

Mandates of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises; the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights; the Special Rapporteur on the right to development; the Special Rapporteur on the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment; the Special Rapporteur on the right to food; the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression; the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders; the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons; the Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes and the Special Rapporteur on the human rights to safe drinking water and sanitation

Ref.: AL OTH 28/2025

(Please use this reference in your reply)

28 April 2025

Dear Mr. Préstamo,

We have the honour to address you in our capacities as Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises; Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights; Special Rapporteur on the right to development; Special Rapporteur on the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment; Special Rapporteur on the right to food; Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression; Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders; Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons; Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes and Special Rapporteur on the human rights to safe drinking water and sanitation, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 53/3, 55/5, 51/7, 55/2, 58/10, 52/9, 52/4, 50/6, 54/10 and 51/19.

We are independent human rights experts appointed and mandated by the United Nations Human Rights Council to report and advise on human rights issues from a thematic or country-specific perspective. We are part of the special procedures system of the United Nations, which has 60 thematic and country mandates on a broad range of human rights issues. We are sending this letter under the communications procedure of the Special Procedures of the United Nations Human Rights Council to seek clarification on information we have received. Special Procedures mechanisms can intervene directly with Governments and other stakeholders (including companies) on allegations of abuses of human rights that come within their mandates by means of letters, which include urgent appeals, allegation letters, and other communications. The intervention may relate to a human rights violation that has already occurred, is ongoing, or which has a high risk of occurring. The process involves sending a letter to the concerned actors identifying the facts of the allegation, applicable international human rights norms and standards, the concerns and questions of the mandate-holder(s), and a request for follow-up action. Communications may deal with individual cases, general patterns and trends of human rights violations, cases affecting a particular group or community, or the content of draft or existing legislation, policy or practice considered not to be fully compatible with international human rights standards.

Santacruz Silver Mining Ltd

In this connection, we would like to bring to your attention information we have received concerning **alleged human rights violations of the indigenous communities of the Ayllu Acre Antequera of the Sura nation, located in the municipalities of Pazña and Antequera in the Poopó province of the department of Oruro, Bolivia, related to the mining activities carried out at the Bolívar mine by the state-owned company COMIBOL and the Canadian company Santacruz Silver Mining Ltd., in addition to other smaller-scale mining operations operating in the ancestral territory of these communities, such as the Empresa Minera Salvada Sociedad Colectiva.** The alleged violations are related to environmental contamination and the impacts on the health, criminalization and displacement of human rights defenders, and abuses of the rights of Indigenous Peoples, including the right to free, prior and informed consent.

The Bolívar mine extracts silver, zinc and lead under a mixed concession. The state-owned company COMIBOL (Corporación Minera de Bolivia) holds a 55% stake, while Asociación Sociedad Minera Illapa S.A. (Illapa), a wholly owned subsidiary of the Canadian company Santacruz Silver Mining Ltd., holds the remaining 45%. Until 11 October 2021, Illapa was owned by the Swiss company Glencore, when the definitive sale of its operating rights in Bolivia to Santacruz Silver Mining Ltd. took place.

According to the information received:

The Ayllu (an ancestral communal system of life and land ownership in Bolivia) Acre Antequera has 3,264 inhabitants (2012 data) from 8 Quechua-speaking communities (Chapana, Antequera, Charcajara, Huacuyo, Queaqueani Grande, Queaqueani Chico, Totoral Grande, and Totoral Chico).

The communities are located in the eastern part of the Poopó province, in the department of Oruro. Large-scale mining operations in this arid highland region are having serious and worrying effects on the Indigenous Peoples living in the area.

Currently, communities that coexist with the Bolívar mine have suffered environmental contamination that affects their health and their right to a healthy environment, as well as criminalization and attacks against indigenous defenders. There have also been reports of a lack of free, prior and informed free, prior and informed consultation and consent on projects, and serious impacts on ways of life, economy and traditional cultural transmission.

Rights to water, health, food and a clean, healthy and sustainable environment

Mining activities have severely contaminated water and soil in the Ayllu Acre Antequera, violating the communities' rights to access food, safe drinking water, right to health and to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment.

Large-scale mining extraction has led to water shortages, exacerbated by the diversion of underground springs to supply mining operations. In a region characterized by its aridity, the Bolívar mine uses 800,000 liters of water a day

and discharges 80 liters of wastewater per second into the Antequera River¹. According to several independent studies cited in a 2017 report, the remaining water is contaminated with arsenic, lead, cadmium, zinc, and cyanide sulphates at levels hazardous to health. As early as 2012, technical reports by the Ministry of Environment and Water had found levels of cyanide and ammonia in water treatment discharge that exceeded permitted limits.

Natural sources are contaminated and unsuitable for human, animal and agricultural consumption, failing to meet acceptable standards for colour, odour or taste. The state does not provide drinking water services. Only a tanker truck brings drinking water from Oruro to Antequera and the mining centres, while sources dry up in winter and springs have been diverted by mining activities.

Residents lack sufficient water for personal consumption and hygiene. Lack of access to clean and sufficient water has had consequences on agricultural and livestock activities, which represent a fundamental source of livelihood and cultural tradition for communities in the region. Crops such as potatoes, essential to the Indigenous diet and culture, have decreased in size and quality, while the loss of domestic livestock, such as llamas and sheep, has further impacted the right to food and the livelihoods of families. Pollution has disrupted traditional food sources, diminishing the availability of safe and nutritious food. The contamination of water and soil has further led to water and food insecurity, forcing communities to rely on external supplies, which are often costly and insufficient.

Pollution has also compromised air and soil quality due to the accumulation and dispersion of toxic waste from tailings dams. These substances are carried by the wind to homes, farmlands and water sources, aggravating the exposure of communities to health risks. Communities are continuously exposed to hazardous substances, affecting their rights to life, health, physical integrity, safe food and water, adequate housing and a healthy environment.

Cultural Rights and community survival

Water and soil contamination in the territory of the Ayllu Acre Antequera has led to environmental devastation that threatens the cultural and communal survival of Indigenous Peoples. In search of clean water and basic living conditions, many families have had to abandon their lands or confine themselves to ever smaller plots of land that cannot sustain their subsistence with the available natural resources.

Forced migration and the reduction of their territories have profoundly disrupted their traditional way of life, affecting their cultural identity and economy based on agricultural and livestock practices. Young people have been separated from the elderly, threatening to interrupt the transmission of cultural knowledge and participation in collective activities that are essential to preserving their heritage and collective identity.

¹ Glencore Shadow Watch Network (April 2017) Shadow Report on Glencore's Operations in Latin America <https://multiwatch.ch/content/uploads/2007/01/Shadow-Report-on-Glencore-Operations-in-Latin-America.pdf>

Equality and non-discrimination

As mining activity has eroded traditional livelihoods and collective economic systems in the Ayllu Acre Antequera, many residents have reportedly become dependent on employment in the mines as their only source of income. However, complaints have been reported from Indigenous community members due to discriminatory practices that exclude access to sources of employment, despite the existence of agreements that prioritize the hiring of local people.

In addition, mining companies have reportedly implemented strategies that foster social division, offering employment only to certain indigenous members (*comuneros*) on the condition that they act as informants in defense of the company, thus weakening community cohesion. Despite complaints filed by residents, no results have been observed to remedy this situation, perpetuating a pattern of exclusion and marginalization.

Criminalization and harassment of human rights defenders

Human rights defenders in the Ayllu Acre Antequera face a systematic campaign of threats, reprisals, criminalization and violence by mining companies and unions affiliated with them. These actions are intended to demobilize those who defend the communities' rights to water, land and territory, to live free of contamination, and have generated an environment of hostility and risks that affect both Indigenous leaders and the communities as a whole.

Since 2018, there have been reported cases of criminal charges, intimidation and physical attacks against community leaders and members, particularly women defenders. The misuse of criminal law (including of provisions relating to illegal mining appropriation and illegal possession of arms, for which the indigenous authority accused was declared innocent), has been aimed at silencing critical voices and dismantling collective community resistance. At least ten people, mostly women, are currently facing legal proceedings that undermine their ability to continue leading the defense of their territory and of the rights of their communities. Family members of the human rights defenders, who were employed in the mines, have been fired in retaliation for their relatives' activism.

On 18 March 2022, during a peaceful vigil organized to monitor mining waste, members of mining unions physically and verbally assaulted 14 women from the community of Totoral Chico. Although at least five of them required medical attention, they have been denied timely access to the Prosecutor's Office and the Forensic Investigations Institute. Their complaint to the Huanuni Prosecutor's Office has been closed due to inaction.

Between 15 May and 29 June 2022, members of the Ayllu held a peaceful vigil in protest of water pollution and scarcity. Following ignored demands for dialogue, on 7 June 2022, approximately 5,000 mine workers reportedly violently broke into the vigil, using dynamite explosions, inflicting physical and verbal violence, uttering threats of death and sexual violence, stealing

belongings, and destroying sacred symbols of Indigenous authorities. The protesters, including elderly, women, and children, were reportedly forced to flee and hide. The women attacked have not yet been able to return to their homes due to risks to their safety and fear of reprisals, and the complaints filed have not progressed.

In April 2024, women from the Totoral Chico community led a peaceful vigil to protect collective grazing lands. During this action, a group of approximately 200 people, including miners from the Avicaya Union and their families (affiliated with the mining company “La Salvada Sociedad Colectiva”, subcontracted by Illapa), allegedly violently attacked the group, dragging women on the ground, insulting them and destroying their belongings. This attack allegedly caused the displacement of 11 women and two children, who fled to the cities of Oruro and La Paz, many of them unable to return to their homes due to persistent insecurity, threats and risks.

In addition, Indigenous authorities have been targeted by new legal actions. In October 2024, criminal proceedings were reactivated against Bertha Ayala and Hernán Roque, ancestral authorities of the Ayllu Acre Antequera. Meanwhile, the demands of the displaced women, who demand guarantees for their safe return and freedom of movement, have still not received an effective response.

These cases reflect a systematic pattern of criminalisation, violence and displacement directed against the communities of the Ayllu Acre Antequera. Women human rights defenders, in particular, have been the target of attacks, threats and harassment.

Right to free, prior and informed consent (FPIC)

According to available information, the Bolívar mining project operates in the ancestral territory of the Ayllu without having carried out consultation and consent processes. In 2013, the companies Illapa and Sinchi Wayra (now owned by the Canadian company Santacruz Silver) signed a 15-year contract with the state-owned COMIBOL to exploit silver, zinc and lead, without consulting the 8 affected communities, which have not been adequately informed of the environmental, social and cultural impacts of the project. This contract, now under the administration of the Canadian company Santacruz Silver Mining Ltd., continues to affect the 8 communities of the Ayllu without their consent or participation.

In June 2024, the Empresa Minera Salvada Sociedad Colectiva, which would be operating in Totoral Chico in an irregular manner due to not having mining grids², requested the start of a controversial “prior consultation” process through the Jurisdictional Administrative Mining Authority (AJAM). The AJAM is a technical body linked to the Ministry of Mining and Metallurgy of Bolivia that is responsible for regulating mining activities, managing concessions and supervising regulatory compliance, including conducting prior consultations in the affected indigenous territories (Law 535 on Mining and Metallurgy).

² Auto AJAM-DEP-OR/CAM/AUTO/28/2028

However, this process has not complied with the basic principles of FPIC, as it is not prior, since it seeks to approve ongoing operations; it excludes the rest of the affected Ayllu and does not recognize the status of the Indigenous People of the Totoral Chico community; it does not provide adequate information, not even in indigenous languages; and it does not respect the decision-making procedures of the communities. For these reasons, the Ayllu authorities have rejected these attempts. Meanwhile, the Ministry of Mining and Metallurgy has continued to meet with mining unions to endorse the continuation of operations without deliberation with the affected communities.

According to available information, the first consultation carried out by AJAM in October 2024 would have been considered valid under the terms of Law 535, under which the FPIC process is limited to three rounds of consultation. If no agreement is reached in these three consultations, the decision would fall unilaterally to the Ministry of Mining and Metallurgy, which could approve the operations even in the face of objections from the affected communities. Law 535, in addition to centralizing decision-making power in the Ministry, focuses on “consultation” rather than “consent,” allowing for an interpretation of this right as a mere administrative procedure.

In this context, the regulatory deficiencies of Law 535 could undermine Indigenous rights, placing the communities of the Ayllu Acre Antequera in a vulnerable position in the face of decisions that would impact their territory, culture and livelihoods.

Without prejudging the accuracy of these allegations, we would like to recall that, as a reflection of the State's existing obligations under international human rights law, the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights indicate that States should protect against human rights violations committed in their territory and/or jurisdiction by third parties, including business enterprises, and require States to set out clearly the expectation that all business enterprises domiciled in their territory and/or jurisdiction respect human rights throughout their operations.

We express our deep concern regarding the alleged violations of the human rights of the communities of the Ayllu Acre Antequera and to attempt to clarify the allegations brought to our attention, including allegations of physical attacks, harassment and intimidation against members of local Indigenous communities, including human rights defenders, particularly in relation to their denunciation of alleged human rights violations and protest against certain business activities that affect the health, well-being and way of life of these communities. These acts are likely to generate a deterrent and intimidating effect in terms of freedom of expression for the affected communities and those defending their rights. We also highlight the importance of guaranteeing the right to free and informed consent and consultation, the right to take part in decision-making processes that have an impact on cultural life, and the concern about the impact on the rights to water, health, food and a clean, healthy and safe environment, and on cultural rights.

In connection with the above alleged facts and concerns, please refer to the **Annex on Reference to international human rights law** attached to this letter which

cites international human rights instruments and standards relevant to these allegations.

As it is our responsibility, under the mandates provided to us by the Human Rights Council, to seek to clarify all cases brought to our attention, we would be grateful for your observations on the following matters:

1. Please provide any additional information and/or comment(s) you may have on the above-mentioned allegations.
2. Please provide information on the human rights policy commitments and human rights due diligence processes put in place by your company, as set out in the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for adverse human rights abuses caused by or contributed to through your own activities, or directly linked to your operations, products or services by your business relationships.
3. Please explain what concrete steps have been taken by your company to exercise leverage, in line with the UN Guiding Principles, in your business relationships to prevent and mitigate human rights abuses committed by businesses, including how your company requires its business partners to conduct human rights due diligence in order to respect human rights, including those of Indigenous Peoples and human rights and environmental defenders.
4. Please provide information on the measures your company has taken or plans to take to address the above concerns and provide remedial measures to address the negative impacts on human rights caused by your activities, as well as remedy measures for those affected.
5. Please provide information on the steps taken by your company to ensure that free and meaningful participation- as part of human rights due diligence or otherwise- of the affected individuals and communities in decisions concerning the relevant mining projects have been undertaken.
6. Please provide information on steps taken by your company to establish, or participate, in operational-level grievance mechanisms, in line with the UN Guiding Principles, to effectively address adverse human rights impacts caused by or (contributed to) your company throughout your operations.
7. Please describe the measures that your company has taken, or plans to take, to prevent recurrence of such business-related human rights abuses in the future.
8. Please provide information on the policies your company has adopted or plans to adopt to ensure the protection of human rights defenders and groups that may be exposed to abuses and violations, such as Indigenous Peoples.

9. Please provide information on the measures taken to prevent displacement and offer assistance, as well as on the measures planned to promote durable solutions for displaced persons.

This communication and any response received from you will be made public via the communications reporting [website](#) within 60 days. They will also subsequently be made available in the usual report to be presented to the Human Rights Council.

While awaiting a reply, we urge that all necessary interim measures be taken to halt the alleged violations and prevent their re-occurrence and in the event that the investigations support or suggest the allegations to be correct, to ensure the accountability of any person(s) responsible for the alleged violations.

Please be informed that a letter on this subject matter has been also sent to those business enterprises involved, including COMIBOL (Bolivian Mining Corporation), Santacruz Silver Mining Ltd., the Asociación Sociedad Minera Illapa SA (Illapa), Empresa Minera Salvada Sociedad Colectiva and Glencore, as well as to the home-States of all involved companies (Canada and Switzerland).

Please accept, Mr. Préstamo, the assurances of our highest consideration.

Lyra Jakulevičienė
Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises

Alexandra Xanthaki
Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights

Surya Deva
Special Rapporteur on the right to development

Astrid Puentes Riaño
Special Rapporteur on the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment

Michael Fakhri
Special Rapporteur on the right to food

Irene Khan
Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression

Mary Lawlor
Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders

Paula Gaviria
Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons

Marcos A. Orellana
Special Rapporteur on the implications for human rights of the environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes

Pedro Arrojo-Agudo
Special Rapporteur on the human rights to safe drinking water and sanitation

Annex

Reference to international human rights law

In connection with above alleged facts and concerns, without intending to prejudge the alleged facts, we would like to draw your attention to the applicable international human rights norms and standards, as well as authoritative guidance on their interpretation. These include the following:

- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR).
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).
- International Labour Organization (ILO) convention No. 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples.
- United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
- UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.
- United Nations Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.
- UN Declaration on the Right to Development.
- UN recognition of the human rights to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment.
- United Nations Framework Principles on Human Rights and the Environment.

We would like to highlight the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, which were unanimously endorsed in 2011 by the Human Rights Council in its resolution (A/HRC/RES/17/31) after years of consultation with governments, civil society, human rights defenders and the business community. The guiding principles have been established as the authoritative global standard for all States and businesses to prevent and address business-related adverse human rights impacts. These guiding principles are based on the recognition of:

- a) "The existing obligations of States to respect, protect and fulfil human rights and fundamental freedoms.
- b) The role of business enterprises as specialized bodies or corporations performing specialized functions, which must comply with all applicable laws and respect human rights.

- c) The need for rights and obligations to be matched by appropriate and effective remedies when they are violated".

The guiding principles also make clear that companies have an independent responsibility to respect human rights. Principles 11-24 and 29-31 provide guidance to companies on how to meet their responsibility to respect human rights and to provide remedies where they have caused or contributed to adverse impacts. The guiding principles have identified two main components of the corporate responsibility to respect human rights, which require “business enterprises to:

- a) Prevent their own activities from causing or contributing to adverse human rights impacts and address those impacts when they occur.
- b) Seek to prevent or mitigate adverse human rights impacts directly related to operations, products or services provided through their business relationships, even where they have not contributed to those impacts”. (Guiding principle 13)

The commentary to guiding principle 13 notes that companies can be affected by adverse human rights impacts, either through their own activities or as a result of their business relationships with other parties (...) The 'activities' of business enterprises are understood to include both actions and omissions; and their 'business relationships' include relationships with business partners, entities in their value chain and any other non-State or State entities directly linked to their business operations, products or services.

To meet their responsibility to respect human rights, companies should have in place policies and procedures appropriate to their size and circumstances:

- a) A political commitment to uphold their responsibility to respect human rights.
- b) A human rights due diligence process to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for how they address their human rights impact.
- c) Processes to redress any adverse human rights impacts they have caused or contributed to (guiding principle 15).

According to guiding principles 16-21, human rights due diligence involves:

- a) Identifying and assessing actual or potential adverse human rights impacts that the enterprise has caused or contributed to through its activities, or that are directly related to the operations, products or services provided by its business relationships.
- b) Integrate the results of impact assessments into relevant business functions and processes, and take appropriate action in accordance with their involvement in the impact.

- c) Monitor the effectiveness of the measures and processes adopted to address these adverse human rights impacts in order to know whether they are working.
- d) Communicate how adverse effects are addressed and demonstrate to stakeholders - particularly those affected - that appropriate policies and processes are in place to implement respect for human rights in practice.

This process of identifying and assessing actual or potential adverse human rights impacts should include substantive consultation with potentially affected groups and other stakeholders (guiding principle 18).

Where an enterprise causes or is likely to cause an adverse human rights impact, it should take the necessary steps to end or prevent that impact. “The establishment of operational-level grievance mechanisms for those potentially affected by corporate activities can be an effective means of redress provided they meet certain requirements listed in principle 31 (guiding principle 22).

Furthermore, business enterprises should remedy any actual adverse impact that they cause or to which they contribute. Remedies can take a variety of forms and may include apologies, restitution, rehabilitation, financial or non-financial compensation and punitive sanctions (whether criminal or administrative, such as fines), as well as the prevention of harm through, for example, injunctions or guarantees of non-repetition. Procedures for the provision of remedy should be impartial, protected from corruption and free from political and other attempts to influence the outcome (commentary to guiding principle 25).

We would also like to recall the UN Special Rapporteur on the right to development’s 2023 report to the General Assembly on the “Role of business in realizing the right to development” (A/78/160), in which he underscored the importance of the principle of self-determination in times where States or companies tend to justify taking control over the natural resources of vulnerable or marginalized communities, without their meaningful participation, for the larger public good or to accomplish a top-down model of economic development.

The Special Rapporteur on the right to development in the same report further noted that “Lack of effective remediation and accountability for business-related human rights abuses – many of which are linked to development projects – is another obstacle to achieving social development. (...) business can play a critical role by ensuring that mining or other development projects in which they are involved promote – rather than undermine – cultural development not only of the present generation but also future generations. Businesses must ensure that mining is not only responsible and sustainable but also conducted only after obtaining a social license from the affected communities through their active, free and meaningful participation.”

The Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognised Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, also known as UN Declaration on Human Rights Defenders, recognizes everyone’s right to promote and to strive for the protection and realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms at the national and international levels. The

Declaration is addressed not only to States but to all individuals, groups and organs of society, and reaffirms, in its article 10, that “No one shall participate, by act or by failure to act where required, in violating human rights and fundamental freedoms”, which includes the responsibility of non-State actors to respect human rights, including the rights of human rights defenders (A/65/223).

We would like to refer to the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement of 1998 (E/CN.4/1998/53/Add.2), which establishes that all authorities and international actors shall respect and ensure respect for their obligations under international law, including human rights and humanitarian law, in all circumstances, so as to prevent and avoid conditions that might lead to displacement of persons (principle 5). Every human being shall have the right to be protected against being arbitrarily displaced from his or her home or place of habitual residence, including in cases of large-scale development projects, which are not justified by compelling or overriding public interests. (principle 6). Prior to any decision requiring the displacement of persons, the authorities concerned shall ensure that all feasible alternatives are explored in order to avoid displacement altogether. Where no alternatives exist, all measures shall be taken to minimize displacement and its adverse effects (principle 7(1)). The authorities undertaking such displacement shall ensure, to the greatest practicable extent, that proper accommodation is provided to the displaced persons, that such displacements are effected in satisfactory conditions of safety, nutrition, health and hygiene, and that members of the same family are not separated (principle 7(1)).

If displacement occurs in situations other than during the emergency stages of armed conflicts and disasters, the following guarantees shall be complied with: (a) A specific decision shall be taken by a State authority empowered by law to order such measures; (b) Adequate measures shall be taken to guarantee to those to be displaced full information on the reasons and procedures for their displacement and, where applicable, on compensation and relocation; (c) The free and informed consent of those to be displaced shall be sought; (d) The authorities concerned shall endeavour to involve those affected, particularly women, in the planning and management of their relocation; (e) Law enforcement measures, where required, shall be carried out by competent legal authorities; and (f) The right to an effective remedy, including the review of such decisions by appropriate judicial authorities, shall be respected (principle 7(3)).

Displacement shall not be carried out in a manner that violates the rights to life, dignity, liberty, and security of those affected (principle 8). States are under a particular obligation to protect against the displacement of indigenous peoples, minorities, peasants, pastoralists and other groups with a special dependency on and attachment to their lands (principle 8). States are under a particular obligation to protect against the displacement of indigenous peoples, minorities, peasants, pastoralists and other groups with a special dependency on and attachment to their lands (principle 9). Every human being has the right to dignity and physical, mental, and moral integrity, and shall be protected in particular against inter alia rape, mutilation, torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and other outrages upon personal dignity, such as acts of gender-specific violence, forced prostitution, and any form of indecent violence, acts of violence intended to spread terror among internally displaced persons, and threats and incitement to commit any of the foregoing acts shall be prohibited (principle 11). All internally displaced persons have the right to an adequate standard

of living, which at a minimum should include essential food and potable water, basic shelter and housing, appropriate clothing, and essential medical services and sanitation (principle 18).

The full texts of the above-mentioned human rights instruments and standards are available at www.ohchr.org or can be made available upon request.