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# Introduction

1. This report examines States’ human rights obligations related to the environment as they have been elaborated by General Assembly and Human Rights Council resolutions and during the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) of the Human Rights Council.
2. This report is one of a series of 14 reports that examine human rights obligations related to the environment, as they have been described by various sources of international law in the following categories: (a) UN human rights bodies and mechanisms; (b) global human rights treaties; (c) regional human rights systems; and (d) international environmental instruments. Each report focuses on one source or set of sources, and all reports follow the same format.
3. These reports were researched and written by legal experts working *pro bono* under the supervision of John H. Knox, the UN Independent Expert on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment. In March 2012, in Resolution 19/10, the Human Rights Council established the mandate of the Independent Expert, which includes, *inter alia*, studying the human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment and reporting to the Council on those obligations.
4. In his first report to the Council, U.N. Doc. A/HRC/22/43 (24 December 2012), the Independent Expert stated that his first priority would be to provide greater conceptual clarity to the application of human rights obligations related to the environment by taking an evidence-based approach to determining the nature, scope and content of the obligations. To that end, he assembled a team of volunteers to map the human rights obligations pertaining to environmental protection in as much detail as possible. The results of the research are contained in this and the other reports in this series.
5. The Independent Expert’s second report to the Council, U.N. Doc. A/HRC/25/53 (30 December 2013), describes the mapping project and summarizes its conclusions on the basis of the findings of the 14 specific reports. In brief, the main conclusions are that the human rights obligations relating to the environment include procedural obligations of States to assess environmental impacts on human rights and to make environmental information public, to facilitate participation in environmental decision-making, and to provide access to remedies, as well as substantive obligations to adopt legal and institutional frameworks that protect against environmental harm that interferes with the enjoyment of human rights, including harm caused by private actors. States are also subject to a general requirement of non-discrimination in the application of environmental laws, and have additional obligations to members of groups particularly vulnerable to environmental harm, including women, children and indigenous peoples.

## Summary of the UPR Process

1. The UPR is a mechanism of the Human Rights Council that was established by General Assembly Resolution 60/251 (15 March 2006). The UPR regularly reviews the human rights records and situations of all 192 UN Member States. Unlike treaty bodies, whose review of State compliance focuses on the requirements of a specific treaty, the UPR reviews State compliance with human rights norms more generally, including with respect to the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, human rights instruments to which the State is party, voluntary pledges and commitments made by the State (including those undertaken when presenting its candidature for election to the Human Rights Council), and applicable international humanitarian law.[[1]](#footnote-1)
2. The UPR consists of three stages: 1) review of the human rights situation of the State under review; 2) implementation of recommendations and voluntary pledges made during the first review; and 3) reporting at the next review on the implementation of those recommendations and pledges and on the human rights situation in the country since the previous review. The first stage of review is referred to as the first cycle of review and the follow-up as the second cycle. The first cycle was completed in 2012 and the second cycle is underway.[[2]](#footnote-2)
3. Three documents are associated with each review: 1) a National Report of 20 pages prepared by the State concerned on the human rights situation in the country; 2) a ten-page report by the Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights (OHCHR) that compiles relevant information from treaty bodies, special procedures and UN agencies such as UNDP and UNICEF; and 3) a summary of ten pages prepared by the OHCHR containing information from civil society. These documents are all available on OHCHR’s web page, at <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/Documentation.aspx>.
4. The State under review begins the review process by presenting its National Report and responses to questions submitted by States in writing ten days before the review. Next, the State engages in an interactive dialogue with other States, which gives all UN member States the opportunity to ask questions and make recommendations on the human rights situation in the country. Finally, the State under review presents its concluding remarks. The outcome of each State review is a final report adopted by the plenary of the Human Rights Council that contains a summary of the information presented by the State under review, a summary of the interactive dialogue, the responses by the State under review to the questions and recommendations, and the full list of recommendations made by States to improve the human rights situation in the country.[[3]](#footnote-3)

## Summary of the Research Process

1. This report summarises references to human rights obligations related to the environment in Human Rights Council and General Assembly Resolutions. Relevant resolutions were accessed through the Human Rights Council web page on OHCHR and the General Assembly web page on the main United Nations web site.
2. This report also summarises the statements and representations made regarding human rights and the environment by all countries during the UPR first cycle of review. Raw data was gathered through a process of key word searches from the following publicly available documents, for each State: 1) the national report of the State under review; 2) the summary of civil society submissions prepared by OHCHR; and 3) the Final Report adopted by the Human Rights Council, which summarises the oral presentations made by the State, the interactive dialogue, recommendations made by other States, and the responses provided by the State under review.[[4]](#footnote-4)
3. The following search terms were used: Environment, Climate, “Global warming”, Air, Natural Resources, Emission, Greenhouse, Water, Flood, Drought, Storm, Hurricane, Typhoon, Drown, Carbon [to catch CO2], Sea [to catch sea levels], Erosion, Food, “Pollut” [to catch pollution/pollute/pollutant], “Contamina” [to catch contaminant/contaminate], Hazardous, Asbestos, PCB, Mercury, Acid, Extinct, Endangered, “Sustain” [to catch sustainable development/sustainability], and sanitary.
4. These search terms sought to capture the full range of statements and representations made by States and civil society that might be relevant to the application of human rights to the environment.

## Overview of the Report

1. Section II examines how Human Rights Council and General Assembly Resolutions have connected environmental harm to impact on human rights and elaborated on human rights obligations relating to the environment. The remainder of this report summarises the key results of the UPR process that are relevant to human rights and the environment. For ease of reference, the report is organised according to particular rights and duties. Often, however, statements may fall into more than one category. For example, a State may discuss the steps it has taken to address climate change, while at the same time focusing on the rights of indigenous people and procedural obligations within this context. Therefore, in an effort to be concise, this report does not repeat every instance where a State has made a statement that is relevant across different themes.
2. In all, 131 out of 192 States raised environmental issues before the UPR Working Group, either through their national reports or through their oral presentations during their review. The references ranged from brief mentions of an environmental law to in-depth discussions of environmental challenges and policies. During the interactive dialogue, the Working Group and/or States raised environmental issues during the review of 74 States, including by requesting information or making recommendations. On ten occasions, the Working Group or States during the Interactive Dialogue raised environmental issues that the State under review had not raised in its National Report or presentation to the Working Group. Representatives of civil society raised environmental issues with respect to the review of 53 States.
3. States raised environmental issues in a wide range of contexts.[[5]](#footnote-5) Many States discussed environmental issues as part of their discussion of economic, social and cultural rights.[[6]](#footnote-6) Other States discussed environmental concerns as part of a discussion of human rights generally.[[7]](#footnote-7) Some States referred to environmental issues in the context of collective rights[[8]](#footnote-8) or third-generation rights.[[9]](#footnote-9) One State, Nigeria, discussed environmental protection in its treatment of civil and political rights.[[10]](#footnote-10)
4. Section III describes how States have connected environmental harm (such as that stemming from mining operations and industrial pollution) to infringements of particular human rights. Section IV examines human rights obligations relating to the environment. These obligations include procedural obligations, substantive obligations, and obligations relating to members of specific groups. This section includes statements by States relating to actions taken to protect human rights from environmental harm. These statements are not always characterizations of requirements of human rights law; sometimes they may reflect a State’s understanding of its own law, or its views of potential good practices. Section V addresses rights and obligations pertaining to climate change in particular.[[11]](#footnote-11) Section VI makes some concluding observations.

# Resolutions of the General Assembly and the Human Rights Council[[12]](#footnote-12)

## Human Rights Threatened by Environmental Harm

1. The General Assembly and the Human Rights Council have described environmental harm as threatening a wide range of human rights. For example, the General Assembly has referred to “the complex character of the global food crisis, in which the right to adequate food is threatened to be violated on a substantial scale, is a combination of several major factors, such as the global financial and economic crisis, environmental degradation, desertification, and the impacts of global climate change, as well as natural disasters.”[[13]](#footnote-13) It has also expressed deep concern at “the number and scale of natural disasters, diseases and pests, as well as the negative impact of climate change, and their increasing impact in recent years, which have resulted in substantial loss of life and livelihood and threatened agricultural production and food security, in particular in developing countries.”[[14]](#footnote-14) Moreover, in a resolution on agricultural development and food security, the General Assembly has recognized the adverse effects of climate change on food security.[[15]](#footnote-15)
2. The Human Rights Council and its predecessor, the Commission on Human Rights, have expressly linked environmental protection with the enjoyment of a range of human rights. The Commission recognised that “environmental damage, including that caused by natural circumstances or disasters, can have potentially negative effects on the enjoyment of some human rights and on a healthy life and a healthy environment.”[[16]](#footnote-16) The Council has noted that “sustainable development and the protection of the environment can contribute to human well-being and the enjoyment of human rights” and “conversely, that environmental damage can have negative implications, both direct and indirect, for the effective enjoyment of human rights.”[[17]](#footnote-17)
3. The Human Rights Council has also recognised that “environmental damage is felt most acutely by those segments of the population already in vulnerable situations.”[[18]](#footnote-18)
4. In particular, the Human Rights Council and the Commission on Human Rights have often described activities related to hazardous and toxic waste as threatening human rights. For example, the Commission on Human Rights affirmed that “the illicit movement and dumping of toxic and dangerous products and wastes constitute a serious threat to the human rights to life and health of individuals, particularly in developing countries that do not have the technologies to process them.”[[19]](#footnote-19) It also identified other human rights affected by the illicit movement and dumping of toxic and dangerous products, including the rights to water, food, adequate housing and work.[[20]](#footnote-20)
5. The Human Rights Council has expanded on the statements of the Commission on Human Rights by stating that the transboundary movement and the dumping of toxic and dangerous products and wastes “may constitute a serious threat to human rights, including the right to life, the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, food, adequate housing and work, access to information, and to safe drinking water and sanitation, public participation and the right to development.”[[21]](#footnote-21)
6. The Human Rights Council has linked environmental degradation with other specific rights, notably the right to food. It has noted that “environmental degradation, desertification and global climate change are exacerbating destitution and desperation, causing a negative impact on the realization of the right to food, in particular in developing countries.”[[22]](#footnote-22) It has expressed its “deep concern” at the number and scale of natural disasters, noting that they have “resulted in massive loss of life and livelihood and threatened agricultural production and food security, in particular in developing countries.”[[23]](#footnote-23) The Council has also linked the the “complex character of the global food crisis” to a combination of several major factors, including “environmental degradation, desertification and global climate change, natural disasters and the lack of development and transfer of relevant technology to address this issue, particularly in developing countries and least developed countries.”[[24]](#footnote-24)

## Obligations on States Related to the Environment

1. The General Assembly and the Human Rights Council (as well as its predecessor, the Commission on Human Rights) have mentioned human rights obligations of States related to the environment.

### Procedural obligations

1. The Commission on Human Rights affirmed that in the context of environmental protection, “everyone has the right, individually and in association with others, to participate in peaceful activities against violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms,” and called upon States “to take all necessary measures to protect the legitimate exercise of everyone’s human rights when promoting environmental protection and sustainable development.”[[25]](#footnote-25) The Commission also encouraged States to take all efforts towards the implementation of the principles of the Rio Declaration, in particular Principle 10, in order to “contribute, inter alia, to effective access to judicial and administrative proceedings, including redress and remedy.”[[26]](#footnote-26)

### Substantive obligations

1. The Human Rights Council has urged “States to take human rights into consideration when developing their environmental policies.” [[27]](#footnote-27)
2. The Human Rights Council has placed the right to development within the context of environmental protection, recognising that “human beings are at the centre of concerns for sustainable development and that the right to development must be fulfilled so as to equitably meet the development and environmental needs of present and future generations.”[[28]](#footnote-28)
3. The Council and the General Assembly have discussed obligations to address environmental impacts from desertification and land degradation on the right to food through “investments and public policies that are specifically appropriate to the risk of drylands and, in this regard, call[ed] for the full implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those countries experiencing serious drought and/or desertification, particularly in Africa.”[[29]](#footnote-29)
4. With respect to the right to food, the General Assembly has stressed “the importance of the preservation of the natural resource base for food security.”[[30]](#footnote-30) Moreover, it has stated that it is “[r]esolved to act to ensure that the human rights perspective is taken into account at the national, regional and international levels in measures to address the global food crisis.”[[31]](#footnote-31) It has urged States to consider joining the Convention on Biological Diversity and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture as a matter of priority.[[32]](#footnote-32)
5. The Commission on Human Rights elaborated on obligations specific to addressing impacts from activities related to hazardous and toxic waste. The Commission urged Governments to take “legislative and other appropriate measures” to prevent the international traffic in toxic and dangerous products” that impact on human rights.[[33]](#footnote-33) Such measures include preventing transfer of toxic and hazardous products and wastes “through fraudulent waste‑recycling programmes;”[[34]](#footnote-34) preventing the transfer of polluting industries, industrial activities and technologies, which generate hazardous wastes, from developed to developing countries;”[[35]](#footnote-35) “ban[ning] the export of toxic and dangerous products, substances, chemicals, pesticides and persistent organic pollutants that are banned or severely restricted in their own countries;”[[36]](#footnote-36) ratifying the Rotterdam Convention;[[37]](#footnote-37) and “strengthen[ing] the role of national environmental protection agencies and non‑governmental organizations, local communities and associations, trade unions, workers and victims, and provid[ing] them with the legal and financial means to take necessary action.”[[38]](#footnote-38)

### Obligations relating to members of groups in vulnerable situations

1. The Commission on Human Rights stressed the importance for States when developing their environmental policies of taking into account the impacts of environmental degradation on “disadvantaged members of society, including individuals and groups of individuals who are victims of or subject to racism.”[[39]](#footnote-39)

### Obligations relating to international cooperation

1. In order to support the call for international cooperation to address global environmental issues, the Human Rights Council has referred to the principles of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, including Principle 7, which states that States should cooperate in a spirit of global partnership to conserve, protect and restore the health and integrity of the Earth’s ecosystem.[[40]](#footnote-40)
2. The Commission on Human Rights urged the international community to take specific measures to protect and promote the human rights to life and health from transboundary toxic waste dumping, including “to give the necessary support to developing countries, upon their request, in their efforts to implement the provisions of existing international and regional instruments governing the transboundary movement and dumping of toxic and dangerous products and wastes.”[[41]](#footnote-41)

### Obligations relating to non-state actors

1. The General Assembly, recognising the importance of private sector agricultural investment in enhancing agriculture development and food security, has called on the private sector to “conduct agricultural practices in accordance with national legislation, taking into account national sovereignty over natural resources, environmental sustainability and the importance of promoting the well-being and improving the livelihood of local communities and indigenous peoples, as appropriate.”[[42]](#footnote-42)

## Climate Change

### Human rights threatened by climate change

1. The Human Rights Council has identified climate change as a threat to the enjoyment of human rights. Specifically, it has expressed concern “that climate change poses an immediate and far-reaching threat to people and communities around the world and has implications for the full enjoyment of human rights.”[[43]](#footnote-43) It has also noted that climate change-related impacts:

have a range of implications, both direct and indirect, for the effective enjoyment of human rights including, inter alia, the right to life, the right to adequate food, the right to the highest attainable standard of health, the right to adequate housing, the right to self-determination and human rights obligations related to access to safe drinking water and sanitation[[44]](#footnote-44)

1. The Council has recognised the particular threat of climate change to certain segments of the population who are in vulnerable situations, “owing to factors such as geography, poverty, gender, age, indigenous or minority status and disability.” [[45]](#footnote-45) In this respect, it has also identified small island States as particularly vulnerable to the effects of climate change.[[46]](#footnote-46)
2. The Human Rights Council has also taken note of the 2009 report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) on the relationship between climate change and human rights.[[47]](#footnote-47) The OHCHR report describes the adverse effects of climate change on specific rights, including: the right to life, which will be threatened by several weather events such as floods, storms, and droughts, as well as by an increase in hunger and malnutrition; the right to food, which will be jeopardized by increased numbers of people facing malnutrition from decreased crop productivity; the right to water, adversely affected for the more than one billion people receiving melt water by the loss of glaciers and reductions in snow cover; the right to the highest attainable standard of health, which will be infringed by not only malnutrition and extreme weather events, but also by malaria and other diseases that thrive in warmer weather; the right to housing, which has already been compromised by the forced relocation of communities in the Arctic and low-lying island States; and the right of self-determination, which is threatened by the possible inundation and disappearance of small island States.[[48]](#footnote-48)
3. The General Assembly has also in various resolutions linked the adverse affects of climate change to different types of human impacts, particularly in developing countries.[[49]](#footnote-49) For example, it has identified that persistent drought and extreme weather events, sea-level rise, coastal erosion and ocean acidification threaten food security and efforts to eradicate poverty and achieve sustainable development.[[50]](#footnote-50)

### Obligations relating to climate change

1. With respect to climate change, the Human Rights Council has affirmed “that human rights obligations, standards and principles have the potential to inform and strengthen international and national policymaking in the area of climate change, promoting policy coherence, legitimacy and sustainable outcomes.”[[51]](#footnote-51) The Council has also specified that “in no case may a people be deprived of its own means of subsistence” as a result of climate change impacts.[[52]](#footnote-52) Moreover, the Council has made reference to the objectives of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and emphasized “that parties should, in all climate change-related actions,fully respect human rights as enunciated in the outcome of the sixteenth session of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention.”[[53]](#footnote-53)
2. The Council has recognised the need for international cooperation to address the global nature of climate change. It has stated in this regard that:

climate change is a global problem requiring a global solution, and that effective international cooperation to enable the full, effective and sustained implementation of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in accordance with the provisions and principles of the Convention is important in order to support national efforts for the realization of human rights implicated by climate change-related impacts.[[54]](#footnote-54)

1. At the same time, it has also acknowledged the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, stating that “the global nature of climate change calls for the widest possible cooperation by all countries and their participation in an effective and appropriate international response, in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities and their social and economic conditions.”[[55]](#footnote-55)
2. The 2009 OHCHR Report on climate change and human rights also identifies human rights obligations relevant to addressing the impacts from climate change at the national and international level.[[56]](#footnote-56) According to the Report, whether a human rights violation exists at the national level “would rest on whether the State through its acts or omissions had failed to protect an individual against a harm affecting the enjoyment of human rights.”[[57]](#footnote-57) In this respect, the Report identifies that at the national level “States may have an obligation to protect individuals against foreseeable threats to human rights related to climate change, such as an increased risk of flooding in certain areas.”[[58]](#footnote-58) Moreover, the OHCHR report identifies awareness raising, access to information, and public participation as critical in efforts to address climate change at the national level.[[59]](#footnote-59) The Report also provides that human rights standards and principles should inform and strengthen national-level policymaking in the area of climate change, promoting policy coherence and sustainable outcomes.[[60]](#footnote-60) At the international level, the Report refers to the duty of international cooperation to address climate change, noting that global warming can only be dealt with through cooperation by all members of the international community.[[61]](#footnote-61)
3. The General Assembly has called for urgent international, regional and national efforts to address the impacts of climate change on food security, specifically to “increase the ability of the agricultural sector to predict, prevent and address the impacts of climate change and extreme weather events, especially floods and droughts, on agricultural production and food systems, as well as to enhance the ability of that sector to regain livelihoods and food production.”[[62]](#footnote-62)
4. The General Assembly has also recognised the importance of public participation in addressing the impacts from climate change, recognising:

the need to engage a broad range of stakeholders at the global, regional, national and local levels, including national, subnational and local governments, private businesses and civil society, and including youth and persons with disabilities, and that gender equality and the effective participation of women and indigenous peoples are important for effective action on all aspects of climate change.[[63]](#footnote-63)

# The Universal Periodic Review: Human Rights Threatened by Environmental Harm

1. In the first cycle of the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process, States discussed a spectrum of human rights that may be infringed or threatened by various human activities or natural disasters impacting on the environment. These rights include the right to a healthy environment, the right to life, the right to housing, the right to water, the right to health, the right to food, the right to an adequate standard of living, and cultural rights.

## Right to a Healthy Environment

1. A total of 45 States discussed their constitutional right to a healthy environment during the UPR review.[[64]](#footnote-64) Spain referred to a right to a healthy environment as an emerging right,[[65]](#footnote-65) while the Maldives referred to it as a new right.[[66]](#footnote-66) Only two States explicitly discussed impacts from environmental harm other than harm caused by climate change on the enjoyment of a right to a healthy environment enshrined within their respective Constitutions. Mongolia stated that an “ecological imbalance resulting from climate change, desertification, water resource shortage, improper use of chemicals, hazardous waste, water and soil erosion etc., entails great danger to citizens’ right to healthy and safe environment.”[[67]](#footnote-67) Peru connected the impacts of mining on the right to a clean and healthy environment of those living in the vicinity of the mining operations.[[68]](#footnote-68) It stated that “[i]n recent years, mining has increased in many parts of the country – often the most depressed areas. In some cases the people living in the vicinity not only fail to notice any benefit but may even feel that the operations may somehow affect their rights, including their right to clean and healthy environment.”[[69]](#footnote-69) As discussed in Section V, Mongolia, Indonesia, and the Solomon Islands discussed impacts from climate change on the enjoyment of a right to a healthy environment.

## Right to Life

1. Greece referred to an infringement of the right to life from environmental impacts generally caused by “cases of natural and man-made disasters.”[[70]](#footnote-70)

## Right to Health

1. In their discussions, 14 countries referred to impacts on human health from environmental harm, although not all explicitly referred to an infringement on the right to health. For example, Ivory Coast referred to toxic waste dumping as creating a serious risk of epidemics and endangering public health.[[71]](#footnote-71) States discussed health impacts from nuclear waste,[[72]](#footnote-72) pesticides,[[73]](#footnote-73) toxic waste dumping,[[74]](#footnote-74) mining operations,[[75]](#footnote-75) natural disasters,[[76]](#footnote-76) armed conflict,[[77]](#footnote-77) oil exploration,[[78]](#footnote-78) and acid rain from volcanic explosions.[[79]](#footnote-79) For example, Mongolia referred to the impact of artisanal gold mining. It stated that “individuals play roles in degrading environment using unauthorized chemicals at gold mines. As a result, families engaged in artisan mines tend to have brain paralyzed, mentally-ill or naturally disabled babies, which may severely affect the genetic sources of the Mongolians.”[[80]](#footnote-80) Kuwait recounted the effects of the 1990 Iraqi invasion, which it explained resulted in over 730 oil wells being set alight and the seepage of millions of barrels of oil into the land and the sea, including forming over 320 oil lakes on land.[[81]](#footnote-81)

## Right to Housing

1. A few States referred to impacts on housing, although not specifically describing them as violations of the right to housing. For example, Cuba discussed the impacts of natural disasters on the housing sector.[[82]](#footnote-82) It estimated that recent hurricanes damaged more than 444,000 dwellings, destroying completely 63,240 of them.[[83]](#footnote-83) Germany asked Ghana to discuss forced evictions as an impact of large-scale mining.[[84]](#footnote-84)

## Rights to Food, Water and an Adequate Standard of Living

1. Some countries described the effect of environmental harm on food production or food security. For example, Guinea referred to the negative impact of mining on arable land.[[85]](#footnote-85) Greece referred to an infringement of the right to food from natural or man-made disasters.[[86]](#footnote-86) Somalia discussed drought as causing food scarcity.[[87]](#footnote-87)
2. Some countries referred to impacts on water resources or safe drinking water. For example, Bolivia noted that phosphate mining on Nauru led to the contamination of water.[[88]](#footnote-88) Brazil noted that communities in Ghana living in the vicinity of mining projects face major problems with access to safe drinking water,[[89]](#footnote-89) while Germany asked specifically about the impacts of mining in Ghana on access to safe drinking water.[[90]](#footnote-90)
3. In one instance, a State referred to the right to an adequate standard of living. Israel requested Italy to assess the pollution emissions from a coal-powered plant in order to ensure an adequate standard of living.[[91]](#footnote-91)

## Cultural Rights

1. Bolivia referred to impacts on the culture and the lifestyle of Nauru’s inhabitants when discussing impacts from phosphorus mining in Nauru.[[92]](#footnote-92)

## Human Rights Generally

1. Some countries referred to violations of human rights without specifying any particular right. For example, Bangladesh noted that Dominica faced serious environmental vulnerabilities that impeded the efforts of the country in realizing the human rights of its people.[[93]](#footnote-93) As another example, Turkey referred to the effects of mining and oil production on the enjoyment of some socioeconomic rights of communities.[[94]](#footnote-94) Madagascar referred to the plundering of biological treasures essential to the realisation of economic, social and cultural rights.[[95]](#footnote-95)

# The Universal Periodic Review: Obligations on States Relating to the Environment

1. This section discusses statements by States relating to actions taken to respect, promote, protect and fulfil human rights as they relate to environmental protection. These statements are not always characterizations of *requirements* of human rights law; sometimes they may reflect how a State understands its own law, or its views of potential good practices. For example, some countries discussed concrete steps taken to ensure procedural duties related to environmental protection, including the enactment of legislation, strategies and policies, as well as the creation of institutions to comply with procedural obligations.

## Procedural Obligations

1. Procedural duties were raised during the review of 23 countries in an environmental context, and States provided recommendations regarding procedural obligations to five of those countries. In many cases, States provided examples of good practices related to procedural rights and the environment. Although these were not necessarily presented as legal obligations *per se*, they provide examples of States’ placing high priority on engaging with civil society. As noted below, many of these examples deal with the protection of groups who are vulnerable to environmental harm, such as indigenous peoples, women and youth.
2. Some countries also discussed their obligations under the Aarhus Convention, which provides a regional example of a convention that addresses the three main categories of procedural duties discussed below. These States most often explained that they have taken concrete steps to comply with the Convention in national law. These countries include Estonia, Iceland, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Latvia. Iceland also noted that the Aarhus Convention links human rights and environmental rights. [[96]](#footnote-96)
3. The following are the main procedural duties raised during the review associated with procedural rights and environmental protection, with country-specific examples provided under each category.

### Obligations to provide information about the environment

1. Iceland explained that public authorities and private entities carrying out any public service are required by law to provide environmental information to the public.[[97]](#footnote-97) Israel described its law on freedom of information, which imposes a duty on any public authority to make information it holds concerning environmental issues available to the public through the authority's internet website and via alternative methods to be determined by the Minister.[[98]](#footnote-98)
2. Kazakhstan stated that its Constitution enshrines the right of everyone to a healthy environment and to reliable information on the state of the environment.[[99]](#footnote-99) Kazakhstan explained that the Ministry of the Environment joined with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Centre in Astana and Ecoforum to open the Aarhus Centre in Atyrau. The Centre provides the public with full, reliable information, over the Internet and by other means, on the state of the environment and on planned and current activities that could have a significant impact on the environment.[[100]](#footnote-100)
3. Panama established the Environmental Volunteers Programme, which provides information, encourages participation, cares for, protects, restores and conserves the environment and raises public awareness through cultural and work-related activities and the use of environmental technologies. [[101]](#footnote-101)
4. One country, Iceland, described procedural obligations for non-state actors: as mentioned, Iceland explained that private entities carrying out any public service are required by law to provide environmental information to the public. [[102]](#footnote-102)
5. Malaysia recommended to Mongolia that one way to step up efforts to improve and conserve the environment is through strengthening the relevant laws and providing the public with the necessary information, education and awareness regarding the impacts of environmental pollution and degradation. [[103]](#footnote-103)

### Obligations to facilitate public participation in environmental decision-making

1. Some countries emphasised that civil society plays an important role with respect to environmental protection, including through participation and advocacy. For example, Bangladesh noted that citizens’ movements, including public interest litigation, play a critical role in consistently holding the government accountable for their actions/inactions and resisting infringements of citizen’s fundamental rights. Bangladesh also referred to its efforts to introduce community-managed programmes to enhance people’s participation in protecting natural resources.[[104]](#footnote-104)
2. Guyana discussed its creation of National Stakeholders’ Forums comprising organisations representing the parliamentary political parties, religious bodies, labour movement, business community, women’s groups, Amerindian organizations, the Guyana Human Rights Association and some citizen non-governmental organizations (NGOs). These stakeholders when convened represent approximately 400,000 citizens. According to Guyana, this form of “conversation” is an innovative attempt to create an opportunity for more broad-based dialogue on matters of national importance and to find a common path for action.[[105]](#footnote-105) This model was used in the development of the draft 2009 Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS), Guyana’s climate change program and its model for sustainable development. All the 134 Amerindian communities were involved and consulted at the community level and at a National Toushaos Conference. Consultations were also held with the private sector.[[106]](#footnote-106)
3. Panama created forums on environmental sustainability at which, in conjunction with the National Environmental Authority, environmental problems and their possible solutions can be discussed.[[107]](#footnote-107)
4. Two countries discussed participation during the environmental review process. Kazakhstan explained that transparency in State environmental impact assessments and public access to decision-making are provided through public hearings as the environmental impact of proposed economic and other activities is assessed at the preplanning, planning, feasibility study and design stages.[[108]](#footnote-108) Estonia stressed that the right to participate in environmental decision-making is taken into consideration when organising activities under its planning and environmental impact legislation.[[109]](#footnote-109)
5. Iceland also explained that the right to participate in decision making on environmental matters is safeguarded in several acts of law.[[110]](#footnote-110)

### Obligations to provide access to legal remedies

1. With respect to access to justice, Mexico described that its 1988 General Act on Ecological Balance and Environmental Protection establishes a procedure for filing citizens’ complaints regarding the right to a healthy environment with the Federal Office of Environmental Protection. From 2001 to 2007, 48,988 complaints were received, of which 32,160 were examined and 15,220 were settled.[[111]](#footnote-111)
2. Some countries described procedural obligations specific to the environment that are enshrined in their Constitutions.
3. For example, Ecuador described its constitutional provision that ensures the right of every community to participate and to be informed, as well as to express opinions on the implementation of State decisions that may affect the environment (enshrined constitutional obligation).[[112]](#footnote-112) Kazakhstan discussed that its constitution enshrines the right of compensation for damage caused to a person’s health or property by an environmental offence.[[113]](#footnote-113) Kyrgyzstan similarly referred to its constitutional right to compensation for damages caused to health or property through activities involving the use of natural resources.[[114]](#footnote-114)
4. Others States discussed good practices. For example, Kazakhstan’s Aarhus Centre in Atyrau gives members of the public an opportunity to appeal against decisions violating public rights under the provisions of the Aarhus Convention, especially in the territory of the Ural-Caspian Basin.[[115]](#footnote-115)
5. A few countries discussed efforts to strengthen the judiciary and/or create specialised environmental courts. For example, Panama explained that judges, prosecutors, magistrates, officials from the Judicial Investigation Department and legal advisers from the Inter-Agency Environmental System have received training in identifying contraventions and offences in the field of the environment. In addition, there is a draft bill to create environmental criminal courts.[[116]](#footnote-116) As discussed above, Mexico established a procedure for filing citizens’ complaints regarding the right to a healthy environment with the Federal Office of Environmental Protection.[[117]](#footnote-117) Bolivia also referred to the creation of environmental courts.[[118]](#footnote-118)

## Substantive Obligations

1. States most often referred to steps that they have taken to improve environmental protection domestically and globally, including through the enactment of environmental laws, policies, and strategies, the creation of environmental institutions, the ratification or membership of multilateral environmental agreements, and other actions to promote environmental protection or address environmental harm. Such statements were not limited to States that have enshrined a right to healthy environment. Again, these statements were not always intended to characterize international human rights obligations, but still may shed light on States’ understanding of those requirements, given the context (a review of their records in implementing their human rights obligations) as well as of good practices in the implementation of those requirements.

### Obligation to create a legal and institutional framework to protect rights from environmental harm

1. Steps taken to enact legislation, policies and strategies were discussed before 35 States under review.[[119]](#footnote-119) During the review, 17 States discussed the creation of institutions to address environmental protection.[[120]](#footnote-120)
2. Eight States expressly linked the creation of institutions to a right to a healthy environment. For example, Togo explained that in light of its constitutionally enshrined right to a healthy environment, it has created a ministry responsible for the environment and it has adopted several national laws relevant to environmental protection.[[121]](#footnote-121) Mongolia explained that to ensure that its environmental rights are promoted, it “constantly enriched its national law.”[[122]](#footnote-122) Ecuador and the Seychelles referred to their constitutional right to an environment as creating responsibility on society as well as the State.[[123]](#footnote-123)
3. Thirteen States that did not refer to a right to healthy environment still discussed implementation of environmental protection laws and policies.[[124]](#footnote-124)
4. Sudan and Zambia referred to the right to life as being supported by legal and institutional mechanisms relating to environmental protection.[[125]](#footnote-125)

### Duty to cooperate with other States to address environmental problems

1. Thirteen States discussed their membership in multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs).[[126]](#footnote-126) Six of those States discussed membership in MEAs under a section in their reports on a right to healthy environment.[[127]](#footnote-127) Togo, Ecuador, Ivory Coast and Mongolia each characterised membership in multilateral environmental agreements as a specific step to realise its constitutional right to an environment.[[128]](#footnote-128) For example, Ivory Coast explained that “[i]n accordance with this constitutional provision, [Ivory Coast] is a party to numerous international legal instruments on environmental protection.”[[129]](#footnote-129) Other States, such as Benin and Nicaragua, discussed membership in MEAs under sections in their reports discussing international human rights commitments.[[130]](#footnote-130) Kenya discussed membership in MEAs under a section on national priorities,[[131]](#footnote-131) and Kuwait discussed it under a section entitled “environment.”[[132]](#footnote-132)

### Duty to integrate environmental protection in policies and laws

1. Many states described how they incorporated environmental concerns in their policies in other areas, such as health, education, housing, water and food.
2. Congo explained that as part of the right to enjoy the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, its Constitution requires that the “State shall take the necessary steps to ensure ... the improvement of the quality of life and of the natural environment.”[[133]](#footnote-133) Oman also stated that tight control of industrial pollutions is a measure to be implemented as part of the right to health.[[134]](#footnote-134) Some other States linked health policy or strategies with environmental protection. For example, Angola stated that promoting and maintaining a healthy environment is one of four strategic aims under its national health policy.[[135]](#footnote-135)
3. Many States discussed incorporating the environment into education curriculums. For example, Bangladesh explained that the “inclusion of environment education in the primary and secondary school curriculum contributes to raising awareness on environmental issues and preservation of bio-diversity amongst the young population.”[[136]](#footnote-136) Kuwait described that it has incorporated environmental subjects into its educational programmes.[[137]](#footnote-137)
4. Some states linked environmental concerns with housing projects or urban housing development. For example, Singapore referred to their housing programme as building environmentally friendly housing[[138]](#footnote-138) and Spain explained that its housing policies include efforts to promote access to more environmentally friendly urban environment.[[139]](#footnote-139) China asked Chile how the Government was addressing urban environmental protection under its State housing schemes.[[140]](#footnote-140) Jordan linked the environment expressly to a right to adequate housing, when it explained that efforts were made to improve environmental conditions in informal settlements as a means to guarantee the realisation of the right to housing.[[141]](#footnote-141)
5. A few countries referred to the need to manage water resources sustainably, without necessarily linking the discussion to a right to water. For example, Honduras explained that its Ministry of the Environment has prepared a water policy to provide guidelines for the recovery, protection, and appropriate management of water resources.[[142]](#footnote-142) Paraguay discussed its water act, which regulates the sustainable and comprehensive management of all water resources to ensure that they are managed in an environmentally sustainable manner.[[143]](#footnote-143)
6. Mongolia included the right to food as a component of the right to a healthy and safe environment.[[144]](#footnote-144) Brazil discussed environmental sustainability as an aim of its National Programme for Agrarian Reform.[[145]](#footnote-145)

## Obligations Relating to Members of Groups in Vulnerable Situations

1. Some States described environmental policies and issues in the context of particular groups vulnerable to human rights violations, including women, members of indigenous groups and the poor.

### Women

1. Zambia discussed its efforts to guarantee procedural rights of women in the context of environmental protection. It explained that the Government is carrying out environmental impact assessment of proposed and existing industries and their effect on the needs of women and children, facilitating and disseminating of information in rural area to enlighten women on environmental issues, promoting women’s knowledge on utilization and reservation of traditional medicinal and nutritional plants and facilitating involvement of women in decision making at all levels in institutions dealing with the environment and natural resources.[[146]](#footnote-146)
2. Although not describing specific obligations related to women and the environment, several States included environmental priority areas in their gender policies. For example, Ecuador listed the enjoyment of environmental rights as a priority area under its Equal Opportunities Plan,[[147]](#footnote-147) while El Salvador explained that the National Policy on Women covers the environment and sustainability as an area of activity.[[148]](#footnote-148)

### Indigenous Peoples

1. Many States discussed environmental protections related to indigenous peoples, although not necessarily specifying legal obligations.[[149]](#footnote-149)
2. With respect to indigenous peoples, as mentioned above, Guyana has a system of Councils that represent all 134 Amerindian Tribes. All 134 Tribes were consulted in the development of the climate change policy, and Guyana’s delegation to the World Summit on Climate Change in Copenhagen included the Chairman of the of the Council. [[150]](#footnote-150)
3. There were some recommendations made specifically with respect to indigenous peoples. Bolivia recommended that the United States implement concrete measures, consistent with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to ensure the participation of indigenous peoples in the decisions affecting their natural environment, measures of subsistence, culture and spiritual practices.[[151]](#footnote-151) Thailand recommended that Papua New Guinea provide adequate judicial review and compensation for cases of government projects that have negative environmental impacts on the land and resources of traditional landowners to ensure that their rights to property and right to environment are duly respected. Engagement with local communities in the decision-making process of any government project should also be promoted. [[152]](#footnote-152) Norway recommended that Panama conduct prior consultations with indigenous communities, as required by international standards, in relation to all plans and project that might affect the environment, and particularly with respect to hydroelectric dams, mining projects, and efforts to reduce emissions from deforestation.[[153]](#footnote-153) Hungary also recommended that Mongolia mandate its Constitutional Court to act upon violations of the individual rights and freedoms guaranteed under the Constitution in order to help remedy violations of the land and environmental rights of indigenous and herder peoples.[[154]](#footnote-154)
4. A few States explained that their programmes or policies on the development or protection of indigenous peoples included a focus on environmental protection.[[155]](#footnote-155) Gabon explained that 13 per cent of the national territory should be designated to create national parks, which would protect the environment and forest inhabitants, in particular Pygmies.[[156]](#footnote-156)
5. Norway referred to legislation that ensured that land and natural resources in Finmark County are managed in a balanced and ecologically sustainable manner in order to, among other purposes, preserve Sami culture.[[157]](#footnote-157)
6. Peru outlined the need for special protection systems for indigenous peoples to enjoy their right to a healthy environment, particularly in areas where these groups are affected by mining in the area.[[158]](#footnote-158) To carry out this protection system, the State has enacted a policy on environmental management that contains a number of commitments for improving the quality of life of Peru’s most vulnerable communities and peoples.[[159]](#footnote-159)

### Those suffering from poverty

1. Two States linked the environment to poverty reduction strategies. Honduras discussed the implementation of a programme to reduce poverty through improved environmental management by States and civil society, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines explained that it views natural resource management as a critical component of poverty reductions strategies.

### Others

1. Bangladesh explained that it has integrated its human rights programme with its natural disaster management programme, including through “support to children, adolescents, the elderly, people with disabilities and other vulnerable groups in sustaining the impact of natural catastrophes.”[[160]](#footnote-160)

# References to Climate Change in the Universal Periodic Review

1. Issues related to climate change were discussed with respect to 46 States under review. Several specific issues were discussed, including the threat or impact of climate change to the enjoyment of human rights, various steps countries have taken to mitigate or adapt to climate change, efforts focusing on vulnerable groups, and the role of the international community to address climate change. States often described climate change as affecting interests protected by human rights, such as food security, health and livelihoods, although most States did not specify particular human rights obligations relating to these effects. The ensuing discussion summaries the major themes from climate change discussions before the UPR.

## Human Rights Threatened by Climate Change

1. The threat or impact of climate change on human rights was raised in the discussion of 30 States under review, either by the State itself, the Interactive Dialogue, or both. As mentioned, not all impacts on climate change were referred to as violating specific rights, but instead areas of harm that are clearly linked to specific rights, such as food production, increase in incidents of disease or displacement of people.
2. Some countries referred to a general impact or threat from climate change on human rights, without specifying specific rights impacted.[[161]](#footnote-161)
3. A few States noted the impacts on climate change on a right to a healthy environment.[[162]](#footnote-162)
4. Many countries referred to a violation of the right to life[[163]](#footnote-163) or the destruction of lives.[[164]](#footnote-164)
5. Many States discussed impacts on the right to food,[[165]](#footnote-165) food production,[[166]](#footnote-166) food pricing[[167]](#footnote-167) or food security.[[168]](#footnote-168) For example, Nauru linked the decline of its fishery resources with the effects of climate change, impacting heavily on peoples’ access to food.[[169]](#footnote-169) States also mentioned impacts on the right to water[[170]](#footnote-170) and water resource security.[[171]](#footnote-171)
6. Countries also referred to impacts on the right to health[[172]](#footnote-172) and to increases in disease as a result of climate change impacts.[[173]](#footnote-173)
7. Some States raised impacts of climate change on the right to housing[[174]](#footnote-174) or damage to homes[[175]](#footnote-175) and to the right to property.[[176]](#footnote-176)
8. Several small island States referred to the violation of their cultural rights as a result of the total displacement of their populations.[[177]](#footnote-177)
9. Many island States also referred to their rights to self-determination[[178]](#footnote-178) being violated with the existence of their statehood at issue. Other States referred to impacts on the right to development.[[179]](#footnote-179)
10. Other rights mentioned include the right to livelihood security,[[180]](#footnote-180) quality standard of living,[[181]](#footnote-181) freedom of movement,[[182]](#footnote-182) and freedom from poverty.[[183]](#footnote-183)
11. A few States referred specifically to the impacts on vulnerable groups. For example, the Marshall Islands noted that the impacts of climate change more often than not target the most vulnerable groups, such as women and children.[[184]](#footnote-184)

## Obligations Relating to Climate Change

### Procedural obligations

1. A few States discussed or provided recommendations concerning procedural duties specific to climate change. For example, the Solomon Islands explained that one of the guiding principles of its climate change policy is to ensure stakeholder participation and collaboration.[[185]](#footnote-185)
2. Some States made specific recommendations regarding procedural obligations and climate change. Malaysia recommended to Papua New Guinea to step up efforts to improve and conserve the environment, including by strengthening the relevant laws and providing the public with the necessary information, education and awareness regarding the impacts of climate change and environmental pollution and degradation. [[186]](#footnote-186) Switzerland also recommended that Tuvalu involve the population more in its decision-making process in mitigating and adapting to the consequences of climate change.[[187]](#footnote-187)
3. A few countries emphasised the need to focus on the effects of climate change on vulnerable groups. Iceland represented that it will continue to emphasise the importance of the gender perspective of climate change, especially the principle of equal participation, and that women are important stakeholders.[[188]](#footnote-188) Finland recommended that the Maldives take all measures for the purpose of post-disaster reconstruction and adaptation to climate change, with a human-rights-based approach, and carry out consultations with the concerned local communities, giving special attention to women, children and persons with disabilities in this process.[[189]](#footnote-189) As discussed above, Guyana also has a comprehensive system to consult with Amerindian communities in developing climate change policy.[[190]](#footnote-190)

### Substantive obligations

1. A few States expressly referred to actions related to climate change as substantive human rights obligations. For example, the Maldives made several recommendations to States under review in order to remind developed countries and other major emitting States of their obligations to help protect human rights by reducing greenhouse gas emissions to safe levels.[[191]](#footnote-191) Some States generally recommended taking a human rights approach to combat climate change. For instance, Finland recommended that the Maldives take all measures for the purpose of post-disaster reconstruction and adaptation to climate change, with a human rights-based approach,[[192]](#footnote-192) while Greece explained that it is strongly engaged in combating climate change effects, through, *inter alia*, a human rights perspective.[[193]](#footnote-193)
2. The following discussion reviews statements related to adaptation and mitigation, and statements related to international cooperation, within the context of climate change.

#### Statements related to adaption and mitigation

1. During the review of 29 States, either the State under review or States during the interactive dialogue discussed the steps being taken by the State under review to mitigate and/or adapt to climate change, requested information on such steps, recommended that a State take such steps, and/or recognised a State’s efforts in this respect. In most cases, these statements were not explicitly linked to a human rights law obligation.
2. Many States discussed mitigation efforts to reduce their emissions levels. For example, Costa Rica discussed its efforts to become a carbon-neutral country by 2021.[[194]](#footnote-194) Similarly, Guyana referred to its positive strides towards mitigating the effects of climate change, including through its policy on avoiding deforestation and its Low Carbon Development Strategy model.[[195]](#footnote-195)
3. Several States also discussed efforts to adapt to climate change. For example, Samoa described several programs and initiatives to ensure resilience and preparedness against the impacts of climate change, including the development of a national strategy on climate change.[[196]](#footnote-196)
4. Some States recommended the need to undertake adaptation measures to address climate change. For instance, the Islamic Republic of Iran recommended that Mongolia take “appropriate measures, including the adoption of a national plan of action to tackle challenges resulting from global warming or climate change.”[[197]](#footnote-197) A few States specifically recommended taking a rights-based approach to adaptation to climate change, although without elaborating on what such an approach would require.[[198]](#footnote-198)
5. Some States requested information from the State under review concerning steps being taken to mitigate or adapt to climate change.[[199]](#footnote-199)
6. Finally, some States recognised efforts by the State under review to mitigate or adapt to climate change.[[200]](#footnote-200)

#### Statements relevant to global responsibility, including common but differentiated responsibility, international cooperation and assistance

1. A few States discussed the role of developed countries or major emitting States in contributing to global warming, and in some instances their need or obligation to reduce emissions. For example, as mentioned above, the Maldives discussed the need to remind developed countries and other major emitting States of their obligations to help protect human rights by reducing greenhouse gas emissions to safe levels.[[201]](#footnote-201)
2. Many States raised the need for international cooperation to address the impacts of climate change. In particular, many States referred to international support or assistance to address climate change impacts.[[202]](#footnote-202) For example, the Maldives stated that the issue of climate change can only be addressed by the whole international community.[[203]](#footnote-203) Micronesia stated that absent a coordinated approach to tackle climate change, the infringement of human rights will continue.[[204]](#footnote-204)
3. States also referred for the need to coordinate or cooperate with international organisations,[[205]](#footnote-205) or asked questions regarding the best manner in which the Human Rights Council or other bodies could address climate change.[[206]](#footnote-206)

# Conclusions

1. During the UPR process, 131 States, or about two-thirds of the total membership of the United Nations, raised environmental issues, either through their own Report or in the interactive dialogue with other States. Representatives of civil society also raised environmental concerns, although less often than the States.
2. Climate change was discussed during the review of 46 States. To a large degree, the discussion of climate change was led by the Maldives and other small island States, which are among the States most gravely threatened by its effects. Other States that regularly raised environmental concerns include Bangladesh, Bolivia, Costa Rica and Ecuador.
3. Many States discussed environmental issues without expressly linking them to human rights. Nevertheless, the connection with human rights is often implicit, not least because the issues are being raised in the context of a review of the States’ human rights records.
4. The General Assembly, the Human Rights Council and the Commission on Human Rights have also identified environmental harms that interfere with the enjoyment of a wide range of human rights, including from the transportation and disposal of hazardous and other waste and from climate change, and have urged States to take steps to address these harms.
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