

LAST LINE OF DEFENCE



The industries causing the climate crisis and attacks against land and environmental defenders

SEPTEMBER 2021

LAST LINE OF DEFENCE

The industries causing the climate crisis and attacks against land and environmental defenders

| | |
|---|----|
| South Africa: My Mother’s Struggle Lives on | 4 |
| Foreword: Bill McKibben | 6 |
| List of 2020 victims | 8 |
| A Global Analysis and Top Findings | 10 |
| Over Half of the Attacks: Colombia, Mexico, and the Philippines | 14 |
| What Do These Attacks Tell us? | 15 |
| Mexico: I Hope That Someone Follows in his Footsteps | 19 |
| Victories for People – and the Planet | 21 |
| Cambodia: Our Land Was Stolen by A Foreign Company. We Won’t Give Up the Fight | 23 |
| Conclusion | 24 |
| Recommendations | 25 |
| Methodology | 27 |
| Acknowledgements | 29 |

SOUTH AFRICA: MY MOTHER'S STRUGGLE LIVES ON

A lot of people thought my mum was crazy.

They thought she was crazy for her warnings about the illnesses the mine would cause. About the livestock it would kill. About the violence it would bring.

Today, it's obvious to everyone that she wasn't crazy. She was right.

For years, my mum Fikile Ntshangase – Mama Ntshangase to me, and to so many others – was a leading force in the campaign against the Tende Coal Mine, which borders the community of Somkhele.

That's where my mum lived, where she raised me. As a teacher, as a mother, as a leader, she began to see things happening in the community. She saw the cracks in the walls of people's homes and wondered if they were caused by the constant blasts from the mine. She saw the coal dust gathering in living rooms and wondered if it was also gathering in people's lungs. And she saw the tension the mine caused, the families it broke apart, the fear it spread.

When Tendele applied to extend its open cast operations, my mum became the mine's worst nightmare. She organised, she campaigned, and educated people about their rights. Many in the path of the extension agreed to leave. But not my mum. She stood firm, rejecting pay-outs, supporting the Mfolozi Community Environmental Justice Organisation's legal action against the mine.

Ultimately, I believe that's what cost my mother's life. One Thursday evening last October, my son Buyile was spending time at his grandmother's property, playing with the dogs in the yard. Three unknown men arrived, stopping to check with Buyile whether his grandmother was in. She was. They shot her dead in her living room.

People sometimes ask me what I'm going to do, whether I'm going to stay here and keep my mother's fight alive. I'm too proud of her to let it die. I know the dangers – we all know the dangers. But I've decided to stay. I'm going to join the fight.

Since my mother's death, things haven't been going well. South Africa's Supreme Court recently ruled in favour of the mine. The courts are yet to rule on the extension. To this day no arrests have been made in the



Fikile Ntshangase. Rob Symons/All Rise

investigation into my mother's murder. There has been no accountability. It seems to me that someone wants this mine expansion and the extraction to go ahead, no matter the cost.

If I could say one thing to all those concerned, it would be this: it's not worth it. Whatever money you're getting from the land, it's not worth families being torn apart, or the blood and tears. Come to the table and listen. You're going to need to, because when Fikile gave her life for her people, she kickstarted a movement that will stand up for what's right. Her struggle lives on.

– **Malungelo Xhakaza**¹

Petmin Limited which owns the Somkhele mine through its subsidiary Tende Coal Mining Ltd., acknowledges community tensions may have been a factor in Fikile's death. It 'strongly condemns any form of violence or intimidation' and has offered full co-operation to the police to ensure that the culprits face the full extent of the law.

Petmin Limited have said that investigations by independent third parties found reported house cracks to be due to poor workmanship rather than blasting; and that reports of respiratory illnesses were unfounded. They state that the mine conforms to legal standards regarding dust in the area.²



Malungelo Xhakaza in the rural community where she lives. Her mother, Fikile Ntshangase, was a vocal opponent of the expansion of the Tende coal mine. THOM PIERCE

The Mfolozi Community Environmental Justice Organisation (MCEJO) – the organisation that Fikile was a leading member of – highlights the urgent need to change our view of extractive industries like coal mining, and the association they have with 'development'. True development means sustainable management of land and natural resources for the benefit of future generations, particularly in the climate crisis. Specifically, MCEJO calls on the South African Government to:

- > Respect and prioritise the principle of free prior and informed consent in all community land rights issues. Those living on land must be properly informed and consulted and their consent must be obtained before any licences are issued. Without it, companies cannot claim land. Government, mining companies and traditional leaders must stop working together to force people to hand over their land to the mining companies. They must let the will of local people be respected at all times.
- > Legislate to ensure that mines cannot operate within a 5km radius of housing. Current guidelines mean that a mine can blast just 500m from housing.
- > End South Africa's economic reliance on coal mining. No economic growth strategy can rely on coal mining, which makes communities and families worse off, especially those that rely on the land for their livelihoods. As part of that shift, the government needs to give the Department of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries authority over mining environmental applications, rather than the Department of Mineral Resources.
- > The authorities must ensure that those responsible for the murder of Fikile Ntshangase are brought to justice and held accountable.



Et Chhai, 36, works on her 1.5 sugar cane plantation on in Chi Khor Loeu commune, Koh Kong Province, Cambodia. She lost 10 hectares of land as a result of the evictions by the Koh Kong sugar companies. "The company said they'd take our land, even if we didn't want to sell it. They came in the night and bulldozed it all". Andrew Ball/Panos/Global Witness

'WE OWE THEM DEBTS THAT CAN'T BE REPAID'

FOREWORD: BILL MCKIBBEN

Each year this report hits me like a blow to the face. I've spent much of my life as an environmental activist and journalist, and so if I haven't met the people described in these pages, I've met hundreds exactly like them. Strong local people, attached to place and community, seeing their role in defending terrain or ancestral territory. Every person like this around the world is at risk.

And they are at risk, in the end, not just because of another local person who pulls the trigger or plunges the blade; they're at risk because they find themselves living on or near something that some corporation is demanding. That demand—the demand for the highest possible profit, the quickest possible timeline, the cheapest possible operation—seems to translate eventually into the understanding, somewhere, that the troublemaker must go. Accountability is rarely accepted by the C-suite. But corporations need to be more accountable and they need to take action. Especially since the people who inhabit these places never really share in the riches they produce: colonialism is still running strong, even if it's dressed up with corporate logos or hidden with offshore bank accounts.

Meanwhile, the rest of us need to realize that the people killed each year defending their local places are also defending our shared planet—in particular our climate. The activities that flood our atmosphere with carbon—fossil fuel extraction and deforestation—are at the heart of so many of these killings. When people stand up to block a pipeline, or an illegal mine, or a new plantation slated for an old forest, they are also standing in the way of the activities that threaten us all—they make life harder for the oil and mining companies and the timber barons, and in so doing safeguard all of us from incessant temperature increases. And as we try and head off that rise by moving to greener technologies, like solar panels and electric cars, we'll need to do so in ways that don't exacerbate the same kind of sad sagas—cobalt mining or lithium production are exploitative too. If we took seriously the stories told in this report, we surely would be able to better design these growing industries.

Great respect is due to those who are working to develop corporate codes of conduct, or industry-wide standards, or government regulations—those are the tools that can help rebalance power, so that people can stand up to exploiters with less fear of being killed. But since we live in a world where greenwashing is a constant threat, let's be clear: the worth of those codes and standards and regulations is not the words themselves, or the promises their sponsors proudly make. Their worth is measured entirely in outcomes - like reducing threats against land and environmental defenders.

What does progress on the climate crisis look like? One wants so badly to pick up this report some year and see that the answer to that question is: fewer killings – that violence is trending dramatically down, that the deaths have begun to fall. It would be as satisfying as watching covid-19 cases drop in the spring. Since there's no vaccine for the greed of the wealthy, it may be years before that happens. But we can speed the day because—to extend the metaphor—we are the antibodies capable of fighting this infection. You and I, armed with the stories contained herein, are capable of putting enough pressure on the culprits that they find it necessary to change.

None of that will bring back these lives. That we have to fight simply to get our leaders to pay attention to science is frustrating, but there's a big difference between fighting and dying: the names of these defenders should be on our lips and in our hearts. We owe them debts that can't be repaid—only paid forward.

This report, and our campaign, is dedicated to all those individuals, communities and organisations that are bravely taking a stand to defend human rights, their land, and our environment. 227 of them were murdered last year for doing just that. We remember their names, and celebrate their activism.

JUAN CARLOS GONZÁLEZ, ARGENTINA
ANDERSON BARBOSA MONTEIRO, BRAZIL
ANTÔNIO CORREIA DOS SANTOS, BRAZIL
ARI URU-EU-WAU-WAU, BRAZIL
CARLOS AUGUSTO GOMES, BRAZIL
CELINO FERNANDES, BRAZIL
CLAUDOMIR BEZERRA DE FREITAS, BRAZIL
DAMIÃO CRISTINO DE CARVALHO JUNIOR, BRAZIL
FERNANDO FERREIRA DA ROCHA, BRAZIL
JOSIMAR MORAES LOPES, BRAZIL
JOSIVAN MORAES LOPES, BRAZIL
KWAXIPURU KAAPOR, BRAZIL
MARCOS YANOMAMI, BRAZIL
MATEUS CRISTIANO ARAÚJO, BRAZIL
ORIGINAL YANOMAMI, BRAZIL
RAIMUNDO NONATO BATISTA COSTA, BRAZIL
RAIMUNDO PAULINO DA SILVA FILHO, BRAZIL
VANDERLÂNIA DE SOUZA ARAÚJO, BRAZIL
VIRGÍNIO TUPA RERO JEVY BENITES, BRAZIL
WANDERSON DE JESUS RODRIGUES FERNANDES, BRAZIL
ZEZICO RODRIGUES GUAJAJARA, BRAZIL
REGAN RUSSELL, CANADA
ABELARDO LIZ CUETIA, COLOMBIA
ALBA ALEXANDRA PIZANDA CUESTAS, COLOMBIA
ALBEIRO SILVA MOSQUERA, COLOMBIA
ALBERTO RUIZ, COLOMBIA
ALEJANDRO CARVAJAL, COLOMBIA
ALEJANDRO LLINÁS, COLOMBIA
ANA LUCÍA BISBICÚS, COLOMBIA
ANUAR ROJAS ISARAMÁ, COLOMBIA
ARAMIS ARENAS BAYONA, COLOMBIA
CARLOS ANDRÉS SÁNCHEZ VILLA, COLOMBIA
CARLOS NAVIA, COLOMBIA
DEIRO ALEXANDER PÉREZ BISBICÚS, COLOMBIA
DIDIAN ARLEY AGUDELO, COLOMBIA
EDIS MANUEL CARÉ PÉREZ, COLOMBIA
EFRÉN OSPINA VELÁSQUEZ, COLOMBIA
EIDER ADÁN LOPERA, COLOMBIA
ERNESTO AGUILAR BARRERAS, COLOMBIA
FELIPE ANGUCHO YUNDA, COLOMBIA
FLORO SAMBONÍ GÓMEZ, COLOMBIA
FREDDY ANGARITA MARTÍNEZ, COLOMBIA
GENARO ISABARE FORASTERO, COLOMBIA
GENTIL HERNÁNDEZ JIMÉNEZ, COLOMBIA
GLORIA OCAMPO, COLOMBIA
HELADIO MORENO, COLOMBIA
HERNANDO JOSÉ MOLINA VILLAMIZAR, COLOMBIA
HUGO DE JESÚS GIRALDO LÓPEZ, COLOMBIA
ISMAEL ANGUCHO YUNDA, COLOMBIA
JAIME JOSÉ VANEGAS URUETA, COLOMBIA
JAIME MONGE HAMMAN, COLOMBIA
JAVIER FRANCISCO PARRA, COLOMBIA
JAVIER GARCÍA GUAGUARABE, COLOMBIA
JAVIER GIRÓN TRIVIÑO, COLOMBIA
JAVIER URAGAMA CHAMORRO, COLOMBIA
JOEL AGUABLANCA VILLAMIZAR, COLOMBIA
JORGE ENRIQUE ORAMAS, COLOMBIA

JORGE LUIS QUINTERO VILLADA, COLOMBIA
JORGE MACANA, COLOMBIA
JOSÉ GUSTAVO ARCILA RIVERA, COLOMBIA
JOSÉ NELSON TAPIA CAIZAMO, COLOMBIA
JUAN PABLO PRADO BOLAÑOS, COLOMBIA
JUANA PEREA PLATA, COLOMBIA
JULIO CÉSAR HERNÁNDEZ SALCEDO, COLOMBIA
JULIO CÉSAR SOGAMOSO, COLOMBIA
LUIS GUILLERMO PIEDRAHITA, COLOMBIA
LUIS HUGO SILVA MOSQUERA, COLOMBIA
MARCO RIVADENEIRA, COLOMBIA
MARÍA NELLY CUETIA DAGUA, COLOMBIA
MARIO CHILHUESO, COLOMBIA
MARY LUZ PÉREZ CAMAÑO, COLOMBIA
MAURICIO PÉREZ MARTÍNEZ, COLOMBIA
MIGUEL TAPÍ RITO, COLOMBIA
NELSON ENRIQUE MENESES QUILES, COLOMBIA
NORBey ANTONIO RIVERA, COLOMBIA
ÓSCAR QUINTERO VALENCIA, COLOMBIA
OSWALDO ROJAS, COLOMBIA
PEDRO ÁNGEL MARÍA TRÓCHEZ MEDINA, COLOMBIA
RODRIGO SALAZAR, COLOMBIA
SIGIFREDO GUTIÉRREZ, COLOMBIA
TEODOMIRO SOTELO ANACONA, COLOMBIA
TULIO CÉSAR SANDOVAL CHIA, COLOMBIA
UBERNEY MUÑOZ, COLOMBIA
VIRGINIA SILVA, COLOMBIA
WILDER GARCÍA, COLOMBIA
WILLIAM RAMIRO MONTOYA, COLOMBIA
YAMID ALONSO SILVA TORRES, COLOMBIA
JHERY RIVERA, COSTA RICA
AUGUSTIN MUGISHO KULONDWA,
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
BAGURUBUMWE CHUHOZE DEOGENE,
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
DJAMALI BADI MUKANDAMA,
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
GERMAIN KAMBALE VYASAKI,
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
HÉRITIER NDAGIJIMANA NDAHOBARI,
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
JACQUES MUHINDO KATEMBO,
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
JEAN-LOUIS KAMBALE MUTSOMANI,
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
JEANNOT MUHINDO ISEVIHANGO,
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
JOSEPH KASOLE JANVIER,
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
JULES KAMBALE TEREMUKA,
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
JUNIOR FAZILI JUSTIN,
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
KADHAFI ABEDI IYALU,
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
LUMUMBA ANUARI BIHIRA,
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
MOISE PALUKU KALONDERO,
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
RUPHIN MASUMBUKO MALEKANI,
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
ABEL RAYMUNDO, GUATEMALA
ABELARDO QUEJ IXIM, GUATEMALA

ALBERTO CUCUL CHOC, GUATEMALA
BENOÎT PIERRE AMADEE MARIA, GUATEMALA
CARLOS ENRIQUE COY, GUATEMALA
CARLOS MUCÚ POP, GUATEMALA
DOMINGA RAMOS SALOI, GUATEMALA
FIDEL LÓPEZ, GUATEMALA
JONATHAN VILLAGRÁN, GUATEMALA
JOSÉ CHOC CHAMÁN, GUATEMALA
MEDARDO ALONZO LUCERO, GUATEMALA
MIXAEL LÓPEZ CATALÁN, GUATEMALA
S.P.C, GUATEMALA
ADÁN MEJÍA, HONDURAS
ALBERTH SNEIDER CENTENO TOMAS, HONDURAS
ANTONIO BERNÁRDEZ, HONDURAS
ARNOLD JOAQUÍN MORAZÁN, HONDURAS
EDWIN FERNÁNDEZ SARAVIA, HONDURAS
FÉLIX VÁSQUEZ LÓPEZ, HONDURAS
FRANCISCA ARACELY ZAVALA, HONDURAS
GERARDO MIZAE L RÓCHEZ CÁLIX, HONDURAS
IRIS ARGENTINA ÁLVAREZ, HONDURAS
JOSÉ ANTONIO TERUEL, HONDURAS
KARLA IGNACIA LÓPEZ MARTÍNEZ, HONDURAS
LAURA CAROLINA VALENTÍN DOLMO, HONDURAS
MARCO TULIO ZAVALA, HONDURAS
MARVIN DAMIÁN CASTRO MOLINA, HONDURAS
MILTON MARTÍNEZ ÁLVAREZ, HONDURAS
SUAMI APARICIO MEJÍA GARCÍA, HONDURAS
VICENTE ZAAVEDRA, HONDURAS
ISRAVEL MOSES, INDIA
PANKAJ KUMAR, INDIA
RANJAN KUMAR DAS, INDIA
SHUBHAM MANI TRIPATHI, INDIA
HERMANUS BIN BISON, INDONESIA
PUTRA BAKTI, INDONESIA
SURYADI, INDONESIA
RIHAM/REHAM YACOUN, IRAQ
ERITARA AATI KAIERUA, KIRIBATI
ADÁN VEZ LIRA, MEXICO
AMALIA MORALES GUAPANGO, MEXICO
ANTONIO MONTES ENRÍQUEZ, MEXICO
DANIEL SOTELO, MEXICO
ELIAS GALLEGOS CORIA, MEXICO
ESTEBAN MARTÍNEZ PÉREZ, MEXICO
EUGUI ROY MARTÍNEZ PÉREZ, MEXICO
EUTQUIO BOUTISTA PACHECO, MEXICO
FREDY GALLEGOS, MEXICO
GABINO ÁVILA MARTÍNEZ, MEXICO
HOMERO GÓMEZ GONZÁLEZ, MEXICO
ISAAC MEDARDO HERRERA AVILÉS, MEXICO
ISMAEL CRUZ GARCÍA, MEXICO
JESÚS MIGUEL JERÓNIMO, MEXICO
JESÚS MIGUEL JUNIOR, MEXICO
JOSÉ BENITO MIGUELEÑO, MEXICO
JUAN AQUINO GONZÁLEZ, MEXICO
JUAN ZAMARRIPA TORRES, MEXICO
MARÍA AGUSTÍN CHINO, MEXICO
MAURILIO HERNÁNDEZ MARTÍNEZ, MEXICO
MIGUEL MIGUELEÑO, MEXICO
MIGUEL VÁZQUEZ MARTÍNEZ, MEXICO
ÓSCAR EYRAUD ADAMS, MEXICO
PABLO GUZMÁN SOLANO, MEXICO

PAULINA GÓMEZ PALACIO ESCUDERO, MEXICO
RAÚL HERNÁNDEZ ROMERO, MEXICO
REYNALDO BOUTISTA BOUTISTA, MEXICO
RODOLFO DÍAZ JIMÉNEZ, MEXICO
TOMÁS MARTÍNEZ PINACHO, MEXICO
UMBER GÓMEZ GONZÁLEZ, MEXICO
DILIP KUMAR MAHATO, NEPAL
AMARU RENER HERNÁNDEZ, NICARAGUA
CRISTINO LÓPEZ ORTIZ, NICARAGUA
DUNIS RODOLFO MORALES, NICARAGUA
FEDERICO PÉREZ GRADIZ, NICARAGUA
JARLE SAMUEL GUTIÉRREZ, NICARAGUA
JUAN EMILIO DEVIS GUTIÉRREZ, NICARAGUA
MARK RIVAS, NICARAGUA
MICHAEL LÓPEZ RIVERA, NICARAGUA
NACILIO MACARIO, NICARAGUA
NELDO DOLORES MORALES GÓMEZ, NICARAGUA
RUBÉN JACOBO BENDLES, NICARAGUA
SIMÓN PALACIOS HERNÁNDEZ, NICARAGUA
ARBILDO MELÉNDEZ GRANDES, PERU
GONZALO PÍO FLORES, PERU
JORGE MUÑOZ SAAVEDRA, PERU
LORENZO CAMINTI, PERU
ROBERTO CARLOS PACHECO, PERU
SANTIAGO VEGA CHOTA, PERU
ARTILITO KATIPUNAN, PHILIPPINES
BAE MERLIN ANSABU CELIS, PHILIPPINES
ELISEO GAYAS JR, PHILIPPINES
EMERITO PINZA, PHILIPPINES
FERNANDO VELARDE, PHILIPPINES
GARSON CATAMIN, PHILIPPINES
GLENN BUNDA, PHILIPPINES
HAROLD TABLAZON, PHILIPPINES
JAY-AR MERCADO, PHILIPPINES
JENNIFER TONAG, PHILIPPINES
JESSIE GOLONDRINA, PHILIPPINES
JOBERT BERCASIO, PHILIPPINES
JOHN FAROCHILIN, PHILIPPINES
JOMAR VIDAL, PHILIPPINES
JORY PORQUIA, PHILIPPINES
LORENZO PAÑA, PHILIPPINES
LOUIE TAGAPIA, PHILIPPINES
MARIO AGUIRRE, PHILIPPINES
MARLON MALDOS, PHILIPPINES
MAURITO DIAZ, PHILIPPINES
NORA APIQUE, PHILIPPINES
PABLO MATINONG JR., PHILIPPINES
RANDY ECHANIS, PHILIPPINES
REYNALDO KATIPUNAN, PHILIPPINES
ROLANDO DIAZ, PHILIPPINES
ROMY CANDOR, PHILIPPINES
RONNIE VILLAMOR, PHILIPPINES
ROY GIGANTO, PHILIPPINES
ZARA ALVAREZ, PHILIPPINES
ABDUL RAHIM AHMAD MAHMOUD AL-HWAITI, SAUDI ARABIA
FIKILE NTSHANGASE, SOUTH AFRICA
LEROY BRUWER, SOUTH AFRICA
SENADEERA PRADEEP BANDARA, SRI LANKA
KANNIKA WONGSIRI, THAILAND
KHUAN CHAIPRASERT, THAILAND
EMMANUEL MATSIPA, UGANDA

A GLOBAL ANALYSIS

ATTACKS ON THE RISE FOR ANOTHER YEAR

In 2020, Global Witness recorded 227 murdered land and environmental defenders – making it once again the most dangerous year on record for people defending their homes, land and livelihoods, and the ecosystems vital for biodiversity and the climate.*

However, our data on killings does not capture the true scale of the problem. In some countries, the situation facing defenders is hard to gauge – restrictions on a free press, or where the independent monitoring of attacks on defenders is not taking place, can lead to underreporting. Land disputes and environmental damage, two of the prominent underlying causes behind communities’ activism, can also be difficult to monitor in parts of the world affected by conflict. We know that beyond killings, many defenders and communities also experience attempts to silence them, with tactics like death threats, surveillance, sexual violence, or criminalisation – and that these kinds of attacks are even less well reported.

These challenges, coupled with the requirement to meet strict verification criteria for recording killings, mean that our figures are almost certainly an underestimate. You can find more information on our verification criteria and methodology on page 27.

HIGHEST COUNTRIES
PER CAPITA

1. Nicaragua

2. Honduras

3. Colombia

4. Guatemala

5. Philippines

* We define land and environmental defenders as people who take a stand and peaceful action against the unjust, discriminatory, corrupt or damaging exploitation of natural resources or the environment. For more detail, see our methodology on page 27.



Aerial view of a deforested area in the municipality of Melgaco, Para State, Brazil, on July 30, 2020. TARSO SARRAF/AFP via Getty Images

TOTAL NUMBER OF DOCUMENTED KILLINGS PER COUNTRY

| | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Colombia 65 | Brazil 20 | Honduras 17 |
| | Democratic Republic Congo 15 | Guatemala 13 |
| Mexico 30 | Nicaragua 12 | India 4 |
| | | Indonesia 3 |
| Philippines 29 | | South Africa 2 |
| | | Thailand 2 |
| | | Costa Rica 1 |
| | Peru 6 | Nepal 1 |
| | | Kiribati 1 |
| | | Uganda 1 |
| | | Saudi Arabia 1 |
| | | Iraq 1 |
| | | Sri Lanka 1 |
| | | Argentina 1 |
| | | Canada 1 |

NUMBER OF DOCUMENTED KILLINGS BY SECTOR³

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|--------|-----------|
| Logging 23 | Land reform 12 | Poaching 6 | Road 2 | Fishing 1 |
| Water & Dams 20 | Sector could not be confirmed 112** | | | |
| Mining & Extractives 17 | | | | |
| Illegal crop substitution 17 | | | | |
| Agribusiness 17 | | | | |

** Land is a key driver of the attacks against defenders, however in many cases the economic motives behind land-related violence are not reported on. This figure is higher for 2020 which could reflect the difficulty of investigating and reporting on these events (often in remote areas) during the COVID-19 pandemic.

TOP FINDINGS

➤ Global Witness recorded 227 land and environmental defenders killed in 2020 – an average of **more than four people a week**. As ever, these lethal attacks are taking place in the context of a wider range of threats against defenders – including arrests, smear campaigns and non-lethal attacks.⁴

➤ **Colombia was once again the country with the highest recorded attacks**, with 65 defenders killed in 2020.* A third of these attacks targeted indigenous and afro-descendant people, and almost half were against small-scale farmers.

➤ **Nicaragua** saw 12 killings – rising from 5 in 2019, making it the most dangerous country **per capita** for land and environmental defenders in 2020.

➤ Where reports indicate that defenders were attacked for **protecting particular ecosystems**, the majority – 71% - were working to defend the world's forests (earth's natural carbon sinks) from deforestation and industrial development – vital to efforts to curb the climate crisis. Others died for their work protecting rivers, coastal areas and the oceans.

➤ Almost 3 in 4 of the attacks recorded took place in the **Americas** – with 7 out of the 10 highest countries located in Latin America. In Brazil and Peru, nearly three quarters of recorded attacks took place in the Amazon region of each country.**

➤ Global Witness documented 18 killings across **Africa** in 2020, compared to 7 in 2019. Most of these took place in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), with two in South Africa and one in Uganda. In the DRC, 12 park rangers and a driver were killed in an attack by militia groups in the Virunga National Park. Verifying cases from across the continent continues to be difficult and it is possible cases are widely unreported.

➤ Over a third of the attacks were reportedly linked to **resource exploitation** – logging, mining, and large-scale agribusiness – and hydroelectric dams and other infrastructure. However, this figure is likely to be higher as the reasons behind these attacks are often not properly investigated nor reported on.

➤ **Logging** was the sector linked to the most murders with 23 cases – with attacks in Brazil, Nicaragua, Peru and the Philippines. Mexico saw a large rise in logging and deforestation related killings, with 9 in 2020.

➤ Agribusiness and mining were each linked to 17 attacks in 2020. Since 2015 these two sectors alone have been linked to over 30% of all the killings that Global Witness has documented against land and environmental defenders.

➤ In 2020 the disproportionate number of attacks against **indigenous peoples** continued once again – with over a third of all fatal attacks targeting indigenous people despite only making up 5% of the world's population. These were documented across Mexico, Central and South America and the Philippines. This year we also recorded attacks against indigenous people in Saudi Arabia and Indonesia.⁵

➤ **Indigenous peoples** were the target of 5 of the 7 mass killings recorded in 2020. In the most shocking of these, 9 Tumandok indigenous people were killed and a further 17 arrested in raids by the military and police on the 30th of December on the island of Panay in the Philippines. Numerous reports state that these communities were targeted for their opposition to a mega-dam project on the Jalaur river.⁶

➤ 28 of the victims killed in 2020 were **state officials or park rangers**, attacked whilst working to protect the environment. Attacks were documented across eight countries: Brazil, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Guatemala, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Uganda.[†]

➤ Over 1 in 10 of the defenders killed in 2020 were **women**. Whilst the recorded killings against women appear lower, those who act and speak out may also face gender-specific threats, including sexual violence. Women often have a twin challenge: the public struggle to protect their land, water and our planet, and the often-invisible struggle to defend their right to speak within their communities and families. In many parts of the world, women are still excluded from land ownership and discussions about the use of natural resources.[‡]

* Global Witness recorded 25 attacks in both 2017 and 2018, rising to 64 in 2019.

** Global Witness' source of data from Brazil is the Pastoral Land Commission (CPT). Each organisation uses its own methodology for documenting killings and, as a result, our numbers are different to CPT's. While Global Witness tracks the murder of 'land and environmental defenders', the CPT monitors rural conflicts affecting small-scale farmers, landless communities, indigenous peoples and traditional communities, as well as rural trade unionists. Since 1975, the CPT has been striving to give visibility to the struggle of these people for land, water, and their rights, and for that reason makes use of the social identities that these groups have determined for themselves.

† See methodology on page XXXX for more details on how we include park rangers in our data. Attacks against state officials and park rangers in 2020 were linked to militia groups and poachers, as well as to logging and mining interests.



Women hold up a sign during a protest for the signing of the Escazú deal on September 24, 2020 in San Salvador, El Salvador. Camilo Freedman/APHOTOGRAFIA/Getty Images

In a promising development, on the 5th November Mexico became the 11th country to ratify the landmark Escazú Agreement for Latin America and the Caribbean – meaning it has now come into effect. The regional treaty sets out commitments for public participation in environmental management and standards for access to information and decision-making on environmental matters. Crucially, for the worst affected region it establishes legally binding commitments for protecting environmental defenders – the first time this has been included in an agreement of this kind.

Under the agreement, states must ensure a safe and enabling environment for defenders and take action to prevent, investigate and bring to justice attacks against them. It also recognises the right of current and future generations to live in a healthy environment. However, several countries are yet to sign the agreement, including Honduras. Of the 24 countries that have signed, only 12 had ratified it by early 2021 – with the countries lagging behind including those with high levels of attacks against defenders such as Colombia and Brazil.⁸

OVER HALF OF THE ATTACKS: COLOMBIA, MEXICO, AND THE PHILIPPINES

For the second year in a row, **Colombia** saw the highest number of killings in 2020 with 65 land and environmental defenders murdered. These took place in the context of widespread attacks on human rights defenders and community leaders across the country – which the United Nations have classified as endemic violence, despite the hopes of the 2016 Peace Agreement. Colombian civil society points to a woeful implementation of this agreement by the government. In many of the most remote areas, paramilitary and criminal groups have increased their control through violence against rural communities and a lack of state action to protect them.⁹

Those seeking to protect their land and environment are increasingly being caught up in the crosshairs of this violence – with those protecting indigenous land particularly at risk. The COVID pandemic only served to worsen the situation across the country – official lockdowns led to defenders being targeted in their homes, and government protection measures were cut. One of the key aspects of the Peace Agreement, coca crop substitution programmes to support farmers to move to legal crops, were linked to 17 lethal attacks in 2020. These programmes have resulted in increased threats from criminal organisations and paramilitaries targeting rural communities for their support or participation in illegal crop substitution programs. Colombia's Somos Defensores Programme has documented 75 such attacks against human rights defenders between 2016 and mid-2020.¹⁰

In **Mexico**, we documented 30 lethal attacks against land and environmental defenders in 2020, a 67% increase from 2019. Logging was linked to almost a third of these attacks, and half of all the attacks in the country were directed against indigenous communities. Impunity for crimes against defenders remains shockingly high – recent research ranking countries on access to justice placed Mexico at 60 out of the 69 assessed countries. Up to 95% of murders do not result in any prosecution.¹¹

Miskito indigenous women sit next to a wall with graffiti reading 'Settlers Out', 'Our community demands respect for our lands' and 'There is no land for settlers', in the community of Sangnilaya, North Caribbean Coast Autonomous Region of Nicaragua. INTI OCON/AFP via Getty Images

In the **Philippines**, the deteriorating human rights situation has received increasing condemnation from international actors – including the United Nations, European Union and the US government. A UN report released in June detailed systematic human rights violations. The report highlights the dangerous rhetoric from the government – including calls for the bombing of indigenous peoples. In the Philippines, opposition to damaging industries is often met with violent crackdowns from the police and military. In our data over half of the lethal attacks were directly linked to defenders' opposition to mining, logging, and dam projects.¹²

President Duterte used the COVID pandemic to further crackdown on dissent – implementing one of the strictest lockdowns enforced by the police and the military. The government also took advantage of the pandemic to rush through the Anti-Terrorism law, which came into effect in June. Critics argue that this will accelerate 'red-tagging' – labelling activists and social leaders as communist rebels – and will lead to an increase in violence against environmental and indigenous defenders. The President has prioritised mining for economic recovery from the pandemic – allowing the industry to operate throughout 2020, as well as recently reversing a ban on open pit mining.¹³

In **Nicaragua** – with the most documented attacks per capita in 2020 – violence against indigenous and afro-descendent communities in the north-east and Caribbean coast regions of the country has accelerated in recent years. Research from the Oakland Institute documents community experiences of violence linked to settlers in indigenous territories and the expansion of cattle ranching, gold mining and logging. Despite having legal protections in place, successive governments have undermined indigenous land rights and allowed the attacks to carry on with impunity. In one attack, four leaders of a Mayangna indigenous community in the Bosawás Biosphere Reserve were killed in an attack by dozens of armed settlers.¹⁴



Machinery operating in the annex pit at the Cerrejon Coal Mine in Barrancas, La Guajira, Colombia. Nicolo Filippo Rosso/Bloomberg via Getty Images

WHAT DO THESE ATTACKS TELL US?

We tend to associate the climate crisis with its environmental impacts – unbearable heat, air pollution, rising seas, burning forests, or super-storms. Yet the data on attacks against land and environmental defenders, which Global Witness has been recording since 2012, show that the unaccountable exploitation and greed driving the climate crisis is also having an increasingly violent impact on people.

This is a crisis against humanity. We all depend on the natural world, and when we set about its systematic destruction, people get killed. It may sound simplistic, but it's a fact worth considering – the process of climate breakdown is violent, and it manifests not just in violence against the natural world, but against people as well.

Each killing is a complex and deeply personal tragedy, rooted in a predatory economic model driven by greed. It might feel morbid to record and analyse each death of a land and environmental defender. But it's important

to understand what connects these seemingly disparate cases – the water defenders murdered in northern Mexico, to the South African grandmother shot dead outside her home seemingly for rejecting the expansion of a nearby coal mine. Analysing the whole dataset helps us understand the overlap between the causes of these attacks, what they represent, what's at stake and the actions that governments and companies must take to prevent them.

Defenders are canaries in the proverbial and sometimes literal coalmine.

Between 2001 and 2015, over 300 million hectares of tree cover was lost: nearly the size of India. 2020 saw the worst ever North Atlantic hurricane season. It was also the hottest year on record, tied with 2016, with the International Panel on Climate Change stating that historical and current emissions mean the world is already on track to reach the destructive 1.5C rise within the next twenty years. As the climate crisis intensifies, so too does its impact on people, including on land and

environmental defenders. This data on lethal attacks can be understood as another climate metric, in step with these other more familiar datasets – 2020 so far being the worst year on record for land and environmental defenders, with a record 227 lethal attacks reported.¹⁵

Global Witness believes that this dataset is almost certainly an underestimate. But looking at the trends over time, we have documented a consecutive rise in the number of killings globally since 2018, rising to well over 200 defenders murdered in 2019 and 2020 – over double the numbers we recorded in 2013. Unfortunately, without significant change this situation is only likely to get worse – as more land is grabbed, more forests felled in the interest of short-term profits, both the climate crisis and attacks against defenders will continue to worsen.¹⁶

The core truths about violence against land and environmental defenders mirror what we know about the climate crisis itself:

1. Its impacts are unequal
2. Business is responsible
3. Governments are both causing and failing to prevent it

ITS IMPACTS ARE UNEQUAL

While climate breakdown is global and affecting every nation on earth, its impacts are disproportionately felt by countries in the Global South. The Global North has extracted natural resources in far greater quantity – yet it is the far more populous Global South that is suffering the most immediate consequences of global warming on all fronts. Violence against land and environmental defenders is yet more unequal and is overwhelmingly concentrated in countries in the Global South. In 2020, all but one of the 227 killings of defenders that Global Witness recorded took place in the Global South. In the period since Global Witness began collecting data, less than 1% of all recorded lethal attacks were documented in the Global North.¹⁷

This disparity also cuts across demographic divides. Between 2015 and 2019 over a third of all fatal attacks have targeted indigenous people – even though indigenous communities make up only 5% of the world’s population. They are some of the most at-risk communities, living across 90 countries and occupying more than a third of Earth’s protected land. Their residence across these territories preserves an astonishing 80 percent of the world’s remaining biodiversity. Yet in 2020, some 37% of recorded lethal attacks were against indigenous people – the agents of climate conservation. Indigenous peoples have been

making the link between preventing climate destructive practices and preserving indigenous rights over several decades.¹⁸

That same disparity is reflected in many other climate metrics. As of 2015, the United States alone bore responsibility ‘for 40% of excess global CO2 emissions’, emissions beyond the acceptable limit of 350 parts per million in the atmosphere, according to analysis by anthropologist Jason Hickel. The Global North is responsible for 92% of those emissions. In contrast, the Global South is responsible for just 8% of excess global carbon dioxide emissions. Christian Aid’s *Climate and Food Vulnerability Index* found that the 10 most food-insecure countries in the world generate less than half a ton of CO2 per person, or just 0.08% of the global total.¹⁹

Like most inequities, the pandemic has made it worse. Marginalised communities, including indigenous peoples, are particularly exposed to the health and economic effects of the pandemic. But repressive governments also used the pandemic as an opportunity to clamp down on civil society, as companies pushed ahead with destructive projects.²⁰

The violence against land and environmental defenders and the climate crisis are intimately connected, and we will not solve one without the other. The health of our planet and of our societies are fundamentally linked.

BUSINESS IS RESPONSIBLE

Many threats and attacks against land and environmental defenders occur after communities voice their concerns about companies and their projects affecting their rights, including to their land. In their pursuit of profit, decades of research by human rights organisations document how companies and financial institutions have failed to respect communities and defenders impacted by their value and investment chains. Worse still, some global companies have been known to dupe well-meaning and conscientious consumers with misleading sustainability brochures, neglecting to mention corporate human rights abuses linked to their global operations.²¹

In too many countries, rich in natural resources and climate critical biodiversity, corporations are operating with almost complete impunity. Entire villages are levelled, waste is dumped into rivers, and shareholders continue to profit without paying the price for this pursuit of unsustainable economic growth. It is business - often enabled or encouraged by negligent governments – that is commonly responsible for the toxic waste, air pollution and mass deforestation destroying our planet and hurting communities across the world. This devastation is wrought in pursuit of one thing – profit, soaked up almost

entirely by the richest 1%, who are today twice as wealthy as 6.9 billion people.²²

Because the balance of power is stacked in the favour of corporations, and against communities and individuals, these companies are seldom held to account for the consequences of their commercial activities. It’s rare that anyone is arrested or brought to court for killing defenders. When they are it’s usually the trigger-men - the ones holding the guns, not those who might be otherwise implicated, directly or indirectly, in the crime. In many cases, access to information, often held by the company, makes it difficult to find those responsible. At a local level, corruption often prevents any effective investigation by state law enforcement.²³

Companies have devolved their operations to include global supply and value chains that are unnecessarily opaque and complex. Where resource extraction and exploitation occurs in countries with weaker governance systems, they are able to benefit from the accountability gap that exists between countries. In the words of Christiana Ochoa, “globalization has produced a disjuncture between business-related activities and the development of capabilities to govern those activities. These ‘governance gaps’ create an environment in which

business-related human rights abuses can occur with relative impunity”.²⁴

When looking at the dataset on attacks in totality, it’s clear that many companies engage in an extractive economic model that overwhelmingly prioritises profit over human and environmental harm. This unaccountable corporate power is the underlying force that has not only driven the climate crisis to the brink, but which has continued to perpetuate the killing of defenders.

GOVERNMENTS MUST STOP THE VIOLENCE

Governments have been all too willing to turn a blind eye and fail in providing their core mandate of upholding and protecting human rights. They are failing to protect defenders – in many cases directly perpetrating violence against them, and in others arguably complicit with business.²⁵

States around the world – from Liberia and Sri Lanka to the Philippines – used the COVID pandemic to strengthen draconian measures to control citizens and close civic

Juana Zúniga sits at Guapinol River located in the valley of Bajo Aguán in the north of Honduras. Juana is a member of the Municipal Committee of Tocoa, Colón. In 2014, these rivers and the people who depend on them were endangered when the state allowed mining exploration in the Carlos Escaleras National Park where the rivers run. The people of Guapinol have organised and protested against this but have found themselves criminalized - many community members are behind bars to this day. *Global Witness/María Aguilar/Iolany Pérez*



space. With journalists, activists, campaigners, and academics confined to their homes, and the freedom of press under renewed attack, the scant pre-pandemic protections that defenders had are under increasing strain.²⁶

An October 2020 Freedom House report found restrictions on the news media as part of the response to COVID-19 occurred in at least 91 countries. Governments enacted new laws against spreading “fake news” – Hungary, for example, passed legislation that criminalises anyone spreading misinformation about the pandemic, which critics say has been misused to further erode democracy in the country. Many civil society actors claim these laws aimed at stopping “fake news” have been used by governments to limit independent questioning at press conferences, enable the suspension of printing of newspapers, and to block the use of legitimate websites.²⁷


According to the International Land Coalition, throughout 2020 activism was limited in many countries “at a crucial time, with protests and demonstrations often banned even though controversial activities, including evictions, demolitions, and extractive projects such as mining”, were allowed to continue. The Freedom House report found that 158 countries have placed new restrictions on demonstrations due to the pandemic. This is despite the UN Special Rapporteur on the right to peaceful assembly and association calling on countries not to use COVID-19 state of emergency declarations to “impose wholesale restrictions on freedom of peaceful assembly and association”.²⁸

But if the state steps in to ensure the protection of land and environmental defenders’ human and environmental rights, including through regulation that holds offending companies to account for their global operations, change is possible. There is a correlation between civic space and attacks against defenders – the most open and tolerant societies see very few attacks, whereas in restricted societies, attacks are much more frequent. Governments can turn the tide on the climate crisis and protect human rights by protecting civil society, and through passing legislation to hold corporations to account for their actions and profits.²⁹

There are positive signs of change. Since 2012, Magnitsky legislation, laws providing for governmental sanctions against foreign individuals who have committed human rights abuses, has been passed in the United States, the UK, Canada, as well as in some EU jurisdictions. These are aimed at deterring human rights abuses, but governments need to go further and target corporate supply chains, which are the root cause of many environmental and human rights abuses against land and environmental defenders around the world.³⁰

The majority of killing took place in state with limited civic freedoms

Data on civic freedoms via CIVICUS Monitor*



* See: <https://monitor.civicus.org/>

The United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the OECD Guidelines on Multinational Enterprises, and related sectoral supply chain guidelines, clearly set out responsibilities and expectations for global business on human rights and environmental protection. However, ten years after the former was officially adopted by the UN, evidence suggests that little has changed. States have relied too much on corporate self-reporting and voluntary corporate mechanisms. As a result, companies continue to cause, contribute to, and benefit from, human rights abuses and environmental harms. Efforts to regulate international business for harm linked to their global operations have not yet matched the scale of the problem. Progress towards a Binding Treaty on Business and Human Rights at the United Nations is underway but slow. Corporate human rights regulation has started to emerge in key jurisdictions, such as France and Norway.³¹

Two initiatives in the European Union have the potential to significantly advance corporate accountability. The EU has committed to introducing Sustainable Corporate Governance legislation requiring companies to conduct mandatory human rights and environmental due diligence on their supply chains. This will require companies to identify, assess, prevent, and mitigate their negative human rights, environmental and governance risks and impacts in their operations and value chains. The second proposed piece of legislation will regulate forest-risk commodities – aiming to exclude deforestation, and hopefully human and land rights violations in producer countries from EU markets. This is vital given that the EU is second only to China in importing commodities linked to deforestation.³²

These advances, if enacted effectively, will begin to tackle the root causes behind the attacks against land and environmental defenders.* Other countries need to follow suit and pass legislation to hold companies accountable for their impact on people and planet.

MEXICO: I HOPE THAT SOMEONE FOLLOWS IN HIS FOOTSTEPS

“I’m indigenous. I’m Kumiai, from Nejí”

That’s how my son, Óscar Eyraud Adams introduced himself no matter where he was. Óscar always wanted to live here on the ranch, to live close to his people.

“Here, we’re going to sow and harvest. We’re going to get through it, mum” he used to tell me. Yet he soon realised how severe the drought was because when he sowed, the water shortages meant he couldn’t harvest his crops.

That’s how he started defending water and the Kumiai territory. “There’s not much we can do without water” he told me, and the rest of the community supported him because they trusted him.



Óscar Eyraud Adams holds a sign calling for respect for the indigenous communities of Baja California. *Mexicali Resiste*



Norma Adams Cuero, Óscar Eyraud’s mother. *Felipe Luna/Global Witness*

Even as he studied to become an engineer, he was still able to quote legal articles and the constitution. Once, he protected us from a lawyer who tried to sell us a project that would profit at the expense of our land. “Those outsiders cannot come and command us”.

It hasn’t rained much for the last couple of years. That has left our water wells empty, and we had to ask for permission from the authorities to dig new wells. They rarely granted us that right. Óscar’s vision was that the whole community would have access to water. Yet he witnessed the repeated invasions from outsiders.

“Big companies have much easier access to the water. That’s not fair – we need the water to survive,” he said, and encouraged us to come together to demand access: “If you come together, if you organize, there’s no way they can beat us down”.

He frequently travelled to Mexicali, meeting other defenders and with the authorities, trying to get our permits back. He would invite journalists and activists to visit our Kumiai territory and see how it was being parched.

* See Recommendations section on page XXXX for further details.



La Rumorosa, the highway that connects Tijuana to Mexicali that runs past Tecate where Óscar lived. *Felipe Luna/Global Witness*

With all the challenges he took on, I was afraid that something might happen to him. However, the idea of somebody killing my son never crossed my mind. I thought people might beat or kidnap him, but I never imagined they would go as far as they did.

My 34-year-old son was murdered in Tecate on the 24th of September, in 2020. He couldn't defend himself.

I felt obliged to bring him back home, so he could rest near his community.

Even now that he's gone, people speak very highly of him. "I hope somebody follows in the footsteps of the Kumiai activist". I am proud that he left a great legacy. Yet I also feel sad because he is dead, and he had so much more to give.

Óscar was doing his job; the killers had no justification for taking his life. I will continue to seek justice for him. We need it soon, to prevent the next killing.

– **Norma Adams** ³³

Centro Mexicano de Derecho Ambiental (CEMDA) calls on the Mexican Government to:

- > Suspend development projects where violence against women and men who defend the environment has occurred until a full investigation is completed.
- > Design, implement and oversee mechanisms that guarantee the right to consent and consultation, incorporating the principles of self-determination and autonomy of indigenous peoples and comparable communities.
- > Comply with its obligations to investigate, prosecute, and punish human rights violations against land and environmental defenders.
- > Implement the obligations arising from the Escazú Agreement, including the provision of adequate funds to guarantee proper functioning of protection mechanisms for land and environmental defenders.
- > Develop legal regulations that effectively guarantee respect and protection of the self-determination and autonomy of indigenous peoples and comparable communities over their territories and cultural heritage.

VICTORIES FOR PEOPLE – AND THE PLANET

In a year where the world's attention was consumed by the pandemic, communities across the globe continued to fight for their rights to land and a healthy environment. We stand in solidarity with the ongoing strength and determination of communities standing up to powerful actors and achieving amazing things.

Thanks to their long-term commitment and persistence, communities celebrated a number of wins in 2020. Below we outline some of these in relation to standing up to fossil fuel projects, damaging industrial developments and securing land rights. These are often won after long legal battles, coupled with sustained community-led campaigning and they offer grounds for hope for communities facing similar challenges around the world.

WINS AGAINST FOSSIL FUEL PROJECTS:

> The Zimbabwe Environmental Law Association took the government and two companies to court over proposed coal mining in the Hwange national park – the country's largest protected area, home to a large population of elephants and the endangered black rhino. Two Chinese companies had been awarded a licence to explore for coal in the park in partnership with the state-owned Zimbabwe Mining Development Corporation. The Zimbabwe Environmental Law Association (ZELA) won the case, leading to the government announcing a ban on coal mining in national parks across the country.³⁴

> In North America, indigenous and climate campaigners secured a number of vital wins to protect the environment against oil extraction and transportation. In January the last of the major US banks committed to stop all financing of fossil fuel exploration in the Arctic. In February Canadian mining major Teck Resources pulled out of a US\$15.7 billion tar sands mine that would have produced 260,000 barrels of crude oil bitumen per day at full capacity, citing climate change as one of the unresolved issues which meant that the project could not proceed. And in July a number of key decisions

Indigenous environmental activists dance in a circle outside the White House to protest against oil pipelines. Organized by the Indigenous Environmental Network, the demonstrators called on President Joe Biden to 'Build Back Fossil Free' by stopping the Dakota Access and Line 3 pipelines. *Chip Somodevilla/Getty Images*





Indigenous Naso campaigners stand chained to each other during a protest outside the Presidential Palace in Panama City in 2009. The Naso have been calling for formal land rights recognition for decades. *ELMER MARTINEZ/AFP via Getty Images*

threw the future of four major oil pipeline projects in the US into further doubt – including the Keystone XL pipeline. However, indigenous communities and climate campaigners have continued to face criminalization and police violence for their protests against the Enbridge 3 pipeline.³⁵

➤ In November, the South African High Court cancelled the environmental approval for a planned coal-fired power station in Limpopo province in the north of the country. According to the Centre for Environmental Rights, the project would have been one of the most emission intensive power plants in the world. This a huge victory for the anti-coal movement in South Africa, with a coalition of organisations working tirelessly since the project was announced in 2015.³⁶

WINS AGAINST INDUSTRIES DRIVING DEFORESTATION, ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE AND HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES

➤ The Wagina Island community in the Pacific nation of the Solomon Islands secured a significant victory against bauxite mining, with the country’s Minister of Environment rejecting an appeal by company owned by two Hong Kong listed businesses. This followed a long campaign by the islanders, who argued that they did not give their consent to the project. The proposed mine would have taken over 60% of the island, decimated virgin forest, and caused significant environmental damage to the land and ocean that the residents rely on for their livelihoods.³⁷

➤ In April, the Ashaninka indigenous community in the Brazilian state of Acre agreed a settlement following a legal battle spanning over two decades for compensation for deforestation in their territory. The company in question was accused of illegally cutting thousands of hardwood trees to supply the European furniture market in the 1980s. The settlement included almost US\$ 3 million in

compensation, an official apology and recognition of the Ashaninka as important guardians of the Amazon – and will hopefully set an important precedent for other environmental crimes in the country.³⁸

➤ In Canada, the Supreme Court issued a landmark ruling that allowed victims of alleged human rights abuses by Vancouver-based mining company Nevsun Resources to pursue legal proceedings in British Columbia. The company had argued that the case should be heard in Eritrea where the mine was built. This ruling on jurisdiction sets another important legal precedent that companies can be held accountable for human rights abuses committed overseas. This claim ultimately resulted in an out-of-court settlement, the terms of which are confidential.³⁹

LAND RIGHTS WINS

The struggle for recognition of land rights, and in particular for indigenous communities, is key to addressing the climate crisis. The importance of this cannot be overstated – recent estimates suggest that land conserved by indigenous and local communities (ICCAs) covers over a fifth of the world, equivalent to the size of Africa. However, without formal recognition of their land rights, the same research found that at least 16% of this area faces high risk of degradation from agribusiness and extractive industries.⁴⁰

➤ In October, Panama’s Supreme Court of Justice issued a ruling that led to the creation of a protected territory for the Naso indigenous group. This followed decades of campaigning for formal land rights recognition and a legal battle lasting over two years. The court explicitly recognised indigenous peoples’ role in protecting the environment and maintaining biodiversity. The Naso have been defending their land from hydroelectric dam projects, making this ruling a significant win for protecting their way of life and the tropical forest and river that is central to this.⁴¹

➤ In June the national assembly of the Democratic Republic of Congo voted to adopt a bill that safeguards the rights of indigenous peoples. This is a significant advance in a country where the indigenous Baka, Mbuti and Batwa peoples have been discriminated against.⁴²

➤ In April, communities in Zambia’s Central Province who were forced off their traditional land seven years ago won their case in the country’s High Court. In 2013 the communities were forcibly evicted, and their homes bulldozed to make way for commercial agriculture. The court ordered the government and one of the companies involved to provide alternative land and compensation for the rights violations.⁴³



Noch Min, 40, and her husband Et Tam, 39, farm their 1.5 hectares of land given to them as compensation. *Andrew Ball/Panos/Global Witness*

CAMBODIA: OUR LAND WAS STOLEN BY A FOREIGN COMPANY. WE WON'T GIVE UP THE FIGHT

The company that stole our land didn’t make any pretence of taking it legitimately. That much was clear as soon as the tractors arrived. They cleared our rice fields, they felled our jackfruit and mango trees, and burned our cottages and our houses to the ground.

They were telling us, very clearly, that our land belonged to the sugar plantation now, that this land that our families lived and farmed on for generations was theirs.

The company had been given the land concession by the government. There had been no preliminary assessment, no consultation with the people who lived here. The communities of Chhouk, Chikhor and Trapeng Kendal were all stunned. We gathered and tried as best we could to stop the tractors.

But they were taking our land, even if we resisted, even if it meant using brute force. The police who accompanied the tractors fired shots, injuring two people from our community.

The company, a powerful Thai group called KSL, cleared us out to grow sugar. Some of that sugar ended up with a foreign buyer called Tate & Lyle Sugars. Many Europeans know that brand. You might have a bag of the sugar they grew on our land in your cupboard.

We had lived in peace before they arrived. Our corner of Koh Kong was everything, and we lived off the land, growing what we ate and selling the excess. The land was good to us – we fished, grew rice, fruit & vegetables, and raised cows and buffalo. We were self-sufficient.

So when the land was taken from us, we had no choice but to fight for it. We filed complaints to the authorities. No one responded. So, we walked over 150 km to Phnom Penh. Even then, we were met with a wall of silence.

In that moment, those tractors destroyed our livelihoods. Across three villages, we are nearly 200 families, and between us we have almost no income now. Our children are in debt. Many have been forced to migrate abroad. These are the unseen impacts of land grabbing.

If our cows or buffaloes strayed onto the stolen land, the fields they used to roam, the company men just shot them. Or kept the animals and demanded payment for them. Some families don’t have any animals left.

This has happened to many other communities, as far afield as Oddar Meanchey in the northwest. Altogether, we think multiple companies have taken around 100,000 hectares across three provinces, and they took it from people who need land like a fish needs water.

It seems the authorities would rather give the land to foreign companies in the name of development, rather than prioritise the rights of local people. But we had hoped Tate & Lyle Sugars might respect our rights once they became aware of the situation. But after years of negotiations, they’ve given up the pretence. Last year, they told us that despite profiting from our land, they wouldn’t pay anyone a riel.

Our basic rights have been violated. The theft of land is like a death sentence. It’s been 15 years now, and we are still here. We’ll keep on fighting, even when everyone else



Sen Norn, 55, poses for a portrait on her 1.5 hectares of land. Her family is one of 200 families involved in the ongoing case against Tate & Lyle. After she was evicted from her farmland by the Koh Kong sugar companies she worked on the sugar cane plantations for 5 years as it was the only way for her to earn an income. *Andrew Ball/Panos/Global Witness*

has moved on. What other choice do we have? We want our land back. And we want the companies held responsible. We won't give up the fight.

– **Teng Kao, representative of Chhouk village, Cambodia**

Tate & Lyle Sugars (a subsidiary of ASR Group) has said that it acquired the sugar division of Tate & Lyle PLC in September 2010 and it subsequently refined only two small shipments of sugar from KSL in 2011 and 2012. The company has said it takes ethical and environmental issues in its supply chain extremely seriously and it is committed to working with stakeholders to find a solution. It says it placed pressure on its supplier over seven years through various meetings with interested parties, including the Cambodian government, and it will continue to use its leverage to ensure its ex-supplier KSL compensates the villagers for the damage they have suffered.

In their submissions to the National Human Rights Commission of Thailand, Khon Kaen Sugar Limited (KSL) claimed that any use of violence occurred before the company received its land concession, and that it does not support any actions that violate human rights. It further stated that it has never killed or confiscated livestock.

In its 2015 report, the National Human Rights Commission of Thailand (NHRCT) found that 'Land concessions given to the sugar industry resulted in serious human rights violations, including the use of violence to evict villagers from their place of residence, impediments against the use of natural resources which is fundamental to community subsistence. The impacts of these human rights violations are a direct responsibility of Khon Kaen Sugar Industry Public Company Limited, due to the company's decision to receive and benefit from the land concessions which caused human rights violations, regardless of the fact that the company did not itself commit the act of human rights violation.'⁴⁴

CONCLUSION

For another year, we are forced to report a rise in attacks against the people on the frontlines of the climate crisis. Land and environmental defenders that have stood up to powerful interests have paid a heavy price – with their freedom, livelihoods and even their lives. What is absolutely clear is that businesses have profited from human rights abuses and environmental damage with relative impunity for far too long. At the same time, global businesses are overwhelmingly responsible for runaway climate change – with research showing that just 100 companies have produced 71% of all greenhouse gas emissions since 1988.⁴⁵

The truth is that companies have been acting irresponsibly for decades, contributing to, and benefiting from, attacks on land and environmental defenders. Strong legal accountability for corporate actors is urgently needed. As the United Nations notes,

“The persistence of business-related human rights abuses should be a matter of urgent priority attention by States and business, as rights-holders continue to experience harm and remain at risk. The last decade has underscored the point made in the UNGPs: voluntary approaches alone are not enough. The rise of mandatory measures will undoubtedly accelerate both uptake and progress.”⁴⁶

Looking forward, as the pandemic and debates on how to 'build back better' continue, we urgently need to change how the world does business. In 2022 Global Witness will publish the 10th annual report detailing attacks against defenders – over the past decade we have seen these attacks steadily rise. It is far beyond time to turn the tide on this trend.

Defenders are our last line of defence against climate breakdown, and we can take heart from the fact that even after decades of violence, people continue to stand up for their land, for our planet. In every story of defiance against corporate theft and land grabbing, against deadly pollution and against environmental disaster, is hope that we can turn the tide on this crisis and learn to live in harmony with the natural world. Until we do, the violence will continue.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Companies and governments need to be held to account for violence against land and environmental defenders, who are often standing on the frontline of the climate crisis. Urgent actions are needed at international, regional, and national levels to end the violence and other injustices that they face.

At the global level, the **United Nations**, through its member states should:

- Formally recognise the human right to a safe, healthy and sustainable environment, as called for by the UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and the Environment, which would fill 'a glaring gap in the architecture of international human rights'.⁴⁷
- Ensure State commitments made at COP26 to implement the Paris Agreement align with existing international human rights obligations and standards applicable to business operations, defenders, and indigenous and other communities.
- Explore all avenues within the UN system to support the recommendations of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, as well as UN Working Group on Business and Human Rights.

At the national level, **Governments** should:

- Protect land and environmental defenders in the context of business by ensuring effective and robust regulatory protection of the environment, labour rights, land rights, indigenous peoples' rights, livelihoods and cultures, including to free, prior and informed consent. Any legislation used to criminalise defenders should be declared null and void.
- Require domiciled companies and financial institutions to carry out mandatory due diligence, that provides

accountability for violence and other harm to land and environmental defenders, throughout their global operations, including supply chains and business relationships.

➤ Ensure access to justice and due process by investigating and pursuing prosecutions of all relevant actors, including implicated corporate actors, for violence committed against land and environmental defenders. Any decision to not prosecute these actors should be made publicly available.

Businesses: To ensure they are not contributing to or profiting from human rights and land rights harms across their supply chains and operations, companies and investors must:

- Publish and implement robust due diligence procedures that seek to prevent, identify, mitigate and account for human rights and environmental harms in their global operations, including supply chains and business relationships. Explicit reference to respecting the rights of land and environmental defenders should be included. At a minimum, these policies should include meaningful details including who at the senior level is responsible for its overall oversight, as well as how it will be implemented and monitored, and clear redlines for suspension or termination of contracts for suppliers who continue to perpetuate environmental, human rights, and land rights harms.
- Adopt and implement a zero-tolerance stance on reprisals and attacks on land and environmental defenders in their global operations, supply chains and business relationships, illegal land acquisition and violations of the right of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) for affected communities.
- Provide for and facilitate effective remedy processes when adverse human rights and environmental impacts and harms occur.**

** For more detailed recommendations for companies and investors, please see our report: 'Responsible sourcing: the business case for protecting land and environmental defenders and indigenous communities' rights to land and resources' available here: <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/campaigns/environmental-activists/responsible-sourcing/>

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EUROPEAN UNION

As a major trading bloc with a global footprint, the European Union has the responsibility and opportunity to lead the way on holding companies to account. It is legally obliged to contribute to the protection of human rights and the environment, including in its actions affecting the union’s international interactions, which must be conducted in accordance with its founding principle of the universality and indivisibility of human rights.

The European Commission is currently preparing two pieces of binding due diligence legislation pertinent to the protection of human rights and the environment through the global reach of the corporate supply and value chains that the EU relies on. These include an initiative on Sustainable Corporate Governance, and a Regulation on forest-risk commodities, both of which are due to be debated by EU law makers in 2022.

It is critical the EU demonstrates global leadership by ensuring both laws effectively build on the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs) and OECD Guidelines and related business and human rights standards to introduce enforceable and meaningful EU and member state law, including the principle of free and prior informed consent (FPIC) of communities affected by corporate activities.

Specifically, the EU should ensure the Sustainable

Corporate Governance initiative:

➤ requires all companies doing business in the EU, including financial institutions, to undertake steps to prevent, identify, address and account for human rights and environmental harms along their value chains as part of their due diligence – including by consulting with, and obtaining the FPIC of, affected indigenous and local communities and land and environmental defenders;

➤ includes a strong enforcement mechanism with robust administrative, civil, and criminal liability regimes and penalties to hold companies accountable for contributing to, failing to prevent, or benefiting from harms, or violations of due diligence requirements, and allowing people negatively impacted by corporate operations to access EU courts to seek remedy.*

The EU must ensure that the proposed due diligence Regulation on Forest-risk Commodities:

➤ explicitly requires companies and financiers doing business in the EU to only source from or finance operations that have obtained the Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) of indigenous peoples and local communities, in line with rights and principles articulated in international law. These provisions should be included in other laws on forest-risk commodities developed in non-EU European countries, such as the UK’s Environment Bill.⁴⁸

METHODOLOGY

The Global Witness Land and Environmental Defenders Campaign aims to stop the broad range of threats and attacks that land and environmental defenders and their communities face. It strives to raise awareness of these abuses and to amplify the voices of defenders in support of their work and that of their networks.

We define land and environmental defenders as people who take a stand and carry out peaceful action against the unjust, discriminatory, corrupt or damaging exploitation of natural resources or the environment. Land and environmental defenders are a specific type of human rights defender – and are often the most targeted for their work.[†]

Our definition covers a broad range of people. Defenders often live in communities whose land, health and livelihoods are threatened by the operations of mining, logging, agribusiness companies or other industries. Others will be defending our biodiverse environment. Others will be supporting such efforts through their work – as human rights or environmental lawyers, politicians, park rangers, journalists, or members of campaigns or civil society organisations, for instance.

Global Witness has produced a yearly account of murdered land and environmental defenders since 2012. We maintain a database of these killings so that there is a record of these tragic events and we can track trends and highlight the key issues behind them.

Research into the killings and enforced disappearances of land and environmental defenders between 1 January 2020 and 31 December 2020:

Global Witness identifies cases of killings by searching and reviewing reliable sources of publicly available online information, through the following process:

- We identify datasets from international and national sources with details of named human rights defenders killed, such as the Frontline Defenders annual report and the Programa Somos Defensores annual report on Colombia, and then research each case.
- We set up search-engine alerts using keywords and conduct other searches online to identify relevant cases across the world.
- Where possible or necessary, we check with in-country or regional partners to gather further information on the cases. We work with approximately 30 different local,

national and regional organisations across over 20 countries to do this.

To meet our criteria, a case must be supported by the following available information:

- Credible, published and current online sources of information.
- Details about the type of act and method of violence, including the date and location.
- Name and biographical information about the victim.
- Clear, proximate and documented connections to an environmental or land issue.

Sometimes we will include a case that does not meet the criteria outlined above, where a respected local organisation provides us with compelling evidence that is not available online, based on their own investigations.

Global Witness includes friends, colleagues and the family of murdered land and environmental defenders in its database if a) they appear to have been murdered as a reprisal for the defender’s work, or b) they were killed in an attack that also left the defender dead.

Our data on killings is likely to be an underestimate, given that many murders go unreported, particularly in rural areas and in particular countries. Our set of criteria can’t always be met by a review of public information like newspaper reports or legal documents, nor through local contacts - having this strict methodology therefore means our figures do not represent the scale of the problem, and we are constantly working to improve this.

In summary, the figures presented in this report should be considered as only a partial picture of the extent of killings of environmental and land defenders across the world in 2020. We identified relevant cases in 22 countries in 2020, but it is likely that attacks affecting land and environmental defenders also occurred in other countries where human rights violations are widespread. Reasons why we may not have been able to document such cases in line with our methodology and criteria include:

- Limited presence of civil society organisations, NGOs and other groups monitoring the situation in the field.
- Government suppression of the media and other information outlets.
- Wider conflicts and/or political violence, including between communities, that make it difficult to identify specific cases.

[†] For example, Frontline Defenders identified 331 killings of human rights defenders in 2020, with 69% classified as land, indigenous peoples, and environmental rights defenders: https://www.frontlinedefenders.org/sites/default/files/flid_global_analysis_2020.pdf



A peat land fire is seen at Rumbai Pesisir village in Sumatra, Indonesia. During Indonesia’s annual dry season, hundreds of fires are often illegally ignited to clear forests on the islands of Sumatra and Kalimantan, where large forest concessions are used by paper and palm oil companies. *AFRIANTOSILALAH/Barcroft Media via Getty Images*

We conducted searches in English, Spanish and Portuguese. Due to the large number of countries and potential sources, we concentrated our searches on those countries where initial alerts indicated that there were potentially relevant cases to investigate. Due to the manner in which this work has evolved over the years, Global Witness has well-established links in some countries but lacks them in others.

Our data may also differ from that being gathered by other NGOs due to variations in methodologies and verification techniques. Some NGOs document attacks against all human rights defenders, while Global Witness data only covers defenders working on land or environmental issues.

PARK RANGERS AND GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Our statistics reveal that a significant number of murdered land and environmental defenders belong to indigenous communities, whose land and water management skills are crucial to combat the climate crisis and biodiversity loss. In some areas of the world, indigenous peoples have been, and continue to be, expelled from their land for the creation or maintenance of conservation reserves. Global Witness clearly does not endorse this approach to environmental protection. We do not include deaths where the victim was reportedly linked to violence against indigenous or local communities.

We do, however, include cases of government officials and park rangers who have been specifically threatened or targeted while trying to protect forestland and biodiversity, where there is no known conflict with indigenous or local communities.

To document the defender stories across Mexico, Cambodia and South Africa in this report we have worked directly with national and local organisations, as well as journalists, in each country. This included sourcing additional information. We also ensured that relevant individuals and organisations checked these case studies for accuracy. Accompanying each case study are a set of defender-led recommendations that aim to amplify the voices of those with whom we work. These are either from long-standing partners or those contacted specifically for their involvement or connection to the specific issue involved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to all those who work tirelessly, often at great risk and sometimes with limited resources, to support defenders. Without the diligent documentation of the following organisations, it would simply be impossible for Global Witness to maintain its database and produce this report. This year, we are particularly grateful for the assistance provided by:

- Aci-Participa, Honduras
- Alianza Mesoamericana de Pueblos y Bosques
- ALL RISE, South Africa
- Alyansa Tigil Mina (ATM), Philippines
- Amnesty International
- Bufete Jurídico Justicia para los pueblos, Mexico
- Business and Human Rights Resource Centre
- Centro de Asistencia Legal a Pueblos Indígenas (CALPI), Nicaragua
- Centro Mexicano de Derecho Ambiental (CEMDA), Mexico
- Centro por la Justicia y Derechos Humanos de la Costa Atlántica Norte de Nicaragua (CEJUDHCAN)
- Comissão Pastoral da Terra (CPT), Brazil
- Comité Cerezo, Mexico
- Comité Municipal de Defensa de los Bienes Comunes y Públicos de Tocoa, Colón, Honduras
- Conectas, Brazil
- Coordinadora Nacional de Derechos Humanos, Peru
- Crude Accountability
- Defenders Protection Initiative, Uganda
- Diakonia, Honduras
- Front Line Defenders
- Human Rights Watch
- Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos, Chile
- Kalikasan PNE, Philippines

- Karapatan, Philippines
- Lembaga Studi dan Advokasi Masyarakat (ELSAM), Indonesia
- Mexicali Resiste, Mexico
- Mfolozi Community Environmental Justice Organisation (MCEJO), South Africa
- Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Colombia
- Peace Brigades International (PBI)
- People's Watch, India
- Proética, Peru
- Programa Somos Defensores, Colombia
- Protection International, Indonesia
- Protection International, Thailand
- Radio Progreso & Equipo de Reflexión, Investigación y Comunicación (ERIC-SJ), Mexico
- Southern Africa Human Rights Defenders, South Africa
- Unidad de Protección a Defensoras y Defensores de Derechos Humanos (UDEFEGUA), Guatemala
- Virunga National Park, Democratic Republic of Congo
- WALHI Sulawesi Selatan, Indonesia

Thank you also to those that have assisted with the editing, design and images, and translation of this report. The Global Witness Land and Environmental Defenders campaign team would like to recognise their amazing colleagues. Without the hard work of the Global Witness communications, development, facilities, finance, human resources, IT, legal and management departments – as well as everybody else who keeps the organisation running – Global Witness would not be able to support those brave defenders on the front line of the struggle for human rights and our planet’s future. Thank you.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Global Witness commissioned interview with Malungelo Xhakaza.

For further information see: “I cannot sell out my people. And if need be, I will die for my people”, Global Witness, 14 December 2020, <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/blog/i-cannot-sell-out-my-people-and-if-need-be-i-will-die-for-my-people/>; ‘Final Warning: Death Threats and Killings of Human Rights Defenders, Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of Human Rights Defenders’, United Nations General Assembly, 24 December 2020, <https://undocs.org/A/HRC/46/35>; The killing of Somkhele environmental activist Fikile Ntshangase: A joint statement, Centre for Environmental Rights, 23 October 2020, <https://cer.org.za/news/the-killing-of-somkhele-environmental-activist-fikile-ntshangase-a-joint-statement>; ‘Environmentalists lose bid to close Somkhele coal mine’, Ground Up, 9 February 2021, <https://www.groundup.org.za/article/environmentalists-lose-bid-close-somkhele-coal-mine/>.

- 2 ‘Petmin Somkhele Fact Sheet’, Petmin, <https://www.petmin.co.za/pdf/about-somkhele/somkhele-fact-sheet.pdf> (accessed: 10 August 2021); ‘Misinformation about Tendele Coal Mine’s operations is heightening tension’, Maverick Citizen Right of Reply – Jan du Preez, 13 December 2020, <https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2020-12-13-misinformation-about-tendele-coal-mines-operations-is-heightening-tension/> (accessed: 10 August 2021).

- 3 Where multiple industries have been reported as linked to attacks, we have included the primary driver.

- 4 See for example: ‘In the line of fire’, Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, March 2021, https://media.business-humanrights.org/media/documents/HRDs_2020_infographic_.pdf (accessed: 11 May 2021); Front Line Defenders Global Analysis 2020, Front Line Defenders, 9 February 2021, https://www.frontlinedefenders.org/sites/default/files/fld_global_analysis_2020.pdf (accessed: 11 May 2021).

- 5 In Saudi Arabia, 20,000 members of the Huwaitat tribe face eviction to make way for a new planned mega-city. Abdul Rahim al-Huwaiti was a vocal opponent of these plans and was killed on 13 April 2020, allegedly by Saudi police.

“It’s being built on our blood’: the true cost of Saudi Arabia’s \$500bn megacity”, The Guardian, 4 May 2020, https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2020/may/04/its-being-built-on-our-blood-the-true-cost-of-saudi-arabia-5bn-mega-city-neom?CMP=Share_iOSApp_Other (accessed: 14 July 2021); ‘Written statement submitted by Maat for Peace, Development and Human Rights Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status’, United Nations Human Rights Council, 3 July 2020, <https://undocs.org/pdf?symbol=en/A/HRC/44/NGO/56> (accessed: 14 July 2021).

- 6 ‘Justice sought for 9 slain in Panay raids’, Philippine Daily Inquirer, 1 January 2021, <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1378106/justice-sought-for-9-slain-in-panay-raids> (accessed: 20 May 2021); ‘Groups decry killing, arrest of Panay indigenous people’, Panay News, 31 December 31 2020, <https://www.panaynews.net/groups-decry-killing-arrest-of-panay-indigenous-people/> (accessed: 20 May 2021); ‘Philippine authorities kill nine indigenous leaders in raid on “communists”’, ASE-AN Today, 4 January 2021, <https://www.aseantoday.com/2021/01/philippine-authorities-kill-nine-indigenous-leaders-in-raid-on-communists/> (accessed: 20 May 2021).

- 7 Women who stand up for their rights to land and a healthy environment face specific threats, on top of those faced by men. Smear campaigns often focus on their private lives, with explicit sexist or sexual content. Sexual violence, much of which is underreported, is also used as a tactic to silence women defenders. Women who do gain leadership positions are often stigmatised for going against traditional gender roles.

‘Situation of women human rights defenders: Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders’, United Nations Human Rights Council, 10 January 2019, <https://digitalibrary.un.org/record/1663970?ln=en> (accessed: 20 July 2021); ‘Our Right To Safety: Women Human Rights Defenders’ Holistic Approach to Protection’, Women Human Rights Defenders International Coalition, March 2014, https://defendingwomen-defendingrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Our-Right-To-Safety_FINAL.pdf (accessed: 20 July 2021); ‘We’ve had enough: a call to action to protect women human rights defenders & their communities’ Women Human Rights Defenders International Coalition, 29 November 2018, <https://www.defendingwomen-defendingrights.org/2018/11/29/weve-had-enough-a-call-to-action-to-protect-women-human-rights-defenders-their-communities/> (accessed: 20 July 2021).

- 8 ‘The Escazú Agreement was ratified by Mexico and its entry into force is imminent’, Global Call to Action Against Poverty, 9 November 2020, <https://gcap.global/news/the-escazu-agreement-was-ratified-by-mexico-and-its-entry-into-force-is-imminent/> (accessed: 8 June 2021); ‘Protecting Environmental Defenders in Latin America: The Escazú Agreement’, IUCN, 16 October 2020, <https://www.iucn.org/news/world-commission-environmental-law/202010/protecting-environmental-defenders-latin-america-escazu-agreement> (accessed: 8 June 2021); ‘Regional Agreement on Access to Information, Public Participation and Justice

in Environmental Matters in Latin America and the Caribbean’, United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/43583/1/S1800428_en.pdf; <https://observatorio10.cepal.org/en/treaties/regional-agreement-access-information-public-participation-and-justice-environmental> (accessed: 8 June 2021); ‘The entry into force of the Escazú Agreement: a landmark in the global environmental governance?’, IDDRI, 17 November 2020, https://www.iddri.org/en/publications-and-events/blog-post/entry-force-escazu-agreement-landmark-global-environmental#foot-note4_th89noo (accessed: 8 June 2021).

- 9 ‘La Mala Hora: Informe anual 2020 Sistema de Información sobre Agresiones contra

Personas Defensoras de Derechos Humanos en Colombia’, Programa Somos Defensores, 20 May 2021, <https://somosdefensores.org/2021/05/20/la-mala-hora/> (accessed: 1 June 2021); Four years later, Colombia’s Peace Agreement advances at a snail’s pace, Open Democracy, 6 January 2021, <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/democraciaabierta/colombia-peace-agreement-advances-snail-pace/> (accessed: 1 July 2021); ‘Situation of human rights in Colombia - Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (A/HRC/46/76) (Advance edited version)’, United Nations Human Rights Council, 10 February 2021, <https://reliefweb.int/report/colombia/situation-human-rights-colombia-report-united-nations-high-commissioner-human-0> (accessed: 1 June 2021); Final Agreement to End the Armed Conflict and Build a Stable and Lasting Peace, Peace Agreements Database, <https://www.peaceagreements.org/view/1845> (accessed: 1 July 2021).

- 10 ‘La Mala Hora: Informe anual 2020 Sistema de Información sobre Agresiones contra

Personas Defensoras de Derechos Humanos en Colombia’, Programa Somos Defensores, 20 May 2021, <https://somosdefensores.org/2021/05/20/la-mala-hora/> (accessed: 1 June 2021); ‘Situation of human rights in Colombia - Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (A/HRC/46/76) (Advance edited version)’, United Nations Human Rights Council, 10 February 2021, <https://reliefweb.int/report/colombia/situation-human-rights-colombia-report-united-nations-high-commissioner-human-0> (accessed: 1 June 2021);

‘Voluntary Substitution Sows Peace’, Programa Somos Defensores, 2021, <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qWjkyX6GLo5dREBdNv2uWf2Wt2CS2qsj/view> (accessed: 1 June 2021).

- 11 ‘Global Impunity Index 2020 (GII 2020). Impunity Levels in the World’, Juan Antonio Le Clercq and Gerardo Rodríguez Sánchez Lara, 3 May 2021, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3837642 (accessed 21 June 2021);

‘Continúa tendencia a la alza de agresiones contra personas defensoras del medio ambiente durante 2020’, CEMDA, 13 April 2021, <https://www.cemda.org.mx/continua-tendencia-a-la-alza-de-agresiones-contra-personas-defensoras-del-medio-ambiente-durante-2020/> (accessed: 21 June 2021); ‘Justice for victims of violent crime in Mexico is rare. Can the deaths of nine Mormons change that?’, The Washington Post, 12 November 2019, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2019/11/08/justice-victims-violent-crime-mexico-is-rare-can-deaths-nine-mormons-change-that/> (accessed: 20 July 2021); ‘Solving A Murder In Mexico Is The Exception, Not The Rule: it would take 124 years to solve all the murder cases’, Animal Politico, <https://www.animalpolitico.com/kill-murder-mexico/homicides-unpunished-mexico.php> (accessed: 20 July 2021).

- 12 ‘Philippines, Events of 2020’ Human Rights Watch, <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2021/country-chapters/philippines> (accessed: 21 May 2021); ‘Situation of human rights in the Philippines Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights’, United Nations Human Rights Council, 29 June 2020, <https://undocs.org/en/A/HRC/44/22> (accessed: 21 May 2021); ‘2020 Karapatan Year-end Report on the Human Rights Situation in the Philippines’, Karapatan, 21 March 2021, <https://www.karapatan.org/2020-karapatan-year-end-report> (accessed: 21 May 2021).

- 13 ‘Inside the world’s longest and strictest coronavirus lockdown in the Philippines’, The Telegraph, 11 July 2020, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/global-health/science-and-disease/inside-worlds-longest-strictest-coronavirus-lockdown-philippines/> (accessed: 21 May 2021); ‘Nature and its defenders under attack’, Philippine Daily Inquirer, 11 August 2020, <https://opinion.inquirer.net/132587/nature-and-its-defenders-under-attack?fbclid=IwAR3MlwYnxRSh4W-g3e05MTWJjvJD6t6v2Wr7t8wFn92Urv48tClI8RC5A3l> (accessed: 21 May 2021); ‘“Complete turnaround’: Philippines’ Duterte lifts ban on new mining permits’, Mongabay, 15 April 2021, <https://news.mongabay.com/2021/04/complete-turnaround-philippines-duterte-lifts-ban-on-new-mining-permits/> (accessed: 21 May 2021).

- 14 ‘Nicaragua: Message from the official spokeswoman for the High Commissioner on attacks against indigenous peoples’, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights Central America Regional Office, 7 February 2020, <http://www.oacnudh.org/nicaragua-mensaje-de-la-vocera-oficial-de-la-alta-comisionada-sobre-los-ataques-contra-pueblos-indigenas/> (accessed: 17 June 2021); ‘Nicaragua is promoting illegal land grabs in indigenous territories – report’, The Guardian, 29 April 2020, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/apr/29/nicaragua-illegal-land-grabs-indigenous-territories-report> (accessed: 15 June 2021); ‘Ataque de

colonos deja un mayangna muerto y otro herido en San José de Bocay’, Confidencial, 12 July 2020, <https://www.confidencial.com.ni/reporte-ciudadano/ataque-de-colonos-deja-un-mayangna-muerto-y-otro-herido-en-san-jose-de-bocay/> (accessed: 15 June 2021); ‘Is Nicaragua for Sale?, The Oakland Institute, <https://www.oaklandinstitute.org/nicaragua-sale> (accessed: 16 June 2021); ‘Nicaragua’s Failed Revolution the Indigenous Struggle For Saneamiento’, The Oakland Institute, May 2020, <https://www.oaklandinstitute.org/sites/oaklandinstitute.org/files/nicaraguas-failed-revolution.pdf> (accessed: 15 June 2021); ‘Masacre en Nicaragua: cuatro líderes de una comunidad indígena asesinados por sus tierras’, Mongabay, 28 March 2020, <https://es.mongabay.com/2020/03/masacre-en-nicaragua-lideres-indigenas-mayangna-asesinados/> (accessed: 17 June 2021).

- 15 ‘How banks, deforestation and the climate crisis are linked’, Global Witness, 21 March 2020, <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/campaigns/forests/how-banks-deforestation-and-climate-crisis-are-linked/> (accessed: 12 August 2021); ‘Forest cover nearly twice the size of the UK has been lost in just one decade’, environment journal, 13 January 2021, <https://environmentjournal.online/articles/forest-cover-nearly-twice-the-size-of-the-uk-has-been-lost-in-just-one-decade/> (accessed: 12 July 2021); Climate change indicators and impacts worsened in 2020, World Meteorological Organization, 19 April 2021, <https://public.wmo.int/en/media/press-release/climate-change-indicators-and-impacts-worsened-2020> (accessed 1 June 2021); ‘2020 Tied for Warmest Year on Record, NASA Analysis Shows’, NASA, 14 January 2021, <https://www.nasa.gov/press-release/2020-tied-for-warmest-year-on-record-nasa-analysis-shows> (accessed: 1 June 2021); ‘Earth may temporarily pass dangerous 1.5 warming limit by 2024, major new report says’, The Conversation, 9 September 2020, <https://theconversation.com/earth-may-temporarily-pass-dangerous-1-5-warming-limit-by-2024-major-new-report-says-145450> (accessed: 1 June 2021); United in Science 2020, World Meteorological Organization, https://public.wmo.int/en/resources/united_in_science (accessed: 1 June 2021); ‘State of Global Climate 2020, World Meteorological Organization, https://library.wmo.int/doc_num.php?explnum_id=10618 (accessed: 1 June 2021); World’s 1.5C goal slipping beyond reach without urgent action, warns landmark IPCC climate report, The Independent, 9 August 2021, <https://www.independent.co.uk/climate-change/news/ipcc-report-2021-climate-un-b1899193.html> (accessed: 12 August 2021); ‘UK calls for greater global ambition as UN finds world warming faster than previously estimated’, United Kingdom Cabinet Office, 9 August 2021, <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-calls-for-greater-global-ambition-as-un-finds-world-warming-faster-than-previously-estimated> (accessed: 12 August 2021); ‘Climate change widespread, rapid, and intensifying – IPCC’, 9 August 2021, International Panel on Climate Change, 9 August 2021, <https://www.ipcc.ch/2021/08/09/ar6-wg1-20210809-pr/> (accessed: 12 august 2021); ‘IPCC, 2021: Summary for Policymakers. In: Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’, IPCC, August 2021, <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/#SPM> (accessed: 12 August 2021).

- 16 See: ‘Deadly Environment, Global Witness, 15 April 2014, <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/campaigns/environmental-activists/deadly-environment/>; ‘Enemies of the State?’, Global Witness, 30 July 2019, <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/campaigns/environmental-activists/enemies-state/>; ‘Defending Tomorrow’, Global Witness, 29 July 2020, <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/campaigns/environmental-activists/defending-tomorrow/>.

- 17 The Global North is often defined as the United States, Canada, Europe, Israel, Australia, New Zealand and Japan. The Global North-South divide started as an economic concept, a way of separating wealthy countries with a colonial past from less wealthy countries. Increasingly, it has become a useful concept for thinking about our climate.

‘Quantifying national responsibility for climate breakdown: an equality-based attribution approach for carbon dioxide emissions in excess of the planetary boundary’, Jason Hickel, 01 September 2020, [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanph/article/PIIS2542-5196\(20\)30196-0/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanph/article/PIIS2542-5196(20)30196-0/fulltext) (accessed: 23 June 2021); ‘The global injustice of the climate crisis’, Deutsche Welle, 28 August 2019, <https://www.dw.com/en/the-global-injustice-of-the-climate-crisis-food-insecurity-carbon-emissions-nutrients-a-49966854/a-49966854> (accessed: 22 June 2021).

Measuring What Matters: A New Approach to Assessing Sovereign Climate Risk’, Four Twenty Seven, 3 December 2020, <https://427mt.com/2020/12/03/measuring-what-matters-a-new-approach-to-assessing-sovereign-climate-risk/> (accessed 1 June 2021).

- 18 ‘A spatial overview of the global importance of Indigenous lands for conservation’, Garnett, S.T., Burgess, N.D., Fa, J.E. et al., Nat Sustain 1, 369–374 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0100-6> (accessed: 22 June 2021); ‘Indigenous peoples defend Earth’s biodiversity—but they’re in danger’, National Geographic, 16 November 2018, <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/article/can-indigenous-land-stewardship-protect-biodiversity-> (accessed: 22 June 2021); ‘Update Number 109’, Indigenous Peoples’ Centre for Documentation, Research And Information, June 2015, http://cendoc.docip.org/collect/upd_en/index/assoc/HASHd175.dir/Upd109_eng.pdf (accessed: 1 July 2021); Indigenous Peoples’ Food Systems: Insights on Sustainability and Resilience from the Front Line of Climate Change’, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2021, <http://www.fao.org/3/cb5131en/cb5131en.pdf> (accessed 10 August 2021).

- 19 ‘Quantifying national responsibility for climate breakdown: an equality-based attribution approach for carbon dioxide emissions in excess of the planetary boundary’, Jason Hickel, 01 September 2020, [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanph/article/PIIS2542-5196\(20\)30196-0/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanph/article/PIIS2542-5196(20)30196-0/fulltext) (accessed: 23 June 2021); ‘Global North Is Responsible for 92% of Excess Emissions’, EOS, 28 October 2020, <https://eos.org/articles/global-north-is-responsible-for-92-of-excess-emissions> (accessed: 23 June 2021); ‘Hunger Strike: The Climate and Food Vulnerability Index’, Christian Aid, August 2019, <https://www.christianaid.org.uk/sites/default/files/2019-07/Hunger-strike-climate-and-food-vulnerability-index.pdf> (accessed: 5 June 2021).

- 20 ‘COVID-19 and Indigenous peoples’, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, <https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/covid-19.html> (accessed: 14 July 2021); ‘Risks to Indigenous and Other Land And Environmental Defenders Heightened During Covid’, International Land Coalition, 7 August 2020, <https://www.landcoalition.org/en/newsroom/case-study-indigenous-peoples-land-and-environment-defenders-face-risks-due-covid-19/> (accessed: 14 July 2021); ‘Defending the environment in the time of COVID-19: increasing threats, clampdowns on freedoms and tragic losses’, Global Witness, 16 September 2020, <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/blog/defending-environment-time-covid-19-increasing-threats-clampdowns-freedoms-and-tragic-losses/> (accessed: 21 July 2021); ‘Six months on: defending the Philippines’, Global Witness, 4 May 2020, <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/blog/six-months-defending-philippines/> (accessed: 14 July 2021).

- 21 Situation of human rights defenders: Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Mary Lawlor, United Nations General Assembly, 16 July 2020, <https://undocs.org/en/A/75/165> (accessed: 20 July 2021); ‘Risky Business: How Leading Venture Capital Firms Ignore Human Rights’, Amnesty International, 30 July 2021, <https://www.amnesty.org.uk/press-releases/worlds-top-ten-venture-capital-firms-all-failing-over-human-rights-due-diligence-new> (accessed: 12 August 2021); ‘State of Remedy 2020’, OECD Watch, 16 June 2021, <https://www.oecdwatch.org/state-of-remedy-2020/> (accessed: 28 July 2021); Trading Risks: How ADM & Bunge are failing Land & Environmental Defenders in Indonesia, Global Witness, December 2020, <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/campaigns/environmental-activists/indonesia-palm-oil-traders-are-failing-land-and-environmental-defenders/> (accessed: 28 July 2021).

- 22 ‘Corporate impunity is common & remedy for victims is rare’, Corporate Legal Accountability Annual Briefing 2017, Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, https://media.business-humanrights.org/media/documents/files/documents/CLA_AB_Final_Apr_2017.pdf (accessed: 22 July 2021); ‘Justice for People and Planet: Ending the Age of Corporate Capture, Collusion and Impunity’, Greenpeace, January 2018, <https://wayback.archive-it.org/9650/20200224055202/http://p3-raw.greenpeace.org/international/Global/international/publications/other/2018/Justice-for-people-and-planet.pdf> (accessed: 22 July 2021); ‘World’s richest 1% have more than twice as much wealth as 6.9 billion people’, Oxfam, 19 January 2020, <https://www.oxfam.ca/news/worlds-richest-1-have-more-than-twice-as-much-wealth-as-6-9-billion-people-says-oxfam/> (accessed: 23 June 2021).

- 23 ‘The supply chain of violence’ Nathalie Butt, Frances Lambrick, Mary Menton and Anna Renwick, Nature Sustainability Vol 2, August 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0349-4>; Situation of human rights defenders: Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, Mary Lawlor, United Nations General Assembly, 16 July 2020, <https://undocs.org/en/A/75/165> (accessed: 20 July 2021).

‘Situation of human rights defenders: Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders’, United Nations General Assesmbly, 15 July 2019, <https://undocs.org/en/A/74/159> (accessed: 2 August 2021); ‘Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples’, United Nations General Assembly, 10 August 2018, <https://www.undocs.org/A/HRC/39/17> (accessed: 2 August 2021).

- 24 ‘The 2008 Ruggie Report: A Framework for Business and Human Rights’, Christiana Ochoa, American Society of International Law Volume 12 Issue 12, 18 June 2008, <https://www.asil.org/insights/volume/12/issue/12/2008-ruggie-report-framework-business-and-human-rights>, (accessed: 2 August 2021); ‘Report of the Special Representative of the Secretary General on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, John Ruggie. Business and human rights: further steps toward the operationalization of the “protect, respect and remedy” framework’, United Nations General Assembly, 9 April 2010, https://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/trans_corporations/docs/a-hrc-14-27.pdf (accessed: 2 August 2021); ‘Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples’, United Nations General Assembly, 10 August 2018, <https://www.undocs.org/A/HRC/39/17> (accessed: 2 August 2021).

- 25 ‘Final Warning: Death Threats and Killings of Human Rights Defenders, Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of Human Rights Defenders’, United Nations General Assembly, 24 December 2020, <https://undocs.org/A/HRC/46/35> (accessed: 2 July 2021).

- 26 ‘Defending the environment in the time of COVID-19: increasing threats, clampdowns on freedoms and tragic losses’, Global Witness, 16 September 2020, <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/blog/defending-environment-time-covid-19-increasing-threats-clampdowns-freedoms-and-tragic-losses/> (accessed: 21 July

2021); ‘Governments and business must stand up for land and environmental defenders now, so that they can help build a more resilient and fair future for us and our planet’, Global Witness, 7 May 2020, <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/press-releases/governments-and-business-must-stand-land-and-environmental-defenders-now-so-they-can-help-build-more-resilient-and-fair-future-us-and-our-planet/> (accessed: 21 July 2021); ‘Democracy under Lockdown’, Freedom House, 2 October 2020, https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/2020-10/COVID-19_Special_Report_Final_.pdf (accessed: 22 June 2021); Coronavirus and Civic Space, International Center for Not-For-Profit Law, <https://www.icnl.org/coronavirus-response> (accessed: 21 July 2021).

27 ‘Democracy under Lockdown’, Freedom House, 2 October 2020, https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/2020-10/COVID-19_Special_Report_Final_.pdf (accessed: 22 June 2021); ‘More Countries Pass ‘Fake News’ Laws in Pandemic Era’, Courthouse News Service, 5 June 2020, <https://www.courthousenews.com/more-countries-pass-fake-news-laws-in-pandemic-era/> (accessed: 22 June 2021).

28 ‘Risks to Indigenous and Other Land And Environmental Defenders Heightened During Covid’, International Land Coalition, 7 August 2020, <https://www.landcoalition.org/en/newsroom/case-study-indigenous-peoples-and-land-and-environment-defenders-face-risks-due-covid-19/> (accessed: 14 July 2021); ‘COVID-19 restrictions should not stop freedom of assembly and association, says UN expert’ United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 14 April 2020, <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=25792&LangID=E> (accessed: 20 June 2021).

29 ‘The Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: guidance on ensuring respect for human rights defenders – Report of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises’, United Nations General Assembly, 22 June 2021, <https://undocs.org/A/HRC/47/39/Add.2> (accessed: 2 August 2021).

30 ‘Magnitsky legislation: Briefing Paper Number CBP 8374’ Ben Smith and Joanna Dawson, House of Commons Library, 13 July 2020, <https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-8374/CBP-8374.pdf> (accessed 9 August 2021); ‘The Magnitsky Act Comes to the EU: A Human Rights Sanctions Regime Proposed by the Netherlands’, Netherlands Helsinki Committee, 20 December 2019, <https://www.nhc.nl/the-magnitsky-act-comes-to-the-eu-a-human-rights-sanctions-regime-proposed-by-the-netherlands/> (accessed 9 August 2021); https://www.globalwitness.org/documents/19887/Responsible_Sourcing_Investor_Briefing_April_2020.pdf

31 See for example: ‘Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights’, United Nations Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights, https://www.ohchr.org/documents/publications/guidingprinciplesbusinesshr_en.pdf; ‘OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises’, OECD, <https://www.oecd.org/corporate/mne/>; ‘OECD-FAO Guidance for Responsible Agricultural Supply Chains’, OECD-FAO, <http://mneguidelines.oecd.org/rbc-agriculture-supply-chains.htm>; ‘OECD Due Diligence Guidance for Responsible Supply Chains of Minerals from Conflict-Affected and High-Risk Areas’, OECD, <http://mneguidelines.oecd.org/mining.htm>; ‘Responsible business conduct in the financial sector’, OECD, <http://mneguidelines.oecd.org/rbc-financial-sector.htm>.

‘Holding Companies to Account: How a New EU Law can Help Create a More Sustainable Future’, Global Witness, April 2021, <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/campaigns/holding-corporates-account/holding-companies-to-account-a-blue-print-for-european-legislation/>; ‘Norway: Parliament passes due diligence law incl. right to information about corporate impacts’, Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, 14 June 2021, <https://www.business-humanrights.org/en/latest-news/norway-govt-proposes-act-regulating-corporate-supply-chain-transparency-duty-to-know-due-diligence/> (accessed: 2 August 2021); Legislation available at: <https://stortinget.no/no/Saker-og-publikasjoner/Vedtak/Beslutninger/Lovvedtak/2020-2021/vedtak-202021-176/>; ‘What lessons does France’s Duty of Vigilance law have for other national initiatives?’, Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, 27 June 2019, <https://www.business-humanrights.org/en/blog/what-lessons-does-frances-duty-of-vigilance-law-have-for-other-national-initiatives/> (accessed: 2 August 2021). Legislation available at: <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/loda/id/JORFTEXT000034290626/>; ‘Four years to a first draft: slow progress toward treaty to bind companies’, Access Now, 31 January 2019, <https://www.accessnow.org/four-years-to-a-first-draft-slow-progress-toward-treaty-to-bind-companies/> (accessed: 2 August 2021).

32 For details of the legislation, see: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-9-2020-0179_EN.html and [https://oeil.secure.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?reference=2020/2137\(INI\)&l=en](https://oeil.secure.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/popups/ficheprocedure.do?reference=2020/2137(INI)&l=en); ‘The relationship between the upcoming EU-level initiatives on horizontal mHREDD and on forest-risk commodities’, The NOVA Knowledge Centre for Business, Human Rights and the Environment (NOVA BHRE), 22 April 2021, <https://novabhre.novalaw.unl.pt/eu-level-initiative-horizontal-mhredd-forest-risk-commodities/> (accessed: 14 July 2021);

‘Stepping Up? The Continuing Impact of EU Consumption on Nature Worldwide’, WWF, April 2021, https://wwfeu.awsassets.panda.org/downloads/stepping_up_the_continuing_impact_of_eu_consumption_on_nature_worldwide_full-report_low_res.pdf (accessed 14 July 2021); ‘EU consumption responsible for 16%

of tropical deforestation linked to international trade - new report’, WWF, 14 April 2021, <https://www.wwf.eu/72831941/EU-consumption-responsible-for-16-of-tropical-deforestation-linked-to-international-trade> (accessed: 14 July 2021).

33 Global Witness commissioned interview with Norma Adams. At the time of publication, no arrests had been made in relation to Óscar’s murder.

For further information see: ‘¿Quién era Óscar Eyraud, activista Kumiai que defendía el agua en BC y fue asesinado?’, Animal Político, 26 September 2020, <https://www.animalpolitico.com/2020/09/oscar-eyraud-activista-kumiai-asesinado/>; ‘Óscar Eyraud Adams: guerrero que defendió el agua del pueblo Kumiai’ Pie de Página, 26 September 2020, <https://piedepagina.mx/oscar-eyraud-adams-guerrero-que-defendio-el-agua-del-pueblo-kumiai/>; ‘Indigenous activist who denounced lack of water murdered in Baja California’, Mexico News Daily, 25 September 2020, <https://mexiconewsdaily.com/news/indigenous-activist-who-denounced-lack-of-water-murdered-in-baja-california/>.

34 ‘Zimbabwe bans coal mining in Hwange and other game parks’, BBC, 9 September 2020, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-54085549> (accessed: 7 June 2021); ‘The Zimbabwe Environmental Law Association (ZELA) files a case against Chinese miners’, ZELA, http://www.zela.org/zela_infor-files-a-case-against-chinese-miners/ (accessed: 7 June 2021); ‘Victory: Zimbabwe Bans Coal Mining in All National Parks’, Global Greengrants Fund, 5 October 2020, <https://www.greengrants.org/2020/10/05/zimbabwe-victory/> (accessed: 8 June 2021); ‘Chinese mining firms in Zimbabwe pose threat to endangered species, say experts’, The Guardian, 3 September 2020, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/sep/03/chinese-mining-zimbabwe-pose-threat-endangered-species-hwange-national-park> (accessed: 8 June 2021); ‘Zimbabwe bans mining in wildlife parks’, Reuters, 8 September 2020, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-zimbabwe-mining-wild-life-idUSKBN25Z310> (accessed: 8 June 2021).

35 ‘Canadian mining giant withdraws plans for C\$20bn tar sands project’, The Guardian, 24 February 2020, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/feb/24/canadian-mine-giant-teck-resources-withdraws-plans-tar-sands-project> (accessed: 10 June 2021); Teck Withdraws Regulatory Application for Frontier Project, Teck Resources Limited, 23 February 2020, Accessed: at: <https://www.teck.com/news/news-releases/2020/teck-withdraws-regulatory-application-for-frontier-project> (accessed: 12 August 2021); ‘The Frontier Project, Building a Leader in Responsible Energy Production’, Teck Resources Limited, https://www.teck.com/media/TECK_Frontier_Brochure.pdf (accessed: 12 August 2021); ‘Every Major Bank Has Now Ruled Out Funding Arctic Drilling’, Dharna Noor, 12 January 2020, <https://gizmodo.com/every-major-bank-has-now-ruled-out-funding-arctic-drill-1845782346> (accessed: 10 June 2021); <https://ourarcticrefuge.org/corporate-commitment-to-protect-the-arctic-refuge/>; <https://www.sierraclub.org/articles/2020/12/not-single-major-us-bank-now-willing-finance-arctic-drilling> ‘How to Defeat the Fossil Fuel Industry’, The Nation, 16 December 2020, <https://www.thenation.com/article/environment/trump-biden-fossil-fuels/> (accessed: 10 June 2021); ‘Big Oil is paying the police for protection. Here’s why that’s a problem’, Global Witness, 1 April 2021, <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/blog/big-oil-is-paying-the-police-for-protection-heres-why-thats-a-problem/> (accessed: 10 August 2021); ‘Protesters against Line 3 tar sands pipeline face arrests and rubber bullets’, The Guardian, 10 August 2021, <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/aug/10/protesters-line-3-minnesota-oil-gas-pipeline> (accessed: 12 August 2021).

36 ‘Exclusive: Consortium pulls plug on South Africa’s Thabametsi coal plant’ Reuters, 17 November 2020, <https://www.reuters.com/article/climate-change-safrica-coal/exclusive-consortium-pulls-plug-on-s-africas-thabametsi-coal-plant-idUSL8N21351C?edition=uk> (accessed: 11 June 2021); ‘Celebrating a major climate victory: Court sets aside approval for Thabametsi coal power plant’ Like After Coal, 1 December 2020, <https://lifeaftercoal.org.za/media/news/celebrating-a-major-climate-victory-court-sets-aside-approval-for-thabametsi-coal-power-plant> (accessed 11 June 2021); ‘Victory: South Africa’s Thabametsi Coal Plant Cancelled’ Global Greengrants Fund, 3 December 2020, <https://www.greengrants.org/2020/12/03/south-africa-coal-victory/> (accessed: 11 June 2021).

37 ‘Solomon Islands blocks bauxite mine in victory for Wagina islanders who feared for livelihoods’, Amnesty International, 6 November 2020, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2020/11/solomon-islands-blocks-bauxite-mine-in-victory-for-wagina-islanders-who-feared-for-livelihoods/> (accessed: 11 June 2021); ‘The little island that won: how a tiny Pacific community fought off a giant mining company’, The Guardian, 6 June 2021, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/jun/07/the-little-island-that-won-how-a-tiny-pacific-community-fought-off-a-giant-mining-company> (accessed: 11 June 2021); ‘Wagina Island residents win bid to stop bauxite mining plan in Solomon Islands’, ABC News, 6 November 2020, <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-11-07/wagina-island-wins-bid-stop-bauxite-mining-plan-solomon-islands/12855704> (accessed: 11 June 2021).

38 ‘\$3 million and an official apology: Brazil’s Ashaninka get unprecedented compensation for deforestation on their land’, Mongabay, 16 April 2020, <https://news.mongabay.com/2020/04/3-million-and-an-official-apology-brazils-ashaninka-get-unprecedented-compensation-for-deforestation-on-their-land/> (accessed 19 May 2021); ‘Indigenous Group in Brazil Wins Decades-Long Battle Over Illegal Logging’, Yale Environment 360, 28 April 2020, <https://e360.yale.edu/digest/indigenous-group-in-brazil-wins-decades-long-battle-over-illegal-logging> (accessed:

19 May 2021); ‘Brazil: Logging company ordered to pay \$3 million to Amazonian Indigenous community for illegal logging’, Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, 15 May 2020, <https://www.business-humanrights.org/en/latest-news/brazil-logging-company-ordered-to-pay-3-million-to-amazonian-indigenous-community-for-illegal-logging/> (accessed: 19 May 2021); ‘Acordo histórico garante reparação a povo indígena Ashaninka por desmatamento irregular em suas terras’, Procuradoria-Geral da República, 1 April 2020, <http://www.mpf.mp.br/pgr/noticias-pgr/acordo-historico-garante-reparacao-a-povo-indigena-ashaninka-por-desmatamento-irregular-em-suas-terras> (accessed: 12 August 2021).

39 ‘Nevsun settles with Eritrean plaintiffs in relation to landmark Supreme Court of Canada case’, Canadian Lawyer, 5 November 2020, <https://www.canadianlawyermag.com/practice-areas/litigation/nevsun-settles-with-eritrean-plaintiffs-in-relation-to-landmark-supreme-court-of-canada-case/334916> (accessed: 20 May 2021); ‘Mining company lawsuit can be heard in Canada, rules Supreme Court in historic decision’, Amnesty International, 28 February 2020, <https://www.amnesty.ca/news/mining-company-lawsuit-can-be-heard-canada-rules-supreme-court-historic-decision> (accessed: 20 May 2021).

40 For an explanation of the methodology and definitions used in this research, please see: ‘A global spatial analysis: The estimated extent of territories and areas conserved by Indigenous peoples and local communities’, Jessica Stewart, Joe Gosling, Colleen Corrigan, Holly C. Jonas, Leila Vaziri Zanjani and June Rubis, 25 March 2021, <https://report.territoriesoflife.org/global-analysis/> (accessed: 2 July 2021); ‘Territories of Life: The past, present, and future of conservation on earth’, Wall Street International, 13 June 2021, <https://wsimag.com/economy-and-politics/66065-territories-of-life> (accessed: 2 July 2021).

41 ‘Panama’s Supreme Court recognizes Indigenous Peoples’ land rights and role as guardians of the environment’, Center for International Environmental Law, 20 January 2021, <https://www.ciel.org/panamas-supreme-court-recognizes-indigenous-peoples-land-rights-and-role-as-guardians-of-the-environment/> (accessed: 1 July 2021); ‘Comarca Naso A vital territory for environmental protection’, Land Rights Now, https://www.landrightsnow.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/POLICY-BRIEF_-_ENG-FINAL.pdf (accessed: 1 July 2021); ‘Panama Supreme Court recognises Indigenous land rights’, National Indigenous Times, 25 November 2020, <https://nit.com.au/panama-supreme-court-recognises-indigenous-land-rights/> (accessed: 1 July 2021); ‘Indigenous community wins recognition of its land rights in Panama’, Mongabay, 17 February 2021, <https://news.mongabay.com/2021/02/indigenous-community-wins-recognition-of-its-land-rights-in-panama/> (accessed 1 July 2021).

42 ‘Overlooked no more: A Victory for the Indigenous Batwa of the Democratic Republic of Congo’, Minority Rights, 16 June 2020, <https://minorityrights.org/2020/06/16/overlooked-no-more-batwa-drc/> (accessed: 1 July 2021); ‘Observations on the State of Indigenous Human Rights in the Democratic Republic of Congo’, Cultural Survival, October 2018, https://www.culturalsurvival.org/sites/default/files/UPR_DRC_2018.pdf (accessed: 1 July 2021).

43 ‘After Seven Years, Displaced Villagers Might Get Land’, Human Rights Watch, 18 May 2020, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/05/18/after-seven-years-displaced-villagers-might-get-land> (accessed: 3 May 2021).

44 ‘Teng Kao, Regional Public Forum On Cross-border investments and forced Migration in ASEAN: The relation of Thailand’s sugar industry to Cambodian Migrant labors in Thailand’, Project Sevana, July 2016, accessed at: <http://www.sevanasea.org/gallery-bangkok.html> (accessed: 02 August 2021); ‘Tate & Lyle accused of betraying Cambodia families whose land was allegedly taken’, The Guardian, 2 January 2021, <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2021/jan/02/tate-lyle-accused-of-betraying-cambodia-families-whose-land-was-allegedly-taken> (accessed: 02 August 2021); ‘Tate & Lyle sugar supplier accused over child labour’, The Guardian, 9 July 2013, <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2013/jul/09/tate-lyle-sugar-child-labour-accusation> (accessed: 02 August 2021); ‘Human Rights Violations in Koh Kong Sugar Plantation Confirmed By Thai Human Rights Commission’, EarthRights International, https://earthrights.org/media_release/human-rights-violations-in-koh-kong-sugar-plantation-confirmed-by-thai-human-rights-commission/ (accessed: 02 August 2021); ‘Findings Report No. 115/2558’, National Human Rights Commission of Thailand, March 10 2015, accessed at: https://earthrights.org/wp-content/uploads/unofficial_english_translation_-_tnhrc_report_on_findings_-_koh_kong_land_concession_cambodia_0.pdf (accessed 02 August 2021); ‘Land Grabbing and Human Right: The Involvement of European Corporate and Financial Entities in Land Grabbing outside the European Union’, European Parliament, 2016, https://www.tni.org/files/publication-downloads/expo_stu2016578007_en.pdf (accessed: 02 August 2021); ‘Particulars of Claim: Song Mao and others and Tate and Lyle Industries Limited and T&L Sugars Limited’, High Court of Justice, accessed at: <https://media.business-humanrights.org/media/documents/files/media/documents/tate-lyle-particular-of-claim-28-mar-2013.pdf> (accessed: 2 August 2021); ‘Defence and Counterclaim of the First and Second Defendants: Song Mao and others and Tate and Lyle Industries Limited and T&L Sugars Limited’, High Court of Justice, accessed at: <https://media.business-humanrights.org/media/documents/files/media/documents/tate-lyle-defence-counterclaim-2-may-2013.pdf> (accessed: 2 August 2021).

45 ‘Just 100 companies responsible for 71% of global emissions, study says’, The Guardian, 10 July 2017, <https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/2017/jul/10/100-fossil-fuel-companies-investors-responsible-71-global-emissions-cdp-study-climate-change> (accessed: 14 July 2021); The Carbon Majors Database CDP Carbon Majors Report 2017, CDP, July 2017, <https://b8f65cb373b1b-7b15feb-c70d8ead6ced550b4d987d7c03fcd1d.ssl.cf3.rackcdn.com/cms/reports/documents/000/002/327/original/Carbon-Majors-Report-2017.pdf?1499691240> (accessed: 14 July 2021); ‘Corporate Honesty and Climate Change: Time to Own Up and Act’, NRDC, 26 February 2019, <https://www.nrdc.org/experts/josh-axelrod/corporate-honesty-and-climate-change-time-own-and-act> (accessed: 1 July 2021).

46 ‘Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights at 10: Taking stock of the first decade’, Report of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises, June 2021, <https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Business/UNGPs10/Stocktaking-executive-summary.pdf> (accessed: 23 July 2021).

47 ‘Human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment: Report of the Special Rapporteur on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment’, United Nations General Assembly, 19 July 2018, <https://undocs.org/A/73/188> (accessed: 14 July 20201).

48 ‘Cross-party support for UK Environment Bill to tackle role of UK banks in funding global deforestation, with £900m funnelled into forest-risk commodities in 2020’, Global Witness, 26 May 2021, <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/press-releases/cross-party-support-for-uk-environment-bill-to-tackle-role-of-uk-banks-in-funding-global-deforestation-with-900m-funnelled-into-forest-risk-commodities-in-2020/> (accessed: 5 August 2021).

FIND THE FACTS EXPOSE THE STORY CHANGE THE SYSTEM

Global Witness protects human rights and the environment by fearlessly confronting corruption and challenging the systems that enable it.

globalwitness.org

ISBN: 978-1-911606-55-0
Sept 2021

Global Witness is a company limited by guarantee
and incorporated in England (No.2871809)

© Global Witness 2021

Printed on 100% recycled FSC accredited paper that is chlorine free.