

Mandates of the Working Group on the rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas; the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises; 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 rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association; 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 15/2026

(Please use this reference in your reply)

22 July 2026

Dear Mr. Kargl-Simard,

We have the honour to address you in our capacities as Working Group on the rights of peasants and other people working in rural areas; Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises; 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 rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association; 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 54/9, 53/3, 55/2, 58/10, 52/9, 59/4, 61/22, 59/12, 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 59 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.

Adventus Mining Corporation

In this connection, we would like to bring to the attention of your company information we have received concerning **allegations of violations and abuses of the human rights of peasants, other persons working in rural areas and Indigenous Peoples in the context of mining projects controlled by Canadian companies and their subsidiaries in Ecuador.**

This communication reflects concerns expressed in several previous communications, in particular our letter of 22 October 2025 (ECU 8/2025) on the deterioration of fundamental freedoms and civic space in Ecuador and persecution of social movements and their leaders; and our letter of 17 April 2024 (ECU 2/2024) on the escalation of violence and misuse of criminal law against environmental and human rights defenders in the framework of environmental consultations for mining projects, in particular the communities of Las Pampas and Palo Quemado.

According to the information received:

“Curipamba – El Domo” mining project in the canton of Las Naves

In the upper area of the Las Naves canton, the Curipamba – El Domo mining project, whose construction began in January 2025 with the aim of starting production by the end of 2026, is generating an acute risk of multiple human rights violations. The project is operated by the Ecuadorian company Curimining S.A, which manages the mining concession where the deposit is located. Curimining S.A. is controlled today by the Canadian company Silvercorp Metals Inc. after acquiring the Canadian company Adventus Mining Corporation, in association with the Canadian company Salazar Resources Limited as a minority partner.

According to the designs submitted to the Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition, the project facilities will cover 290 hectares, with a part of the open-pit mine occupying 53 hectares. There will also be a mineral processing plant where minerals will be separated using toxic substances such as sodium cyanide, sodium hydroxide, copper sulfate, and sodium metabisulfite. Due to its installation in an area of river headwaters used for human consumption and agricultural irrigation, the implementation of this project would represent a direct threat to health, the right to drinking water, food security, the environment, and the livelihoods of numerous peasant families and Indigenous Peoples in the canton. According to the information received, a situation of water risk is already observed, derived from the decrease in the flow, contamination and mixing of wastewater, with a greater impact on the health of the people surveyed: 54% would report cases of digestive problems, 31% would observe skin irritations and 22% would mention respiratory diseases related to the consumption of contaminated water.

Since 2021, more than 50 criminal investigation proceedings have been opened against human rights and environmental defenders for alleged crimes of illicit association, violation of private property, attack or resistance, injuries and kidnapping, for their participation in public meetings and peaceful protests against the Curipamba-El Domo mining project. In October 2025, 13 defenders

were reportedly sentenced to up to 4 years in prison, allegedly issued without respect for due process rules and without sufficient evidentiary support.

Between June 2023 and January 2024, the Ministry of the Environment, Water and Ecological Transition carried out an environmental consultation process in the Las Naves canton. However, this process was carried out under conditions of pressure and intimidation, with a strong police and military presence, the exclusion of peasant, Montuvia, and indigenous communities, and the absence of minimum guarantees of meaningful participation of the impacted communities. This would have limited the population's access to the space where the information was made available. Thirteen people were injured and two arrested and later sentenced for participating in peaceful demonstrations against the project. In addition, at the time of the consultation, advanced exploration activities in the territory had already begun, and the impacted communities were not adequately informed, since the information provided was overly technical, incomplete and prepared by the company Curimining S.A. In addition, only 420 people, out of a total of 7012 inhabitants of the canton, participated in the consultation.

As of December 2024, a local community began to be affected by the intensive traffic of heavy machinery linked to the mining project, which caused damage to homes, environmental contamination and risks to pedestrian safety on its communal road. On 13 May 2025, the community began to restrict access to the road. On 21 May 2025, agents of Law Enforcement and the Motorized Police, accompanying vehicles of the company involved in the mining project, violently evicted people in resistance, using tear gas and physical force against women and the elderly. On 24 June 2025, more than 300 police officers carried out a large-scale operation in the community camp, where about 30 people were located, mostly women, children and the elderly. During the intervention, less lethal projectiles and tear gas were fired, tents were set on fire and food and utensils were destroyed. Three people were injured. Despite multiple public complaints and requests for peaceful intervention submitted by a local organization to local and provincial authorities, no institution adopted protective measures or investigated the reported abuses.

On 3 April 2025, the Court of Criminal Guarantees of Bolívar issued sentences against three local community leaders imposing four years in prison, a fine equivalent to four unified basic salaries (*salarios básicos unificados*) and the payment of six hundred US dollars as reparation in favor of the complainants, relatives of workers of the mining company Curimining S.A. In these cases, the court reportedly criminalized cultural practices of territorial and collective defense such as *mingas* (traditional forms of collective, voluntary community work), community assemblies and actions of social control, interpreting them as acts of “vandalism”, “illicit association” or “violation of private property”. The fact that the accused identified themselves as community leaders, indigenous, Montuvio, and peasant leaders was presumably used as evidence of authorship or leadership of the alleged crime, and as evidence of the unlawful conduct.

In addition, in May 2025, six environmental defenders were sentenced to three years in prison, a fine equivalent to ten unified basic salaries and the payment

of six hundred US dollars in favour of the company Curimining S.A. as comprehensive reparation. The conviction was handed down without material or expert evidence to prove the commission of the crime of “illicit association”, and in a process allegedly marked by serious violations of due process, evidentiary irregularities and lack of judicial impartiality, in a context of persecution of community leaders who legitimately exercise their right to defend water, Nature, and its territories.

While we do not wish to prejudge the veracity of these allegations, the information provided raises serious concerns regarding the alleged multiple violations of the rights of peasants, rural workers and indigenous communities in Ecuador; among others, their right to life, security, health, food security and sovereignty, a healthy environment, drinking water, land, freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, participation and consultation in good faith. We are concerned that, in the context of extractive and agro-industrial projects, the human rights of the inhabitants of these communities are being violated in a massive and systematic way.

In the case of the “Curipamba – El Domo” mining project in the canton of Las Naves, we are concerned about the alleged toxic contamination of river headwaters for human consumption and agricultural irrigation, which directly threatens the rights to health, a healthy environment, drinking water, food security and livelihoods of numerous families in the canton, peasants, rural workers and indigenous communities. We are also concerned that there has not been a process of consultation in good faith with local communities. Likewise, the cases of criminalization of social leaders and human rights defenders raise our deepest concerns, as does the repression of peaceful protests and the excessive use of force – including less-lethal weapons which can cause permanent lesions, as well as acts of torture and mistreatment up to and including death – by law enforcement and private actors against protesters, among them vulnerable people such as children and the elderly.

These allegations raise serious concerns about the human rights policies and due diligence processes applied by your company and its subsidiaries, as well as the measures adopted to prevent, mitigate, and remediate adverse human rights and environmental impacts throughout your operations.

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 describe the measures that your company has taken, or is planning to take, to prevent recurrence of such situations in the future.

3. Please provide information as to what human rights due diligence policies and processes have been put in place by your company and its subsidiaries to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for how they address adverse human rights impacts throughout their business operations, including the rights of peasants, rural workers, Indigenous Peoples, and the right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment, in line with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs).
4. Please provide information on the measures taken to ensure effective consultations with affected people, including by your company's subsidiaries' at all stages of projects' implementation.
5. Please indicate the measures taken by your company and its subsidiaries to ensure effective access to remedy, in line with the UNGPs. This includes information on whether your company and its subsidiaries have established or participate in any operational-level grievance mechanisms, to provide access to remedy for affected individuals and communities.
6. Please provide information regarding the measures that your company and its subsidiaries have taken, in follow up to the recommendations provided to businesses in the report of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises on its visit to Canada in 2017 (A/HRC/38/48/Add.1).

This communication, and any response received from your company, will be made public via the communications reporting [website](#) at the 60 days mark. Should your company 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.

Pending your response, we would like to urge your company to take effective measures to prevent such occurrences, if any, from recurring.

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 to clarify the issue/s in question.

Please be informed that a letter on this subject matter has also been sent to the Governments of Canada and the Republic of Ecuador, as well as to the companies Curimining S.A., Adventus Mining Corporation, Salazar Resources Limited, Silvercorp Metals, La Plata S.A., Toachi Mining Inc., Atico Mining Corporation, Dundee Precious Metals, Export Jaime S.A., Industria Alimenticia de Sud América (Indalsud) S.A., and Trupeca S.A.S.

Please accept, Mr. Kargl-Simard, the assurances of our highest consideration.

Shalmali Guttal
Chair-Rapporteur of the Working Group on the rights of peasants and other people
working in rural areas

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

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

Sofia Monsalve Suárez
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

Gina Romero
Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association

Andrea Bolaños Vargas
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 the above alleged facts and concerns, we would like to draw your company's attention to the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (A/HRC/17/31), which were unanimously endorsed by the Human Rights Council in June 2011, and which 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, 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.

Principle 13 has 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".

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).

In the 2018 report of the Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises (Working Group) to the General Assembly, the Working Group noted that “The Guiding Principles clarify that business enterprises have an independent responsibility to respect human rights and that in order to do so they are required to exercise human rights due diligence. Human rights due diligence refers to the processes that all business enterprises should undertake to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for how they address potential and actual impacts on human rights caused by or contributed to through their own activities, or directly linked to their operations, products or services by their business relationships”. In addition, this involves (b) Integrating findings from impact assessments across relevant company processes and taking appropriate action according to its involvement in the impact; (c) Tracking the effectiveness of measures and processes to address adverse human rights impacts in order to know if they are working; (d) Communicating on how impacts are being addressed and showing stakeholders – in particular affected stakeholders – that there are adequate policies and processes in place.

The full texts of the human rights instruments and standards recalled above are available on www.ohchr.org or can be provided upon request.