

25.05.2020

David Boyd

UN Special Rapporteur on human rights and the environment

srenvironment@ohchr.org

**Contributions for the consultation on human rights and the environment**

Rainforest Foundation Norway appreciates the work by the special rapporteur on the important issue of human rights and environment and the opportunity to contribute to the consultation. RFN has for the past 30 years worked with CSOs and IPs organizations to protect the remaining irreplaceable tropical rainforests and support indigenous and other forest dependent communities to secure their rights to land and livelihood. Our approach builds on the understanding that the peoples who over generations have developed their cultures and societies in interaction with the highly complex yet vulnerable rainforest ecosystems, are best placed to protect the forests. We see however, that when conflicts arise over how forests should be used, managed and protected, the human rights of forest dependent communities are often not respected. Furthermore, it is these remaining forests that harbor most of the world's today and, have profound impacts on the worlds water cycle and climate regulation making them essential for the fulfillment of basic human rights of people worldwide.

We work with partner organizations in seven major rainforest countries, and several have been participating in the consultations. As a northern NGO in a global partnership, we see how the unsustainable exploitation of tropical forests is strongly linked to consumption, and to business and trade interests in our part of the word – a few export oriented commodities, such as palm oil, soya and beef, are the main driver of tropical deforestation. This underlines the shared responsibility by southern and northern governments to address both the human rights violations resulting from degradation of ecosystems, and the protection of key territories with a rights-based approach.

1. Please provide examples of ways in which declining biodiversity and degraded ecosystems are already having adverse impacts on human rights. Adversely affected rights could include, among others, the rights to life, health, water, food, culture, non-discrimination, a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, and Indigenous rights.

Deforestation, biodiversity loss and degradation of ecosystems diminish the carrying capacity of indigenous people’s territories as they are turned into small islands of forest in degraded landscapes. This adds stress to livelihoods, undermines cultures and seriously threatens the survival of the very vulnerable indigenous peoples in voluntary isolation. We see this in our work as our partners in the Amazon report more frequent sightings and encounters with neighbor IP tribes in voluntary isolation, and an increase in hostility that has in some cases resulted in limitations to their monitoring routines –as is the case with the Mascho-Piro tribe in Peru.

For people depending on forest ecosystems, food becomes less available and variable, and fresh water decrease in quantity and quality. We see examples of indigenous people (IPs) forced to change their customs and practices as healing plants and medicine become scarce. These factors threaten the health, well-being, food and water security, and cultural practices of forest dependent peoples, and have adverse impacts on their human rights.

Some examples:

The difficult situation many Amazon communities are facing today due to their rivers being polluted as a result of industrial work and development, both legal and illegal, such as gold mining. The *Organización Nacional de los Pueblos Indígenas de la Amazonia Colombiana* (OPIAC), our **Colombian** partner, has declared a state of emergency after several studies found that mercury concentration in both fish and people living along the Caquetá, Apaporis, Cotuhe, Amazonas, Putumayo, Guaviare and Vaupes Rivers exceed the concentration threshold set by the WHO. Studies have also found high concentrations of mercury in 2-year-old children and younger, contaminated through their mother’s milk.

Similarly, IPs Rivers and territories in **Brazil** have also been heavily polluted with mercury and agrochemicals deriving from agricultural activities. Such is the case for Yanomami and Kayapo people who feel threatened to extinction.

In addition, miners generally bring infections and other harmful practices that pose great danger to these communities. Historically, viruses and diseases have killed hundreds of IPs and exterminated many American cultures. As deforestation increases and agricultural and urban frontiers expand, loggers, miners and drug traffickers, among others, have easier access. This allows them to get closer and closer to IPs living in voluntary isolation. Their physical and cultural integrity, together with their future are put in danger. Human rights such as their right to decide on their way of life, the right for self-determination, the right for their cultures and traditions, as well as the rights to life, health, safe and clean water and environment are under serious threat.

This is the case for many communities in the Gran Chaco and in the Amazonian basin, including those in the Brazilian Javari Reserve recently threatened by missionaries determined to contact them during the current COVID-19 pandemic. This is directly tied to Bolsonaro’s policies, which have cut back on enforcing environmental laws, as well as fighting illegal mining, logging and ranching, hence allowing land grabbers, illegal actors associated with deforestation and religious groups to strengthen and increase their space of action in these areas. As a result, we see a significant increase in deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon today and a rapid expansion of the COVID-19 pandemic dramatically affecting IPs.

Indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs) in **Indonesia**, **Papua New Guinea** and the **Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)** have also been greatly affected by biodiversity loss, deforestation and ecosystem degradation resulting from the recent massive expansion of oil palm plantations and logging that have been incentivized by current policies. IPLCs suffer the most when forests are replaced by extensive monocultures, and the examples we see clearly illustrate the interdependence between the realization of human rights, sustainable development, rainforest and biodiversity protection.

Many studies have identified a remarkable overlap between the worlds remaining areas of high biodiversity and IPs lands. Documentation shows that at least 36% of the remaining intact forest landscapes (IFL) are within IPs territories, and that –although still vulnerable to many threats- there is evidence that suggests IFL loss is considerably lower within these territories[[1]](#footnote-2). In other words, the forest and biodiversity in rainforest areas where IPs are in control of their traditional territories are protected in a much larger degree than in surrounding areas, which are often highly devastated[[2]](#footnote-3). For IPs, the fulfillment of their human rights is closely connected to the fulfillment of the right to their lands.

Among many examples shared with us by our partners in rainforest countries are the stories of the Iban Dayak in West Kalimantan, and the Orang Rimba in Jambi. Their traditional lands have been converted from rainforests extremely rich in biodiversity, to huge plantations where they have no legal rights to live. They are forced to change their lives completely. For the Orang Rimba, this means they are no longer free to move around as they are used to, or forage, gather and plant to satisfy their needs. They are forced into a situation of limited access to water, hunger, and into scavenging palm nuts they can sell to be able to afford rice or noodles. This deprives them from their right to health, and other essential rights, and in some cases their rights to live.

This situation is also valid for IPs and other forest dependent people in DRC, where there is a lack of prior identification and securing of their customary rights. Even when the required free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) processes are undertaken, they usually end up losing their lands to more powerful third parties that use FPIC processes as convincing mechanisms where *unequal* IPLCs are pressured to accept the proposed terms. Industrial activities are seen as development and therefore favored over IPLCs needs and customs, leading to violations of their rights to forests.

2. To protect a wide range of human rights, what are the specific obligations of States and responsibilities of businesses in terms of addressing the main direct drivers of harm to biodiversity and ecosystems (e.g. land conversion, loss and degradation of habitat, climate change, overexploitation, pollution, invasive species) and the indirect drivers (unsustainable production and consumption, rapid human population growth, trade, conflict and inequality)?

Many basic human rights depend on healthy ecosystems, abundant biodiversity, and a stable climate which today are all greatly dependent on the remaining large areas of contiguous tropical forests. In our view, States have an obligation to protect the remaining tropical rainforests from deforestation and forest degradation, to secure the human rights to life, livelihood and culture for indigenous peoples and local communities directly affected by forest destruction, but also the rights of a broader human population to avoid the effects of an uncontrollable climate crisis. Saving tropical rainforests is a necessary –although not sufficient– measure to avoid the most severe climate scenarios.

Today scientists warn that major tropical forest systems, even the huge Amazon rainforest, is getting close to a tipping point where the ecological systems will not be able to withstand the pressure and may collapse. This will threaten basic human rights of millions of people in societies near and far that now receive essential services from these ecosystems. The obligation is not just for states with tropical rainforests within their borders, but also States that indirectly add pressure to these essential tropical ecosystems through production, trade and consumption –or directly through private sector companies within their jurisdiction.

Great portions of these irreplaceable rainforests are on IPs traditional lands[[3]](#footnote-4). With that in mind, it is essential for both states and businesses to secure and respect **the territorial rights of IPs.**

States should recognize the role of IPs as active and positive actors in the protection of biodiversity and forest ecosystems and should consider them as allies in their efforts to address the major drivers of deforestation and ecosystem degradation. To do so, they should ensure IPs’ traditional knowledge and practices are protected, promoted and considered in decision-making processes. IPs land management as well as other community-based forest management models should be recognized and promoted as important conservation measures. In addition, given that insecurity undermines environmental and cultural protection as well as sustainable development processes, States must protect IPs and their territories against illegal invasions with proper laws and government enforcement.

States should also take the necessary measures to guarantee that businesses, infrastructure development, agricultural and urban frontiers, and all members of society fully respect the right for self-determination of IPs in voluntary isolation. National governments in Amazon countries have recognized the existence of such IPs, and the need to implement special protection to secure their rights to food, housing, life, health and culture. This will require states to improve existing policy measures.

Furthermore, guaranteeing effective implementation of land use planning tools and moving from practices and policies that promote or halt destruction, to ones that ensure rainforest protection and restoration whilst securing human rights is urgent. Proper enforcement of existing tools, rights and legislations that recognize IPs rights, include the right to free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) as descried in article 6 of the ILO convention 169. States must guarantee that FPIC tools are properly implemented to secure IPLCs land and forest rights prior to any land use allocation to third parties on their traditional lands, or which may have negative impacts on their territories, customs and traditions (rather than using them as tools to convince those most vulnerable to accept the conditions and interests of third parties).

Additionally, they should adopt new legislation that requires companies to conduct due diligence throughout their entire supply chains in order to identify, prevent, and mitigate environmental, social and human rights risks and impacts. Thus, guaranteeing sustainable supply chains, free from deforestation, forest degradation and conversion or degradation of natural ecosystems, that comply with international standards and obligations regarding human rights –including the rights of IPLCs[[4]](#footnote-5). Also, states should introduce due diligence requirements on financial institutions to identify, prevent, and mitigate environmental, social and human rights impacts.

As suggested by the recent Intergovernmental Panel for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), the different reports presented by the CBD Secretariat in relation to the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, and other international conventions, States, businesses and society as a whole must commit to take actions that can enable the necessary and urgent social, economic and cultural transformation required to halt biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation, and to protect human rights. Both states and businesses have a key role to play.

3. Please provide specific examples of constitutional provisions, legislation, regulations, policies, programs or other measures that employ a rights-based approach to prevent, reduce, or eliminate harm to biodiversity and ecosystems or to restore and rehabilitate biodiversity and ecosystems.

The **Colombian** constitution, for example, recognizes IPs’ right to govern themselves and their territories allowing them to decide how to manage their resources based on their specific planning, administrative and governance systems in non-municipalized areas of the Amazonas, Guainía and Vaupes departments. This is an important basis for securing their rights to livelihood and food. Colombia is also developing new policies within the National System of Protected Areas (SINAP) which recognizes the role of IPs managed forests in the conservation of the country’s biodiversity, as well as their contribution to complying with international commitments such as those included in the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD).

**In Brazil, where we today see dramatic attacks on forests as well as on IPs rights, have in place** National Policy for Peoples and Communities[[5]](#footnote-6) which intends to guarantee traditional communities’ territories and access to natural resources, and to recognize and respect their traditional knowledge and resource use. This clearly shows that legislation and regulations are not enough in itself, political will to follow them is essential.

In **DRC**, 14 years after the 2002 Forest Code recognized local communities’ rights to manage part of their traditional forests, the regulatory framework for community forests was completed finally making implementation of indigenous rights possible. Local communities can now be granted concession titles (known as Local Community Forest Concessions or CFCL for their name in French) of up to 50,000 ha pertaining to their traditional territories. Community forest concessions and community-based forest management models have a huge potential to become major land use categories and contribute to the protection of forest biodiversity and other natural ecosystems. Although this is progress, there is still an urgent need to for a more comprehensive law to safeguard indigenous peoples’ rights in DRC.

At an international level, both the CBD and the ILO conventions provide guidelines and tools that can prevent ecosystem degradation whilst securing the rights of IPs. The CBD has been relied upon most frequently by international human rights bodies with respect to indigenous people’s rights in the context of extractives, agriculture, or conservation. It also offers guidance on what States, business enterprises and others need to do to integrate human rights and biodiversity considerations into climate change adaptation and mitigation.

4. If your State is one of the 156 UN Member States that recognizes the right to a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, has this right contributed to protecting, conserving and restoring biodiversity and healthy ecosystems? If so, how? If not, why not?

-

5. Please provide specific examples of good practices in preventing, reducing, or eliminating harm to biodiversity and ecosystems, or restoring and rehabilitating biodiversity and ecosystems. These examples may occur at the international, national, sub-national, or local level. Where possible, please provide evidence related to the implementation, enforcement, and effectiveness of the good practices (e.g. measurable outcomes such as increases in terrestrial and marine protected areas, increases in Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas, declining rates of deforestation and poaching, or progress in the recovery of species that were previously threatened or endangered).

As mentioned before, extensive research has demonstrated the importance and effectiveness of IP’s led conservation and management of ecosystems and biodiversity. The state of Acre in western Brazil provides a great example of effective collaboration between local communities and the state government through “forest-based development” policies. These policies recognize that standing forests are one of the state’s great assets, and therefore support and promote forest management strategies that safeguard both the rights and livelihoods of forest peoples and rainforest ecosystem services managed for long-term sustainability and as a basis for development. As more than 15 different IPs and forest dependent peoples inhabit the forests of Acre, forest management strategies that recognize and strengthen culture and identity, and recognition of indigenous land rights, have been essential for the sustainability of these processes. Coordination of policies and initiatives to ensure the compatibility of activities in neighboring areas has also been considered, given their potential to strongly impact the sustainability of and biodiversity within these forests. For more details of this case please see full report [here](https://d5i6is0eze552.cloudfront.net/documents/Publikasjoner/Andre-rapporter/Rapport-Acre-lavopplost-oppslag-ID-43389.pdf?mtime=20170928112428).

In addition, we would mention the importance of business regulations like Brazil’s Amazon Soy Moratorium that has been a very successful agreement involving businesses, producers and government since 2007. Attempts to construct a similar agreement regarding the cattle industry have been made. However, it has been systematically delayed.

6. Please identify specific gaps, challenges and barriers that your government, business, or organization has faced in attempting to employ a rights-based approach to preventing, reducing, or eliminating harm to biodiversity and ecosystems.

Lack of political will and governments with great interest and support to extractive activities such as mining, fossil fuel extraction, and logging –among others, pose strong challenges to the conservation of tropical forests. Furthermore, turnover of personnel in political offices as well as changes in political programs and agendas pose a challenge to the continuity of many long-term processes. Deforestation and ecosystem degradation happen very fast once there is room for it and have tremendous long-term impacts on tropical forests. Instead, consolidating IPLCs’ rights and conservation and restoration processes are slow and require long periods of time in order to achieve the desired results. Threats to environmental and social leaders pose important security challenges that need to be considered when designing and implementing our strategies.

In **DRC**, challenges met in community forest management projects in other countries are often used to downplay efforts to promote the development of community-based forest management models in the country. Unfortunately, such reluctance ignores the fact that these challenges have been due precisely to a lack of political will and appropriate support to local communities. Opponents to community-based forest management models also argue that the development of such models in practice would require unrealistic amounts of financial means and time investment. As a result, IPLCs are not yet given the opportunity to play an active and positive role in the protection of forest ecosystems and their biodiversity.

7. Please specify ways in which additional protection is provided (or should be provided) for populations who may be particularly vulnerable to declining biodiversity and degraded ecosystems (e.g. women, children, persons living in poverty, members of Indigenous peoples and local communities, older persons, persons with disabilities, ethnic, racial or other minorities and displaced persons). How can these populations be empowered to protect and restore declining biodiversity and degraded ecosystems?

As mentioned before, IPs and forest dependent peoples are the most vulnerable to deforestation, especially those in voluntary isolation. Therefore, formal and effective recognition of their territorial rights as well as taking the necessary actions to guarantee the legal security to the territories they inhabit is essential. However, prohibiting third parties to access territories of IPs in voluntary isolation, implementing mechanisms to avoid spreading of diseases, controlling and preventing deforestation and other activities that threaten biodiversity and ecosystem integrity within their territories are equally important to guarantee the well-being and survival of these vulnerable communities.

Policies that respect, enable and promote the right to self-determination, and that are reflected in the institutional practice of the State, are of great importance to empower IPs to maintain the practices that have resulted in the protection of the forest ecosystems and biodiversity within their lands. The recognition of IPLCs as allies in the protection of natural ecosystems and biodiversity, and their inclusion in decision-making processes, will empower them. This could in turn result in strengthen IP cultures that can share their knowledge and expertise with other sectors of society, promoting good practices and ways of life that can result in a balanced relationship with nature beyond their territories.

In DRC, policy and decision makers should consider: 1. The interdependence of rainforest protection and sustainable development, as protecting the rainforest and its integrity is a precondition for development, which depends on the health and sustainability of forest biodiversity and ecosystems; 2. Poverty alleviation, food security, sustainable development, rainforest protection, biodiversity protection and climate change mitigation are all interdependent; and 3. Forest dependent peoples are directly affected by these major challenges, and should therefore be recognized and supported as actors and drivers of positive change. Policy and legislative reforms, not the least the land use planning, land tenure and forest reforms, will be crucial in clarifying to what extent local communities should be seen and supported consequently as drivers of change.

The holistic, inter-sectorial and prospective nature of land use planning makes it a fundamental reform for ensuring coherence and sustainability of the sectorial strategies. The theory of change that will be defined and detailed in this specific policy, and the role this theory will recognize for local communities and indigenous peoples, will thus be of utmost importance to ensure all sectorial policies and strategies contribute to the protection of forest biodiversity and ecosystems.

The adoption of the draft law on IPs’ rights, which has been pending at the DRC National Assembly since 2014, would also be a major acknowledgement of the positive role IPs’ traditional knowledge and practices have and could continue to have in the protection of forest ecosystems and biodiversity in general. Such a positive development has been the focus of numerous recommendations formulated under the Universal Periodic Reviews of DRC’s implementation of UN human rights instruments.

DRC’s international partners should address these opportunities in their dialogue with DRC policy-and decision-makers. These opportunities could positively contribute to the State’s obligation to guarantee the sustainable management of the country’s natural resources, as well as to the Government’s primary objective of fighting poverty and ensuring the population’s well-being.

The Central African Forest Initiative (CAFI), which has adopted a promising holistic approach to the reduction of deforestation and forest degradation, should be a prominent interlocutor to DRC on these matters.

8. How do you safeguard the rights of individuals and communities working on biodiversity issues (potentially identified as environmental human rights defenders or land defenders)? What efforts has your Government made to create a safe environment for them to freely exercise their rights without fear of violence, intimidation, or reprisal?

Environmental human rights defenders (EHRDs) are today the most vulnerable group of human rights defenders (HRDs) in the world, facing threats, harassment and violence from both state and non-state actors. They are also the group of HRDs mostly killed, with numbers varying between 50-70% of all killed HRDs according to Global Witness and Frontline defenders.

The RFN has over the last two years set in motion several measures to protect our partners from increasing threats to their lives and well-being, and to help secure them space to defend their human rights and territories. Among these measures are security training, which we have so far performed for all partners in Colombia. We are also working to secure training for partners in Brazil and DRC and gradually to all partners. Furthermore, after security training is ensured, we plan to perform training in documentation of human rights threats and advocacy work. Many EHRDs work in areas far from the general public and the threats they face are rarely documented or reach the public eye. We think that documentation, advocacy and media-work can have a positive impact on their security, because if the world is watching then it’s not as easy for actors to use all means possible to take what they want.

Also, the RFN has led communication work, campaigns and advocacy work, both nationally and internationally, to shed light on the grave situation for EHRDs. We have worked hard the past two years to make Norway adopt human rights due diligence law for businesses, together with other civil society actors. A strong law proposal is now in ready and we are hopeful that it will soon be in place. Such a law will, hopefully, compel Norwegian companies to perform due diligence processes based on the UN Guiding Principles on business and human rights, in all countries they operate in and in their supply chains. We have also recommended that due diligence on environmental issues is part of this law. If a strong law is adopted, Norway will have come a long way in creating a safer environment for EHRDs from Norwegian business activities at least. However, we also see laws, law proposals and discussions on business and human rights in several other countries now and hopefully the ricing recognition of the importance of national laws on this matter will have a positive impact in the years to come.

Norway is one of main champions for HRDs in the world and regularly puts forward resolutions and work to secure support for these in the UN. These resolutions include HRDs as a general group, but we also have resolutions on specific groups such as EHRDs.

9. There is substantial evidence that consumption in high-income States is adversely affecting biodiversity and ecosystems in low and middle-income States. What are ways in which high-income States should assist low-income States in responding to biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation, while simultaneously contributing to sustainable development in those low-income States?

High income States should provide funding for low income States to help them maintain biological and cultural diversity, as well as essential natural ecosystems such as IFLs, that provide benefits for the whole world. They could also set and enforce import rules and restrictions that can drive the transformational changes needed in production and consumption, for example by setting environmental and human rights requirements for trade agreements.

In addition to this, high income States should divest from businesses associated with deforestation practices and should guarantee that their public funds support only deforestation free and sustainable practices. They should also take the necessary actions needed to change their production and consumption patterns within their States. Concrete examples related to soy and biofuels can be found in the following links[[6]](#footnote-7):

* On international investment in soy:
	+ Report: [No one wants to know how the sausage gets made](https://d5i6is0eze552.cloudfront.net/documents/Publikasjoner/Andre-rapporter/How-the-sausage-gets-made-FINAL.pdf?mtime=20200506131239).
	+ Report: [Investments in soy destruction. Norwegian savings and pensions are contributing to one of the worst environmental crises of our time: the extensive destruction of native ecosystems.](https://d5i6is0eze552.cloudfront.net/documents/Annet/Investments-in-soy-destruction.pdf?mtime=20180518131414)
	+ Report: [Salmon and soy beans –Deforestation and land conflict in Brazil](https://d5i6is0eze552.cloudfront.net/documents/Publikasjoner/Andre-rapporter/Salmon-on-soy-beans-deforestation-and-land-conflict-in-Brazil.pdf?mtime=20181029093010).
* On biofuel:
	+ Report: [Biofuel to the fire. The impact of continued expansion of palm and soy oil demand through biofuel policy.](https://d5i6is0eze552.cloudfront.net/documents/RF_report_biofuel_0320_eng_SP.pdf?mtime=20200310101137)

10. For businesses, what policies or practices are in place to ensure that your activities, products, and services across the entire supply chain (extraction/sourcing, manufacturing, distribution, sale, and end-of life management) minimize biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation and meet human rights standards, especially those articulated in the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights?

As mentioned before, Brazil’s Amazon Soy Moratorium contributes to prevent deforestation. In addition to this, we suggest that States adopt new policies that requires companies to conduct due diligence throughout their entire supply chains in order to identify, prevent, and mitigate environmental, social and human rights risks and impacts. Thus, guaranteeing sustainable supply chains, free from deforestation, forest degradation and conversion or degradation of natural ecosystems, that comply with international standards and obligation regarding human rights –including the rights of IPLCs[[7]](#footnote-8). Also, States should introduce due diligence requirements on financial institutions to identify, prevent, and mitigate environmental, social and human rights impacts. This can ensure that the finance and banking sectors are not linked (directly nor indirectly) to deforestation, forest degradation, conversion or degradation of natural ecosystems, or to the violation of human rights.

As described above, we have been working on a strong law proposal to adopt due diligence on both human rights and environmental issues by businesses in Norway (to be conducted both in all countries they operate in and in their supply chains).

1. See for example Fa, J.E. et. al. (2019). *Importance of Indigenous Peoples’ lands for the conservation of Intact Forest Landscapes*; Schuster, R. et. al. (2019). *Vertebrate biodiversity on indigenous-managed lands in Australia, Brazil and Canada equals that in protected* areas ; Toledo, V. (1999). *Indigenous Peoples and Biodiversity*. Encyclopedia of Biodiversity. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. See for example Ferretti-Gallon, K. & Busch, J. (2014). *What Drives Deforestation and What Stops It? A Meta-Analysis of Spatially Explicit Econometric Studies* <http://www.cgdev.org/publication/what-drives-deforestation-and-what-stops-it-meta-analysis-spatially-explicit-econometric> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. See for example Dowie, M. (2009) *Conservation Refugees: The Hundred-Year Conflict Between Global Conservation and Native Peoples*. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. See for example NGO Briefing. (2020). *Protecting forests, natural ecosystems and human rights: a case for EU action*.https://www.fern.org/fileadmin/uploads/fern/Documents/2019/Briefing\_-\_Protecting\_forests\_\_\_human\_rights\_-\_a\_case\_for\_EU\_action.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Política Nacional de Povos e Comunidades, decrete number6040/2007 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. For more reports visit: <https://www.regnskog.no/no/publikasjoner/rapporter>. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. See for example NGO Briefing. (2020). *Protecting forests, natural ecosystems and human rights: a case for EU action*.https://www.fern.org/fileadmin/uploads/fern/Documents/2019/Briefing\_-\_Protecting\_forests\_\_\_human\_rights\_-\_a\_case\_for\_EU\_action.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-8)