

December 10, 2005

Via FedEx and Facsimile

Paul D. Wolfowitz, President  
The World Bank Group  
1818 H Street NW  
Washington, DC 20433

Lars Thunell, Incoming Executive Vice President  
The International Finance Corporation  
2121 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20433

Mr. Wolfowitz and Mr. Thunell:

We are writing to express concerns about the International Finance Corporation's revisions to its environmental and social policy framework; these concerns are shared by the 224 organizations signed on below. As the public comment period has now officially closed, we are turning to you as senior management of this public institution. We are writing to notify you of significant problems with the IFC's second draft of its policy and performance standards, and we are calling on you to exercise your leadership by removing the Involuntary Resettlement and Indigenous Peoples performance standards from the current "fast track" approval process that the IFC is pursuing. Both of these policies are substantially inadequate as safeguards, and as instruments for sustainable development. As currently drafted, they will exacerbate poverty and conflict over resources.

By calling for the removal of these two policies from the package, we are not implicitly endorsing the remaining elements of the package, which suffers from many overarching and interconnected problems, as noted in numerous submissions to the IFC. However, our analysis shows that these two performance standards are in glaring contradiction to the goals of equitable and sustainable development and the Bank's mandate of poverty alleviation. They both suffer from significant deviations from existing World Bank policy and the known requirements for dealing with the social, cultural, economic and environmental risks associated with forced displacement, and the impacts of projects on indigenous peoples and local community members. To proceed with them as drafted would represent a significant step backwards, and put tens of millions of people at risk of impoverishment and significant harm.

The International Accountability Project (IAP) and Forest Peoples Programme (FPP) have been part of an international civil society network that has been engaging with the IFC over their policy revision process for the past 15 months. We both have significant experience with the WBG's policies on involuntary resettlement and indigenous peoples, having participated extensively in the conversion of the Operational Directives (OD 4.30 and OD 4.20, respectively) into Operational Policies and Bank Procedures (OP/BP 4.12 and OP 4.10) – a process that occurred over many years. Our organizations also have direct field experience with the project-level impact of these policies, and we work with grassroots organizations and international networks on these issues. It is from this basis of experience that we have engaged in the analysis of Performance Standard 5 (PS 5) on Involuntary Resettlement and Performance Standard 7 (PS 7) on Indigenous Peoples.

We have consistently shared our analysis and engaged with the IFC, Board members, government representatives, civil society colleagues, and the Equator Banks throughout this process, both providing substantive input and raising procedural concerns. This revision process has had its share of procedural flaws, and we won't lengthen this letter by going into detail. Suffice it to say that while the IFC considers this process to have been extensive and comprehensive, civil society groups around the world have consistently objected to the rushed nature of the process, the failure to provide timely and translated information, and the failure to incorporate feedback on a number of concerns, particularly those relating to the lapses in accountability and the deference to client-generated information that is being built into the proposed system.

More importantly, there has been no meaningful attempt to consult with indigenous peoples throughout the process, despite public assurances to the contrary. There was no consultation with indigenous peoples on the first draft of the performance standard, and when this was denounced during a public meeting in April, IFC staff pledged to engage in consultation. However, their subsequent engagement consisted of one rushed meeting with indigenous peoples at the UN in May 2005. This is simply unacceptable and contrary to international practice in the twenty-first century. (In comparison, the revision of OD 4.20 involved years of discussion with indigenous peoples at the global and regional levels, as well as direct meeting with World Bank legal staff and management.)

Despite these problems, we and other civil society groups have nonetheless remained engaged in the policy revision process because we perceive the stakes to be very high. In addition to the IFC's own lending portfolio, the policy revisions will also potentially affect projects financed by the growing list of private sector banks that have signed onto the Equator Principles, representing more than \$60 billion in additional project finance per year. We engaged because we hoped that our input could help correct the worst of the policy changes, and we hoped to help advance the policy debate, and to reflect learning from the harsh lessons of the past several decades.

Instead, we have been profoundly disappointed with the IFC's approach. The IFC has made radical new policy proposals with far-reaching implications. If allowed to stand, these changes would weaken Bank policy and undermine internationally recognized and valued human rights, including the distinct rights of indigenous peoples under international law. The changes reflect a bias against the rights and interests of poor and marginalized people, and in favor of local elites and corporate power.

In the case of the involuntary resettlement policy, the IFC's second draft is drastically weaker than the first. Key policy objectives have been removed, and the premise of preventing and mitigating impoverishment risks has been eliminated. Here we must note that impoverishment in the context of development-induced displacement is not a hypothetical construct, it is a reality that must not be ignored. There is a well-documented track record of impoverishment associated with forcible displacement, often having impacts over multiple generations, and there is an established literature on risks and rights analyses that are required in light of such impacts. The findings of World Bank reviews of involuntary resettlement, and more recent in-depth analyses by the World Commission on Dams and the Extractive Industries Review, have been disregarded in this draft of the PS.

Furthermore, the IFC has not upheld the existing minimum requirements of existing World Bank policy, as promised in the terms of reference for the Safeguard Policy Review. As a result, the IFC has increasingly lost credibility throughout this policy revision process. Accordingly, we believe the involuntary resettlement and indigenous peoples performance standards must be removed from

the IFC process, and exempted from the January 2006 approval timeline. These two policies, which are interrelated in so many ways, and which go to the core of the Bank's development mission, should be assigned to an independent and credible team of experts to be redrafted, consistent with the knowledge base that is available about the impacts of development projects on indigenous peoples and local communities threatened with displacement, and with the full and freely chosen participation of indigenous peoples and persons from local communities.

We will now provide some details of the problems with the IFC's proposed policy and performance standards regarding resettlement and indigenous peoples.

### Involuntary Resettlement

It is important to recognize that (a) the IFC claims to be following Operational Directive (OD) 4.30 until the new policy and performance standards are adopted; and (b) the IBRD and IDA are following Operational Policy/ Bank Procedure (OP/BP) 4.12. The IFC's PS is measured against both of these documents in our analysis, with an emphasis on OD 4.30 since that is the standard that is being replaced by this process.

- The premise of all Bank policies on involuntary resettlement to date, including OD 4.30 and OP 4.12, is that involuntary resettlement imposes significant impoverishment risks. In contrast, the IFC has deleted any reference to impoverishment in the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft of PS 5. The IFC draft Performance Standard bears almost no resemblance to the policy that it is proposing to replace. The first draft of the PS included impoverishment risks.
- Furthermore, it must be remembered that the WBG's involuntary resettlement policy has also emphasized the objective of resettlement with development opportunities. For example, the opening sentence of OD 4.30's statement of "objectives" is that: "The objective of the Bank's resettlement policy is to ensure that the population displaced by a project receives benefits from it." This fundamental objective has been deleted from the second draft of PS 5's list of objectives, though it had been included in the 1<sup>st</sup> draft.
- Language in the OD and OP objectives about ensuring that benefits accrue to displaced people and that involuntary resettlement should be "conceived and executed as development programs, with resettlers provided sufficient investment resources to share in project benefits" has been dropped from the IFC's PS 5 objectives.
- PS 5 reverses, thereby weakening, WBG policy with respect to people who lack protection under national land titling or compensation laws. Rather than recognizing their vulnerability and taking special precautions to protect the rights of groups who do not have title, the PS discriminates in its application, privileging those with nationally-recognized claims to land, and denying full benefits and rights to those without.
- PS 5 creates a category of "informal settlers," defined as those who are "occupants of land without legally recognizable claims to land," (p. 20) in other words, without rights that are "recognized or recognizable under the laws of the country (p. 18)." It reverses existing Bank approaches and policy protections for landless people, including their right to compensation for loss of land. And the IFC eliminates the policy preference that people who are displaced from land-based livelihoods should be provided with land-based resettlement strategies and alternatives; this must be restored.
- With respect to economic or livelihood displacement, the policy has inadequate guarantees of livelihood restoration or improvement, which is a primary grievance of people displaced by development projects: they are deprived of their homelands and their livelihoods, and left

without any means of supporting themselves or their families in the future. People who are economically displaced, particularly when they are also physically displaced, lose their ability to be productive members of society, and can fall into a cycle of impoverishment that impacts several generations. Livelihood restoration is a necessary aspect of rehabilitation, and should serve as a critical indicator of truly sustainable development. Livelihood restoration cannot simply be dropped because it is difficult to accomplish. The difficulty and challenge, rather, must be factored into the impacts, costs, and desirability of proceeding with projects that will cause physical or economic displacement. Finally, even in the context of economic displacement, PS 5 would privilege those with recognized claims to real property over those who are “informal.” This discrimination has no justification.

- Whereas other performance standards recognize the “project’s area of influence,” or the impacts that “may arise from project activities,” the resettlement PS would be limited to “project-related land acquisition,” which in turn is narrowly defined in a footnote as situations involving transfer of title or granting of an easement. The IFC has stated that this definition is part of a deliberate attempt to exclude known project impacts or risks that cause physical and economic displacement - such as flooding of land without prior exchange of title; or displacement induced by pollutant emissions from a factory; or destruction of fisheries by project operations; or because a facility has drawn down the water table or otherwise adversely affected groundwater resources, disrupting local people’s rights to water, health, and livelihood. The IFC intends that these physical and economic displacement impacts would not be covered by the resettlement PS; nor are they covered in other Performance Standards. This will encourage the externalization of the impacts of IFC-financed facilities onto local people and the surrounding environment, providing an economically perverse policy incentive.
- In footnote 7 of PS 5, the IFC seems to imply that urban informal settlers may be forced to accept a “trade-off” between security of tenure and locational advantages. This language must be eliminated or modified, and the policy and PS must recognize that a change in location triggers a set of consequences, including access to transportation, livelihood, schools, health care, and social networks, and that these consequence must necessarily be mitigated, compensated for, and treated as development opportunities.
- We believe that the gendered aspects of displacement and resettlement must be explicitly recognized in the resettlement PS, and that the policy and PS must be strengthened to ensure protection of the rights of women, particularly when it comes to issues of livelihood impacts; land titles, property rights, and compensation systems; and participation, consultation, and decision-making issues.
- Far too many studies of involuntary resettlement have shown that displacement (and subsequent impoverishment) disproportionately impacts women and children, the elderly, indigenous and tribal peoples, and marginalized groups. Therefore, policy precautions are needed to recognize and explicitly factor these impacts into project/resettlement planning.

### Indigenous Peoples

PS7 is fraught with problems, loopholes and ambiguities that cumulatively undermine claims that it could be an effective and meaningful safeguard for indigenous peoples. The PS (and the policy framework overall) seems to be based on the proposition that indigenous peoples should trust the IFC (and in some cases the client) to ensure that rights and interests are protected. However, PS7 does not provide an effective safeguard at all for their rights and interests, as it permits activities that are in direct contravention of those rights and interests.

In some important ways, PS7 is weaker than the standards set forth in the Bank's Operational Policy (OP) 4.10. There are substantial differences between the policies that cannot be justified on the basis of any private/public sector distinction. The provisions pertaining to lands, relocation and due process rights are weak, vague and flawed.

- First and foremost, PS7 was developed without meaningful consultation with indigenous peoples who will be directly affected by these policy provisions. Nor does the final draft address the concerns and comments that have already been expressed by indigenous peoples and NGOs in this limited comment process.
- There is a significant difference between OP 4.10 and PS 7 concerning the definition of "free, prior and informed consultation (FPICon)." OP 4.10 states that FPICon with affected indigenous peoples' communities' refers to a culturally-appropriate and collective decision-making process subsequent to meaningful and good faith consultation and informed participation regarding the preparation and implementation of the project. In PS7, this definition is missing, and it means that for the IFC and its clients, FPICon amounts to nothing more than mere consultation, a standard that has proven ineffective.
- In OP 4.10, FPICon, resulting in broad community support (BCS), is required for every project affecting indigenous people, regardless of size or the degree of impact, and it must be established at each stage of the project. In contrast, BCS is not included in PS 7 at all. The two paragraphs of the IFC policy that reference BCS have not included the requirement to evaluate BCS at each stage of the project, and they would narrow the application of FPICon to "large" projects with "significant adverse" impacts. BCS must also be reflected in PS 7, and the application, definition and measurement of BCS must be no weaker than the provisions in OP 4.10.
- PS7 lacks any meaningful guarantees for indigenous peoples' rights to their lands, territories and resources, traditionally owned or otherwise occupied and used, and adopts a more restrictive approach than OP 4.10. While OP 4.10 covers projects affecting lands over which indigenous peoples' have a 'collective attachment', PS7 restricts actionable impacts to land under actual use, thereby weakening the policy coverage.
- There are provisions in PS 7 regarding documenting land use in consultation with affected indigenous peoples' communities, informing affected communities of their rights with respect to affected lands under national law (including laws recognizing customary rights or use), and offering compensation and due process rights, as well as culturally appropriate development opportunities, that should be part of any environmental and social impact assessment process affecting anyone and do not add any meaningful substantive or procedural requirements in relation to indigenous peoples' land rights.
- While PS 7 states that "Care should be taken to ensure that any indigenous peoples' land claim is not prejudiced during these steps" it is entirely unclear what the actual requirements are in relation to this statement, and non-mandatory language 'should' is employed raising questions about whether the client is actually required to do anything at all. Use of the term 'claim' is also problematic in and of itself as indigenous peoples have rights in international law to own and control lands, territories and resources traditionally owned or otherwise occupied and used. States and corporations have, at a minimum, the obligation to respect those rights. Rights in this sense are not 'claims', but impose specific obligations of conduct and result applicable to others. Also, in principle any operation within indigenous peoples' traditional territories that takes place without their consent may be considered a violation of rights and this is certainly prejudicial to those rights or a 'claim' over the same lands.

- Draft PS 7 contains other provisions that undermine or are in violation of the unique rights of indigenous peoples. For example, it says that “indigenous peoples will be offered at least compensation and rights to due process available to those with full legal title to the land in the case of commercial development of their land under national law,” as though this were meant as a positive statement. In fact, indigenous peoples’ rights to lands, territories and resources, including attendant due process, are accorded higher degrees of protection under international law and many domestic legal regimes than non-indigenous property rights.
- One higher due process standard accorded to indigenous peoples’ property rights under international law – at least in part because of the applicability of the right to self-determination – is the right to give or withhold FPIC (“free, prior, informed consent”), including in cases of proposed resettlement (physical or economic). In contrast, PS 5 and PS 7 would allow for the involuntary economic displacement of indigenous peoples from their lands, and the provisions pertaining to physical resettlement are ambiguous. Non-consensual expropriation of indigenous peoples’ lands and territories amounts to a gross violation of their international rights.
- The draft PS contains other provisions that are blatantly discriminatory against indigenous peoples. For example, PS 7 focuses only on impacts to “customary” livelihoods rather than all livelihoods and non-customary livelihoods are not accorded any protection at all. Non-indigenous persons’ livelihood rights are not restricted to those that are “customary,” and it is manifestly discriminatory to apply such a standard to indigenous peoples. In this scenario, indigenous peoples would be compensated for the loss of seasonal gathering grounds (say, areas where berries are picked), but may well not receive compensation for the loss of areas that support non-traditional (but nonetheless significant) livelihoods, such as small-scale mining or an eco-tourism lodge.
- Regarding economic displacement, the IFC does not obligate the client to reach a negotiated settlement with indigenous peoples pursuant to either PS 5 or PS 7.

In discussing OP 4.10 in relation to the Extractive Industries Review, Dr. Emil Salim observed that “revision of the safeguard policy on indigenous peoples is a fundamental test of the World Bank’s commitment to poverty alleviation through sustainable development.” The same is also the case with regard to PS7, and the IFC is in danger of failing that test.

### Conclusion

If the policies are weakened along the lines outlined in the September 22<sup>nd</sup> draft, any claim to social and environmental leadership will be lost. These changes will have ripple effects involving billions of dollars in project finance and the rights of millions of people. The Equator Banks presumably selected IFC policies because they viewed them as the highest policy standards available, thereby providing some degree of insurance against project risks, including reputational risks and risk associated with resistance by local communities and their allies. Proceeding with the IFC’s current approach will diminish the Equator Principles, as well as the credibility of IFC’s claim to provide “value added” through environmental and social quality control.

We also see the IFC proposals as providing an unfortunate assault on the informal economy of the poor and marginalized. Considering the recently announced initiative to triple IFC investments in Africa, we are called to remember the recent situation in Zimbabwe, where the government has deliberately targeted residents of the informal economy by bulldozing and burning them out of their

homes and evicting the poor from urban areas. Will the IFC view this type of situation as an investment opportunity, and support wealthy enterprises to move onto this cleared land?

Although we have been quite detailed, this letter has not fully addressed the myriad problems with the involuntary resettlement and indigenous peoples Performance Standards. We believe that the drafts as currently presented will do a disservice to all who are involved in and affected by IFC-financed projects, and that they are doomed to exacerbate tension, fuel increased resistance to projects, and contribute to the unjust impoverishment of affected communities. Moreover, the IFC and its clients will be exposed to both reputational and commercial risk if projects go ahead under the extant flawed provisions.

We urge you to exercise your leadership to reject and reverse any changes that would weaken or narrow the rights of indigenous peoples and of other people who are threatened with displacement. Ensure that the rights of vulnerable people are respected, and that the IFC adopt policies and performance standards that are at least as strong as those followed by the rest of the World Bank Group, and that reflect the principles and learning that are required for sustainable and equitable development in the twenty-first century. In order to accomplish this, we strongly recommend that the resettlement and indigenous peoples performance standards be taken off the fast track that the IFC is pursuing, and remanded to a special task force of capable and credible independent experts, including indigenous peoples and persons from local communities, to provide drafting assistance.

We thank you for taking the time to read this letter, and for taking steps to respond to the concerns. We also wish to thank the 224 organizations from 60 countries that have joined with us on the occasion of Human Rights Day to endorse these concerns and demands.

Sincerely,

Dana Clark

Fergus MacKay

cc: Board of Executive Directors  
Rachel Kyte, IFC  
Motoko Aizawa, IFC

These concerns and demands are endorsed by:

Astrid Puentes  
Interamerican Association for Environmental Defense (AIDA)  
Americas

María del Carmen Rodríguez de Castro  
Dr. Roberto A. Castro  
Asociación San Francisco de Asís  
Argentina

Dra. Naomi Abad  
Marcelo Leguizamón  
EcoPortal  
Argentina

Gerardo Coria  
Red Solidaria para el Uso Responsable del Agua Traslasierra  
Argentina

Stella Dictarina  
Union Participacion Solidaridad Compromiso  
Argentina

Claudia De Francesco  
Area 16  
Argentina

Viviana E. Figueroa  
Asociación de la Juventud Indigena Argentina  
Argentina

Christel Genuit  
Asociacion Civil El Eden Flora y Fauna  
Argentina

Eduardo A. Hidalgo  
Asamblea Permanente por los Derechos Humanos de Bahía Blanca  
Argentina

Edith Hemilse Iriani  
Asociación Civil "Un Techo Para Mi Hermano"  
Argentina

Lilia Inés Sierra, Prof. Adjunto Ordinario  
Cátedra de Antropología Sociocultural  
Universidad Nac. De La Plata  
Argentina

Daniel Taillant  
CEDHA  
Argentina

Ing. Agr. Marcelo Villegas  
periódico elbuenosaires  
Argentina

Heinz Stockinger  
PLAGE/Independent Salzburg Platform Against Nuclear Dangers  
Austria

Techa Beaumont  
Mineral Policy Institute  
Australia

Paul Bourke, George Farley  
Australia Tibet Council  
Australia

Vikki John  
Bougainville Freedom Movement  
Australia

Les Malezer  
Foundation for Aboriginal and Islander Research Action  
Australia

Tim O'Connor  
AID/WATCH  
Australia

Margaret Smith  
Smith Street Films  
Australia

Rob Wesley-Smith  
Australians for a Free East Timor  
Australia

Binota Moy Dhamai  
Bangladesh Indigenous Peoples Forum  
Bangladesh

Muhammad Hilaluddin  
Angikar Bangladesh Foundation,  
Bangladesh

Zakir Kibria  
BanglaPraxis  
Bangladesh

Ahmed Swapan Mahmud  
Voice  
Bangladesh

Arup Rahee  
Lokoj Institute  
Bangladesh

Devasish Roy  
Taungya, Chittagong Hill Tracts  
Bangladesh

Mathura Tripura  
Zabarang Kalyan Samity  
Bangladesh

Jan Cappelle  
Proyecto Gato  
Belgium

Aline Dehasse  
ONG Quinoa  
Belgium

Judith Neyer  
FERN  
Belgium

Godsman Ellis  
Belize Institute of Environmental Law and Policy (BELPO)  
Belize

Jesus Castillo  
Asamblea del Pueblo Guaraní (APG)  
Bolivia

Jorge Cortés F.  
Colectivo de Estudios Aplicados al Desarrollo Social – CEADES  
Bolivia

Preciliano Cruz Loza, Jach'a Mallku  
Jach'a Suyu Pakajaqi  
Bolivia

Carlos Cuasace Pdte.  
Organización Indígena Chiquitana (OICH)  
Bolivia

Genovevo Chambi Mallku  
Consejo de Ayllus Originarios de Potosi (CAOP)  
Bolivia

Fernando Rodriguez  
Capitulo Boliviano de Derechos Humanos, Democracia y Desarrollo (CBDHDD)  
Bolivia

Anacleto Supayabe  
Coordinadora de Pueblos Etnicos de Santa Cruz (CPESC)  
Bolivia

Russell Peterson  
The NGO Forum on Cambodia  
Cambodia

Kim Sangha  
3S Rivers Protection Network  
Cambodia

Adelard Blackman  
Buffalo River Dene Nation  
Canada

David B. Brooks, Ph.D.  
Friends of the Earth Canada  
Canada

Dr. J. Douglas Salmon, Jr.  
Centre for Family, Child & Adolescent Advancement  
Canada

Fernando Dougnac  
FIMA  
Chile

Cristián Gutiérrez  
Oceana South America and Antarctica Office  
Chile

María Elena Rozas  
Red de Acción en Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas de América Latina  
Chile

Gregorio Mesa Cuadros  
Planeta Paz  
Colombia

Fabio Monroy Martinez  
Corporación Deberes & Derechos  
Colombia

Milo Bekins Faries  
International Analog Forestry Network (IAFN)  
Costa Rica

Rolando Castro  
CEDARENA  
Costa Rica

Emily J. Yozell, Rafael Gonzalez  
Justicia para la Naturaleza  
Costa Rica

Lola García-Alix  
International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs  
Denmark

Benjamin Batista  
Sociedad Cultural Apolinar Perdomo  
Dominican Republic

Elena Alvarado, Enrique Gallo  
La Casa del Lago Centro Cultural  
Ecuador

Stefan Bohórquez Gerardy  
Comité Ecológico del Litoral  
Ecuador

Lorena Gamboa  
International Analog Forestry Network  
Ecuador

Manolo Morales  
ECOLEX  
Ecuador

Santiago Salazar C.  
Corporación foro Ecuatoriano de Ciencia y Tecnología-Corfecyt  
Ecuador

Luis Yanza  
Asamblea de Afectados por Texaco  
Ecuador

Carlos Zorrilla  
DECOIN  
Ecuador

Fidel Flores Hernandez  
Asociacion Coordinadora de Comunidades Indigenas de el Salvador ACCIES  
El Salvador

Juan Nelson Rojas  
Coalicion Anti-represas en los Rios Torola y Lempa (CARTYL)  
El Salvador

Mattias Ahren  
Sami Council  
Finland, Norway, Sweden and Russia

Sebastien Godinot  
IFI Reform Campaign  
France

Mawuli Dake  
National Coalition Against Privatization of Water  
Ghana

Koranteng Richard Twum Barimah  
Volta Basin Development Foundation  
Ghana

Knud Vocking  
Urgewald  
Germany

Manana Kochladze  
CEE Bankwatch Network  
Georgia

Piedad Espinosa  
Trópico Verde  
Guatemala

Kid James  
Amerindian Peoples Association of Guyana  
Guyana

Allan Bernardez  
Camara Nacional de Turismo Garifuna  
Honduras

András Lukács  
Levegő Munkacsoport/Clean Air Action Group  
Hungary

Dr. PR Arun  
India Centre for Human Rights Law  
India

Prof. Sanjai Bhatt  
Department of Social Work  
University of Delhi  
India

Shivani Chaudhry  
Housing and Land Rights Network  
India

Dr. Vijay Diwan  
Nisarga Mitra Mandal  
India

Ashish Fernandes  
Ecologist Asia  
India

Walter Fernandes  
North Eastern Social Research Centre  
India

Girija Godbole  
Jeevan Sanstha  
India

Akhil Gogoi  
All Assam Kirishak Mukti Sangram Samity  
India

Monoj Gogoi  
Peoples' Movement for Subansiri Brahmaputra Valley  
India

Tony Herbert  
Prerana Resource Centre  
India

Bidulata Huika  
Orissa Adibasi Manch  
India

Ashish Kothari  
Kalpavriksh  
India

Smitu Kothari  
Lokayan and  
Intercultural Resource Center  
India

Souparna Lahiri  
Delhi Forum  
India

Roy Laifungbam, Anna Pinto  
Centre for Organisation Research and Education (CORE)  
India

Gemma Mendes  
Chotanagpur Adivasi Sewa Samiti (CASS)  
India

Ravindra Nath  
River Basin Friends  
India

Sujit Patwardhan  
Parisar  
India

Sankar Ray  
Journalist  
India

Ravi Rebbapragada  
Samata  
India

Aruna Rodriguez-Clarke  
Sunray Harvesters  
India

Arup Kumar Saika  
Rural Volunteers Centre  
India

R. Sreedhar  
Environics Trust  
India

N.Sukumaran  
Advocate  
India

Adi Widyanto  
Mining Advocacy Network (JATAM)  
Indonesia

Antonio Tricaricio  
Campagna per la Riforma della Banca Mondiale  
Italy

Yuki Tanabe  
Japan Center for a Sustainable Environment and Society (JACSES)  
Japan

Soren Ambrose  
Solidarity Africa Network in Action  
Kenya

Lucy Mullenkei  
Indigenous Information Network  
African Indigenous Women's Organization – East Africa  
Kenya

Kanyinke Sena  
Ogiek Cultural Initiative Program  
Kenya

Richard Hackman  
Canada Fund for Local Initiatives  
Lao PDR

Sam Hui  
S.O.S. Selangor  
Malaysia

Gustavo Alanis-Ortega  
Centro Mexicano de Derecho Ambiental (CEMDA)  
Mexico

Héctor Duarte Tagales  
Centro de Desarrollo Ambiental  
Mexico

Dr. Raul Hernandez Garciadiego  
Alternativas y Procesos de Participación Social A.C.  
Mexico

Israel Xchel Leños Luna  
Koatlikue Pachamama  
México

Juliana Orozco Pizano  
Sociedad Civil  
Mexico

Jaime E. Rendón de León  
Centro de Formación e Investigación Municipal (CEFIMAC)  
Mexico

Scott S. Robinson  
Depto. de Anthropologia  
Universidad Metropolitana  
Mexico

Iván Rudenko León  
Colectivo Rebelión  
Mexico

Dr. Luis Tamayo  
Organización de Humanistas Ambientalistas  
Mexico

Dr. Francisco Valdés Perezgasga  
Prodefensa del Nazas, AC  
Mexico

Stuart Vasquez Furlong  
Biologist  
Mexico

Arturo Vélez Jiménez  
Fundación Campesina para la Conservación de la Naturaleza  
Mexico

Miriam Anne Frank  
Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples  
The Netherlands

Johan Frijns  
BankTrack  
The Netherlands

Longgena Ginting  
Friends of the Earth-International  
The Netherlands

Huub Scheele  
Both ENDS  
The Netherlands

Daizy Zamora  
Writer  
Nicaragua

Priscilla M Achakpa  
Women Environmental Programme  
Nigeria

Akanimo Sampson  
Journalists for Niger Delta (JODEL)  
Nigeria

Etiosa Uyigue  
Society for Water and Public Health Protection  
Nigeria

John Y. Jones  
The IGNIS Foundation  
Norway

Lars LØvald  
Rainforest Foundation Norway  
Norway

Andrew Preston  
FIVAS - Association for International Water Studies  
Norway

Amjad Nazeer  
SUNGI Development Foundation  
Pakistan

Jorge G. Conte B.  
Grupo Parques Nacionales  
Panama

Pedro Rivero Ramos  
Grupo de Agricultura Alternativa y de Aletta Ane la Tansgenesis (AGALAT)  
Panama

Damien Ase  
Center for Environmental Law and Community Rights, Inc. (CELCOR)  
Papua New Guinea

John Chitoa  
Yat Paol  
Bismarck Ramu Group (BRG)  
Papua New Guinea

Matilda Koma  
Centre for Environmental Research and Development  
Papua New Guinea

Heriberto Luis Cabral  
Red de Organizaciones Sociales  
Paraguay

Joel Filartiga  
Médico  
Paraguay

Elías Díaz Peña  
SOBREVIVENCIA, Friends of the Earth-Paraguay  
Paraguay

Ing. Felix Alvarez Velarde  
Asociacion Civil Labor  
Peru

Ivan M. Brehaut  
Asociación Nampitsi  
Peru

Juan Farfan Martinez  
Colegio de Abogados de Cusco y  
Red Latinoamerica de Defensa de los Recursos Energeticas  
Peru

Italo Borja Delgado  
COSERGESA  
Peru

Lily La Torre Lopez  
Groupo de Trabajo Racimos de Ungurahui  
Peru

Teodomiro Melendres  
La Central Fronteriza del Norte de Cafetaleros  
Peru

Manuel Pulgar-Vidal  
Sociedad Peruana de Derecho Ambiental (SPDA)  
Peru

Asian Indigenous Women's Network  
Philippines

Clemente G. Bautista Jr.  
Kalikasan-People's Network for the Environment  
Philippines

Joji Carino  
Tebtebba (Indigenous Peoples' International Centre for Policy Research and Education)  
Philippines

Joan Carling  
Cordillera Peoples Alliance  
Philippines

Rhoda Dalang  
Dinteg-Cordillera Indigenous Peoples Legal Center  
Philippines

Jenne de Beer  
NTFP Exchange for South and Southeast Asia  
Philippines

Ingrid Gorre  
Legal Rights and Natural Resources Center  
Kasamasa Kaliksan/Friends of the Earth-Philippines  
Philippines

Grizelda Mayo-Anda, Neriza S. Regal  
Environmental Legal Assistance Center, Inc. (ELAC-Palawan)  
Philippines

Datu Migketay, Victorino L. Saway  
PANAGTAGBO-Mindanao  
United Indigenous Nations of Mindanao  
Philippines

Edwin Morales Perez  
Movimiento Laboral del Oeste  
Puerto Rico

Victoria Sharakhmatova  
Fund Network of the Indigenous Peoples of the North  
Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Kamchatka Region  
Ethno-Ecological Information Center "Lach" (RAIPON)  
Russia, Kamchatka Peninsula

Stefan Janco  
Friends of the Earth Slovakia  
Slovakia

Ecuador Llactacaru  
Comitè de Solidaritat amb els Pobles Indigenes d' Amèrica – Barcelona  
Spain

Valle López-Tello Jiménez  
Los Verdes de Córdoba  
Spain

Patricia Borraz, Eva Sáinz  
ALMÁCIGA  
Spain

Chris de Wet  
Anthropologist  
South Africa

Hugo Jabini  
Association of Saramaka Authorities  
Suriname

Bruno Gurtner  
Alliance Sud  
Switzerland

Chacha Benedict Wambura  
Foundation HELP  
Tanzania

Jannie Lasimbang  
Asian Indigenous Peoples Pact  
Thailand

Chana Maung  
EarthRights International-SouthEast Asia  
Thailand

Shalmali Guttal  
Focus on the Global South (FOCUS)  
Thailand

Ida Le Blanc  
National Union of Domestic Employees  
Trinidad and Tobago

Mulindwa Joseph  
Environmental NGOs Lobby Group  
Uganda

Frank Muramuzi  
National Association of Professional Environmentalists  
Uganda

Eduardo Gudynas  
CLAES (Latin American Center Social Ecology)  
Uruguay

Teresa Perez  
World Rainforest Movement  
Uruguay

Lucy Baker  
Bretton Woods Project  
UK

Frances Carr  
Down to Earth  
UK  
Colleen Freeman  
Rights and Accountability in Development  
UK

Mark Golding  
Gallery54  
UK

Nick Hildyard  
The Corner House  
UK

Dr. Lyla Mehta  
Institute of Development Studies  
UK

Mika Minio-Paluello  
PLATFORM  
UK

Geoff Nettleton  
Indigenous Peoples Links  
UK

Diana Bohn  
Nicaragua Center for Community Action  
San Francisco Bay Area Jubilee Debt Cancellation Coalition  
US

Peter Bosshard  
International Rivers Network  
US

Gregory Button, PhD  
School of Public Health  
University of Michigan  
US

Liane Casten  
Chicago Media Watch  
US

Angana Chatterji  
California Institute of Integral Studies  
US

Gopal Dayaneni  
Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition  
US

Ted Downing  
Arizona House of Representatives and  
International Network on Displacement and Resettlement  
US

Randy Hayes  
International Forum on Globalization  
US

Ilyse Hogue  
Rainforest Action Network  
US

Douglas B. Hunt  
United Church of Christ Network for Environmental and Economic Responsibility  
US

David Hunter  
Peregrine Environmental Consulting  
US

Deborah James  
Global Exchange  
US

Bruce Jenkins  
Bank Information Center  
US

Barbara Rose Johnston  
Center for Political Ecology  
US

Prakash Kashwan  
Researcher  
US

Michelle Kinman  
Crude Accountability  
US

Dolores Koenig  
Professor of Anthropology  
American University  
US

Stephen Kretzmann  
Oil Change International  
US

Jessica Lawrence  
The Borneo Project  
US

Ann Leonard  
Global Alliance for Incineration Alternatives  
US

Esperanza Lujan  
Indian Law Resource Center  
US

Chris McKenna  
Tibet Justice Center  
US

Doug Norlen  
Pacific Environment  
US

Tony Oliver-Smith  
University of Florida  
US

Paula Palmer  
Global Response  
US

Katie Redford  
EarthRights International-US  
US

Bruce Rich  
Environmental Defense  
US

Thayer Scudder  
Professor of Anthropology Emeritus  
California Institute of Technology  
US

Atossa Soltani  
Amazon Watch  
US

Lhadon Tethong  
Students for a Free Tibet International  
US

Alfredo Quarto  
Mangrove Action Project  
US

Alberto Salamando  
International Indian Treaty Council  
US

Jim Vallette  
Sustainable Energy & Economy Network (SEEN)  
US

Martin Wagner  
Earthjustice  
US

Abigail Abrash Walton  
Antioch New England Graduate School  
US

David Waskaw  
Friends of the Earth-US  
US

María Magdalena Ríos Cabrera  
Universidad Pedagógica Experimental Libertador  
Venezuela

Dayne González  
Universidad Nacional Abierta  
Venezuela

Luis R. Jiménez P.  
Phynatura, A.C.  
Venezuela

Evelyn Vázquez  
Diseñador Gráfico  
Venezuela

Boniface S. Mutale  
Basilwizi  
Zimbabwe