



MOZAMBIQUE

TECHNICAL FORM FOR THE PRESENTATION OF A CASE

Chapter I – Characteristics of the Case

1. Organisation(s) or group(s) responsible for presenting the case

Justiça Ambiental, JAI and representatives from affected communities in Nampula (Districts of Ribaué, Rapale and Mecuburi)

2. Name of the company and/or consortium being accused

Green Resources AS (GRAS) subsidiaries in Mozambique are being accused. It is important to note here that our main focus in this case is the subsidiary Lurio Green Resources in Nampula province, which is where most of the conflicts were found. However, in 2019, GRAS decided to concentrate development in Niassa province and leave all other areas. From civil society community visits in February 2020 it appears communities were not aware of an upcoming exit and continue to appeal to GRAS to get their land back and receive compensation. Actions from the provincial prosecutor in August 2020 on the GRAS dossier do not indicate that GRAS has exited the plantations. Now, according to GRAS' own information it only seems to hold the plantations in Niassa province, of 13,000 hectares, through three subsidiaries: Niassa Green Resources SA (NGR), Chikweti Forests of Niassa (CFN) and Florestal do Planato (FdP).^{1,2} We also need to note that Orbis database and FSC certification reports³ give decidedly different corporate structures for GRAS from the companies own reports.

3. Place of operation in which events related to the accusation/case occurred

Mozambique, specifically in Nampula, Zambézia and Niassa Provinces. GRAS operates:

- In Niassa Province, 13,000 hectares (districts Sanga, Lichinga, Chimbonila, Lago and Muembe), through its subsidiaries NGR, CFN and FdP.
- Lúrio Green Resources (LGR) in Nampula province (districts Ribaué, Mecuburi and Rapale)
- In Zambézia province (districts of Alto Molocue, Ile, Gurue, Namarroi, Milange e Mocuba), GRAS subsidiaries Tectona Forest of Zambézia, and Ntacua.

GRAS decided in 2019 to exit the operations in Zambézia and Nampula province.

Chapter II – Characteristics of the Company / Consortium

1. Country or countries where the company has its headquarters / main office

Green Resources AS (GRAS) is a private Norwegian company with Company no. 975 879 968, registered in Oslo, Norway. In 2016, GRAS moved its head office from London in the UK to Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania.⁴

¹ GRAS, 2020, 2019 Sustainability report, <https://greenresources.no/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/GR-Sustainability-Report-2019.pdf>

² GRAS, version July 2019, Forest Management Plan, <https://greenresources.no/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/GR-Mozambique-Forest-Management-Plan-2018-2022-public-summary.pdf>

³ <http://fsc.force.com/servlet/servlet.FileDownload?file=00PF300001403DdEAL>, page 13

⁴ GRAS, 2017, Environmental and Social Impact Report 2016, page 6

3. Ownership of the company's capital

GRAS was established by Mads Asprem in 1995, at that time with the name Fjordgløtt, before changing to its current name in 1996. Mads Asprem is a former deputy member of the Norwegian parliament for the Conservative party (Høyre). The GRAS Annual Report 2013-2014,⁵ for example, mentions that GRAS had over 80 shareholders at the beginning of its creation with a majority of Norwegian capital. It began its operations in Africa in 1996 and now operates in three African countries: Mozambique, Tanzania and Uganda.

Note the branching of this company through its various subsidiaries in Mozambique, Uganda and Tanzania. In fact, these subsidiaries are judicially autonomous entities. According to the Orbis Norfund Ownership Summary, the Green Forest Fund Atiebolag, a Swedish fund to promote forest restoration, owned by GRAS, has majority stakes in four Mozambique subsidiaries.⁶ GRAS operates in Niassa through Niassa Green Resources (NGR). Orbis shows other formerly independent companies, which have since been absorbed or controlled by GRAS, such as the well-known Chikweti Forests of Niassa (57% owned) and Companhia Florestal de Massangulo (65% owned). In Nampula we find Lúrio Green Resources (LGR) and in Zambezia Ntacia Florestas of Zambezia (67% owned by GRAS) and Tectona Forest of Zambezia LDA (70% owned by GRAS), but these plantations might have been exited since 2019.

Recent information from Orbis shows that most of GRAS shareholders are based in Norway, apart from Unicredit Bank of Austria AG, which according to Orbis is the second-biggest shareholder (9.46%) after the Norwegian government's majority stake (50.62%) through its private equity fund, Norfund.⁷ Contrary to the Orbis data, the 2019 GRAS Annual Report⁸ states that as of June 30, 2019 Norfund, and ultimately the Norwegian government held a 67% stake. It subsequently reports that, in October 2019, the Finnish government fund, Finnfund, bought shares in Green Resources from Norfund, increasing Finnfund's stake in the company from 0% to 25% and reducing Norfund's stake from 67% to 42%, making both the governments of Norway and Finland major investors in Green Resources.

2. Country or countries in which the parent company has its operations

Mozambique, Uganda, Tanzania

Chapter III – General Argumentation of the Case

GRAS acquired between 2005 and 2009 approximately 74 DUATs (Direito do Uso e Aproveitamento da Terra: rights for private persons to use and benefit from the land), representing more than 264,898 hectares of land in three provinces (Nampula, Zambézia and Niassa) over the Nacala Corridor territories aimed at pine and eucalyptus monoculture plantations.

These three provinces are part of the Nacala Development Corridor, one of the three foremost development corridors in the country, which are geared towards putting to good use the range of infrastructures surrounding the Nacala port, and the connecting road and railways. The Nacala Corridor is also considered one of the most fertile areas in Mozambique: this land represents the livelihoods of around 4.5 million people who have been farming for generations through mostly small-scale farming. This contradicts the arguments of the plantation corporations and the Mozambican government, who often state that the land in the Nacala Corridor is free or unused.

Over the course of 10 years, the company only planted 24,585 ha of this area (9.2%), which demonstrates lack of a concrete operating plan and financial resources for large areas like these. Part of the areas assigned to GRAS by the Mozambican Government coincide with areas occupied by families and local communities, immediately raising a juridical-legal problem, as the Land Law recognises customary land rights and therefore the government cannot assign occupied land without the express and informed consent of the rightful occupants and accompanied by corresponding compensation and reparation for damages, which was not the case.

⁵ Green Resources AS, 2015. Annual Report 2013-2014.

⁶ Orbis Norfund Ownership Summary, accessed February 2020

⁷ Orbis Green Resources, accessed 26 February 2020

⁸ <http://greenresources.no/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Green-Resources-Annual-Report-2019.pdf>.

The communities affected by GRAS plantations are mostly poor rural populations, completely dependent on agriculture and other natural resources for their livelihoods. Agriculture is mainly performed in small family operations, ranging from one to five hectares, rain fed and intercropping local food cultures (corn, mapira, cassava, peanut, beans, etc.). Many families still use traditional soil fertilisation methods, such as fallowing the lands, or incorporating the soil with plant rubble, manure and ashes.

Although there was a so-called community consultation process during the process of the Environmental Impact Assessment, records of these consultations are not public. According to the local communities, the process was not duly undertaken and the resulting compensations were not negotiated between the affected people and the company. It is also important to note that these affected rural communities are mostly poor and illiterate; most don't understand Portuguese or use it as a second language, and this was not adequately taken into account in the consultations. Most consultations were conducted in Portuguese and documentation on the project is also only available in Portuguese.

GRAS made several verbal promises during the community consultations, which were not translated into written agreements. Among the many promises made during consultation, the most significant were access to jobs; improved schools and education; rehabilitation of existing hospitals and schools; promotion of alternative crop production techniques, which would ensure higher yields and require less land. All of these were forgotten once GRAS was in possession of the land, leaving communities frustrated.

Conflict over land, false promises and compensation is still ongoing in several of the affected communities, such as the communities in Ribaué District, namely Lancheque, Meparara, Namacuco and Messa which are the most actively resisting GRAS. These communities still do not understand how compensation was determined to establish the amounts paid back in 2015. The values were not negotiated with the affected communities, but determined between the government and GRAS. Most families received less than MZN500 in compensation for loss of seasonal and permanent crops and more than 90% of compensation paid to each family amounts to less than MZN2,000 (around USD 30).

Local communities have their settlements very close to roads and rivers, and most of the plantations were established in areas previously occupied by native forests, community crops (machambas) and very close to rivers and roads, which clearly contradicts GRAS statements of planting on degraded and unused land. Rather,⁹ GRAS established its plantations on fertile and occupied land.

Affected communities associate GRAS plantations with recent environmental changes they have registered, such as reduction of soil productivity, reduction of rainfall, reduced access to medicinal plants, firewood, water and hunting.

Affected communities in Nampula are organised and working with national NGOs and the National Peasants Union to reclaim their rights. In collaboration with NGOs these communities have submitted letters, petitions denouncing these issues and demanding GRAS to fulfill all promises or give back their land.¹⁰ Government institutions including the Parliament and the President are well aware of these conflicts through the many letters, petitions and actions organised and have not yet taken real steps to solve the

Chapter IV – Impacts: Violations of People's Rights and Destruction of the Environment

1. What are the main impacts of the company's operations in the place the accusation is being made?

- Loss of access to fertile and productive land leading to food insecurity;
- Impoverishment of local communities and loss of their livelihoods;
- Loss of crops and fruit trees;
- Restricted access to water and other vital resources;

⁹ <https://www.business-humanrights.org/en/latest-news/mozambique-green-resources-response/>, accessed 16 October 2020

¹⁰ Justiça Ambiental, Livangingo and the National Peasants Union, 2016, O Avanço das Plantações Florestais sobre os Territórios dos Camponeses no Corredor de Nacala: o caso da Green Resources Moçambique, https://issuu.com/justicaambiental/docs/o_caso_da_green_resources_moc_amb

- Increased distance to water points;
- Increased corruption and bribery, especially to ensure work opportunities in the company;
- Those who refused to give away their land were left with no compensation and surrounded by trees;
- Intimidation of community members who speak up against the company;
- Refusal to provide information on the land acquisition process, on the compensation process and on the environmental and social monitoring reports;
- Forced sexual favours in exchange for promises of employment and access to social responsibility programs.

2. In the impacts mentioned above, what has the company's involvement been?

With direct involvement of the company:

- Loss of access to fertile and productive land leading to food insecurity;
- Loss of crops and fruit trees;
- Restricted access to water and other resources;
- Increased distance to water points;
- Refusal to provide information on the land acquisition process, on the compensation process and on the environmental and social monitoring reports;
- GRAS denies having made promises during the community consultation process.

From local leadership:

- Increased corruption and bribery, especially to ensure work opportunities in the company;
- Those who refused to give away their land were left with no compensation and surrounded by trees;
- Intimidation of community members who speak up against the company.

3. Who has been mainly or differently affected by the company's activities?

- Women and children appear to be most affected.
- Due to the inherited sexual division of work and responsibilities in the affected communities, women are mostly responsible for the household chores including family meals, hygiene, etc, and therefore carry the burden of the increased work in securing water, food, healthcare for their families.
- Men are considered the head of the family and therefore responsible for any negotiation or decision that needs to be taken in regards to the family's assets and future. In many families, men take these decisions alone, without discussing it with their partners, and many times these unilateral decisions do not represent the family's best interests leading to conflicts in the marriage. Men are more eager to exchange land for employment believing they will be better off, but do not tend to question the conditions of these job opportunities. Generally men are also the ones who receive the compensation and this money is not always used for the family, which also leads to conflicts in the family and divorce.

4. What strategies has the company used to legitimise its actions or quell resistance?

- Co-optation of local leaders, but it is unclear if it is mainly through the company or through local government officials;
- Publicity on their corporate social responsibility programs, most of which are not yet in implementation;
- GRAS has mentioned in several meetings that their operations are certified, which was only true for a limited period and not for all operations - currently only the Niassa Green Resources plantations in Sanga and Lichinga district (4426 hectares) are FSC certified for responsible management.¹¹ Lurio Green Resources FSC certificate for the Nampula plantations was terminated in 2017, after the audit team found major non-compliance incidents regarding workers rights, customary rights, mechanisms for grievances and complaints among others;¹²
- Greenwashing: the company says its plantations are planted forests, whereas plantations are classified as a wholly different land use, with other ecological, social and economic parameters;

¹¹ FSC certification database, <https://info.fsc.org/details.php?id=a0240000007nSIFAA2&type=certificate>, accessed 16th October 2020

¹² <https://info.fsc.org/details.php?id=a0240000008hYgcAAE&type=certificate#result>, accessed 16th October 2020

- Intimidation and social exclusion of community members who oppose the project. These community members are referred to as being from the opposition party and against the development of the country, which leads to the isolation of the community member or family;
- From time to time, the company promises to revisit the compensation process in order to reduce tension and calm communities;
- Violent repression of protests organised by affected communities by the police, who serve the interests of the company.

Chapter V – Strategies of Resistance: Local and National Level

1. What strategies of resistance have social organisations and affected communities adopted in the company's place of operation?

- Building mobilisation through several meetings with communities and civil society;
- Documentation and dissemination of information;
- Strategy meetings in affected communities but also with the participation of neighbouring communities;
- Development and dissemination of various public statements and press releases;
- Affected communities have organised themselves in groups to participate in meetings with GRAS and government representatives;
- Affected communities from different districts have also organised meetings with the support of NGOs;
- Three civil society organisations commissioned a study, conducted by Lexterra, on the impacts of Green Resources Plantations and this study was then published in 2016;¹³
- A documentary was also produced in 2017 based on the study and disseminated internationally;¹⁴
- A petition with the demands from affected communities was submitted to the Mozambican Parliament, demanding their intervention, to which they haven't reacted to yet;
- Letters demanding intervention from governmental institutions were also submitted to the Ministry of Land, Environment and Rural Development; Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security; National Human Rights Commission; Ambassador of Norway in Mozambique; Director of GRAS; 5th Committee of the Parliament–Committee on Agriculture, Economy and Environment; Provincial Governor of Nampula; District Administrators. The only reply received was from the National Human Rights Commission stating that they would investigate;
- Various public actions were organised in Maputo city (the capital), such as the distribution of pamphlets presenting the social, environmental and economic impacts of GRAS and other monoculture plantations;
- A speakers tour to Sweden and Norway was organised in 2017 with members of the affected communities and representatives from the three NGOs who commissioned the study and the case was presented and discussed with key institutions such as Norfund, Norad, Norwegian Parliamentarians, and many public meetings aimed at civil society organisations in Sweden and Norway;¹⁵
- Many field visits were conducted to the various affected communities;
- Capacity building sessions for the affected communities were also undertaken;
- JA in partnership with two other partner organisations also organised an experience exchange and strategy meeting for communities affected by different monoculture plantations that took place in Zambézia Province.

2. Has a case been presented before a local, national or international court?

No case against GRAS was submitted in court due to lack of supporting documentation on the process of land acquisition. Although JA! has submitted several written requests to GRAS and to the Ministry of Land and Environment to have access to the DUAT processes none of these requests were positively answered by the company and or government institutions. The main difficulty at this stage is to access documentation and then to analyse it and develop a case.

¹³ Justiça Ambiental, Livangingo and the National Peasants Union, 2016, O Avanço das Plantações Florestais sobre os Territórios dos Camponeses no Corredor de Nacala: o caso da Green Resources Moçambique, https://issuu.com/justicaambiental/docs/o_caso_da_green_resources_moc_amb

¹⁴ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jPU9ydB4b2U>

¹⁵ <https://wrm.org.uy/articles-from-the-wrm-bulletin/section1/green-resources-mozambique-more-false-promises/>

3. Is there evidence of corporate influence and capture that has played a role against the interests of the affected people? How do you describe the company's relationship with the local / national government?

The Director of GRAS in Mozambique has many connections to national government - he is well known and respected in the forest sector; he was the National Director of Forestry and Wildlife for many years; and is very well connected politically. In Mozambique, political connections serve as economic connections and facilitate business deals, including land acquisition.

Local and National government protect and defend the company's interests. This is evident by the lack of action to solve the many conflicts between the GRAS and affected communities that have been brought to the attention of authorities on many occasions. The government facilitates all community consultation processes, and government officials participate.

GRAS is currently or has previously been supported by significant international financial institutions such as IFC,¹⁶ the Dutch development bank FMO,¹⁷ Norfund and FinnFund, which also financially support several other development projects and areas of intervention in Mozambique in close partnership with the Mozambican Government. These institutions benefit from strong political connections and there is a huge interest from Mozambique in maintaining good relations with such institutions. Besides the connections between the Mozambican government and these financial institutions, the Norwegian Embassy in Mozambique, through their Ambassador, also defends GRAS' image and denies knowledge of any conflicts between the company and rural communities, having in fact referred to the allegations in the 2016 civil society lead study as false.

4. What are the main obstacles for access to justice for affected communities?

- Most communities do not know their rights and the laws that may protect them; and even when they do know the laws they lack the necessary support to make good use of them.
- Lack of access to official documentation and information such as the financial agreement between the Government and the company; the documentation of the land acquisition process; documentation of the compensation process; environmental and social monitoring reports etc. To begin any case it is necessary to collect and analyse these documents, which are not available.
- Lack of resources – and in this case it may be human resources to prepare and submit the case but also financial resources to cover expenses for lawyers, documents and even the payments required for the court proceedings.
- The legal system is not independent but highly controlled by political elites and their financial interests.

Chapter VI – Global Context: Policies, Actors, States and National / International Institutions and Frameworks relevant to the case

1. What official international instruments and/or international declarations are being ignored or violated by the accused company?

- The Constitution of Mozambique and several other national legislations such as the Land Law and the Resettlement regulation;
- African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights, in particular the right to life and implicit rights to housing and food; the right to self determination; the right to development; the right to peace and security;
- UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People, in particular the right to self determination and land rights;
- UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in particular the right to life; the right to freedom of thought and association; the right to a standard of living, including the right to housing and land;
- The Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) has clear provisions about the participation of rural women in consultation processes.

2. Which national and international institutions are facilitating the entry and operations of this company / consortium?

The Government of Mozambique is the main driver, as it believes that the development of our country can only be done through huge land and resource intensive projects with foreign investment, and invites such initiatives through the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (in this particular case).

¹⁶ <https://ifcext.ifc.org/ifcext/pressroom/ifcpressroom.nsf/1f70cd9a07d692d685256ee1001cdd37/4ab39481551e6f93852575d10051368c>, accessed 16th October 2020

¹⁷ <https://www.fmo.nl/project-detail/57233>, accessed 16th October 2020

So far the FSC facilitates the entry and operations of GRAS in Mozambique by giving its seal of approval for responsible forest management to its plantations despite the well documented human rights issues. Termination and suspension of these certificates takes years and in the meantime the company will have easier access to finance and the marketplace, where investors and buyers demand certified operations and products.

The sale of Carbon Credits has also been a key part of Green Resources' business model and public relations around its mission to combat climate change. Several international organisations, consultancies and firms have facilitated this, such as carbon credit standard manager Verra. The CDM, the carbon trading mechanism under the Kyoto protocol, has validated Green Resources projects, including the Niassa plantations.¹⁸ Green Resources, however, failed to achieve the status of verification of its carbon credits under Verra's CCB standards in Uganda and Mozambique.¹⁹ In 2020 the Swedish Energy Agency cancelled the contracts to buy carbon credits because of impacts of the industrial plantations on communities in Uganda, including land evictions.²⁰ In Tanzania, the carbon credit project still seems to be operating.²¹

3. Was the company's entry to the country facilitated by the policies of international financial institutions or other Financial instruments?

Yes, GRAS received funding from International Financial Institutions (direct foreign investments), such as Norfund, FMO and Finnfund. It received an IFC investment (for operations in Tanzania) and it also benefited from the current profit driven "reforestation" plans and programs driven by World Bank and FAO policies. Norfund and Finnfund essentially rescued GRAS from bankruptcy in 2018.

4. Which mechanisms or instruments did these financial institutions use to facilitate the entry of the corporation?

- Direct foreign Investment
- Consultancies
- Structural adjustment plans – review of the forest sector policies and strategies to accommodate and facilitate the establishment of monoculture plantations as a reforestation effort

5. What is the position of the government of the corporation's country of origin? Has it facilitated the entry of the corporation into the country where it is being denounced?

The position of the country of origin, Norway, has been in favour and in defence of the company. In meetings with the Ambassador of Norway in Mozambique in July and September 2017 it was clear that the embassy does not accept that there are serious negative social and environmental impacts caused by GRAS and denies any wrongdoing by the company. It facilitates not only the entry of GRAS but the perpetuation of human rights violations.

6. In the place the company is being denounced, have the national and local governments favoured the company by making changes to legislation? Are these changes related to the impunity with which the company acts? What has the position of the national government been in the conflict?

In general the forest sector has been undergoing reviews to all its governing instruments, policies, strategies, and even definitions to accommodate and facilitate schemes for payment of ecosystem services and commodification of nature, such as the National REDD+, Forest Conservation and Increase of Carbon Reserves through Forests Strategy (Estratégia Nacional para a Redução de Emissões de Desmatamento e Degradação Florestal, Conservação de Florestas e Aumento de Reservas de Carbono Através de Florestas (REDD+) 2016-2030) which was approved despite civil society groups arguing against it. In this strategy a new definition of forest is also adopted, to be able to serve the REDD+ mechanism and include monoculture plantations as planted forests. Monoculture plantations have been gaining significance and relevance in the sector and there is huge interest from the government in promoting more of such investments. All these changes in policies favour companies such as GRAS.

¹⁸ CDM project database, <https://cdm.unfccc.int/Projects/DB/DNV-CUK1380279225.53/view>

¹⁹ Verra project registry: <https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/CCB/1617>

²⁰ <https://redd-monitor.org/2020/03/11/the-swedish-energy-agency-has-stopped-buying-carbon-credits-from-green-resources-destructive-plantations-in-uganda/>, accessed 16th October 2020

²¹ <https://registry.verra.org/app/projectDetail/CCB/142>, accessed 16th October 2020

National government reiterates all the process of acquiring land, community consultations and dispossession was done in accordance to the national Law despite all the complaints and actions taken by affected communities and allies. It continues to deny access to the documentation of such processes and does not take any action to resolve conflicts.

7. What role are the company's majority shareholders / owners playing? What is the relationship between the accused company and the government of the country in question?

The company's shareholders defend their interests and claim that all proceedings were undertaken in accordance with national legislation or in line with international standards. They consistently deny all allegations of social and environmental impacts.²² Norfund and Finnfund state that they support the company to 'meet its financial and sustainability goals'.²³

8. Is the company receiving public or private funding? From whom?

The Norwegian government and other development banks including the IFC, Finnfund and the FMO, previously invested in Green Resources, and according to the Norfund website, the Norwegian government, through Norfund, became a shareholder in 2018 due to "financial challenges" at the company.²⁴ The GRAS 2019 Annual Report lists current and non-current loans, including historical loans it had with the IFC that were taken over by Norfund and with the FMO from 2018. The report also states that GRAS signed a restated loan agreement in April 2019 with Norfund and Finnfund for USD 19.5 million, to finance the company through to 2021, to be repaid in August 2023.²⁵

9. Has a lobby or interest group become involved with the intention of favouring the company in the conflict?

Yes, international conservation groups such as WWF in Mozambique have become involved favouring the company and promoting certification schemes such as FSC certification, which has shown to be nothing but a greenwashing strategy. Besides the efforts by these groups to greenwash the company's actions, other groups such as the World Bank and again big international conservation groups are also controlling/influencing the forest sector policy reviews by funding such reviews and studies. One example of how tight and interwoven these connections are is the recent report promoting investments in Africa for monoculture plantations, written for the African Development Bank and WWF Kenya, funded by the World Bank and co-written by former Green Resources CEO Mads Asprem.²⁶

²² See for example: <https://redd-monitor.org/2019/09/10/swedish-energy-agency-delays-us1-million-carbon-credit-payment-to-green-resources/>

²³ Norfund, "Green Resources USD, <https://www.norfund.no/investment/green-resources-usd/> accessed 27 February 2020

²⁴ Norfund, "Green Resources USD, <https://www.norfund.no/investment/green-resources-usd/> accessed 27 February 2020

²⁵ Green Resources, "Annual Report 2019," <http://greenresources.no/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Green-Resources-Annual-Report-2019.pdf>, accessed 27 February 2020

²⁶ <https://redd-monitor.org/2020/09/22/international-day-of-struggle-against-monoculture-tree-plantations-how-wwf-and-the-african-development-bank-are-promoting-land-grabs-in-africa/>, accessed 16th October 2020

NOTE: Most of the information that served as the basis for this case was around the fieldwork developed by JAI and other civil society organisations together with rural communities, which later, due to its relevance, followed a deeper study that resulted in the widely published report on the advance of plantations in the peasants territory in the Nacala Corridor.²⁷ JAI continues to monitor the situation of four communities in particular: the Meparara, Lancheque, Namacuco and Messa communities in the Ribaue district in Nampula Province. Our monitoring is done through regular communication with local key community members (on a monthly basis); field visits at least once a year, but mostly 2-3 times a year since the release of the study; continuous involvement of members of these communities in our activities, such as capacity building events, meetings and providing events for experience exchange with other communities also affected by monoculture plantations in Mozambique and also with communities who are implementing community forest management projects.

This form is based on the “Technical Form for the Presentation of a Case Against a Transnational Corporation”, from the Permanent Peoples Tribunal, used on the occasion of the Southern Africa’s Permanent Peoples Tribunal on Transnational Corporations (Manzini - Johannesburg, 2016-18)

Publication date: 20.11.2020

²⁷ Calengo, A., Machava, F., Vendo, J., Simalawonga, R., Kabura, R., Mananze, S. (2016). The Progress of Forest Plantations on the Farmers’ Territories in the Nacala Corridor: the case of Green Resources Moçambique. Livaningo, Justiça Ambiental e UNAC. Maputo, Mozambique – in https://wrm.org.uy/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/The_Progress_of_Forest_Plantations_on_the_Farmers_Territories_in_the_Nacala_Corridor_the_case_of_Green_Resources_Mocambique.pdf

