compliance; and orange, partial compliance. This process assists with clearly communicating to Banjima traditional owners, mining companies and regulators where the key areas of misalignment lie, where the closure knowledge base maturity is deficient, and where forward workplan actions should be prioritised to deliver stronger compliance as the closure plans mature and improve.

This process is now being embedded with engagement on mine development and closure, and is working well, although several companies are recalcitrant and resistant to the erosion of the power imbalance. There will always be some misalignment and issues; however, the process is helping to minimise these and deliver better closure (and progressive rehabilitation) outcomes for both Banjima and the mining companies.

Several larger mining proponents have even expressed their appreciation that clear expectations are being communicated upfront. Technical and closure planning personnel in particular are reporting that this is helping to identify and assess options, and to focus further engagement. Some are now seeking more Banjima traditional owner guidance which is opening up opportunities for integration of Indigenous knowledge into planning processes. Notably, the Banjima closure principles and outcomes have now been referenced within some MCPs submitted to the regulator, utilised within collaborative closure workshops (some held on Country) and used to inform completion criteria development.

In time, Banjima and BNTAC expect that the process will help to deliver more streamlined and cost-effective planning and execution of closure for mines within Banjima Country, so long as mining proponents further embrace and adapt to the ideology behind the initiative. BNTAC are now preparing a process to monitor and measure the improvements from the process and principles over time. This will include a series of key performance indicators at the individual mine and Banjima Country scale, and at the level of implementation of Banjima's desired closure outcomes, through the development of template closure completion criteria.

4 Learnings from Banjima for other First Nations groups

There are other Australian examples of First Nations[‡] groups documenting and asserting their closure vision and desired principles or outcomes; for example, the Gunaikurnai People's (2025) Healing Wurruk After Coal Position Statement, and also the Rirratjingu and Gumatj traditional owners (Gove Peninsula Futures Reference Group 2020). Similarly, various Indigenous groups are seeking co-management of culturally significant species and ecological communities, also known as cultural keystones or culturally significant entities (Goolmeer et al. 2024). Banjima acknowledge the irreversible damage to Country resulting from mining, and that they are not the first – but can learn from the lived experience of other – traditional owners and rightsholder group. They also feel that in recent years they have developed a process and approach which offer significant improvement; a more effective way which could be adopted by other groups across Australia. The collective sharing and learning from these experiences will provide a strong basis for more sustainable mining and improved cultural sustainability.

Some of the key lessons for other First Nations groups include:

- Positive and proactive action on mine closure by traditional owners can initiate a shift in the power imbalance and result in win-win opportunities.
- Truth-telling provides a basis for a stronger and more transparent relationship between traditional owners and mining companies.
- Meeting regulatory requirements around consultation/engagement does not necessarily meet traditional owner expectations, and hence should not be solely relied upon by mining proponents.

[‡] The term 'First Nations' as used in this paper refers to the original, Indigenous inhabitants of a land and their descendants, which could be in Australia or any other Country.

- Seeking long-term visibility on proponent intentions and project proposals provides opportunity for miners to be more transparent and demonstrate their commitment to fully informed engagement.
- Traditional owners should be included in the full range of closure project options, impact assessments and approvals (safety, health, heritage, cultural, environmental, social, economic etc.).
- Decision-makers and those with the right to speak (legally and culturally) should be in the room during engagement; both traditional owners and mining proponents. This demonstrates respect and helps facilitate more productive engagement.
- As part of FPIC, mining proponents should provide funding for independent experts to support traditional owners in fully understanding the MCPs, risks and opportunities. This ensures Traditional Owners can engage on a more equitable basis.
- Clearly documenting and asserting expectations for FPIC and co-management in mine closure planning can assist in land disturbed by mining being returned to traditional owners in a condition that restores native title rights and healthy Country, and enables sustainable economic development for future generations.

5 Benefits for mining companies

While adopting the Banjima closure principles and outcomes in a co-management approach, a key benefit is the reduction of the long-term negative effects of mining on the physical landscape, cultural heritage and spiritual connection to Country. This links very strongly to a mining company's reputation, productive relationship and social licence to operate with the Banjima traditional owners. With 50–100 years of iron ore resources remaining on Banjima Country, further developing and maintaining the social licence and trusting relationships with Banjima will be critical to gain access to those deposits.

A lack of a social licence to operate (or opposition to) mining projects frequently emerges from perceived community exclusion, inequitable benefit distribution and limited decision-making influence (Owen & Kemp 2013). These areas can equally be applied to the concept of a 'social licence to close' (Wilson et al. 2022), and relying on local community sponsorships or corporate philanthropy is not enough. The social licence is built upon trust (Moffat & Zhang 2014) and trust can only be built where mining companies follow through on their promises and commitments, including both those made directly to traditional owners as well as those made via corporate policy commitments.

Therefore, some of the key benefits for mining companies that can influence the business case to adopt a co-management approach to mine closure with First Nations rightsholders, and better improve the level of trust, include:

- Developing and maintaining a social licence to operate (or to close) is critical for company's reputation and future access to deposits.
- Saying what you do and doing what you say Always act with integrity and fully implement publicly made commitments. If not, there will be little trust.
- Increasing the level of transparency with traditional owners will further help to build trust and work to overcome the decades of exclusion.
- Modernising ILUAs/participation agreements to formally include processes for co-management and seeking formal FPIC, and for the fair distribution of benefits, will demonstrate commitment to a long-term relationship.
- Working through a co-management approach can help expedite statutory approvals and derisk project development schedules.
- Delivering more streamlined and cost-effective planning and execution of mine closures results in earlier lease relinquishment and associated cost savings.

6 Conclusion

This paper outlines the development process of the Banjima closure principles, how they are utilised in a co-management approach with miners and how Banjima monitors compliance against them for each mine on Country. This occurs within the framework of the Banjima engagement and co-management position; having Banjima clearly assert that their expectations for mine closure has already contributed to improvements in some proponents' mine closure plans and operational practices. These FPIC and co-management learnings could be applied to other First Nations groups to help reduce the long-term negative effects of mining on the physical landscape, cultural heritage and spiritual connection to Country while enhancing a mining company's social licence to operate with traditional owners.

Acknowledgement

We would like to acknowledge the Banjima traditional owners and, in particular, their Elders who participate in collaborative workshops on mine closure planning with mining proponents while continuing to assert their native title rights and strive for better outcomes for their Country. It is not the intention of this paper to speak directly for the Banjima (as the authors do not hold that collective cultural authority) but to highlight some of their experiences and share their evolving approaches to working with mining proponents.

We also acknowledge the staff at Banjima Native Title Aboriginal Corporation and the mining proponents who are on the journey together to the Banjima Free, Prior and Informed Consent and co-management of the mine closure.

References

- AIATSIS 2020, 'Engaging with Traditional Owners', viewed 12 April 2026, https://aiatsis.gov.au/sites/default/files/research_pub/AIATSIS%20FPIC%20Policy%20Snapshot%202020.pdf
- ANTAR 2024, 'Free, Prior and Informed Consent Factsheet', viewed 12 April 2026, <https://antar.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/ANTAR-FPIC-Factsheet.pdf>
- Australian Government 2022, *Australian Government response to the Joint Standing Committee on Northern Australia's: A Way Forward: Final report into the destruction of Indigenous heritage sites at Juukan Gorge and Never Again: Inquiry into the destruction of 46,000 year old caves at the Juukan Gorge in the Pilbara region of Western Australia- Interim Report*, Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water, viewed 12 April 2026, www.dcceew.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/australian-response-to-destruction-of-juukan-gorge.pdf.
- Bagnall, C 2018, 'Rethinking closure planning - a case study of BHP Nickel West', *Mine Closure 2018: Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Mine Closure*, Australian Centre for Geomechanics, Perth.
- Banjima People v State of Western Australia (No 2) 2013 FCA 868, viewed 12 April 2026, www.austlii.edu.au/cgi-bin/viewdoc/au/cases/cth/FCA/2014/201.html
- Benkert, J, Eversole, R & Krzysztof, D 2025, 'Towards Authentic Engagement with Indigenous Peoples: Lessons from Negotiated Agreements in the Pilbara, Western Australia', *Business and Society*, vol. 64, no. 4, <https://doi.org/10.1177/00076503251376892>
- Boulot, E & Collins, B 2023, 'Regulating Mine Rehabilitation and Closure on Indigenous Held Lands: Insights from the Regulated Resource States of Australia and Canada', *International Development Policy*, vol. 16, <https://doi.org/10.4000/poldev.5319>
- DCCEEW, 2025, *First Nations Engagement: the Principles of Free, Prior and Informed Consent: Better Practice Engagement with First Nations Communities and People*, Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water, viewed 1 May 2026, www.dcceew.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/free-prior-informed-consent-guidelines.pdf
- DMPE, 2025, *Guidelines for Preparing Mine Closure Plans*, Department of Mining, Petroleum and Energy, viewed 17 April 2026, www.wa.gov.au/government/publications/guideline-preparing-mine-closure-plans
- Environmental Protection Authority 2014, *Cumulative environmental impacts of development in the Pilbara region: Advice of the Environmental Protection Authority to the Minister for the Environment under Section 16(e) of the Environmental Protection Act*, viewed 1 May 2026, [https://www.parliament.wa.gov.au/publications/tailedpapers.nsf/displaypaper/4013804c65c1a3492689026f4825854c00819c62/\\$file/tp-3804.pdf](https://www.parliament.wa.gov.au/publications/tailedpapers.nsf/displaypaper/4013804c65c1a3492689026f4825854c00819c62/$file/tp-3804.pdf)
- Environmental Protection Authority 2025, *Chair Determination - Abstraction of Groundwater*, APP number: APP-0026350, viewed 12 April 2026, www.epa.wa.gov.au/sites/default/files/Extract_of_determination/Chair%20Determination%20-%20Abstraction%20of%20groundwater%20from%20the%20Millstream%20water%20reserve_0.pdf
- Environmental Protection Authority 2026, *Guideline for Cumulative Impact Assessment*, viewed 12 April 2026, <https://www.epa.wa.gov.au/policies-guidance/cumulative-impact-assessment>
- Garlett, E & Holcombe, S 2023, *Sustainable Water in Mining? importance of Traditional Owner Involvement in Commercial Water Use and Management in the Pilbara Region of Western Australia*, <https://www.ebsco.com/articles/environmental->

- [sciences/a606100f-cf10-5772-bf12-cb484036d924/sustainable-water-in-mining-the-importance-of-traditional-owner-involvement-in-commercial-water-use-and-management-in-the-pilbara-region-of-western-australia](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-024-02466-w)
- Goolmeier, T & Costello, O, Culturally Significant Entities workshop participants, Skroblin, A, Rumpff, L & Wintle BA 2024, 'Indigenously-led designation and management of culturally significant species', *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, vol. 8, pp. 1623–1631, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-024-02466-w>
- Gove Peninsula Futures Reference Group 2020, *A New Journey Together: Traditional Owners' Vision for the Future of Nhulunbuy and the Gove Peninsula*, viewed 12 April 2026, https://govefutures.nt.gov.au/_resources/documents/traditional-owner-vision-new-journey-together.pdf
- Government of WA 2021a, *Environment Protection Act 1986*, version 09-k0-00, as at 23 Oct 2021, viewed 12 April 2026, www.legislation.wa.gov.au/legislation/statutes.nsf/law_a252_currencies.html
- Government of WA 2021b, *The Aboriginal Empowerment Strategy Western Australia 2021-2029: Strategy Overview*, as viewed 1 May 2026, www.wa.gov.au/system/files/2021-09/Aboriginal-Empowerment-Strategy-OVERVIEW.pdf
- Gregory, SJ, Mackenzie, SP, Sprenkels, TJ & Slabber, AG 2022, 'Applying monitoring data to measure and improve rehabilitation performance at four mine sites in the Pilbara region of Western Australia', in AB Fourie, M Tibbett & G Boggs (eds), *Mine Closure 2022: Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Mine Closure*, Australian Centre for Geomechanics, Perth, pp. 869–882, https://doi.org/10.36487/ACG_repo/2215_63
- Gunaikurnai People 2025, *Healing Wurruk After Coal - Position Statement*, Gunaikurnai Land and Waters Aboriginal Corporation, viewed 12 April 2026, <https://gunaikurnai.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Healing-Wurruk-after-Coal-Position-Statement-FINAL.pdf>
- Holcombe, S 2021, 'The Relentless Threat Mining Poses to the Pilbara Cultural Landscape', *The Conversation*, <https://doi.org/10.64628/AA.rjt3kxep9>
- Kaur, A, Lodhina, S & Lesue, A 2025, 'Being left behind: disclosure strategies to manage the Juukan Gorge cave blast', *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 700–729, <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-03-2023-6368>
- Malan, S & Murphy, D, 2024, 'Navigating divergent expectations: completion criteria challenges in the Pilbara, Western Australia', in AB Fourie, M Tibbett & G Boggs (eds), *Mine Closure 2024: Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Mine Closure*, Australian Centre for Geomechanics, Perth, pp. 337–350, https://doi.org/10.36487/ACG_repo/2415_24
- McCullough, CD 2024, 'Below water table mining, pit lake formation and management considerations for the Pilbara mining region of Western Australia', *Mining*, vol. 4 no. 4, <https://doi.org/10.3390/mining4040048>
- Moffat, K, & Zhang, A, 2014, 'The paths to social licence to operate: An integrative model explaining community acceptance of mining', *Resources Policy*, vol. 39, pp. 61–70, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301420713001141>
- O'Faircheallaigh, C 2021, Explaining outcomes from negotiated agreements in Australia and Canada, *Resources Policy*, vol. 70, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2020.101922>
- O'Faircheallaigh, C 2023, *Indigenous Peoples and Mining: A Global Perspective*, online edn, Oxford University Press, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192894564.001.0001>
- Office of the Auditor General 2025, *Conservation of Threatened Ecological Communities - Performance Audit*, Report 23: 2024–25, 26 June 2025, viewed 12 April 2026, https://audit.wa.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/Report-23_Conservation-of-Threatened-Ecological-Communities.pdf
- Oliveri, VA, Porter, G, Davies, C & James P, 2024 'The Juukan Gorge destruction: A case study in stakeholder-driven and shared values approach to cultural heritage protection', *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 919–933 <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-12-2021-0208>
- Owen, JR & Kemp, D 2013, 'Social licence and mining: a critical perspective', *Resources Policy*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 29–35, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2012.06.016>
- Parmington, A & Canning, S 2025, 'Mining and the Banjima People', unpublished report for the Banjima Native Title Aboriginal Corporation, Australian Cultural Heritage Management, 19 February 2025.
- Reeves, D, Dowell, K & Welch, J 2025a, 'Argyle diamond mine: a First Nations perspective on closure', in S Knutsson, AB Fourie & M Tibbett (eds), *Mine Closure 2025: Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Mine Closure*, Australian Centre for Geomechanics, Perth, https://doi.org/10.36487/ACG_repo/2515_33
- Reeves, D, Dowell, K & Welch, J 2025b, 'Argyle diamond mine: a model for First Nations engagement', in S Knutsson, AB Fourie & M Tibbett (eds), *Mine Closure 2025: Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Mine Closure*, Australian Centre for Geomechanics, Perth, https://doi.org/10.36487/ACG_repo/2515_42
- Shi, R, Smal, R & Janse Van Rensburg, J 2024, 'General surface water management for open-cut mining in the Pilbara – erosion and sediment controls', *Hydrology and Water Resources Symposium*, Melbourne, 18–21 November 2024.
- Unger, C, Everingham, J & Bond, 2025, 'Getting it right: regulating mine rehabilitation and closure in Australia for the green energy transition and critical minerals boom', *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, vol. 56, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2025.101004>
- United Nations 2007, *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, viewed 1 May 2026, www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2018/11/UNDRIP_E_web.pdf
- Wall, L 2024, 'Social outcomes following mine closure: an abundance of good intentions undermined by a lack of leverage', in AB Fourie, M Tibbett & G Boggs (eds), *Mine Closure 2024: Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Mine Closure*, Australian Centre for Geomechanics, Perth, pp. 275–284, https://doi.org/10.36487/ACG_repo/2415_19
- Wall, L 2026, 'The role of benefit sharing agreements in mine closure: a golden opportunity or a square peg for a round hole?', *Resources Policy*, vol. 116, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2026.105921>

- Wilson, C, Mandke, P & Harding, L 2022, 'Social licence to operate through mine closure transition: lessons from theory and practice', in AB Fourie, M Tibbett & G Boggs (eds), *Mine Closure 2022: Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Mine Closure*, Australian Centre for Geomechanics, Perth, pp. 199–206, https://doi.org/10.36487/ACG_repo/2215_11
- Zharfpeykan, R 2021, 'Representative account or greenwashing? Voluntary sustainability reports in Australia's mining/metals and financial services industries', *Business Strategy and the Environment*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 2209–2223. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2744>