

Mandates of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises; the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights in the context of climate change; the Special Rapporteur on the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment and the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons

Ref.: AL MOZ 1/2026
(Please use this reference in your reply)

5 March 2026

Excellency,

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 on the promotion and protection of human rights in the context of climate change; Special Rapporteur on the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment and Special Rapporteur on the human rights of internally displaced persons, pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 53/3, 57/31, 55/2 and 59/12.

In this connection, we would like to bring to the attention of your Excellency's Government information we have received concerning the **reported approval by the African Development Bank (AfDB), on 14 January 2026, of a USD 150 million loan to support the development of the Coral North Floating Liquefied Natural Gas (FLNG) Project in Mozambique.**

The case of alleged human rights violations and mass displacement in the context of attacks and military operations in Cabo Delgado province were previously raised in the communication AL MOZ 1/2021 and UA MOZ 1/2019. On 23 January 2019, the receipt of the communication UA MOZ 1/2019 was acknowledged but no further reply has been received. No response was received to communication AL MOZ 1/2021.

According to the information received:

Gas in Mozambique is currently centred on offshore gas extraction and Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) in the Cabo Delgado province. The LNG focus is on two offshore concession areas that have been granted to consortiums of fossil fuel companies – Area 1 and Area 4 of the Rovuma Basin. In Area 1 is the Mozambique LNG Project, led by TotalEnergies. In Area 4, there are the Coral North LNG Project, led by Eni S.p.A., and the Rovuma LNG project, led by ExxonMobil.

Following the Coral South LNG project which became operational in 2022, the 7 billion USD Coral North LNG Project will develop, construct, and operate a FLNG facility with an annual capacity of 3.55 million metric tons, approximately 55 kilometers off the coast of northern Mozambique's Cabo Delgado province. On 14 January 2026, the Board of Directors of the AfDB approved a 150 million USD senior loan to support the development of the Coral North LNG Project. An AfDB press release of 22 January 2026 justifies the project by reason of the fiscal revenues and jobs expected to be generated and

contribution to the Southern African Development Community regional energy and security. According to the AfDB press release, the project commits to set aside a portion of LNG production for clean cooking access and domestic industrial development in addition to export. The press release also mentions that, in addition to the African Development Bank Group, financing will be provided by other development finance institutions, export credit agencies and commercial lenders.

The human rights impacts of the Mozambique gas industry have purportedly been devastating. The construction phases of gas projects in Cabo Delgado have allegedly resulted in thousands of people being displaced, even for offshore projects, often with no or restricted access to traditional livelihoods and subsistence agricultural lands or fishing areas to sustain their families, without meaningful consultation with affected populations, including genuine participation in decisions regarding adequate relocation, and in violation of safeguards guaranteeing transparency, access to information and inadequacy of compensation. Relocations often lack sufficient investment in infrastructure and services, leaving displaced populations in vulnerable situations. This has resulted in people living in resettlement sites for years with limited livelihood opportunities, insecure land tenure and insufficient access to adequate housing, their traditional livelihoods and community structures, as many depend on fishing, agriculture and other natural resources to make a living. Despite promises that LNG projects would create employment opportunities for local communities, the high rate of illiteracy and limited access to formal education in the region mean that many residents lack the skills and qualifications required for the jobs being generated. As a result, these projects are likely to provide only limited employment benefits to the affected local communities.

Furthermore, the lack of civil documentation and the destruction of infrastructure present challenges to internally displaced persons seeking access to housing and land and property rights in both displacement and resource-rich areas of return, leading to instances of forced evictions, illegal expropriations, illegal occupations and land disputes. In areas of ongoing armed clashes, many returnees are unable to resume their livelihoods owing to insecurity in accessing their farmland or obtaining their housing and lands, including in areas where existing forms of tenure security existed. As a result, internally displaced persons may need to engage in intercommunity land disputes in their places of origin, exposing them to further risk of forced eviction and thereby jeopardizing their sustainable return and reintegration. In urban areas, displaced individuals face high housing prices and threats of eviction. Despite the country's land-tenure framework guaranteeing equal rights, ineffective enforcement and discriminatory norms have marginalized women.

In addition, the projects also have the potential to result in significant release of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, especially methane, for decades to come. Research from Cornell University has found that, due to methane emissions, conventional natural gas has a greater impact on climate than coal or oil. The LNG project lifecycle processes of production, transport, liquification, shipping, regassification, and power plant combustion are incredibly energy intensive. For reference, the Rovuma LNG project's Environmental Impact Assessment

indicated: “The pre-mitigation impact of the Project on Mozambique’s national GHG emissions is likely be of MAJOR significance both during the construction and operational phases of the Project. Given the scale and nature of the Project, while good practice can be employed to reduce the GHG emissions, the overall significance of the impact is not expected to significantly change post-mitigation.” In the meantime, Mozambique has been greatly affected by internal displacement as a result of disasters, exacerbated by the adverse effects of climate change, resource extraction projects and armed conflict. Mozambique faces recurrent natural hazards, including droughts, heavy rains, tropical storms and cyclones, and their frequency and intensity are amplified by the global climate crisis, with major consequences for rural communities. Yearly tropical storms and cyclones have been particularly devastating over the past five years. As of February 2026, an estimated 723,000 people have been affected by recent flooding across southern and central Mozambique, with the majority in Gaza Province.

Additional human rights risks factors should be considered in the context of the ongoing conflict between State forces and non-State armed groups. Since 2017, Cabo Delgado Province has been affected by large-scale internal displacement, both within the province and to neighbouring ones, owing to ongoing armed conflict and violence. The conflict has led to civilian casualties, infrastructure destruction, loss of livelihoods and serious violations of international human rights and humanitarian law. The situation was further exacerbated by the lack of basic infrastructure and services, poverty, unemployment and social inequality owing to pre-existing disparities between the south and the north of the country. Approximately 400,000 people in Cabo Delgado province are currently displaced. Just between January and August 2025, over 95,000 people had been internally displaced according to the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, due to the insecurity in Cabo Delgado. In this context, the ongoing gas operations might have allegedly contributed to fueling violent conflict. Civil society organizations have reported on serious human rights violations alleged to have been carried out between July and September 2021 by Mozambican armed forces in connection with the Mozambique LNG Project in Cabo Delgado, including enforced disappearances, summary executions, torture and other cruel, degrading or inhuman treatment of dozens of civilians. In March 2025, the Office of the Attorney General of Mozambique confirmed the opening of a criminal investigation into these allegations. While on 26 January 2026, the National Commission of Human Rights of Mozambique noted it could not find sufficient evidence to corroborate the allegations of human rights violations by military personnel, another report by the Clingendael’s Conflict Research Unit, which was commissioned by the Dutch Ministry of Finance,¹ corroborated that a large number of civilians were detained and abused by Defence and Security Forces personnel in front of the LNG project’s site. The report concludes that the Mozambican Defence and Security Forces (FDS) have a troubled record of human rights violations in the region surrounding the LNG project’s site in Afungi. This report was released as the Dutch and British governments announced they were withdrawing some 2.2 billion USD in support for the gas

¹ Following these allegations, debate was reignited in the Dutch Parliament over the Netherlands’ involvement in the LNG Area 1 project led by TotalEnergies, and specifically the credit insurance policies issued by Atradius Dutch State Business (ADSB) in 2021 to companies involved in the project.

plant. Information received also indicates that journalists reporting on the conflict have been subject to arbitrary arrests and detention, and allegations of torture.

Without wishing to prejudge the accuracy of the information received, we would like to express our most serious concern regarding the adverse impacts on human rights caused by activities such as the exploitation of fossil fuels which contribute to climate change, biodiversity loss and toxic pollution. Under the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, and under international human rights law more generally, States have an obligation to protect all internationally recognized human rights, including in the context of climate change.

We note that the International Court of Justice stressed “that States have an obligation under international human rights law to respect and ensure the effective enjoyment of human rights by taking the necessary measures to protect the climate system and other components of the environment” and the failure to do so including through the production of fossil fuels, the consumption of fossil fuels, the granting of licenses for fossil fuel exploration, may constitute an international wrongful act.

We also note that in her 2025 report on the imperative of defossilizing our economies (A/HRC/59/42), the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights in the context of climate change clarifies States’ obligations and businesses’ responsibilities to phase out fossil fuels across their full life cycle, including extraction, production, transport and use, within this decade as fossil fuel extraction causes severe, interlinked and widespread human rights impacts throughout its life cycle, including toxic pollution, ecosystem degradation and climate harm. Continuing to approve or finance new fossil fuel projects exceeds the remaining carbon budget compatible with 1.5°C, rendering such projects incompatible with the protection of human rights. The Special Rapporteur explicitly rejects narratives that gas should be treated as a “transition” or “bridge” fuel where it results in new upstream investments or long-term locking, emphasising that such framing delays effective climate action and entrenches human rights harm. States and businesses must refrain from enabling new fossil fuel extraction, including gas, because doing so predictably undermines the right to a clean, healthy, and sustainable environment.

In addition, while the Mozambique LNG Area 1 and FLNG projects are different in numerous material respects, any possible linkage between the military and the FLNG project would be a matter of the utmost concern. This could be the case, for example, where project security arrangements involve those credibly accused of human rights violations, and/or where project revenues directly or indirectly inure to their benefit.

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 indicate measures taken by Your Excellency's Government to ensure that the legal and regulatory frameworks governing the extractive industry comply with international human rights and humanitarian law, environmental laws and human rights standards, especially in relation to climate change, as well as in the context of biodiversity loss and toxic pollution, and that they adequately protect the rights of affected communities, including provisions related to land rights, compensation and resettlement.
3. Please provide updated information on measures taken to protect human rights in the context of climate change, biodiversity loss and toxic pollution, including regarding potential increase of air, water and soil pollution, increase of greenhouse gases, among other crucial elements. including with regard to the full life-cycle of fossil fuels.
4. Please provide information on whether Your Excellency's Government has undertaken an independent, comprehensive human rights impact assessment prior to the project approval, including whether these assessments explicitly addressed the situation of women, female-headed households, and other groups in vulnerable situations, to minimize negative impacts on affected communities, prevent or reduce displacement, provide adequate compensation and resettlement assistance, when necessary, and safeguard livelihoods and access to essential services. Please indicate if such impact assessment includes assessment of environmental and climate impacts.
5. Please indicate whether participation from local communities, including women and populations in vulnerable situations in coastal areas, was meaningfully integrated into the impact analysis and consultation processes prior to the project approval. Please provide information on any identified risks or mitigation measures related to gender-differentiated impacts, displacement, loss of livelihoods, or security-related human rights concerns, and how these were assessed and addressed.
6. Please advise the steps taken to ensure that Your Excellency's Government encourages respect for human rights in line with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, including by requiring businesses to conduct human rights due diligence that addresses how to prevent, mitigate and remediate the adverse climate change-related and other human rights impacts that business may cause or contribute to through its own activities, or which may be directly linked to its operations, products or services by its business relationships.

7. Please provide information on measures taken to provide confidential complaint mechanisms and referral pathways to ensure prompt, thorough, independent and impartial investigation and ensure accountability for any human rights violations and abuses committed against internally displaced persons by security forces, community leaders and others with power or involved in humanitarian assistance in resettlement areas, and provide necessary support, protection and reparations.
8. Please indicate any steps that Your Excellency's Government has taken to require business to assess Scope 1, 2 and 3 greenhouse gas emissions throughout their operations, and how these will be prevented and mitigated, with an explanation of how such identification is science-based, verifiable and informed by expert input, as well as being based on meaningful consultation with all relevant stakeholders.
9. Please provide information on the measures Your Excellency's Government is taking or considering taking to ensure that persons affected by the activities of commercial enterprises domiciled in your jurisdiction have access to free, prior and informed consent in extractive projects, allowing affected communities and groups in vulnerable situation to meaningfully participate in decision-making processes that may impact their lands, livelihoods and other rights as well as to redress in your country, through judicial or extrajudicial State mechanisms.
10. Please provide information on measures taken to strengthen legal and regulatory frameworks governing the extractive industry to ensure that they adequately protect the rights of affected communities, including provisions related to housing, land and property rights compensation and resettlement. Please provide information on measures taken to adopt a comprehensive national action plan on business and human rights, in line with the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, including monitoring, reporting and enforcement mechanisms to track the impact of extractive activities on internal displacement and to hold extractive companies and relevant stakeholders accountable.

This communication, and any response received from your Excellency's Government, will be made public via the communications reporting [website](#) at the 60 days mark. Should Your Excellency's Government respond within 60 days, both the communication and the response, may be published before the 60 days mark. The communications and responses will also be made available in the subsequent periodic report to be presented to the Human Rights Council.

While awaiting a reply, we urge that Your Excellency's Government establish a moratorium on LNG activities in Cabo Delgado province.

We may publicly express our concerns in the near future as, in our view, the information upon which the press release will be based is sufficiently reliable to indicate a matter warranting immediate attention. We also believe that the wider public should

be alerted to the potential implications of the above-mentioned allegations. The press release will indicate that we have been in contact with your Excellency's Government's to clarify the issue/s in question.

Please be informed that a letter on this subject matter has also been sent to the African Development Bank, as well as copies to the companies Eni S.p.A, ExxonMobil Corporation and TotalEnergies SE.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of our highest consideration.

Damilola S. Olawuyi
Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and
transnational corporations and other business enterprises

Elisa Morgera
Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights in the context of
climate change

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

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

Annex

Reference to international human rights law

In connection with above alleged facts and concerns, we would like to bring to Your Excellency's attention the Advisory Opinion of July 2025 of the International Court of Justice on States' obligations in respect of climate change. The Court found that all States have stringent due diligence obligations to prevent significant harm to the environment and the climate system. The Court further clarified that States have multiple obligations under climate change treaties, environmental treaties including the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Convention against Desertification, the law of the sea, and customary international law in this connection. Failure of a State to take appropriate action to protect the climate system from greenhouse gas emissions – including through fossil fuel production, consumption, the granting of fossil fuel exploration licences or the provision of fossil fuel subsidies – may constitute an internationally wrongful act which is attributable to that State (paragraph 427). Furthermore, the International Court emphasized “that States have an obligation under international human rights law to respect and ensure the effective enjoyment of human rights by taking the necessary measures to protect the climate system and other components of the environment”, in particular the obligation to prevent significant transboundary harm. The Court also highlighted that States may be responsible for the conduct of private actors resulting in emissions of greenhouse gases where, for example, it has failed to exercise due diligence by not taking the necessary regulatory, legislative and monitoring measures to limit the quantity of emissions caused by private actors under its jurisdiction (paragraph 428).

In connection with above alleged facts and concerns, we would like to highlight the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (A/HRC/17/31), which were unanimously endorsed by the Human Rights Council in June 2011, are relevant to the impact of business activities on human rights. These Guiding Principles are grounded in recognition of:

- (a) “States’ existing obligations to respect, protect and fulfil human rights and fundamental freedoms.
- (b) The role of business enterprises as specialized organs or society performing specialized functions, required to comply with all applicable laws and to respect human rights.
- (c) The need for rights and obligations to be matched to appropriate and effective remedies when breached.”

According to the Guiding Principles, States have a duty to protect against human rights abuses within their territory and/or jurisdiction by third parties, including business enterprises. States may be considered to have breached their international human law obligations where they fail to take appropriate steps to prevent, investigate and redress human rights violations committed by private actors. While States generally have discretion in deciding upon these steps, they should consider the full range of permissible preventative and remedial measures.

Furthermore, we would like to note that as set forth in the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, all business enterprises have a responsibility to respect human rights, which requires them to avoid infringing on the human rights of others to address adverse human rights impacts with which they are involved. The responsibility to respect human rights is a global standard of expected conduct for all business enterprises wherever they operate. It exists independently of States' abilities and/or willingness to fulfil their own human rights obligations, and does not diminish those obligations. Furthermore, it exists over and above compliance with national laws and regulations protecting human rights.

Principles 11 to 24 and principles 29 to 31 provide guidance to business enterprises on how to meet their responsibility to respect human rights and to provide for remedies when they have cause or contributed to adverse impacts. Moreover, the commentary of principle 11 states that "business enterprises should not undermine States' abilities to meet their own human rights obligations, including by actions that might weaken the integrity of judicial processes". The commentary of guiding principle 13 notes that business enterprises may be involved with adverse human rights impacts either through their own activities or as a result of their business relationships with other parties. [...] Business enterprise's "activities" are understood to include both actions and omissions; and its "business relationships" are understood to include relationships with business partners, entities in its value chain, and any other non-State or State entity directly linked to its business operations, products or services".

The Guiding Principles have identified two main components to the business responsibility to respect human rights, which require that "business enterprises: (a) Avoid causing or contributing to adverse human rights impacts through their own activities, and address such impacts when they occur; [and] (b) Seek to prevent or mitigate adverse human rights impacts that are directly linked to their operations, products or services by their business relationships, even if they have not contributed to those impacts" (guiding principle 13).

Principles 17-21 lays down the four-step human rights due diligence process that all business enterprises should take to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for how they address their adverse human rights impacts. Principle 22 further provides that when "business enterprises identify that they have caused or contributed to adverse impacts, they should provide for or cooperate in their remediation through legitimate processes".

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 or other attempts to influence the outcome (commentary to guiding principle 25).

Furthermore, we would like to recall that on 8 October 2021, the Human Rights Council adopted resolution 48/13, recognizing the right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment, confirmed by the General Assembly in July 2022 with

resolution A/RES/76/300. In addition, the Framework Principles on Human Rights and the Environment, presented to the Human Rights Council in March 2018 (A/HRC/37/59), set out the basic obligations of States under human rights law as they relate to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment. Principle 8 provides, specifically, that “To avoid authorizing actions with environmental impacts that interfere with the full enjoyment of human rights, States should require the prior assessment of the possible environmental impacts of proposed projects and policies, including their potential impacts on the enjoyment of human rights”, including the rights to life, health, food, water, housing and culture.

Further, principles 6 and 7 provide that “States should provide for education and public awareness on environmental matters” and “public access to environmental information by collecting and disseminating information and by providing affordable, effective and timely access to information to any person upon request”. In its Advisory Opinion on States’ obligations in respect of climate change, the International Court of Justice clarified that the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment is a “precondition”, “inherent,” and “essential” for the enjoyment of all other human rights.

In relation to the above-mentioned facts and concerns, we would also like to draw your attention to the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, ratified by Your Excellency’s Government on 4 June 2018, which acknowledges that State Parties should, when taking action to address climate change, respect, promote and consider their respective obligations on human rights (preamble). As clarified by the International Court of Justice in its Advisory Opinion on States’ obligations in respect of climate change, each State should take climate action according to its highest possible ambition to make an adequate contribution to global efforts capable of achieving the 1.5°C global average temperature goal, as a matter of stringent due diligence obligation, taking into account historical contributions to cumulative emissions, level of development and national circumstances of each State. In addition, each State’s commitments to climate change mitigation should be informed by the outcomes of the first Global Stocktake, which included explicit reference to fossil fuels and related subsidies, renewable energy development, energy efficiency, sustainable production and consumption, nature and ocean protection and restoration, as well as meaningful and effective social dialogue and participation. Further, States should include protection and restoration of ecosystems, as a form of mitigation, adaptation and redress for climate and human rights harm.

With specific regard to fossil fuels, the Special Rapporteur on climate change in A/HRC/59/42 concluded that “priority, comprehensive, coherent action on the fossil fuel phaseout within this decade is necessary to ensure a liveable future for all, as an urgent precondition for a just transition and for effective human rights protection in the context of current planetary crises” In this context, she recommended, “While decarbonization continues to be essential, coupled with detoxification of any decarbonization technology, it must be accompanied by the defossilization of our economies with a view to:(a) Prioritizing the phaseout of fossil fuel production and of the use of fossil fuels, as the main cause of climate change; (b) Overcoming “carbon tunnel vision”, to prevent biodiversity loss and toxic pollution from the fossil fuels life cycle, which cause further human rights harm and worsen climate impacts on those in vulnerable situations”.

The Special Rapporteur also stressed that “States should adopt and enforce explicit and time-bound legislative measures:(a) To prohibit new fossil fuel exploration and exploitation, as well as any expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure;(b) To revoke licences for existing fossil fuel exploration and exploitation, including for captive and on-grid coal plants; (c) To strictly regulate the import and export of fossil fuels; (d) To prohibit the abandonment of fossil fuel infrastructure without remediation, requiring financial guarantees to cover costs for the environmental management of facility closure and subsequent phases, including regarding extraterritorial impacts”.

According to the Rapporteur, States should immediately prohibit the most damaging forms of fossil fuel extraction: fracking, oil sands and gas flaring; offshore exploration and exploitation; and exploration or exploitation in protected and highly biodiverse areas. In addition, the Rapporteur stressed the obligations to provide effective remedies for human rights harm from fossil fuel operations by business entities, including by: setting and enforcing strict financial penalties for human rights abuses by fossil fuel companies; requiring fossil fuel companies to finance climate adaptation, mitigation and loss and damage, ensuring that they are directly accessible by affected communities; and ensuring restitution of territories to Indigenous Peoples and peasants in areas previously allocated to fossil fuel operations, as long as the return is desired and is made possible through the dismantling of fossil fuel infrastructure, and ecosystem restoration and full remediation of toxic contamination. Otherwise, compensation should be provided.

The Special Rapporteur on the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment has clarified the obligations of States in relation to environmental impact assessment processes and the need to take into account the impact on human rights and society in order to carry out comprehensive and integrated assessments (A/80/187). Her report highlights the challenges and best practices in line with human rights and international obligations, and is presented with the intention of improving these processes, outlining some of the ways in which existing assessment frameworks need to evolve in order to effectively and comprehensively measure potential impacts on the environment, climate, biodiversity, health, society, culture, the economy and human rights through comprehensive and integrated assessments, based on the best available scientific knowledge, including Indigenous and traditional sciences, and through transparent and participatory processes. Further, the Special Rapporteur on the human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment, in her report A/HRC/61/47 on Priority actions towards breathing clean air, protecting public health and ensuring a healthy environment, has clarified the need to assess and prevent air pollution, including for fossil fuels projects.

We further highlight that the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights has over the years emphasized the need for enhanced protection of human rights and the environment, especially through the development of effective mechanisms for holding non-state actors accountable for human rights violations in Africa, including resolutions ACHPR/Res. 148(XLVI) 2009, ACHPR /Res. 364(LIX) 2016, and resolution ACHPR/Res. 367(LX) 2017. Further, the African Commission underscored in its Advisory Note in October 2019 to the African group in Geneva, on the matter of the legally binding instrument to regulate in international human rights law, the activities of transnational corporations (TNCs), that gaps and power imbalances

between TNCs and States exist in the current legal regime. The African Union developed an African Union Policy Framework on Business and Human Rights and the African Commission subsequently adopted resolution 550(LXXIV) 2023 on Business and Human Rights with the aim of holding businesses accountable and more responsive to human rights obligations.

Further, we would like to underscore that article 24 of the African Charter on Human and People’s Rights indicates that “All peoples shall have the right to a general satisfactory environment favorable to their development”.

Finally, we recall that the African Commission adopted the Principles and Guidelines on the implementation of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in the African Charter (known as Nairobi Guidelines), which place on States the primary responsibility to protect, fulfil and realize economic, social and cultural rights. In doing so, it encourages States to meet their “minimum core obligations, the elaboration of national frameworks and actions plans for the implementation of rights, and the obligation to provide special attention to vulnerable and disadvantaged groups”. According to the same publication, the State Party Reporting Guidelines for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in the African Charter (known as the [Tunis Reporting Guidelines](#)) assist States in their reporting on economic, social and cultural rights under the African Charter. Both Guidelines emphasize the importance of civil society participation and serve as important advocacy tools for organizations working towards the realization of economic, social, and cultural rights on the continent.