



Date: 21 April 2023

Green financing, a just transition to protect Indigenous Peoples' rights

Submission to the UN Special Rapporteur on the rights of Indigenous Peoples for a Report to be presented to the Human Rights Council

Amazon Watch submits this document in response to the call for comments issued by the UN Special Rapporteur on the rights of Indigenous Peoples for a Report to be presented to the 54th session of the Human Rights Council in September 2023.ⁱ While there are many aspects to green financing and its potential benefits or harms to Indigenous peoples and their rights, this submission focuses on the harms and risks to Indigenous peoples' rights of carbon markets matters.

Introduction

Carbon markets have long been touted as a way to provide incentives and financing for emissions reductions activities, as well as to protect crucial ecosystems like forests. However, they have not lived up to these claims. Theoretically, carbon markets work by emissions reductions activities generating credits that are then bought by another entity that uses those reductions to meet its emissions reduction targets. Largely these credits are used to offset the buyer's ongoing emissions elsewhere, so that they can claim to have met their emission reduction obligations, or assert 'carbon neutrality' or 'net reductions.' When the supposed emissions reduction activity is linked to a nature-based project or activity, claims are often made about the benefit to that forest or ecosystem.

However, carbon offsets have largely failed to live up to any of the climate or nature protection promises. Instead of promoting overall emissions reductions and increased ambition, carbon markets have facilitated the trade of emissions around the world and outsourcing of climate action, allowing States and companies to continue business-as-usual activities while claiming that they are combatting the climate crisis through buying credits. What's worse, carbon markets can lead to increased global emissions by overestimating reductions or selling credits for non-permanent reductions that allow emissions elsewhere.ⁱⁱ

Offsets also do not address the underlying causes of forest loss. The primary driver of rainforest loss is large-scale commodity production. Researchers estimate that the agribusiness industry is responsible for 80% of Amazon deforestation;ⁱⁱⁱ globally, it's about three-quarters.^{iv} Mining, fossil fuel extraction, and infrastructure development are also contributors to Amazon deforestation,^v yet the urgent need to contain these destructive drivers is being largely overlooked in favor of offset schemes.

Most importantly for the purpose of this submission, offsets perpetuate environmental injustice and often result in violations of the rights of Indigenous and tribal peoples. GHG-emitting

520 Third Street, Suite 108
OAKLAND, CA 94607
Tel: 510.281.9020 Fax: 510.218.9021

amazon@amazonwatch.org
amazonwatch.org

1101 15th Street NW, 11th Floor
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
Tel: 202.785.8700

industries are disproportionately located in poor communities and Black, Indigenous, and people of color communities. Allowing companies to “offset” continued pollution instead of real emissions reductions at the source forces those communities to continue bearing their toxic emissions. Furthermore, satisfying corporate desire to “compensate” for business-as-usual emissions would require access to huge expanses of land and forest, much of which is occupied by Indigenous peoples and local communities. Yet most governments do not sufficiently recognize Indigenous land rights,^{vi} allowing some offsets schemes to deny communities access to ancestral lands.

Case Studies

The following Amazonian case studies from Ecuador, Peru, Colombia, and Brazil illustrate how false climate solutions have exacerbated, rather than mitigated, climate impacts, while driving rights abuses in Indigenous communities in the Amazon.

Indigenous Land Grab in Ecuador

The recent experience of the Sapara people in Ecuador shows how programs like REDD+ can have perverse incentives that result in land grabs, violence, and rights violations. The Sapara number roughly 700 people and hold collective legal land title to more than 364,000 hectares (900,000 acres) of roadless rainforest in Ecuador’s remote Amazon. They were recognized by UNESCO in 2001 as Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity for their unique language and cultural vulnerability. The Sapara have successfully protected their forests and culture from oil extraction and illegal logging for decades.

But in May 2021, a small non-Sapara community interested benefitting from the funding the Sapara federation (NASE) receives from Ecuador’s *Socio Bosque* (‘forest partner’) program filed a claim before the country’s Undersecretariat of Rural Lands and Ancestral Territories to 250,000 hectares of officially-recognized Sapara territory.^{vii} The agency granted the claim, in violation of multiple constitutional provisions that stipulate that Indigenous territories are imprescriptible, inalienable, unseizable and indivisible, as well as the right to free, prior, and informed consultation and consent. In this process, the Ecuadorian government never consulted either the legitimate Sapara representatives, or the grassroots communities, effectively usurping the legally recognized representation of Sapara nationality.^{viii} According to a NASE statement, “We are experiencing the consequences of external interference that seeks to monetize the protection and preservation of nature, and is generating serious internal conflicts.”

Government programs that offer payments for forest conservation like REDD+ and *Socio Bosque* ignore the greatest threat to the forest: government-sponsored extractive projects. Many areas covered by these “conservation” programs are also included in oil and mining concession areas. The government has also used these programs to push communities into the hands of industry by withholding funds, or by creating divisions and conflicts that are then exploited by companies. None of this helps forests, and in fact does the opposite, by threatening Indigenous land defenders – who have the most successful track record in keeping forests standing.^{ix}

Conflicts between Indigenous Communities and REDD+ projects in Peru

The Autonomous Territorial Government of the Wampís Nation has denounced the Peruvian Government’s intention to convert the ecosystemic and spiritual heart of its Amazonian ancestral territory into a state-run Conservation Area. The Wampís assert that there is no need for a state-

run program in their territory, since their autonomous government has already restricted outsiders' access to an area known as the Kampankias Hills, which is considered an ICCA – an area conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities by the ICCA Consortium – and is registered in the world database of protected areas.^x

In fact, the Wampís fear that the government's attempt to categorize such an important part of their territory is being carried out with the objective of obtaining REDD + financing for a forest that they have always preserved. The Wampís' concerns are based on a series of land grabbing cases carried out by the Peruvian government itself. The most notorious such case is the conflict between the Kichwa people and the government over the creation of the Cordillera Azul National Park.^{xi} The Park was created in 2001 without the consent of the communities of the Kichwa people and other Indigenous peoples whose territories it overlaps. Between 2008 and 2019, the park sold 25 million tons of carbon credits to aviation and oil companies, while the Kichwa people say they have received no benefits from these sales, nor provided their consent for these transactions.^{xii}

Overcounting forest carbon credits in Colombia

The carbon-avoidance REDD+ project in the Matavén Indigenous reservation^{xiii} in the Colombian Amazon is the largest of its kind in Colombia. However, a recent investigation found that many of the carbon credits being sold on the international market do not correspond to the true amount of emissions avoided by protecting this area from deforestation.^{xiv} In fact, researchers argue that the project intermediaries have overestimated the increase in deforestation that would have occurred if this offset project had never been implemented – even though the project used the widely-used and prestigious Verified Carbon Standard (VCS). Colombian government statistics themselves demonstrate a serious issue: according to the Colombian Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development's funding application to the Green Climate Fund, preservation of Matavén should result in five times fewer credits than the VCS project claims.

REDD+ promise in Brazil fails to materialize and drives community divisions

The Suruí Forest Carbon Project was the first REDD+ project proposed in Indigenous lands in Brazil, implemented from 2009 on the Sete de Setembro Indigenous territory, located between the states of Rondônia and Mato Grosso.^{xv} Although economic, environmental and social indicators that show some preservation and development of land within the scope of the project,^{xvi} which became famous with the sale of carbon credits to large companies such as Natura,^{xvii} the project's suspension in 2018 highlights the limits and difficulties of governance of these initiatives.

According to the project's creators, the suspension was due to successive incursions by illegal mining and illegal logging in the vicinity of the Indigenous land, making it impossible for the initiative to continue.^{xviii} However, starting as early as 2015, multiple Suruí leaders denounced the initiative to the public authorities,^{xix} citing problems like bureaucratic and financial obstacles, the lack of transparency in the management of payments, the creation of expectations of improvement in the living conditions of the Suruí (which ultimately did not materialize), and the outside control of the Indigenous subsistence agriculture activities within project areas led to a deep divisions between the Suruí. The project caused a rupture between those who supported the project and those who opposed the model – a rupture that remains even with the suspension

of the initiative.^{xx} As the general chief of the Suruí people, Henrique Iabaday, said in a 2014 interview about the project, “The carbon project for our land is to take the life of the Suruí people, it will take our life away from happiness, from the right to live in over our land(...) We want the project to be shut down.”^{xxi}

LEAF: False claims by offset program of addressing rights issues^{xxii}

On April 23rd, 2021, at the Leaders Summit on Climate, representatives of the U.S., U.K., and Norwegian governments announced the formation of the LEAF (Lowering Emissions by Accelerating Forest Finance) Coalition: a public-private partnership between those governments and a spate of corporate actors intended to mobilize funds for the protection of tropical forests.^{xxiii} Just months later, at the United Nations Climate Conference (COP26) in November, the coalition announced that it had raised \$1 billion USD, billing itself as the largest-ever public-private effort to protect tropical forests.^{xxiv} It signed initial agreements with five countries: Ecuador, Ghana, Costa Rica, Nepal, and Vietnam.

The LEAF Coalition attempts to distinguish itself from a traditional carbon offset program—in which carbon credits are applied directly to “offset” the emissions of the entity that purchases them—by requiring that its corporate participants commit to climate targets through the Science Based Targets Initiative and the United Nations’ Race to Zero program, which place limits on companies’ use of offsets to meet emissions reduction goals. However, these safeguards have been weak and inconsistent in practice, and corporations participating in these programs have remained reliant on offsets. A 2022 report by the NewClimate Institute found that many of the LEAF Coalition’s corporate participants, including Amazon, Nestlé, and Unilever, are already exaggerating their climate commitments with deceptive net-zero targets that rely on carbon offsets rather than real emissions reductions.^{xxv}

Carbon offset credits generated by LEAF-funded projects will be verified using The REDD+ Environmental Excellence Standard (TREES). According to the LEAF Coalition’s website, the use of this standard will “ensure uncompromising environmental and social integrity.” However, a closer look at the TREES standard reveals significant areas of concern for both climate integrity and Indigenous rights.

According to a 2020 Climate Focus report, the TREES standard’s climate safeguards have weaknesses that increase the likelihood of the deceptive accounting and exaggerated climate benefits that carbon offset programs have repeatedly demonstrated in the Amazon and across the world.^{xxvi}

The TREES standard’s safeguards on Indigenous rights may be even weaker than its shortcomings in measuring forest carbon sequestration. During the LEAF Coalition’s launch webinar,^{xxvii} representatives claimed that Indigenous communities would qualify as jurisdictions under the then-under-development TREES 2.0 standard, which would allow them to enter into LEAF agreements independently. However, when TREES 2.0 was released, language around Indigenous jurisdictional eligibility had been dropped altogether; only national and subnational governments are eligible under the latest TREES standard. This keeps intact the dominant paradigm among carbon market programs that relies on funding “trickling down” through governments before it reaches Indigenous peoples and local communities.

As a result, Indigenous communities seeking to ensure equitable benefit-sharing from LEAF programs may be forced to do so through engagement with governments that do not abide by international legal standards on self-determination and sovereignty of Indigenous peoples. For example, TREES does not require adherence to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), does not mandate the development of equitable benefit-sharing programs, and maintains only partial commitments to Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) with Indigenous peoples.^{xxviii} In short, TREES offloads the implementation of many Indigenous rights safeguards to the governments with which LEAF partners. Because of this, respect for Indigenous rights and consultation will likely only be as strong as the policies of the governments through which LEAF projects are run, and LEAF will be able to shirk responsibility for violations that occur through its programs.

LEAF and Ecuador: Cause for Concern about programmatic and government respect for rights

The LEAF Coalition’s agreement with Ecuador, submitted by Ecuador’s Ministry of Environment, Water, and Ecological Transition (MAATE), was signed in 2021. At the time the agreement was accepted, Ecuador claimed to satisfy 70% of TREES requirements, and MAATE had formed a technical team to help meet the remaining TREES requirements, with advisory from UN-REDD. LEAF projects will be administered by MAATE through Ecuador’s existing REDD+ Action Plan: Forests for Good Living (2016-2025). MAATE held a workshop regarding LEAF planning with Indigenous communities in Macas city in July 2021, and claimed that its FPIC and participatory processes were under implementation.

Although the Ecuadorian constitution contains provisions that would seem to protect against exploitative carbon market programs, carbon market proponents have found ways to circumvent these protections. For example, Article 74 of Ecuador’s constitution forbids the appropriation and marketization of environmental and nature-based services. However, the LEAF Coalition claims to abide by this regulation by preventing buyers of LEAF-generated Ecuadorian carbon credits from reselling them. Additionally, Ecuador has a constitutional commitment to FPIC (Article 57), but in practice this has meant only feeble gestures at “consultation” of Indigenous peoples rather than true consent. In February 2022, Ecuador’s Constitutional Court ruled that consultations must be carried out with the intention of gaining consent from affected peoples.^{xxix} To date, however, there is no existing law enforcing FPIC in Ecuador.

In keeping with these weak safeguards, the REDD+ Action Plan that the LEAF Coalition would operate through has a poor record of honoring Indigenous rights. As part of the REDD+ Action Plan, the Ecuadorian government has implemented several forest protection programs aimed at preserving forests and biodiversity while sequestering carbon emissions, including Socio Bosque, REDD Early Movers (REM), ProAmazonía, and the Results Based Payments Project (PPR). In theory, these programs are subject to human rights safeguards implemented by the United Nations Development Programme.^{xxx} In practice, the story has been much different. Many communities join these programs thinking they will protect their territories from extraction, but Ecuador’s forest programs aimed at reducing emissions in the Amazon run contrary to government policies expanding oil and mining activity—often for the very same areas of forest and Indigenous territories.

The experience of the Shuar Arutam People (PSHA) is one example of Ecuador's REDD+ programs enabling extractive industries in Indigenous territories. The PSHA are composed of 47 communities with a total of 12,000 inhabitants. They live in their ancestral territory in the south of the Ecuadorian Amazon, which has been part of Socio Bosque since 2008.^{xxxii} However, the mining industry has also operated in this area since 1980. Despite the PSHA's steadfast opposition to mining in their territories and participation in Socio Bosque, which claims Indigenous rights safeguards and a commitment to FPIC, the majority of their land continues to be dominated by major mining companies such as Lowell-Solaris Resources Inc. (Canada), SolGold (Australia), Explorcobres S.A. (China/Canada), and Ecuasolidus S.A (Canada). Indigenous leaders and families who have expressed opposition towards mining activities have been subject to threats and harassment from mining companies, police, and the Ecuadorian military.^{xxxiii} PSHA communities have faced intimidation and violence, threatening their livelihoods and the health of the ecosystems they inhabit.

Despite its significant failures, Socio Bosque was a major source of income for the PSHA—until MAATE terminated the contract, claiming that the PSHA failed to comply with program requirements. However, MAATE's implementation of Socio Bosque had been rife with irregularities and inconsistencies; the government failed to provide support for proper implementation of the agreement and still allowed mining companies into PSHA territory.^{xxxiii} The termination of the program has created even more economic difficulties for the PSHA, creating divisions among communities and families that could drive them into the arms of the mining companies: a perverse outcome of a program aimed at forest protection.

The Kutuku Shaimi Protected Forest, one of the most important natural areas in the Ecuadorian Amazon, serves as another example of the deceptive nature of forest carbon programs in Ecuador. Without carrying out a proper FPIC process, the Ecuadorian government authorized mining company Ecuasolidus S.A to operate within the territory. Kutuku Shaimi is part of MAATE's System of Protected Areas, and some of its Indigenous populations receive compensations from Socio Bosque for protecting their territory within the forest. Additionally, the Ecuadorian government updated the management plan for the forest through ProAmazonía, another component of REDD+ Action Plan. However, according to Jose Esach, President of the Kutukú Shaimi Protected Forest Defense Committee, the updated plan has excluded community demands to declare the territory a mining-free area, and the state failed to consult all communities dependent on the forest, circumventing FPIC processes. As a result, mining persists within the territory, and environmental degradation continues.

The flagrant contradictions between the Ecuadorian government's extractive agenda and embrace of financialized forest carbon programs tell a clear story: programs like REDD+ and LEAF are being used to enable continued government support for extractive activities and the state's persistent prioritization of economic interests over guaranteeing collective rights. Ecuador's commitments to protecting Indigenous territories from extraction are questionable at best, and carbon market programs are its greenwashing strategy to create the illusion of progress on its Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) to the Paris Climate Accords.

These discrepancies are further amplified by the centrality of oil and gas in Ecuador's national development plan. Current president Guillermo Lasso has pledged to double oil extraction,

opening up Ecuador's state-owned oil companies to private investment in a bid to dramatically increase production.^{xxxiv} This oil extraction often threatens Indigenous lands, even in areas where forest conservation programs are supposed to be in operation.

For example, according to Ecuador's 2019 NDC document, the government plans to achieve additional climate change mitigation through the "Efficient energy plan - optimizing the generation of electricity and renewable energy" (OG&EE).^{xxxv} As part of this plan, Ecuador would aim to reduce flaring of natural gas as well as the use of gas for electricity production. However, the Ecuadorian government has not taken any significant steps to comply with OG&EE, raising questions about its commitment to mitigate climate change. In fact, the Ecuadorian government continues to grant authorizations to fossil fuel companies flaring natural gas at more than 447 sites across the Ecuadorian Amazon, contaminating the air of local communities. Affected populations filed a lawsuit alleging impacts on their health and violation of the rights of nature, a right enshrined in Ecuador's Constitution. Additionally, even though the Provincial Court of Justice of Sucumbíos ruled in July 2021 that all flaring near affected towns must be discontinued within 18 months, the Ecuadorian government continues to permit gas flaring in these areas.^{xxxvi}

It is no surprise, then, that Ecuadorian Indigenous activist Patricia Gualinga, a Kichwa leader and member of the Amazonian women's collective Mujeres Amazónicas, has called carbon credit programs "pure hypocrisy," noting that such programs are "a way of commercializing rainforests that are already being protected by Indigenous peoples ... These schemes are unviable, they're always talking about spending millions of dollars. Not even 0.01% of the state's budget or those millions reach our community."^{xxxvii}

Not all of Ecuador's existing REDD+ programs produce carbon offset credits. However, marketized conservation programs like REDD+ financialize forest carbon, turning natural forests into commercialized areas and creating a bureaucratic web of regulatory schemes that are inaccessible to Indigenous peoples subject to them. The LEAF Coalition's addition of corporate carbon offsets into the mix adds yet another layer of deceptive accounting and greenwashing that would allow the Ecuadorian government's violation of Indigenous rights to continue while simultaneously enabling continued corporate pollution. Ensuring that climate and forest finance like LEAF will have a positive effect would require the Ecuadorian government to stop prioritizing extractive industries and instead fundamentally prioritize the rights of Indigenous and forest-dwelling peoples. As long as the Ecuadorian state maintains business as usual, the perverse impacts of REDD+ and carbon market programs in Ecuador make LEAF a concerning addition.

Conclusion: A Call for Indigenous-Led Conservation, No Strings Attached

Indigenous peoples across the Amazon Basin, and likely around the world (though Amazon Watch can speak less to that) face difficult decisions about maintaining their sovereignty and protecting their homelands from extractive companies and government policies. Financing forest protection by delivering payments to Indigenous peoples for community-based, Indigenous-led conservation programs can be an effective tool for protecting forests while strengthening Indigenous communities. However, Amazon Watch understands from years of work in this area

that carbon market schemes are a dangerous distraction from real climate action and direct, reparative forest and climate finance for Indigenous peoples.

Furthermore, carbon offsets and financial derivative products built upon them are complex financial products and as such create a disadvantageous situation for Indigenous communities in trying to protect their own interests in contract negotiations. Financing for Indigenous climate solutions should prioritize mechanisms in which Indigenous peoples and their organizations maintain the greatest leverage possible. Market mechanisms will inevitably leave Indigenous organizations at a disadvantage to the intermediaries who control the negotiation.

As the research we lay out in this document has shown, the LEAF Coalition’s agreement with the Ecuadorian government threatens to expand forest carbon programs that have enabled the operation of extractive companies in Ecuador’s Indigenous territories, all while delivering carbon offset credits and “green” reputational benefits to corporations and governments of the Global North that routinely violate Indigenous rights, destroy forests, and worsen the climate crisis.

What, then, can be done to truly protect forests, advance Indigenous sovereignty, and halt climate change? Ironically, the rare instances where carbon offset programs have claimed some measure of success provide part of the answer. Projects in the Yaeda Valley of Northern Tanzania and Colombia’s Selva de Matavén have effectively channeled resources to Indigenous communities, seemingly improving livelihoods while healing ecosystems.^{xxxviii} These programs have demonstrated the essential truth of what Indigenous peoples and environmental justice activists have been saying for years: financing truly Indigenous-led conservation programs on a foundation of cooperation, community control, and enshrinement of land rights is one of the best ways to protect forests and strengthen communities’ sovereignty.

However, even these most successful of offset programs are, at the end of the day, offset programs—and as can be expected by now, both have serious issues that exemplify the spurious nature of offsets as a climate change solution. The Yaeda-Eyasi Landscape REDD+ Project in Tanzania sells carbon credits to MyClimate, a European company that offers carbon offsets to climate-harming companies including airlines and a fossil gas firm.^{xxxix} Meanwhile, the Selva de Matavén REDD+ project has come under fire for overcounting carbon credits, thus exaggerating its climate impact.^{xl}

These problems illustrate the fundamental contradiction at the heart of carbon offsetting: trading carbon credits invariably perpetuates the carbon emissions that drive climate change. Rising temperatures have already begun to destabilize the Amazon rainforest’s delicate ecosystems and drive drought and unlivable temperatures in sub-Saharan Africa. In practice, then, even when carbon offset programs deliver immediate benefits to forest-dwelling Indigenous peoples, those benefits are contingent on maintaining the drivers of climate change that threaten the very environments on which they depend: a total perversion of climate justice.

This, of course, is why the true solution is both readily apparent and politically inconvenient for governments and corporations that seek to avoid scrutiny for their role in driving climate change and forest destruction. We have seen that prioritizing climate finance for community- and Indigenous-led conservation programs can have remarkable results—but it must be done

unconditionally, and free of any offset schemes or pay-to-pollute models that enable continued carbon emissions elsewhere. Conservation programs must be governed equitably by Indigenous peoples and comply with Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) before any decision that affects the integrity and environmental or social balance of Indigenous communities. While repairing and preserving natural carbon sinks can have an important climate impact, offsets cannot be trusted to reduce emissions at scale; this must be done by rapidly drawing down consumption of oil and gas, with immediate cessation of exploration and drilling on Indigenous lands.

We can look to the Indigenous Kichwa of Sarayaku in the Ecuadorian Amazon for inspiration: through a lengthy community decision-making process, the people of Sarayaku developed their *Kawsak Sacha* (or “living forest”) proposal, which would create a new internationally-recognized conservation classification allowing Indigenous peoples to practice traditional management of their territories free of extractive activities like mining, fossil fuels, or agribusiness. Ultimately, supporting initiatives like *Kawsak Sacha* is not just the right thing to do from an environmental justice and Indigenous rights perspective: it is simply a more reliably effective solution for strengthening Indigenous rights and preserving forests than the LEAF Coalition or similar offset programs. Corporate sustainability actors would do well to remember this when thinking about how to fulfill their social and environmental commitments.

ⁱ Call for input: Green financing, a just transition to protect Indigenous Peoples’ rights, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/calls-for-input/2023/green-financing-just-transition-protect-indigenous-peoples-rights>.

ⁱⁱ See, e.g., The Guardian, *Revealed: more than 90% of rainforest carbon offsets by biggest certifier are worthless, analysis shows* (Jan. 18, 2023), <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/jan/18/revealed-forest-carbon-offsets-biggest-provider-worthless-verra-aoc>; Follow the Money, <https://www.ftm.eu/articles/south-pole-kariba-carbon-emission?share=6RVuzdbosPV0PocNbS%2BH06J1ACyVhYtk%2F6WUHcx2K3WRT2THqLrTelruqj%2F6FG0%3D>; Investor Group Bans Carbon Removal CO2 reduction plans (Jan. 31, 2023), <https://www.reuters.com/business/sustainable-business/investor-group-bans-carbon-removal-co2-reduction-plans-2023-01-31/>.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Mongabay*. “New report examines drivers of rising Amazon deforestation on country-by-country basis,” 23 May 2019, <https://news.mongabay.com/2019/05/new-report-examines-drivers-of-rising-amazon-deforestation-on-country-by-country-basis/>.

^{iv} Geist, H. J., & Lambin, E. F. “Proximate Causes and Underlying Driving Forces of Tropical Deforestation,” *BioScience*, Vol. 52, Iss. 2, February 2002, Pg. 143–150, [https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568\(2002\)052\[0143:PCAUDF\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2002)052[0143:PCAUDF]2.0.CO;2).

^v Inter-American Dialogue, *Nearing the Tipping Point: Drivers of Deforestation in the Amazon Region*, 15 May 2019, <https://www.thedialogue.org/analysis/nearing-the-tipping-point-drivers-of-deforestation-in-the-amazon-region/>.

^{vi} Rights and Resources Initiative & McGill University, *Status of Legal Recognition of Indigenous Peoples’, Local Communities’ and Afro-descendant Peoples’ Rights to Carbon Stored in Tropical Lands and Forests*, 2 June 2021, <https://rightsandresources.org/publication/carbon-rights-brief/>.

^{vii} *El Comercio*, “Sapara exigen a Gobierno revertir adjudicación de tierras,” 25 May 20121,

^{viii} Corape Satelital, “La Nacionalidad Sapara denunció vulneración a sus derechos territoriales con la entrega de sus tierras a una organización ilegítima,” 25 May 2021, <https://www.corape.org.ec/satelital/noticia/item/nacionalidad-sapara-denuncio-vulneracion-asus-derechos-territoriales-con-la-entrega-de-sus-tierras-a-una-organizacion-ilegitima>

^{ix} Gabriel Popkin, *National Geographic*, “Forest gardens’ show how Native land stewardship can outdo nature,” 23 April 2021, <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/article/forest-gardens-show-how-native-land-stewardship-can-outdo-nature>.

^x Protected Planet, <https://www.protectedplanet.net/en>.

^{xi} Forest Peoples Program, Indigenous Kichwa Community take Peruvian State and National Park to Court,” 1 July 2021, <https://www.forestpeoples.org/en/press-release/kichwa-take-Peru-state-PNAZ-court>.

^{xii} Chris Lang, *REDD Monitor*, “Indigenous Kichwa community takes the Peruvian State and Cordillera Azul National Park to court,” 2 July 2021, <https://redd-monitor.org/2021/07/02/indigenous-kichwa-community-takes-the-peruvian-state-and-cordillera-azul-national-park-to-court/>

^{xiii} Resguardo Indígena Unificado de la Selva de Matavén, <https://www.selvamatavenredd.org/es/proyecto/resguardo-indigena-unificado>

^{xiv} Carbon Market Watch, “Two Shades of Green: How hot air forest credits are being used to avoid carbon taxes in Colombia,” 29 June 2021, <https://carbonmarketwatch.org/2021/06/30/colombian-fossil-fuel-companies-abuse-forestry-offsets-to-avoid-taxes-report/>.

- ^{xv} Government of the State of Rondônia, Localização Terra Indígena Sete de Setembro, <http://www.sedam.ro.gov.br/projeto-de-carbono-florestal-suruí/>.
- ^{xvi} Danstin Nascimento Lima, “Crédito de carbono gerado em terras indígenas: uma análise a luz da sustentabilidade,” 44 f. Bachelor's of Science thesis, Federal University of Rondônia, 2018, <https://ri.unir.br/jspui/handle/123456789/2534>.
- ^{xvii} Emanuel Alencar, *O((e))co*, “Quinze anos depois, programas REDD+ sofrem esvaziamento e buscam recomeço,” 15 November 2020, <https://www.oeco.org.br/reportagens/quinze-anos-depois-programas-reed-sofrem-esvaziamento-e-buscam-recomec>.
- ^{xviii} Ideasam, “Mineração ilegal força suspensão do primeiro projeto de REDD+ indígena do mundo,” 12 September 2018, <https://ideasam.org/noticia/mineracao-ilegal-forca-suspensao-do-primeiro-projeto-de-redd-indigena-do-mundo/#>.
- ^{xix} Conselho Indigenista Missionário, “Os Suruí e o projeto carbono: para que o mundo saiba,” 24 February 2015, <https://cimi.org.br/2015/02/36980/>.
- ^{xx} Conselho Indigenista Missionário, “Lideranças Paiter Suruí pedem extinção de projeto de carbono com a Natura,” 1 December 2015, <https://cimi.org.br/2015/01/36894/>.
- ^{xxi} Conselho Indigenista Missionário, “‘Pra quê projetos que destroem a vida?’”, questiona Henrique Suruí,” 9 December 2014, <https://cimi.org.br/2014/12/36798/>.
- ^{xxii} Based on research published by Amazon Watch, A LEAF Out of an Old Book, 6 June 2022, <https://amazonwatch.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/LEAF-Briefer-English-6-6-2022.pdf>.
- ^{xxiii} “Fact Sheet: President Biden's Leaders Summit on Climate.” The White House, The United States Government, 23 Apr. 2021, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/04/23/fact-sheet-president-bidens-leaders-summit-on-climate/>.
- ^{xxiv} “Leaf Coalition Mobilizes \$1 Billion for Tropical Forest Conservation.” Emergent, 3 May 2022, <https://www.emergentclimate.com/leaf-mobilizes-1-billion-for-forest-protection/>.
- ^{xxv} Day, Thomas, et al. “Corporate Climate Responsibility Monitor 2022.” NewClimate Institute, 3 Mar. 2022, <https://newclimate.org/2022/02/07/corporate-climate-responsibility-monitor-2022/>.
- ^{xxvi} Chagas, Thiago, et al. “A Close Look at the Quality of REDD+ Carbon Credits.” CLIMATE FOCUS, 27 Apr. 2020, <https://www.climatefocus.com/publications/close-look-quality-redd-carbon-credits>.
- ^{xxvii} “Leaf Coalition US Leaders Summit Launch Event.” YouTube, YouTube, 23 Apr. 2021, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XR_1Ljib418&ab_channel=Emergent.
- ^{xxviii} Frechette, Alain. “Commentary: Reflections on ART-TREES, Jurisdictional REDD+ and Nature-Based Solutions.” Rights and Resources Initiative, Oct. 2021, https://rightsandresources.org/wp-content/uploads/Reflections-on-ART-Trees-Jurisdictional-REDD-and-NBS_Final-EN.pdf.
- ^{xxix} Brown, Kimberley. “Ecuador's Top Court Rules for Stronger Land Rights for Indigenous Communities.” Mongabay Environmental News, 9 Feb. 2022, <https://news.mongabay.com/2022/02/ecuadors-top-court-rules-for-stronger-land-rights-for-indigenous-communities/>.
- ^{xxx} “UNDP Social and Environmental Standards: United Nations Development Programme.” UNDP, 1 Jan. 2021, <https://www.undp.org/publications/undp-social-and-environmental-standards>.
- ^{xxxi} “Pueblo Shuar Arutam y Salvaguardas Socioambientales.” Centro De Derechos Económicos y Sociales - CDES, Dec. 2017, http://cdes.org.ec/web/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Informe_SocioBosque-digital.pdf.
- ^{xxxii} “Inspiration, Healing, and Resistance from Amazonian Women Defenders!” Amazon Watch, 12 Apr. 2022, <https://amazonwatch.org/news/2022/0328-inspiration-healing-and-resistance-from-amazonian-women-defenders>.
- ^{xxxiii} “Letter from the Shuar Arutam People to the Country & the World: Indigenous Environmental Network.” Indigenous Environmental Network, 30 June 2021, <https://www.ienearth.org/letter-from-the-shuar-arutam-people-to-the-country-the-world/>.
- ^{xxxiv} “Ecuador Accelerates Oil Opening as Transition Looms: Argus Media.” Commodity & Energy Price Benchmarks, 3 Dec. 2021, <https://www.argusmedia.com/en/news/2280049-ecuador-accelerates-oil-opening-as-transition-looms>.
- ^{xxxv} “República Del Ecuador Primera Contribución Determinada a Nivel Nacional ...” UNFCCC, Mar. 2019, <https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/ndcstaging/PublishedDocuments/Ecuador%20First/Primera%20NDC%20Ecuador.pdf>.
- ^{xxxvi} “El Estado Ecuatoriano Incumplió Sentencia En El Caso Mecheros.” Radio La Calle, 20 Apr. 2022, <https://radiolacalle.com/el-estado-ecuatoriano-incumplio-sentencia-en-caso-mecheros-y-ofrecera-disculpas-publicas/>.
- ^{xxxvii} Arellano, Astrid. “‘Indigenous People Are Fighting to Protect a Natural Equilibrium’: Q&A with Patricia Gualinga.” Translated by Matthew Rose, Mongabay Environmental News, 5 May 2022, <https://news.mongabay.com/2022/05/indigenous-people-are-fighting-to-protect-a-natural-equilibrium-qa-with-patricia-gualinga/>.
- ^{xxxviii} Pearce, Fred. “In Tanzania, Carbon Offsets Preserve Forests and a Way of Life.” *Grist*, 2 June 2022, <https://grist.org/climate/in-tanzania-carbon-offsets-preserve-forests-and-a-way-of-life/>; Myers, John Edward, et al. “How Carbon Offsetting Can Build a Forest (SSIR).” *REDD+ Deforestation Projects and the Future of Carbon Offsetting*, 9 Nov. 2021, https://ssir.org/articles/entry/how_carbon_offsetting_can_build_a_forest.
- ^{xxxix} “Energiapro - Offsetting 100% of Natural Gas Emissions.” *Myclimate*, <https://www.myclimate.org/information/partners-in-climate-protection/partner-detail/energiapro-offsetting-100-of-natural-gas-emissions/>.
- ^{xl} “Two Shades of Green: How Hot Air Forest Credits Are Being Used to Avoid Carbon Taxes in Colombia.” *Carbon Market Watch*, 30 June 2021, <https://carbonmarketwatch.org/publications/two-shades-of-green-how-hot-air-forest-credits-are-being-used-to-avoid-carbon-taxes-in-colombia/>.