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A human rights-based approach to highly hazardous pesticides (HHPs)

State duties

Baskut Tuncak
Massachusetts Toxics Use Reduction Institute (TURI)
Governments have obligations under international human rights law

OUTLINE:

1. Multiple obligations related to pesticides (and other hazardous substances)
2. Duty to protect people and the environment
3. Duties regarding transparency and participation
4. Duty to secure access to effective remedies and justice
5. Duty to prevent transboundary harm
The multitude of human rights & principles implicated by toxics

- Equality
- Life & dignity
- Health
- Physical integrity of the body
- Clean water, safe food, and adequate housing
- Safe and healthy working conditions
- Healthy and sustainable environment
- Information and freedom of expression
- Participation and prior informed consent
- Child’s maximum development & consideration of child’s best interests
- Justice and an effective remedy
Obligation to Protect
Duty to protect people and the environment – examples of UN statements

“Prevention and reduction” of exposure to hazardous substances

- CESC, General Comment 14 (2000) – human right to health

Adoption of “any appropriate laws or other measures in order to protect life from all reasonably foreseeable threats emanating from private persons and entities”


To prevent unsafe exposures by workers


To protect the human rights of all ... in all actions undertaken to address environmental challenges

- UN G.A. Res. A/76/L.75 (2022) – human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment
Cáceres et al. v. Paraguay (2019, UN Human Rights Committee)

- UN found violations by Paraguay of rights to life & dignity of 22 individuals due to exposure to HHPs
- States have an obligation to take measures to prevent chronic exposure to hazardous substances, even if it does not kill the person exposed
- UN did not rule out violations of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment
Transparency and Participation
Rights to information and participation

- Independent rights that are inseparable from other human rights.
- States are obliged to generate, collect, assess, update, and effectively communicate info, particularly to those disproportionately at risk of adverse impacts (A/HRC/30/40 para. 99)
- States must facilitate participation in environmental decision-making regarding toxics, which should be active, free and meaningful (A/HRC/36/41 para 22)
- States should put in place protection programmes for defenders of human rights and initiate appropriate proceedings against perpetrators of intimidation, threats and other forms of reprisals against defenders
- Heightened duties attach to certain vulnerable groups, such as indigenous peoples, workers, disabled, minorities, children, among others
Justice and Remedy
Duty to secure justice and an effective remedy

- Many perpetrators of human rights abuses by HHPs are unaccountable, continuing to act with impunity.
- States have the primary obligation to ensure effective and timely remedy for victims, may include:
  - Compensation
  - Restitution
  - Remediation
  - Apology
  - Criminal sanctions
- Requires non-repetition—“indirect prevention” (corrective measures to prevent recurrence, e.g. bans, restrictions and clean up as necessary)
Preventing transboundary harms
Duty to exercise control over businesses in their jurisdiction or territory

- States have an obligation to redress human rights infringements from toxic exposures that occur outside their territories or jurisdiction resulting from the activities of actors over which they can exercise control (UN CESC, Gen. Comment no. 24, para 36), including
  - Pesticide exporters
  - Food and agricultural product importers
- National and regional agreements impose a “reciprocal ban”
  - Bamako Convention of Africa
  - Central American Agreement
  - Various national laws
Impacts of trade in “banned pesticides”

“The import and use of pesticides or chemicals banned or restricted for use in third countries, which particularly affect indigenous children in the State of Sonora, is also a reason of deep concern....

The Committee recommends that the State party: ...

Prohibit the import and use of any pesticides or chemicals the use of which has been banned or restricted in exporting countries; “

UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, CRC/C/MEX/CO/4-5, paras 51-52
States must stop exporting unwanted toxic chemicals to poorer countries, says UN expert

GENEVA (9 July 2020) – The practice of wealthy States exporting their banned toxic chemicals to poorer nations lacking the capacity to control the risks is deplorable and must end, a UN expert said today, with the endorsement of 35 fellow experts of the Human Rights Council.

Last year, at least 30 States exported hazardous substances that had been banned locally because of health and environmental reasons to Latin America, Africa and Asia.

“The ability to manufacture and export toxic substances banned from use domestically is one, albeit large, element of how States have institutionalised externalities through discriminatory national laws and an outdated system of global governance for chemicals and wastes,” said the UN Special Rapporteur on toxics, Baskut Tuncak.

The expert said that wealthier nations often create double standards that allow the trade and use of prohibited substances in parts of the world where regulations are less stringent, externalising the health and environmental impacts on the most vulnerable.

The racialised nature of these standards cannot be ignored, he said, as the dangers are externalised to communities of African descent and other people of colour – a grave concern which also exists internally in exporting countries with respect to the siting of polluting industries and dumping of hazardous waste.

“In nearly every case there is no legitimate public interest justification,” Tuncak said. “These loopholes are a political concession to industry, allowing their chemical manufacturers to profit from inevitably poisoned workers and communities abroad, all the while importing cheaper products through global supply chains and fueling unsustainable consumption and production patterns. It is long-overdue that States stop this exploitation.”

In reports from Denmark, Germany, and the United Kingdom, the Special Rapporteur has highlighted dangers posed by the exportation of toxic chemicals, and communicated similar concerns to Canada and Switzerland.

Tuncak has also made similar recommendations to Brazil regarding communities poisoned by exports. In the face of such violations, some individuals were forced to defend their communities, putting themselves at further risk in a country which ranks among the world’s deadliest for environmental rights defenders. “The EU continues to export such pesticides and toxic industrial chemicals, resulting in widespread infringements of human rights to life, dignity and freedom from cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment in low and middle-income countries.”

Double standards

- “Deplorable practice” of exporting banned pesticides must end
- Clear illustration of externalizing health impacts on the poor and those of different races and ethnicities
- Exporting States are starting to take measures
  - E.g. France, Switzerland
- Importing States are also taking measures
  - E.g. India, review of pesticides triggered by human rights petition
- More action is needed to prevent this form of exploitation

Statement available at: https://bit.ly/3EWBidA
Some resources on a rights based-approach to HHPs

**Thematic Reports**
- Duty to prevent exposure – 2019, UN General Assembly (A/74/480)
- Principles on the protection of worker rights – 2019, UN Human Rights Council (HRC) (A/HRC/42/41)
- Pesticides and the right to food – 2017, UN HRC (A/HRC/34/48)
- The rights of the child and toxics – 2016, UN HRC (A/HRC/33/41)
- Right to information on toxic substances – 2015, UN HRC (A/HRC/30/40)

**Key Resolutions**
- Worker rights and toxic exposures, 2019 HRC resolution
- The rights of the child and the environment, 2020 HRC resolution
- The human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment, 2022 GA resolution

**UN Treaty Body decisions**
- UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, review of Mexico, CRC/C/MEX/CO/4-5 (2015)
- For several relevant General Comments, see 2019 UN General Assembly report “Duty to prevent exposure”, above
Contact & more information:

Web: www.srtoxics.org

Email: baskut@turi.org

LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/baskut

Twitter: @baskut_t
Question 1

Does your country have a human rights-based approach to pesticide management, (e.g., the right to be protected from certain exposures, information/participation, and/or access to effective remedies)?

If so, what are some of the success stories? If not, what are the main obstacles to developing or implementing a human rights-based approach for pesticide management in your country? List your country in your response.

NOTE:
If you are having technical issues, please join the HHP WhatsApp group, using this link, and we will assist you; https://chat.whatsapp.com/JFBuA0TRuRZ0NAqm8JHp0

This question will be discussed for 25 minutes. Please use chat only, mute your microphone, and turn your video off. Thank you!
Would you like to see stronger linkages between human rights and pesticide management in your country?

- Yes: 9
- No: 0
- Not sure: 0
In what way do you think a human rights-based approach would make the most valuable contribution in your country:

8. Reducing harmful exposures
1. Providing access to information
3. Enabling community participation
0. Ensuring access to effective remedies
2. Helping to address transboundary injustices and inequalities.
A Right-Based Approach to HHPs

The Corporate Responsibility to Respect Human Rights
Global consensus 2011: **UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights**, supported by all stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Unanimous adoption in the UN Human Rights Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td><img src="logos.png" alt="Logos: OECD, ILO, BIAC" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Geneva, 30 May 2011 |
| Civil Society           | Support                                          |
UN Framework / Guiding Principles on Business & Human Rights

Pillar I
State Duty to Protect

Pillar II
Corporate Responsibility to Respect

Pillar III
Access to Remedy
The corporate responsibility to respect

- Business enterprises should respect human rights. This means that they should **avoid infringing** on the human rights of others and should **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 it exists **over and above compliance with national laws** and regulations protecting human rights.

- Addressing adverse human rights impacts requires taking adequate measures for their **prevention, mitigation** and, where appropriate, **remediation**.
Internationally recognized human rights

- The responsibility of business enterprises to respect human rights refers to **internationally recognized human rights** – understood, at a minimum, as those expressed in the **International Bill of Human Rights** and the principles concerning fundamental rights set out in the **International Labour Organization’s Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work**.

- These are the benchmarks against which other social actors assess the human rights impacts of business enterprises. The responsibility of business enterprises to respect human rights is **distinct from issues of legal liability and enforcement**, which remain defined largely by national law provisions in relevant jurisdictions.

- Depending on circumstances, business enterprises may need to consider **additional standards**, including instruments protecting rights of individuals belonging to specific groups or populations that require particular attention.
What this responsibility involves?

The responsibility to respect human rights requires that business enterprises:

1. **Avoid causing or contributing** to adverse human rights impacts through their **own activities**, and **address** such impacts when they occur;

2. 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.

A 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.
Apropiate policies and processes

In order to meet their responsibility to respect human rights, business enterprises should have in place policies and processes appropriate to their size and circumstances, including:

1. A **policy commitment** to meet their responsibility to respect human rights;

2. A human rights **due diligence process** to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for how they address their impacts on human rights;

3. Processes to enable the **remediation** of any adverse human rights impacts they cause or to which they contribute.
Policy commitment

As the basis for embedding their responsibility to respect human rights, business enterprises should express their commitment to meet this responsibility through a statement of policy that:

(a) Is approved at the most senior level of the business enterprise;
(b) Is informed by relevant internal and/or external expertise;
(c) Stipulates the enterprise’s human rights expectations of personnel, business partners and other parties directly linked to its operations, products or services;
(d) Is publicly available and communicated internally and externally to all personnel, business partners and other relevant parties;
(e) Is reflected in operational policies and procedures necessary to embed it throughout the business enterprise.
Human rights due diligence

In order to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for how they address their adverse human rights impacts, business enterprises should carry out human rights due diligence. The process should include assessing actual and potential human rights impacts, integrating and acting upon the findings, tracking responses, and communicating how impacts are addressed. Human rights due diligence:

a. Should cover adverse human rights impacts that the business enterprise 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;

b. Will vary in complexity with the size of the business enterprise, the risk of severe human rights impacts, and the nature and context of its operations;

c. Should be ongoing, recognizing that the human rights risks may change over time as the business enterprise’s operations and operating context evolve.
Assessing human rights risks

In order to gauge human rights risks, business enterprises should identify and assess any actual or potential adverse human rights impacts with which they may be involved either through their own activities or as a result of their business relationships.

This process should:

(a) Draw on internal and/or independent external human rights expertise;

(b) Involve meaningful consultation with potentially affected groups and other relevant stakeholders, as appropriate to the size of the business enterprise and the nature and context of the operation.

Because human rights situations are dynamic, assessments of human rights impacts should be undertaken at regular intervals.
Prevent and mitigate impacts

- In order to prevent and mitigate adverse human rights impacts, business enterprises should integrate the findings from their impact assessments across relevant internal functions and processes, and take appropriate action.

- Where a business enterprise causes or may cause an adverse human rights impact, it should take the necessary steps to cease or prevent the impact.

- Where a business enterprise contributes or may contribute to an adverse human rights impact, it should take the necessary steps to cease or prevent its contribution and use its leverage to mitigate any remaining impact to the greatest extent possible.

- Where a business enterprise has not contributed to an adverse human rights impact, but that impact is nevertheless directly linked to its operations, products or services by its business relationship with another entity, the situation is more complex.
Verify whether impacts are addressed

In order to verify whether adverse human rights impacts are being addressed, business enterprises should **track the effectiveness** of their response.

Tracking should:

(a) Be based on appropriate qualitative and quantitative **indicators**;

(b) Draw on **feedback** from both internal and external sources, including affected stakeholders.

**Tracking is necessary** in order for a business enterprise to know if its human rights policies are being implemented optimally, whether it has responded effectively to the identified human rights impacts, and to drive continuous improvement. Business enterprises should make particular efforts to track the effectiveness of their responses to impacts on individuals from groups or populations that may be at **heightened risk of vulnerability or marginalization**.
Account for how impacts are addressed

In order to account for how they address their human rights impacts, business enterprises should be prepared to communicate this externally, particularly when concerns are raised by or on behalf of affected stakeholders.

Business enterprises whose operations or operating contexts pose risks of severe human rights impacts should report formally on how they address them. In all instances, communications should:

(a) Be of a form and frequency that reflect an enterprise’s human rights impacts and that are accessible to its intended audiences;

(b) Provide information that is sufficient to evaluate the adequacy of an enterprise’s response to the particular human rights impact involved;

(c) In turn not pose risks to affected stakeholders, personnel or to legitimate requirements of commercial confidentiality.
Remediation

• Where business enterprises identify that they have caused or contributed to adverse impacts, they should provide for or cooperate in their remediation through legitimate processes.

• Even with the best policies and practices, a business enterprise may cause or contribute to an adverse human rights impact that it has not foreseen or been able to prevent.

• Where a business enterprise identifies such a situation, whether through its human rights due diligence process or other means, its responsibility to respect human rights requires active engagement in remediation, by itself or in cooperation with other actors.

• Operational-level grievance mechanisms for those potentially impacted by the business enterprise’s activities can be one effective means of enabling remediation
Criteria for non-judicial mechanism

In order to ensure their effectiveness, non-judicial grievance mechanisms, both State-based and non-State-based, should be:

(a) **Legitimate**: enabling trust from the stakeholder groups, and being accountable for the fair conduct of grievance processes;

(b) **Accessible**: being known to all stakeholders, and providing adequate assistance for those who may face particular barriers to access;

(c) **Predictable**: providing a clear and known procedure with an indicative time frame for each stage, and clarity on the types of process and outcome available;

(d) **Equitable**: seeking to ensure that aggrieved parties have reasonable access to sources of information, advice and expertise necessary to engage in a grievance process on fair, informed and respectful terms;

(e) **Transparent**: keeping parties to a grievance informed about its progress;
Thank you
Question 2

In your opinion, what responsibility do pesticide companies have to respect human rights? Should these responsibilities be made mandatory in legislation? If yes, who would be responsible for their enforcement and monitoring? If not, why not?

This question will be discussed for 20 minutes. Please use chat only, mute your microphone, and turn your video off. Thank you!

NOTE:
If you are having technical issues, please join the HHP WhatsApp group, using this link, and we will assist you; https://chat.whatsapp.com/JFBUA0TRuRZ0NAqm8JHpp0
Are companies that sell highly hazardous pesticides in LMICs violating their responsibility to respect human rights?

- Yes: 12
- No: 3
- Not sure: 3
Do you think that the corporate responsibility to respect human rights should be made mandatory?

- Yes: 12
- No: 0
- Not sure: 1
THANK YOU for attending the third Highly Hazardous Pesticides CoP Discussion for 2022!

SAVE THE DATE FOR DISCUSSION 3:

Topic: Farmers perspectives on HHPs
Date: 12 December 2022
Time: 10h00-11h30 (GMT +2)

Registration Link to be shared soon.

This activity is supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) project ID: 9771 on Global Best Practices on Emerging Chemical Policy Issues of Concern under the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM).
What value have you gained from this and other HHP CoP discussions? (Check all that apply)

- Being part of a community of others doing similar work: 4
- Got to know other practitioners: 2
- Learned information to help me phase out the use of HHPs: 7
- Explored and exchanged information on HHPs along their lifecycle: 6
- I did not get value from any HHP CoP discussions: 0
- Other (please specify in the chatroom): 0
ELIMINATION OF HIGHLY HAZARDOUS PESTICIDES

How extending and strengthening Workers’ Rights, as Human Rights, can help with the elimination of HPPs
If you work in agriculture, you:
- feed the world
- you work in a high risk, dangerous industry

180,000 farmers and farmworkers are killed every year

Risk of: Pesticide poisonings? Injuries? Diseases?

The **FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT** of agricultural workers and farmers to decent health and safety conditions at work

**Workers rights are Labour rights are Human rights**
HEALTH & SAFETY NOW ONE OF ILO’s FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES & RIGHTS AT WORK

- ILO 2022. Health and Safety made the 5th Category of ILO’s Fundamental Principles & Rights at Work
  - Convention No.155 Occupational Safety and Health & the Working Environment, 1981

- Means ILO Member States commit to respect & promote a safe & healthy working environment, whether or not they have ratified the relevant conventions

What opportunities does this landmark decision mean for HHP elimination?
ILO promotes “Decent Work” for all
End “decent work deficits” such as poisoning from HHPs
ILO is tripartite - governments, employers, workers
The only place in the UN system where Workers and Employers have the **RIGHT TO VOTE**
Every ILO Convention has been voted into being by Governments, Employers and Workers
Hired/waged agricultural workers - part of the world’s poorest people. Essential workers - legally, have to work even in dangerous conditions to feed the world
Decent work sums up the aspirations of people in their working lives.

It involves opportunities for work that is productive and delivers a fair income, security in the workplace and social protection for all, better prospects for personal development and social integration, freedom for people to express their concerns, organize and participate in the decisions that affect their lives and equality of opportunity and treatment for all women and men.
Right to a **National Health & Policy in Agriculture**

Right to **Representation**, to legally empowered:
- worker H&S reps (dealing with H & S on a daily basis)
- worker reps on workplace OHS committees.
- Worker OHS reps who can then negotiate to eliminate HHPs
- Harness their energy & enthusiasm for decent work

Right to actively participate in **Workplace OHS Risk Assessments** by the employer & in applying the risk controls

Gender sensitive risk assessments - women workers

Right to **H&S Information** - in a language(s) workers can understand (Migrant workers). (Young workers)

RIGHT to receive **OHS training** by the employer using “**competent person(s)**”. ILO COP Agriculture 2011
 Sounds fine doesn’t it!!

 We can all put our hands up and support it

 BUT

 There are still some other fundamental workers’ rights that need to be achieved to ensure decent OHS at work and help with elimination of HHPs

 And which the Community of Practice ought to discuss
“Many governments consciously & deliberately still exclude agricultural workers from protection under labour laws”

Guy Ryder, ILO Director General, 21 July **2021**. Presentation to the UN Food Systems Summit

The Community of Practice needs to support the **RIGHT** of hired/waged agricultural workers to have the same level of protection under national H&S and labour laws as workers in industry and commerce
FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION
PROTECTION OF THE RIGHT TO ORGANISE
FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS
HEALTH & SAFETY
NOW ONE OF ILO’s FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES & RIGHTS AT WORK

➤ “Workers & Employers, without distinction whatsoever, shall have the RIGHT to establish & subject only to the rules of the organisation concerned, to join organisations of their own choosing without previous authorisation”. (ILO C 187)

➤ 1921: ILO Convention No. 11 Right of Association (Agriculture) - the very first ILO convention

➤ 101 years later IUF Agricultural Workers Conference, November 2022 still campaigning for FoA in agriculture to be implemented as a fundamental workers’ right

➤ If you want workers to support your efforts to eliminate HHPs it is important to support workers’ and trade unions in their efforts to secure the fundamental human and workers’ right to FoA & the Right to Organise - & for farmers as well
- Government **Labour Inspection** in agriculture. Non-existent or so weak as to be of no practical value in protecting workers.
- Advice is part of enforcement.
- LI set up to protect workers - to stop women & children working underground in coal mines, in 19th century Britain.
- COP SUPPORT for Labour Inspection services in agriculture.
- COP SUPPORT for introducing **mandatory health, safety & environmental Due Diligence requirements** for agricultural/food companies.
- Due diligence a concept of growing importance and one that is increasingly being legislated on at national and European Union levels (EU Directive on Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence).
Workers’ rights & HHP elimination

- The initiative to eliminate HHPs is a welcome one
- Promoting workers rights in agriculture to decent health and safety conditions is fundamental to helping eliminate HHPs
- Workers rights on OHS link to Farmers’ rights on OHS
- Workers and their health and safety reps are the eyes and ears you need in the workplace to help negotiate the elimination of HHPs. Pressure at “field” level so to speak
- Can help ensure that HHPs stay “eliminated” as a fundamental step to decent work for all, to human rights in agriculture/food systems and to agroecological production and food chains
ILO C 184: Framework for OHS activities

- **Women workers** (Article 18): Develop OHS activities for women & to link to other gender-related initiatives
- **Young workers & hazardous work** (Article 16)
- **Temporary & Seasonal Workers** (Article 17) - same levels of OHS protection as permanent workers
- **Sound Management of Chemicals** (Article 12). Links to IUF resolution on agroecology & banning toxic pesticides
- **Handling & Transport of Materials** (Article 11) - linked to heavy &/or receptive work & musculoskeletal disorders
- **Biological agents** (Article 14). Diseases including covid
- **Working time arrangements** (Article 20) - hours of work, rest periods
Question 3

How can extending and strengthening workers’ human rights in agriculture help with the elimination of Highly Hazardous Pesticides in your country? List your country in your response.

This question will be discussed for 20 minutes. Please use chat only, mute your microphone, and turn your video off. Thank you!

NOTE:
If you are having technical issues, please join the HHP WhatsApp group, using this link, and we will assist you; https://chat.whatsapp.com/JFBUA0TRuRZ0NAqm8JHpp0
Should the ILO Convention No. 184 on Safety and Health in Agriculture be used for promoting and ensuring workers’ rights in your country?

Access to hazard information and personal protective equipment is key. Making the workplace healthier through precision agriculture.

Yes - South Africa

In my country the law is present but implementation, application is not obvious.

A very good starting point

Iran - As I recall it already includes.

Yes - Madagascar

Yes, it should be used as a framework for promoting and ensuring workers’ rights in agriculture and include risk assessments for workplace health and safety - Caribbean

It would be very welcome move - India

agree - Malawi
Should the ILO Convention No. 184 on Safety and Health in Agriculture be used for promoting and ensuring workers’ rights in your country?

- Convention no 184 should be used in Eswatini to strengthen workers rights and put their health as a priority of concern.
- I think its not only good but desirable to use the No. 184 on safety and health in Agriculture as a framework for promoting workers’ rights in agriculture in my country Uganda.
- Yes but Benin didn't make ratification of this ILO convention.
Should the right to a healthy and safe environment due diligence requirement for agricultural employers and companies be introduced in your country?

- Yes
- Yes it very crucial
- Yes but implementation and application is problematic.
- Yes, the right to health and safe environment for agricultural employees should be introduced to minimize exposure to chemicals including pesticides
- Iran: I surely agree and these are what we have been waiting for a long time but always different problems like lack of enforcement, in Iran high amounts of pesticide smuggling due to many neighbors (15), but who is going to do this?
- Yes, but also for foreign companies that are directly or indirectly sourcing food/agriculture from others
- Yes the right for a good environment is include in Benin constitution