Abstract
Although non-state actors, including Indigenous Peoples, are central to the production of global environmental governance, there is little attention directed to the politics of representation in global environmental governance. Instead, scholars commonly argue that Indigenous Peoples have been marginalized through their engagement at international policy events. Such findings not only detract the significance of Indigenous presence at these events, but further reinforce dominant power hierarchies entrenched in international relations scholarship. In this paper, we ask how do Indigenous Peoples carve out space for meaningful and influential representation at state-dominated sites? We argue that maps, technology, and built spaces are leveraged by Indigenous Peoples to expand and make their voices legible in spaces where Indigenous representation might otherwise be rendered insignificant. By utilizing visual ethnography of images triangulated with field notes collected through collaborative event ethnographies (CEE) at three different sites of global environmental governance (COP10, WCC, and COP21), we show the ways in which Indigenous Peoples reclaim self-determination and cultural identity through the intentional use or exploitation of structurally embedded systems in global environmental governance in order to exercise influence.

Research Questions
1. What forms of representation do maps, technologies, and built spaces reflect?
2. How are maps, technologies, and built spaces transformed as a means of resistance/means of control?
3. How are maps, technologies, and built spaces leveraged as tools to affect policy change/paths or modes of power?

Results
Our analysis demonstrates how Indigenous People utilize informal processes to gain representation and influence in global environmental governance events. Maps, technologies, and built spaces were formed and presented in various ways across the three events. All three structures acted as barriers and entry points of representation for Indigenous People at the three events.
- Maps from Indigenous and non-Indigenous sources were used to present environmental and political impacts of the three events. While maps were primarily from non-Indigenous sources (including NGOs, secretarial, governments), maps were utilized by Indigenous people to present their territories, identities, and concerns.
- Built spaces at the conferences provided the opportunity to showcase their policies and identities, including Indigenous ways of knowing. Frequently across the three conferences, Indigenous groups would take space to do so, using it not for its original intended function and therefore subverting expectations and changing audiences. The spaces at COP21, for instance, were utilized by Indigenous Peoples to showcase their presence and to project their identities.
- Technology at the three events was generally used as a means of communication of ideas and knowledge, such as through film and translation devices. Obstacles to Indigenous influence were shown by lack of access to technology, presentation of Indigenous People through technology without representing present, and a lack of capacity for utilizing technology.
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Technology at WCC (below)

Map at WCC (left). Built space at COP21 (below)

Background
Representation encompasses strategies through which political actors attempt to influence opinion or action (Schweber, 2016; Cells, 2013)
- There are two forms of political representation: responsiveness and inclusiveness. Inclusiveness refers to the presence of political groups in political institutions, while responsiveness the degree of change in an outcome as a result of an actor’s agency (Cells, 2013).
- Political entrepreneurs respond to both internal and external incentives: personal drive to foster change, and the goal of accumulating political capital in the forms of support and votes (Fischer, 2016).
- Scholars of indigenous representation have identified specific goals for indigenous representation, primarily: maintaining cultural identities and prevention of extinction (Strong, 2007).

Environmental justice comprises a universal dimension, concerning procedural and distributional notion of justice (de Bruijn, 2013; Harris, 1997; Othmer, 2013), and a particular dimension, related to the specific puzzle of identifying responsibility and recognition rights (LaBelle, 2017; Mason, 2011).
- Other scholars of GEP, have defined the latter in terms of “accountability”, identifying who is to be responsible for social and ecological impact (Mason, 2001).

The relationship between representation and justice can be analyzed in terms of how indigenous representation affects the procedural, distributional and recognitional rights of indigenous groups. For instance, the degree of inclusiveness is central to understand the outcome of decision-making bodies, whose power influences the procedural justice among groups, as fostering diversification of groups enhances procedural justice (Aziz, 1993; Kim & Söder, 2013).

Methods
Leveraging from collaborative event ethnography (CEE) at three different field sites:
- COP10: 2010 Convention on Biological Diversity
- COP21: 2015 UN Climate Change Conference
- WCC: 2016 IUCC World Conservation Congress

Undergraduate seminar research team
- Practiced qualitative research methods and learned about research process
- Teams divided by theme (maps, technology, built spaces) and event (COP10, COP21, WCC)

Qualitative analysis of over one thousand images using NVivo:
- Teams created codes for categorizing images
- Took note of themes and distinctions across tools and events
- Combined data and thematic analysis
- triangulated coded images with corresponding field notes
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