



PRACTICES TO ADVANCE THE RECOGNITION, PROTECTION AND PARTICIPATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL HUMAN RIGHTS DEFENDERS

Briefing note by the Leaders Network for Environmental Activists and Defenders, created by the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ICNL) and the European Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ECNL).

INTRODUCTION

Environmental human rights defenders (EHRDs) are playing a leading role around the world in pushing back against the triple planetary crisis of climate change, environmental pollution, and biodiversity loss, and in pointing the way forward to a just, sustainable, and equitable future. Yet EHRDs are under widespread threat: targeted by attacks, harassment, criminalization, legal restrictions on the exercise of freedoms, stigmatization, abusive litigation, and legal sanctions and reprisals. EHRDs likewise face significant barriers to participating in decision-making regarding the future of our shared habitats, ecosystems, and resources. These barriers range from licensing and permitting decisions authorizing the exploitation of fragile environments without prior and informed consent or meaningful consultation of affected communities, to multilateral climate negotiations where industry representatives receive privileged access while defenders representing local communities struggle to secure visas and accreditation, and face notable restrictions on advocacy and mobilization for climate justice when they arrive.

As a global community, we cannot address the pressing crises we face, and assure a clean, healthy, and sustainable environment for all, unless EHRDs are afforded a safe space to lead the way towards solutions of these crises. Ensuring this safe space requires:

- **recognition**, in multilateral and other spaces, of the essential contribution of EHRDs to protecting our natural patrimony and promoting a just transition to sustainable co-existence with our environment;
- **protection** of the rights of EHRDs and safeguarding these defenders from threats; and
- enhancing genuine **participation** of EHRDs and the communities they represent in environmentally consequential decision-making, from the local to the multilateral levels.

Given the multi-dimensional nature of threats and restrictions facing EHRDs, these responses require collaboration and contributions from a diverse group of stakeholders: governments, international institutions and mechanisms, funders, civil society, the private sector, and others.

The **Leaders Network for Environmental Activists and Defenders (LEAD)** aims to promote this multi-stakeholder collaboration, including by fostering exchange and learning on approaches to advance recognition, protection, and participation of

EHRDs. To encourage this exchange, the LEAD initiative has been engaged in research and outreach to identify practices to expand civic space for EHRDs.¹ What follows is a selection of practices in this area, with a focus on actions undertaken by governments and multilateral institutions.

This enumeration is meant to be neither comprehensive nor definitive. At this early stage of the research, the list does not assess the effectiveness of the identified practice. We would welcome further information regarding both these practices – details regarding their formulation and implementation; impacts to date; exemplary features; and gaps, deficiencies, and challenges needing to be addressed – and other practices, undertaken by governments and other stakeholders, to advance recognition, protection, and participation of EHRDs. One of the objectives of this research is not only to disseminate and amplify these practices but to strengthen and improve their implementation so that they more effectively safeguard and support the rights of EHRDs. At the same time, we seek to spark further innovation and greater ambition in the undertaking of practices to expand space for EHRDs.

SELECTED PRACTICES

Practices to expand civic space for EHRDs that we have identified fall into several broad categories: (1) issuance of guidance to diplomatic representatives on actions to take in support of EHRDs; (2) creation of measures and mechanisms to foster due diligence and accountability regarding violations of rights of EHRDs; (3) development of domestic instruments and mechanisms to protect the rights of HRDs; (4) multilateral instruments to foster the protection, participation, and recognition of EHRDs; (5) international protection mechanisms to permit EHRDs to avoid and mitigate threats facing them as a result of their activism; (6) efforts to foster participation of EHRDs in multilateral fora; and (7) efforts at multilateral fora to recognize the contributions of EHRDs to environmental protection and to counter threats to EHRDs.

Diplomatic Guidance & Engagement

[Canada](#) has issued guidelines for Canadian officials on supporting human rights defenders that feature specific guidance on land rights and environmental human rights defenders. This includes instructions to engage in public communications highlighting the importance of engagement and consultation, protection of the environment and traditional livelihoods, and other issues of concern to land rights and environmental HRDs; and to undertake efforts to promote dialogue between EHRDs and governments. The guidelines specifically note that “Canadian companies operating abroad are expected to respect human rights and to operate lawfully and in consultation with the host government (national and municipal) and local communities,” and that “Missions are expected to provide support to HRDs even when they allege or appear to have suffered human rights abuses by a Canadian company.”

¹ This research has drawn on informative materials previously compiled by other partners. These resources are listed at the end of this brief as suggestions for further reading.

In a previous administration, the [United States](#) released guidelines for U.S. diplomatic missions on support to civil society and HRDs, which recognize the special vulnerability of land and environmental defenders to attacks. The U.S. guidelines endorse strengthening environmental and social safeguard policies and practices of multilateral development banks, including those related to protecting HRDs, and developing policies to reduce violence against HRDs seeking to protect against negative environmental impacts. These guidelines also recommend that missions monitor and report on the implementation of laws providing for public participation in decision-making, including on environmental issues, and engage in focused activities to address the needs and risks of HRDs working on environmental and land issues.

The [United Kingdom](#)'s policy on support for HRDs notes the contributions of defenders to "protection of the land and the environment, and thereby to people's livelihoods, protecting biodiversity and tackling climate change." The U.K. policy identifies HRDs working on land and environmental issues as facing increased risk of attacks, including from private companies seeking to conceal rights-abusing or illegal activities, and from development projects in rural areas of ancestral lands. [Finland](#) has similarly issued guidance for the Finnish Foreign Service on supporting HRDs, which includes a specific section noting threats faced by EHRDs and Finland's commitment to supporting them. [Norway](#)'s guidelines for support to HRDs also identifies EHRDs and those working for environmental and land rights as facing particular risks. Other diplomatic guidance and policies on support to HRDs, including EHRDs, have been issued by the [European Union](#) and [Switzerland](#).

Practice Pointers: For diplomatic guidelines to be effective in preventing violations and ensuring the protection of EHRDs, institutions should work towards the proper dissemination of the guidelines (including by translating them into local languages) so affected communities are empowered to use them. Guidelines should include redress and accountability mechanisms in case of breach and missions should ensure ongoing dialogue with affected communities over the implementation of the guidelines to address any challenges experienced by EHRDs. In addition, it is crucial that mission staff are trained on their content and how to implement them in practice, including by facilitating peer exchanges between different diplomatic missions to ensure coordination.

Due Diligence Requirements and Accountability Mechanisms

Several jurisdictions have established legal requirements for companies to carry out due diligence and mitigate or prevent environmental and human rights risks resulting from their operations or occurring in their supply chains. In 2017, France enacted its [Loi de vigilance](#), or Duty of Vigilance Law, that imposes obligations on French companies to manage human rights and environmental risks resulting both from their operations, and from those of their subsidiaries, subcontractors, and suppliers. The French Law requires covered companies to publish an annual vigilance plan, developed in consultation with affected stakeholders, that identifies risks to human rights and the environment posed by covered activities, and describes plans to prevent these harms.

The law establishes mechanisms not only to compel companies to comply with their vigilance obligations, but to permit injured parties to bring civil lawsuits seeking damages from a company's failure to comply with these obligations. Just last year, a French court [admitted a case](#) brought under the duty of vigilance law by HRDs and NGOs representing indigenous communities in Mexico, alleging that French energy company EDF had failed to respect these communities' right to free, prior, and informed consent in the planning of a windpark in Oaxaca, and moreover had failed to take adequate steps to prevent intimidation, harassment, and violence against HRDs criticizing this project.

In 2024, the European Commission's [corporate sustainability due diligence directive](#) (CSDDD) entered into force, requiring covered companies to identify and address adverse human rights and environmental impacts of their activities both within and outside Europe. Though the CSDDD as enacted includes robust obligations concerning stakeholder consultation, civil liability, and conduct of due diligence throughout supply chains, the Commission in its February 2025 "[simplification omnibus package](#)" has now proposed watering down or eliminating these requirements and delaying the date by which companies must commence compliance. These changes will be considered by the European Parliament and Council in the coming months.

In 2021, Germany also adopted its [Act on Corporate Due Diligence Obligations in Supply Chains](#), which requires covered enterprises to establish a risk management system to identify, prevent or minimize the risks of human rights violations and damage to the environment. The German law provides for the imposition of significant administrative fines upon enterprises failing to comply with legal requirements, which may also be barred from competing for public contracts. In that same year, Norway enacted its own [Transparency Act](#), requiring covered enterprises to conduct due diligence on their operations and those of their suppliers, to assess whether these activities have caused or contributed to actual or potential adverse impacts on human rights and decent working conditions.

International financial institutions and governments have established other accountability mechanisms that can address harm to EHRDs. The Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), in 2010, created an independent accountability mechanism – the [Independent Consultation and Investigation Mechanism \(MICI\)](#) – to receive and address complaints about environmental and social harm arising from Group-financed projects. MICI offers a dispute resolution and independent investigation process for persons who feel they may have been harmed by operations financed by the IDB, and has since its establishment handled more than 230 complaints. The World Bank established its own [Accountability Mechanism](#) in 2020. This mechanism houses the [Inspection Panel](#), created in 1993 to receive and assess complaints from local affected communities, to determine whether Bank-funded projects have complied with its policies and procedures, including environmental and social policies; and the [Grievance Redress Service](#), established in 2020 to hear complaints from individuals and communities believing that a World Bank project has or is likely to have adverse effects on them, their community, or their environment. The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) similarly created an [Independent Project](#)

[Accountability Mechanism](#) in 2019 with the mandate to independently review issues raised by individuals or organisations in relation to projects financed by the EBRD that are understood to have caused harm or are likely to do so.

Canada has established the [Canadian Ombudsperson for Responsible Enterprise](#), which is mandated to review complaints about possible human rights abuses by Canadian companies when those companies work outside Canada in the garment, mining, and oil and gas sectors, and to provide recommendations to help resolve disputes.

Practice Pointers: For due diligence requirements and accountability mechanisms to be successful in countering environmental and human rights harms, governments and institutions need to invest in building the capacity of communities, defenders, and civil society to notify harms and bring complaints, and must provide for prompt resolution of these complaints, including cessation or appropriate adjustment of harmful activities and provision of remediation and redress for harms suffered by communities and individuals. To be effective, corporate due diligence requirements should include an array of [key elements](#): due diligence obligations for all businesses across their full global value chains; effective and safe stakeholder engagement; a strong civil liability regime; and mandatory requirements that go beyond box-ticking exercises and auditing, address irresponsible business models and purchasing practices, and are embedded in appropriate governance and accountability structures. Accountability mechanisms must be granted suitable investigatory powers to follow up on complaints, have the necessary resources to ensure compliance, and be structured to ensure independence from other decision-making within the responsible institutions.

Domestic Protection Instruments and Mechanisms

Governments have adopted laws and policies that seek to ensure that human rights defenders can do their work in safe and supportive environments and be free from attacks, reprisals and unreasonable restrictions. These measures are usually general in nature and do not specifically focus on EHRDs, though they in most cases encompass EHRDs. The International Service for Human Rights (ISHR) records that HRD protection instruments [have been adopted in 15 countries worldwide](#), with nearly twenty additional such measures under consideration. Before adopting their laws on protection of HRDs, in an example of a good practice, the parliaments of Mexico and Mongolia [shared the draft bills](#) with civil society for their inputs.

Authorities have established protective domestic norms through means other than HRD protection laws, as well. In 2019, the National Human Rights Institution of Ecuador [issued a resolution](#) on “[N]orms to promote and protect human rights and nature defenders,” which sets out the State’s specific responsibilities for ensuring protection of the rights of EHRDs.

Related to the adoption of HRD protection laws and policies, governments have established domestic mechanisms to foster the protection of HRDs, including EHRDs. In 2004, Brazil launched the National Programme for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders, which aims to establish principles, guidelines, and programs to provide assistance to persons and groups engaging in human rights defense who have been exposed to risks or threats as a result. Local protection programs have also been established in some states of the country, which aim to foster coordination amongst law enforcement, ombudsman's offices, prosecutors, and civil society, and to implement specific protection mechanisms to safeguard individual defenders.

In 1997, Colombia enacted a law directing the Ministry of Home Affairs to create a protection program for persons at risk from political or ideological violence or from internal armed conflict. This led to the establishment of the General Protection Programme of the Directorate of Human Rights in the Colombian Ministry of Home Affairs and Justice. This program aimed to assist the government in safeguarding the "lives, integrity, freedom and security" of persons facing serious risks as a result of their political, public, social or humanitarian activities, including EHRDs. Colombia also has an early warning system, set up by its NHRI, which relies on citizen reports to anticipate and develop recommendations for countering human rights violations.

Guatemala has likewise set up a Coordination Unit, pursuant to an agreement of the Presidential Commission for Human Rights in Guatemala (COPREDEH) in 2004, to coordinate amongst government institutions to implement measures directed by the Inter-American system or the United Nations for the protection of HRDs, law enforcement officials, and media representatives. This body has included participation not only of investigative agencies but of national and international human rights NGOs. Guatemala also established (in 2008) a Support Institute for the Analysis of Attacks on Human Rights Defenders, which convenes government agencies, civil society, judges and the press to not only analyze and identify patterns in attacks against HRDs in Guatemala, but design and implement protective measures for individual defenders. The Guatemalan human rights NGO UDEFEGUA and UN OHCHR may follow up on cases of requested assistance to ensure they meet the established protection protocols.

Mexico has also established a Programme for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders, housed in the Unit for the Promotion and Defence of Human Rights (UPDHR) in the Ministry of Home Affairs. This mechanism aims to foster federal-state coordination in the implementation of preventive and protective measures to safeguard the life, integrity, liberty and security of those at risk due to their advocacy for human rights or the environment. The Unit accepts requests, conducts risk assessments, establishes protocols, and designs and implements protective measures, as well as actions aimed at preventing risks and threats. Mexico likewise has an early warning mechanism at the state level in Chihuahua, which is government-led but implemented in coordination with CSOs.

Beginning in 2015, Honduras established mechanisms, including a special prosecutor's office, to protect HRDs, journalists, media professionals and justice officials, and to

implement recommendations from the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. In 2021, Peru created an [intersectoral mechanism to protect HRDs](#), which includes measures to prevent risks to defenders occurring in the course of their work; encourage coordination between relevant government agencies; and promote access to justice for defenders.

Practice Pointers: Domestic protection mechanisms should, where possible, be established by formal legislation in preference to decrees or policy measures, to ensure appropriate institutionalization and implementation across ministries and through successive political administrations. Domestic protection instruments and commitments should be binding and implemented at both national and sub-national levels. Domestic protection mechanisms should also be adequately resourced, with sufficient funding and staffing to permit achievement of protection objectives. Such mechanisms should adopt a comprehensive, collective and preventative approach to protection, and have appropriately trained staff able to conduct situated risk assessments and develop solid protection plans. These mechanisms must be developed in close coordination with communities of EHRDs and civil society, with particular attention to inclusion of indigenous defenders and activists. Defenders and civil society should have a formal governance role in overseeing and adjusting implementation of all domestic protection mechanisms, which should be subject to regular review and assessment to ensure effective functioning and address challenges. In many cases, it may be appropriate for CSOs, defender associations, and local communities to have a prominent role in implementing domestic protection mechanisms. These mechanisms must be designed and implemented, moreover, with a primary concern for doing no harm to the welfare and security of defenders; for addressing mistrust between defenders and state entities; and for protecting the personal information and privacy of defenders in line with legal requirements and international best practices.

Multilateral Instruments for the Protection and Participation of EHRDs

The [Escazu Agreement](#) (formally, the Regional Agreement on Access to Information, Public Participation and Justice in Environmental Matters in Latin America and the Caribbean) entered into force in January 2021, aiming to guarantee the full and effective implementation in Latin America and the Caribbean of rights of access to environmental information, public participation in the environmental decision-making process, and access to justice in environmental matters. Article 9 of the Agreement provides specifically that “Each Party shall take adequate and effective measures to recognize, protect and promote all the rights of human rights defenders in environmental matters, including their right to life, personal integrity, freedom of opinion and expression, peaceful assembly and association, and free movement, as well as their ability to exercise their access rights.” Article 9 further requires parties to guarantee a safe and enabling environment for persons, groups, and organizations engaged in environmental defense, and to respond appropriately to attacks, threats, and intimidation targeting EHRDs. The Agreement has been ratified by 17 states parties, with 7 additional signatories.

The [Aarhus Convention](#) (formally, the UNECE Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters), which entered into force in October 2001, also requires its parties to guarantee the rights of access to information, public participation in decision-making, and access to justice in environmental matters. Article 3(8) of the Convention mandates that “Each Party shall ensure that persons exercising their rights in conformity with the provisions of this Convention shall not be penalized, persecuted or harassed in any way for their involvement.” The Convention is open to accession by any UN Member State and has been ratified by 47 Parties in Europe, Eurasia, and Africa.

Practice Pointers: For multilateral agreements to be effective in their implementation, institutions should foster sustained cooperation and synergies among different treaties and agreements, and with the overall global environmental agenda. Further, it is important that the different mechanisms created by the agreement (e.g., compliance, accountability, rapid response) are well-resourced and can fulfil their mandates. Governments should also explore and support the establishment of additional regional protection instruments and mechanisms, for instance in Africa and the Asia-Pacific, that can build on the successful examples of the Escazu and Aarhus Conventions.

International Protection Mechanisms

In April 2024, at the third Conference of Parties to the Escazu Agreement, states agreed to an [Action Plan on Human Rights Defenders in Environmental Matters](#) which sets out priority areas and strategic measures to advance full and effective implementation of Escazu Article 9. The Action Plan [prescribes steps](#) to “[c]ontribute, through capacity-building and cooperation, to the formulation and implementation by institutions of various laws, policies, plans, programmes or measures at the national, subnational or other levels for the recognition, protection and promotion of the rights of persons, groups and organizations that promote and defend human rights in environmental matters.” The Action Plan also sets out planned engagements in the areas of knowledge creation, recognition, and evaluation and follow-up. The Action Plan, which was prepared by an open-ended working group with significant opportunities for public input, including from Indigenous Peoples and local communities, will be implemented from 2024-2030.

In October 2021, the Parties to the Aarhus Convention established a rapid response mechanism for the protection of EHRDs: the [Special Rapporteur on Environmental Defenders under the Aarhus Convention](#), with Michel Forst elected as the inaugural mandate-holder in June 2022. The Special Rapporteur is tasked with taking measures to protect any person who is experiencing, or at imminent threat of, persecution, penalization or harassment for seeking to exercise their rights under the Convention. The Special Rapporteur’s responsive measures may include issuing immediate and ongoing protection measures; using diplomatic channels; issuing public statements; or bringing the matter to the attention of other relevant human rights bodies, and of

the concerned Governments and Heads of State. The mandate has already made public [correspondence](#) concerning more than fifteen complaints.

The European Union, supported by the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), has established the mechanism [ProtectDefenders.eu](#), which provides small grants and assistance to defenders in urgent need, as well as medium-term and long-term support aimed at reducing risks, threats, restrictions and sanctions facing defenders. The mechanism has a particular focus on vulnerable categories of defenders, including EHRDs. The [Claim Your Space](#) rapid response mechanism, administered by Global Focus with financial support from Denmark, similarly provides rapid financial support to civil society and defenders at risk due to restrictions on civic space. Building Responses Together (BRT), which also receives funding from Denmark and is coordinated by Global Focus, is a global network of rapid response mechanisms. The purpose of the network is to facilitate collaboration and coordination among mechanisms to provide holistic, timely and complementary support to civic actors at risk.

The [Shelter City](#) program supports temporary relocation of human rights defenders under threat or pressure due to their work, to a network of 22 shelter cities located in the Netherlands and elsewhere in Europe, Africa, Asia, and Latin America. In Spain, the national government, as well as regional and local governments, have supported [relocation initiatives for defenders](#), primarily from Latin America, needing a temporary refuge from threats or risks resulting from their work. Ireland has established a [humanitarian visa scheme for HRDs](#), operated with Front Line Defenders, that provides a fast-track approach to processing applications for HRDs to travel to Ireland for short stays for the purpose of respite, and because of temporary safety issues.

The UN Environment Programme adopted a [defenders policy](#) in 2018 that aims to assist the UN in promoting greater protection for individuals and groups defending environmental rights. Through the policy, UNEP has committed to denouncing attacks on EHRDs; advocating for better protection of environmental rights and defenders; supporting responsible management of natural resources; and advancing accountability of governments and companies for attacks on EHRDs. The policy also establishes a response mechanism for dealing with cases of attacks on EHRDs that are brought to UNEP's attention. UNEP and the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) also, in 2019, [concluded an agreement](#) to support cooperation in monitoring threats to EHRDs and urging accountability of those perpetrating violence and threats. Previously, in 2017, OHCHR and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) had launched a [joint regional initiative](#) to research measures implemented in Latin America for protection of HRDs and EHRDs, and to support implementation of best practices in the region. IACHR has also been fostering protective actions by governments by [issuing precautionary measures](#) to prevent irreparable harms to the rights of EHRDs, including mandates for physical protection and investigations of attacks on defenders.

The United States has established an informal interagency working group to reduce violence against EHRDs, coordinated by the Bureau of Oceans and International

Environmental and Scientific Affairs in the U.S. State Department. Since 2017, this working group has convened regular meetings involving representatives of U.S. agencies and diplomatic missions to share information about trends and specific cases of attacks and threats on EHRDs, and to encourage effective responses by U.S. government representatives in cooperation with civil society and other partners. Over 20 agencies and 40 diplomatic missions participate in the working group, which has over 1500 members; EHRDs and civil society representatives have been welcomed at working group meetings, as well, to provide or participate in briefings. In addition to providing a forum for the working group coordinators to present in-depth research on attacks against EHRDs to an interagency audience, the working group has been instrumental in fostering recognition within the U.S. government of EHRDs' role as human rights defenders, and in facilitating USG encouragement and leadership of action to protect EHRDs through such fora as the Escazu Agreement and the Summit of the Americas.

Practice Pointers: Governments should afford robust financial and diplomatic support to multilateral and transnational protection mechanisms, including to publicize these mechanisms and promote their accessibility to marginalized and vulnerable defender communities facing heightened risks of repression. Governments should seek to liberalize granting, migration, and residence requirements to promote the greater efficacy of transnational protection mechanisms, and foster inter-ministerial and inter-governmental cooperation to address challenges and threats facing defenders.

Participation in Multilateral Fora

Colombia, as host of the 16th Conference of Parties of the UN Convention on Biodiversity (CBD COP 16), engaged in extensive consultations with domestic and international civil society, including representatives of specially affected and frequently marginalized constituencies such as indigenous communities and women EHRDs, to develop the agenda for COP 16 and ensure robust scope for civil society and defender participation.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) of Denmark has included CSOs working on key issues (including development and climate) in its official delegation to the UN General Assembly. The Danish MFA has also provided CSOs access to other international events on an ad-hoc basis, including the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Conference of Parties, and the High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development.

Practice Pointers: Governments should support the convening of international environmental conferences and negotiations in countries with demonstrated track records of respect for the civic freedoms and safety of defenders and activists, and should provide financial and logistical support, including where appropriate accreditation as members of official state delegations, to facilitate the participation of frontline defenders and activists in these spaces. Government should likewise establish modalities of access to information,

consultation, and collaboration that generate genuine opportunities for defender and civil society participation in environmental negotiations, through for example daily briefings for and solicitation of inputs from defenders and activists during the course of negotiations. Host governments and treaty secretariats should invite civil society inputs into the development of host government agreements and publicly release the texts of these agreements once finalized, while ensuring that these agreements permit the exercise of civic freedoms at and around negotiations in line with international human rights law and best practice.

Multilateral Recognition of EHRDs

Furthering recognition of EHRDs at multilateral fora requires shedding light on their contributions to environmental protection, and on threats, attacks, and restrictions that they face. Colombia, as host of CBD COP 16, devoted a day of the program to [human rights and environmental justice](#), to recognize the role of EHRDs in conserving biodiversity and promoting environmental protection. In 2019, Norway and the Netherlands sponsored a [resolution](#) at the UN Human Rights Council recognizing the contribution of EHRDs to human rights, environmental protection and sustainable development, and the importance of their protection.

Practice Pointers: Recognition of the vital role EHRDs play should also be included in binding human rights instruments and national legislation, and recognized by Governments and high-level officials in speeches, and media engagements.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING

Business & Human Rights Resource Centre, “Mandatory due diligence,” <https://www.business-humanrights.org/en/big-issues/governing-business-human-rights/mandatory-due-diligence/>.

European Center for Not-for-Profit Law, “International Standards Protecting the Climate and Its Defenders,” <https://ecnl.org/handbook-climate-international-standards>.

Forest Peoples Program, *Enough! Pledging zero tolerance to attacks against environmental and human rights defenders* (2019), https://www.forestpeoples.org/sites/default/files/documents/Enough_Pledging%20zero%20tolerance%20to%20attacks%20against%20environmental%20and%20human%20Rights%20defenders_0.pdf.

Mexican Center for Environmental Law (CEMDA) et al., *Emerging practices of States regarding the protection of EHRDs in Latin America and the Caribbean* (2016), <https://www.cemda.org.mx/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/PRACTICA-EMERGENTESeng1.pdf>.

Protection International, *Protection of human rights defenders: Best practices and lessons learnt* (2012), <https://www.protectioninternational.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Protection-of-human-rights-defenders-best-practices-and-lessons-learnt.pdf>.

UN Environmental Programme, *Environmental Rule of Law: Tracking Progress and Charting Future Directions* (2023), https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/43943/Environmental_rule_of_law_progress.pdf?sequence=3.

UNEP & Universal Rights Group (URG), *Protecting the Frontline: Good practices for Recognising and Supporting Environmental Human Rights Defenders* (2024), <https://www.universal-rights.org/download.php?file=https://www.universal-rights.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/Protecting-the-Frontline-UNEP-URG3.pdf>.

UN Special Rapporteur on the right to a safe and healthy environment, *Right to a healthy environment: good practices* (2020), <https://www.srenvironment.org/sites/default/files/Reports/2020/Good%20practices%20on%20the%20right%20to%20a%20safe%2C%20clean%2C%20healthy%20and%20sustainable%20environment%20-%20User%20friendly%20version.pdf>.

World Resources Institute (WRI), *The Escazú Agreement: Seeking Rights to Information, Participation, and Justice for the Most Vulnerable in Latin America and the Caribbean* (2023), <https://www.wri.org/research/escazu-agreement-seeking-rights-information-participation-and-justice-most-vulnerable>.