



Human Rights Advocates

P.O. Box 5675, Berkeley, CA 94705 USA

**The Right to Food, Undermined by Threats to Indigenous Peoples' Land
Security from REDD+ Projects and Agro-Industrial Practices**

Contact Information:

**P. Lawrence Teal, Frank C. Newman Intern
Representing Human Rights Advocates through
University of San Francisco School of Law's
International Human Rights Clinic**

Tel: 415-422-6961

plteal@dons.usfca.edu

Professor Connie de la Vega

delavega@usfca.edu

I. Introduction

The right to food, as originally established in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (UDHR),¹ has been expanded upon and codified into countless international and national-level legal instruments. Unfortunately, this widespread acceptance has not shielded the right from routine violations by both state and private actors. In a recent resolution the Human Rights Council, recalling the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Persons (UNDRIP),² noted the concern expressed by indigenous peoples regarding obstacles and challenges to securing the right to food and called upon states to take special actions to combat their root causes.³ Echoing this concern, this statement uses the Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) Programme⁴ established by United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the agro-industry, as examples to highlight certain government-sponsored and privately-initiated development projects threatening indigenous communities' right to food.

II. International Legal Framework of the Right to Food

The right to food is a fundamental human right, recognized by international law in several dimensions. As an element of the right to an adequate standard of living, the right to food is affirmed in the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, (ICESCR) Article 11(1),⁵ which is binding on ratifying states and imposes legal obligations to guarantee the effective enforcement of the agreement at the national level. Article 11(2)⁶ of the ICESCR recognizes the fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger, which is to be read in

¹ *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR), UN General Assembly Resolution 217 A (III), (10 December 1948).

² *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (UNDRIP), A/RES/61/295, (2 October 2007).

³ *The Right to Food*, A/HRC/RES/28/10, ¶ 21 (2 April 2015).

⁴ *About the UN-REDD Programme*, UN-REDD Programme, available at <http://www.un-redd.org/aboutun-reddprogramme/tabid/102613/default.aspx> (last accessed Feb. 24 2016), (hereinafter *About the UN-REDD Programme*).

⁵ *International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights* (ICESCR), UN General Assembly Treaty Series, Resolution 2200 (XXI) vol. 993 (16 December 1966).

⁶ ICESCR. Article 11(2) (1966).

conjunction with those concerning the right to life (UDHR, art. 3; the ICCPR, art. 6; the CRC, art. 6; the ECHR, art. 2; the ACHR, art. 4; and the African Charter, art. 4).⁷

Additionally, the 1989 ILO Convention No. 169 is a call to states to respect indigenous lands and territories:

The rights of indigenous peoples to the natural resources pertaining to their lands shall be specially safeguarded. Where the State retains ownership of mineral or sub-surface resources, governments shall establish procedures to consult these peoples and ascertain if their interests are prejudiced. They shall participate in the benefits and receive fair compensation.⁸

UNDRIP (2007),⁹ though non-binding, embodies the broadest intergovernmental response yet to the claims of indigenous peoples and sets the international minimum standards for the protection of indigenous peoples. Concerned with the historic injustice indigenous peoples have suffered as a result of colonization; Article 3 states, “[i]ndigenous people have the right to self determination...[to] freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.”¹⁰ Recognizing the inherent rights of indigenous peoples to their lands, Article 8, section 1 affirms the role of States in preventing “[a]ny action which has the aim or effect of dispossessing [indigenous peoples] of their lands, territories or resources.”¹¹ Article 10 reaffirms those rights by acknowledging that, “[i]ndigenous people shall not be forcibly removed from their lands or territories.”¹² No relocation shall take place without the free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) of the indigenous people concerned and after agreement on just and fair compensation and, where possible, with the option of return.¹³ Article 18 ensures “the right to participate in

⁷ *The Right to Food in Emergencies*, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome (2002).

⁸ International Labour Organization (ILO), *Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, C169*, Article 15(1) and (2) (1989).

⁹ UNDRIP, *supra* note 2 (2007).

¹⁰ *Id.* Article 3.

¹¹ *Id.* Article 8.

¹² *Id.* Article 10.

¹³ *Id.*

decision-making in matters which would affect would affect their rights.”¹⁴ In recognizing that respect for indigenous practices contribute to sustainable development and proper management of the environment, Article 20 aims to protect indigenous rights to maintain and develop their economic systems and to be secure in “their own mean of subsistence.”¹⁵ Continuing the recognition of indigenous lands, Article 26 acknowledges that “Indigenous people have the right to the land, territories and resources which they have traditionally owned...the right to control and develop [those] lands” and the States’ obligation to recognize and protect them.¹⁶ Article 29 compliments Article 26 by stating that indigenous people “have the right to the conservation and protection of the environment and the productive capacity of their lands.”¹⁷ Lastly, Article 32 grants indigenous peoples with the right to “determine and develop strategies for the development or use of their lands.”¹⁸ In essence, UNDRIP is an unequivocal acknowledgement of the rights held by indigenous peoples to live just as they have for millennia, irrespective of the transforming world around them, with unrestricted access to the land, water and trees which they have subsisted upon for countless generations and to be free in exercising their culture and traditions.

Land, territory, natural resource, and subsistence-related activities referenced in UNDRIP are all relevant to the realization of indigenous peoples’ right to food. As a founding principle of indigenous peoples’ rights, the right to self-determination empowers those community members with the ability to grant or withhold consent (commonly known as FPIC rights) to certain development projects that impact their resources. A violation of UNDRIP land rights may also implicitly constitute a violation of the right to food when the land and resources are the means of

¹⁴ Id. Article 18.

¹⁵ Id. Article 20.

¹⁶ Id. Article 26.

¹⁷ Id. Article 29.

¹⁸ Id. Article 32.

the community's subsistence, and in particular when no alternative sources of food and income are available. For indigenous peoples' dependent on access to particular territories and its' resources, this is generally the case. Considering this wide recognition in international, national laws, and States' commitments through soft-law instruments, there is a view that at least freedom from hunger can be considered as a norm of international customary law, which is binding on all States, regardless of whether they have ratified specific treaties.

Unfortunately, privatization or the granting of concessions by governments to commercial enterprise operations such as plantations frequently destroy their traditional food and agro-ecological systems.

III. Case Studies

A. Threats to the Right to Food Posed by REDD+ Projects

In an effort to slow global deforestation while simultaneously address rising CO₂ levels, the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations' Framework Convention on Climate Change established Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation, often abbreviated as REDD.¹⁹ It is a framework through which developing countries are financially rewarded for any reductions in CO₂ emissions achieved through a decrease in the conversion of forests to alternate land uses. REDD provides a unique opportunity to achieve large-scale emissions reductions at comparatively low abatement costs.²⁰ At the 2010 Conference of the Parties-16, the Cancun Agreements later expanded REDD to REDD+ to include the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests, and enhancement of forest carbon stocks.²¹ Simultaneously working to reduce deforestation and acting as a funding mechanism to assist developing countries in alleviating poverty, REDD+ has enormous potential for mitigating climate change. Participating

¹⁹ *What is REDD+?*, the REDD desk, available at <http://theredddesk.org/what-is-redd> (last accessed Feb 24, 2016).

²⁰ *What is REDD+?*

²¹ *Id.*

countries can then accrue and sell carbon pollution credits when they can prove they have lowered deforestation below a baseline. The UN-REDD Programme supports nationally-led REDD+ processes and promotes the informed and meaningful involvement of all stakeholders, including indigenous peoples and other forest-dependent communities, in national and international REDD+ implementation.²² REDD+ operates by either directing support to the design and implementation of UN-REDD National Programmes, or is complimentary to national REDD+ projects through common approaches and analyses. As of June 2014, total funding for these efforts amounted to \$195.7 million.²³

Dense tropical forests, commonly found in developing countries, function as carbon reservoirs that store immense amounts of CO₂. Tropical deforestation accounts for 10% of the world's heat-trapping emissions, making them ideal for REDD+ initiatives.²⁴ Inhabited with indigenous communities, these same forests serve as means of protection and nourishment, in addition to acting as a binding social fabric. Forest-dwelling indigenous peoples safeguard approximately 80% of the planet's biodiversity within their traditional territories, yet legally have title to less than 11% of these lands.²⁵ Where REDD+ impacts land tenure and access to forest resources, conflicts inevitably ensue, and with it, regular violations of the indigenous community's right to food. Currently, REDD+ is being implemented in 64 partner countries, spanning, Africa, Asia, and Latina America. The following case studies are selected samples of threats REDD+ projects pose to securing the right to food.

²² *About the UN-REDD Programme.*

²³ *Id.*

²⁴ Union of Concerned Scientists, *Global Warming Solution: Stop Deforestation*, available at http://www.ucsusa.org/global_warming/solutions/stop-deforestation#.Vs5BysdlIE4 (last visited Feb 24, 2016).

²⁵ The World Bank, *Indigenous Peoples*, available at <http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/indigenouspeoples/overview> (last accessed Feb. 24 2016).

i. Kenya

In Kenya, the Mau forest is home to the largest group of forest dwellers, the Ogiek. The Ogiek people have lived inside the Mau forest since time immemorial, depending and subsisting on the forest for food and shelter. Forest resources have been, and continue to be vital to Ogiek culture and function as a source of livelihood. In 2007, the World Bank partnered with the Kenyan Government and the Kenya Forest Service (KFS) to launch a REDD+ project.²⁶ In a practically synchronized act, the Kenyan government enlarged the borders of many forest reserves. The Ogiek People, along with the Sengwer People and several other indigenous tribes, found themselves inside a forest reserve that was to be the basis of a REDD+ project.²⁷ Without any consultation or notice, they were automatically subject to forced evictions.²⁸ Leading to widespread condemnation from the global community, the then-UN special rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples and the UN committee on the eliminations of racial discrimination both condemned the evictions. Mr. James Anaya warned that any removal of Sengwer people from their traditional lands should not take place without adequate consultations and agreement with them, under just terms that are fully protective of their rights.²⁹ As partner and lead funding mechanism, the World Bank investigated the project and found that it had violated its own

²⁶ World Bank, *Kenya- Natural Resource Management Project: inspection panel report and recommendation*. Washington DC; World Bank (2013), available at <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2013/05/17782376/kenya-natural-resource-management-project-inspection-panel-report-recommendation>.

²⁷ *World Bank and UN Carbon offset scheme 'complicit' in genocidal land grabs-NGO*, Ahmed, Nafeez, the guardian (July 2014), available at <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/earth-insight/2014/jul/03/world-bank-un-redd-genocide-land-carbon-grab-sengwer-kenya> (last accessed Feb. 24, 2016), (hereinafter *World Bank complicit*).

²⁸ *World Bank complicit* (2014).

²⁹ United Nations Human Rights, Office of the High Commissioner, *Kenya/Embobut Forest: UN rights expert calls for the protection of indigenous people facing eviction* (Jan. 2014), available at <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=14163&LangID=E#sthash.agEat2Tc.dpuf> (last accessed Feb. 24, 2016).

safeguards by failing to protect the rights of the Ogiek and Sengwer people. The KFS carried out evictions from 2007 through 2013, essentially the entire length of the project itself.³⁰

The World Bank and Kenyan government's goal of protecting forest reserves by dispossessing the Ogiek and Sengwer People from land long lived and relied upon inadvertently generated conservation refugees. This approach is misguided and often results in either the criminalization and violent evictions of local peoples, or subjects those residing within a conservation zone to such stringent regulations that they are no longer able to subsist according to their traditional customs.³¹ Disrupting their traditional subsistence activities and threatening their right to food. States that deprive local populations from accessing productive resources that are indispensable to their livelihoods act in violation of the human right to food.³² In the process of implementing REDD+ projects aimed at forest conservation, Kenya must ensure that doing so will not result in food insecurity. Forcefully evicting and resettling the Ogiek and Sengwer people places particular hardships on women and children because women bear the brunt of traumatized and dislocated communities.

ii. Brazil

Brazil is one of the world's fastest growing economies, due primarily to its export capacity, which is heavily reliant on Amazon-related products. However, this growth has come at a substantial cost to the Amazon and the indigenous peoples that call it home. The Brazilian Amazon is home to approximately 240 tribes, totaling 900,000 indigenous peoples.³³ Amazonian deforestation and agricultural development accounts for approximately 70% of Brazil's national

³⁰Kenya Government's forced evictions threaten cultural survival of the Sengwer, Forest Peoples Programme, Feb. 2014, available at <http://www.forestpeoples.org/topics/rights-land-natural-resources/news/2014/02/kenyan-government-s-forced-evictions-threaten-cult> (last accessed Feb. 24, 2016).

³¹Submission of EarthRights International to John Knox, United Nations Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and the Environment, EarthRights International (2015).

³²Large-scale land acquisitions and lease: A set of core principles and measures to address the human rights challenge, De Schutter, Olivier, Special Rapporteur on the right to food (June 2009).

³³Brazilian Indians, Survival, available at <http://www.survivalinternational.org/tribes/brazilian> (last accessed Feb. 24, 2016).

emissions. In 2008, Brazil's then-President Luíz Inácio Lula da Silva launched the country's first REDD+ program. As envisioned, the project conserves and sustainably manages the Amazonian forest, outlining specific protected areas and regularizing land tenure. Built in to Brazil's REDD+ projects are policies that function to restrict access to the forest necessary for indigenous communities' survival, threatening their right to food.

A 2013 analysis into the safeguards in projects related to Brazil's REDD+ initiative found precisely that. The study, conducted by member members of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, recognized the risk that valuing forests for their climate change mitigation capacity could mean that REDD+ activities undermine some of the ecosystem services that forests provide and that are especially important to the lives and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and other forest communities.³⁴ This risk includes decreased local food production, possibly resulting in food security risks and the subsequent loss of livelihood.³⁵ Brazil's obligation to respect, protect and fulfill the right to food would be hindered where the state arbitrarily evicts or displaces people from their land, especially if the land was their primary means of feeding themselves.³⁶ When the State's REDD program conflicts with customary land ownership rights and the communities that principally rely upon that land in feeding themselves, the entire national program is undermined.

iii. Indonesia

Indonesia boasts the largest tropical rainforest in all of Asia, and is home to an estimated 50-70 million Indigenous Peoples.³⁷ Though the nation's REDD+ program is more advanced than

³⁴ United Nations, Economic and Social Council, *Indigenous people's rights and safeguards related to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation: report by the Secretariat to the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues*, E/C.19/2013/7 (5 February 2013), available at undocs.org/E/C.19/2013/7, (hereinafter *Indigenous people's rights*).

³⁵ *Indigenous people's rights*, ¶ 12.

³⁶ UN Commission on Human Rights, *Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food*, E/CN.4/2006/44 (16 March 2006).

³⁷ *Indigenous Peoples and REDD+: A Critical Perspective*, Osborne, Tracy, PhD., Indigenous Peoples' Biocultural Climate Change Assessment Initiative (2014), (hereinafter *Indigenous Peoples and REDD+*).

most other participating countries, major issues remain, including insecure land tenure, lack of adequate stakeholder participation, and the continued exploitation of forest resources. The degree to which states recognize indigenous peoples' rights, and the level of participation by indigenous communities will ultimately determine whether REDD+ policies and activities will have a positive or negative impact.³⁸ Land tenure issues in Indonesia are particularly difficult to resolve, and are exacerbated by the fact that the Indonesian government lacks a formal unifying piece of legislation that recognizes indigenous groups.³⁹ Without such a document, the inclusion of indigenous communities in the REDD+ planning process will be hindered, and they will continue to endure the effects of widespread land tenure insecurity, in turn jeopardizing food security for land-dependent communities.

Indonesian women and forest-dependent communities are considered particularly vulnerable with regards to Indonesia's REDD+ efforts due to the inadequacies of constructive involvement in forest and land decision-making processes. Women often have little or no effective access to these processes, not only when official decisions are taken, but also in terms of controlling the use of natural resources and capturing the benefits from the just management of forest and land.⁴⁰

B. Threats to Indigenous Peoples' Right to Food Posed by Agro-Industrial Operations

Member states to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)⁴¹ and the international community at large have legally binding obligations related to the human right to adequate food. States must guarantee poor rural communities access and

³⁸ *Indigenous people's rights*, ¶ 7 (2014).

³⁹ *Indigenous Peoples and REDD+* (2014).

⁴⁰ *Participatory Governance Assessment: The 2012 Indonesia Forest, Land, and REDD+ Governance Index*, UN-REDD Programme (2013).

⁴¹ ICESCR (1966).

control to land and other natural resources for food production.⁴² States must also implement policies that promote the adequate and sufficient supply of food at a local and national level, guaranteeing the supply is economically accessible for every citizen.⁴³ Developing states' obligations to ensuring the right to adequate food for their citizens is taking a back seat to the demands from developed states. Global demand for food and agricultural products has placed immense pressure on developing countries to convert virgin soil into productive land. As a result, the global south has seen a nearly a doubling of their productive output in the last 25 years.⁴⁴ Though the threats posed to the right to food by agro-industrial operations span many states throughout the global south, this paper surveys only select ones in order to highlight common issues for the most oppressed and marginalized social groups.

Latin American states routinely initiate and expand palm oil production. For example, Colombia and Guatemala have plans to dramatically increase their palm oil production. As member states to the ICESCR, and in the case of Colombia, who has Constitutionally codified indigenous land rights,⁴⁵ both states are obligated to promote adequate food production when implementing policies that impact traditional subsistence activities.⁴⁶ Colombia is the fourth largest producer of palm oil in the world, and the biggest producer in Latin America, with Guatemala following behind.⁴⁷

i. Colombia

National and international investments in Colombia's rapidly expanding palm oil industry have come at the expense of indigenous rights in various regions, including Mapiripan, Meta,

⁴² Office of the United Nations High Commission for Human Rights, *The Right to Adequate Food, Fact Sheet No. 34* (April 2010) available at <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/PublicationsResources/Pages/FactSheets.aspx>, (last accessed Feb. 26 2016) (hereinafter *Fact Sheet No. 34*).

⁴³*Id.*

⁴⁴ *Agro-Industries for Development*, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (2009).

⁴⁵ Constitución Política de Colombia, [C.P.] art 330 (1991).

⁴⁶ *Supra*, note 42.

⁴⁷ *Colombia*, Environmental Investigation Agency, available at <http://eia-global.org/campaigns/forests-campaign/latin-america/colombia> (last accessed Feb. 25 2016).

Colombia. A recent report by the Environmental Investigation Agency in collaboration with the Colombian NGO La Comisión Intereclesial de Justicia y Paz has chronicled widespread displacement of indigenous communities from their ancestral lands due to expanding palm oil plantations financed by the Italian-owned company Poligrow. The Jiw and Sikuni indigenous communities have been deprived of their traditional hunting and fishing lands, violating their human rights,⁴⁸ including their right to food. The Jiw report violations of their right to free, prior, and informed consultation with Poligrow regarding their traditional lands.

Safe access and control over land, water and other resources for food production (direct availability of food through farming activity, hunting, fishing or gathering) is fundamental to securing the right to food. An increasing demand for land and water due to the expansion of agro-industrial operations is increasing conflicts for these common goods and a greater destruction of natural resources used by marginalized rural groups, such as indigenous people and peasant farmers.⁴⁹ Palm oil plantations, such as Poligrow's, encourage deforestation and water contamination in regions where indigenous communities' diet depends on the jungle and territories. Forced evictions and the violent extraction of natural resources has meant that countries like Colombia already have around 3 million internally displaced persons.⁵⁰ Securing the right to food requires that Colombia, in line with the state's Constitutional and international mandates, recognize traditional land rights. Thereby enabling the implementation of policies that mitigate adverse impacts such as the restricted possibilities for indigenous people to hunt and collect food or fish. Ultimately, it may require seeking an end to the illicit expansion of agro-industrial operations into indigenous territory.

⁴⁸ *Oil Palm Plantations in Colombia Expand into Indigenous Territory*, Environmental Investigation Agency, available at <http://eia-global.org/news-media/oil-palm-plantations-in-colombia-expand-into-indigenous-territory> (last accessed Feb. 25 2016).

⁴⁹ *Agrofuels and the right to food in Latin America, Realities and threats*, FIAN International (2008) (hereinafter *Agrofuels*).

⁵⁰ *Agrofuels* (2008).

ii. Guatemala

In Guatemala, agro-businesses promoting palm oil expansion as development and job-creating for rural communities is coming with high costs to the local community's land and food security. The palm industry has transformed land once used for the production of food staples, such as maize, rice and beans, into rows of palm, worsening the country's ongoing hunger crisis, especially for the indigenous communities most reliant on these crops.⁵¹

Eighty percent of agricultural land in Guatemala is owned by only eight percent of the agricultural producers; while half a million rural farmers have no land at all.⁵² The rapid expansion of industrial monoculture (particularly sugarcane and palm oil) is displacing basic food production.⁵³ The country's Strategic Plan for Nutrition Security (2012-2016) points out how the rapid increase of non-food crops undermines domestic production of basic grains, raising food concerns.⁵⁴ Concerns amplified by the fact that one in every two children is chronically undernourished,⁵⁵ and per capita food production has decreased over the last 15 years.⁵⁶ Expanding into areas once used for the production of corn and beans by family farms for local consumption,⁵⁷ agro-business operations have affected the livelihoods of small-scale farmers and the nutrition of smaller communities. These areas are some of the most food insecure, as families are no longer able to produce their own food yet lack adequate purchasing

⁵¹ *Smallholders At Risk, Monoculture Expansion, land, food and livelihoods in Latin America*, Oxfam Briefing Paper, Oxfam BG Oxfam International (April 2014) (hereinafter *Smallholders at Risk*).

⁵² *Smallholders At Risk* (2014).

⁵³ Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to food, addendum, Mission to Guatemala, A/HRC/13/33/Add.4, ¶ 34 (Jan 2010).

⁵⁴ The government's Strategic Plan for Food and Nutrition Security 2012–2016 warned: 'The accelerated growth of cultivated areas with non-food products constitutes a risk for the production of basic grains. In the northern region of the country, the advance of oil palm production has already substituted a significant area of corn production, while in the southern region sugarcane and tobacco have expanded to the detriment of corn production.' See Government of Guatemala, Strategic Plan for Food and Nutrition Security 2012-2016, p. 24.

⁵⁵ Guatemala: V Encuesta Nacional de Salud Materno Infantil, 2008–09', November 2009. For some indigenous communities this rate is more than 90 percent.

⁵⁶ *Smallholder at Risk*, (2014).

⁵⁷ Over one-third of the land today occupied by oil palm plantations was planted with corn ten years ago, according to IDEAR study quoted by the Central American Network to Monitor the DR-CAFTA (2011) 'Centroamérica: ¿Mercados o naciones? Impactos del DR-CAFTA en la región a cinco años de vigencia', Guatemala City.

power or easy access to markets where nutritious food is available. Field research in the communities near the Palmas del Ixcán's plantations revealed that households that have sold the land once used to grow food and must now buy it, but often cannot afford to do so.⁵⁸ Plantation jobs are seasonal and low-paying, leading to an increase in food insecurity. In addition, many families who once rented the land for their subsistence crops are finding this more difficult and expensive due land competition from international oil palm companies.⁵⁹

Private investments must recognize the centrality of the biggest agricultural investors: small-scale producers, particularly women. Private investments should complement rather than displace the investments made by these producers, addressing their needs and challenges. Investment approaches should be grounded in human rights obligations and avoid undermining the rights and livelihoods of small-scale and subsistence stakeholders, and local communities.

IV. Conclusion

The right to food faces many challenges in the developing world; it is constantly under threat and in many instances undoubtedly violated. Sensible, practical steps can be taken by States and international agencies to enable the most vulnerable and marginalized populations access to adequate food. States participating in REDD+ initiatives must work to promote constructive dialogue with their forest-dwelling populations. It is ultimately in the best interests of indigenous communities, the state, and the world, that deforestation come to an end.

Environmentally-destructive operations such as agro-industrial plantations threaten the right to food, particularly with regards to small subsistence farmers, and more so where land ownership is not clear. States lacking formal unifying legislation that recognizes traditionally-owned territory must work to prevent the expansion of environmentally-detrimental practices

⁵⁸ *Smallholder at Risk*, (2014).

⁵⁹ *Id.*

that threaten smaller communities' right to food. In keeping with international principles, states promoting and investing in agro-industrial operations must consult with small-scale farming communities. Preventing violations of and stemming threats to the right to food require doing so.

V. Recommendations

A. Human Rights Advocates requests that the Council urge REDD+-participating states to:

- i. Promote constructive dialogue with forest-dwelling communities, and help to address REDD+-implications on the right to food;
- ii. Adhere to the standards and norms set by international human rights instruments on indigenous peoples' rights, in all stages of REDD+ projects implicating the right to food;
- iii. Promote respect and protection of human rights, as reflected in UNFCCC decisions, including the REDD+ safeguards, and their effects on the right to food.

B. Human Rights Advocates requests that the Council urge States Promoting Agro-Industrial Operations to:

- i. Investigate environmentally-destructive private operations to prevent the expansion of practices that violate the right to food and challenge local land rights, and;
- ii. Ensure that full legal recognition is given to indigenous communities through policy and land reform initiatives;
- iii. Consult with indigenous communities where development impacts traditionally-held territories.