October 11, 2021

Dr. Tania Reneaum Panszi
Executive Secretary
Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
Washington D.C.

Reference: Request for a thematic hearing on the human rights situation of individuals and communities affected by Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations ("CAFOs") in the hemisphere.

Dear Secretary Reneaum Panszi,

We, the 19 undersigned organizations, with the support of an additional 127 organizations and 151 academics, scientists, and other individuals, write to request a thematic hearing before the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights ("IACHR" or "Commission") during its 182nd period of sessions, from December 6 to 17, 2021, in accordance with Articles 61, 62, and 66 of the Rules of Procedure of the IACHR.

I. Objective of the hearing

The objective of the hearing would be to present detailed information on the impacts and threats to human rights caused by Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations ("CAFOs") in the Americas, with an emphasis on CAFOs in Argentina, Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, and the United States. Specifically, we will present:

1) An overview of how CAFOs, which represent an extractive model of agro-industrial production, and resulting human rights impacts have spread from the United States to the rest of the hemisphere.
2) Testimony of victims from affected communities and scientific experts detailing the impacts and threats to human rights caused by CAFOs, including impacts on health, water, air, and the environment, as well as concerns regarding access to information and public participation, attacks on environmental defenders, and the respect for Indigenous people's rights. We will highlight how many States in the hemisphere have failed to adopt appropriate regulations or measures to effectively protect human rights from CAFOs and the lack of attention that States and international organizations have given to this industry despite evidence of numerous, repeated human rights violations.
3) A series of recommendations for both States and the IACHR to effectively guarantee human rights in the face of the growing threat presented by CAFOs in the hemisphere.

The information we will present is of vital importance in connection with the IACHR's mandate to monitor the general human rights situation in the hemisphere, and it is particularly relevant to the work of the Special Rapporteur on Economic, Social, Cultural and Environmental Rights; the Special Rapporteur on Human Rights Defenders; and the Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. This information will also be relevant for evaluating future

requests for precautionary measures and petitions for human rights violations related to CAFO activity.

II. Justification for the Hearing

A. Industrial Meat Production and Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations.

CAFOs are industrial meat and dairy production operations that confine hundreds or even thousands of animals; some poultry CAFOs confine more than one million birds. These animals produce an enormous amount of urine and feces. As a result, many individual CAFOs generate more waste than the human populations of large cities. For example, one pig CAFO in the United States confines 79,488 pigs per year. By a conservative estimate, the pigs in that CAFO generate more than 331,122,430 kilograms of manure annually[1]—that is, more than the amount of fecal matter generated by the entire human population of a large city such as Los Angeles, California or Medellín, Colombia.[2] CAFOs throughout the Western Hemisphere threaten human health and the environment. They pollute surface water and groundwater, foul the air, and spread dangerous pathogens. Inadequate management of waste and animals, lax government oversight, and weak regulations all conspire to leave communities' rights and the environment vulnerable to CAFOs' toxic impacts.

B. The Spread of CAFOs in the Americas

Despite the numerous human rights impacts caused by CAFOs, this model of industrial meat production has spread throughout the United States and is now being exported to countries in Latin America. According to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization ("FAO"), by 2050, global meat consumption is expected to increase to 52 kg per person.[3] The FAO estimates that meat production in Latin America will continue to grow in the next decade, mainly in Argentina, Mexico, Brazil, Chile, Uruguay, and Paraguay, countries whose production is focused on exports.[4] Already the dominate form of meat production in the United States, CAFOs are spreading to more countries in the region to meet growing demand: Chile is currently the world's fifth largest pork exporter; Argentina has 100,000 pig farms, mostly located in the center of the country[5]; and, in Mexico, industrial meat production is expanding rapidly in the southern part of the country. Experts have already documented the grave consequences of industrial meat

[1] *See* Natural Resources Conservation Service, *RCA Issue Brief #7* (Dec. 1995), https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/technical/nra/rca/?cid=nrcs143_014211#table1.
[2] According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency, a person produces approximately 0.2 kilograms of fecal matter per day. *See* EPA, *Risk Assessment Evaluation for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations* 9, Table 3.3 (2004).
[3] FAO, How to Feed the World in 2050, at 11, http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/wsfs/docs/expert_paper/How_to_Feed_the_World_in_2050.pdf.
[4] *See* Fundación Heinrich Böll, El Atlas de la Carne de la Fundación Heinrich Böll (2014), https://mx.boell.org/sites/default/files/atlasdelacarne2014_web_140717.pdf.
[5] Fermín Koop & Manuela Andreoni, *China mira hacia América Latina en medio de la crisis de la peste porcina*, Diálogo Chino (2019), https://dialogochino.net/es/agricultura-es/28472-china-mira-hacia-america-latina-en-medio-de-la-crisis-de-la-peste-porcina/.

production for human health and the environment in the United States.[6] The expansion of CAFOs in low- and middle-income countries in the hemisphere, often with the support of State policies and without a strong regulatory framework, will expose many more communities to these serious threats to public health and the environment.[7]

C. The Human Rights Impact of CAFOs

1. Water Quality and Access to Water (Rights to Life, Personal Integrity, Water, Health, and a Healthy Environment)

The storage and disposal of CAFO waste threatens surface water, groundwater, and well water. Most pig and dairy CAFOs store manure in liquid form in vast, uncovered pits. This method of waste storage threatens water quality because manure can seep out of storage pits and into groundwater,[8] and heavy precipitation can cause storage pits to overflow or breach, releasing large quantities of manure into surface water.[9] Many poultry CAFOs store manure-caked litter in massive, outdoor piles, where wind and precipitation can spread it onto neighboring properties and wash it into surface water. To dispose of liquid manure and dry litter, CAFOs typically spread it on fields. CAFOs often apply more nutrients to fields through the application of manure and litter than plants can utilize, allowing the excess to run off into surface water or leach into groundwater.[10] And even when manure and litter are not overapplied, subsequent precipitation can wash them off fields into surface water.[11] The pollutants in CAFO

---

[6] Shawn G. Gibbs et al., *Airborne Antibiotic Resistant and Nonresistant Bacteria and Fungi Recovered from Two Swine Herd Confined Animal Feeding Operations*, 1 Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene 699 (2004) (finding high levels of multi-drug resistant bacteria present both within and downwind of industrial swine facilities); Christopher D. Heaney et al., *Source Tracking Swine Fecal Waste in Surface Water Proximal to Swine Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations*, 511 Science of the Total Environment 676 (2015) (finding that surface waters in areas where industrial swine facility density is high have high concentrations of fecal coliforms, E. coli, and Enterococcus); Susan S. Schiffman et al., *Symptomatic Effects of Exposure to Diluted Air Sampled from a Swine Confinement Atmosphere on Healthy Human Subjects*, 113 Environmental Health Perspectives 567 (2005) (finding that people exposed to diluted air from an industrial swine facility were more likely to report eye irritation, nausea, and headaches than a control group exposed to clean air); Sigurdur T. Sigurdarson & Joel N. Kline, *School Proximity to Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations and Prevalence of Asthma in Students*, 129 Chest 1486 (2006) (finding that there is a higher prevalence of asthma among elementary school children attending schools near industrial animal facilities).

[7] Yukyan Lam et al., *Applying an Environmental Public Health Lens to the Industrialization of Food Animal Production in Ten Low- and Middle-Income Countries*, 15 Global Health 40 (2019).

[8] *See* R.L. Huffman & Phillip W. Westerman, *Seepage and Electromagnetic Terrain Conductivity Around New Swine Lagoons*, 47 Transactions of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers 1507 (1991); *see also* R.L. Huffman & Phillip W. Westerman, *Estimated Seepage Losses from Established Swine Waste Lagoons in the Lower Coastal Plain of North Carolina*, 38 Transactions of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers 449 (1995).

[9] *See* JoAnn Burkholder et al., *Impacts of Waste from Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations on Water Quality*, 115 Environmental Health Perspectives 308, 308 (2007).

[10] *See* J. C. Burns et al., *Swine Lagoon Effluent Applied to 'Coastal' Bermudagrass: I. Forage Yield, Quality, and Element Removal*, 14 Journal of Environmental Quality 9, 14 (1985); *see also* Kimberley A. Rosov et al., *Waste Nutrients from U.S. Animal Feeding Operations; Regulations are Inconsistent Across States and Inadequately Assess Nutrient Export Risk*, 269 Journal of Environmental Management 1, 1 (2020); Philip Wayne Westerman et al., *Swine Manure and Lagoon Effluent Applied to a Temperate Forage Mixture: II. Rainfall Runoff and Soil Chemical Properties*, 16 Journal of Environmental Quality 106, 106 (1987).

[11] *See* Burkholder et al., *supra* note 9, at 308.

waste can harm humans, wildlife, and entire species.[12] For example, excess nutrients in CAFO waste can cause harmful algal blooms in surface water, which can kill fish[13] and cause gastrointestinal tract distress and skin, eye, and ear infections in humans.[14]

Once CAFO manure enters groundwater, it can infiltrate drinking wells. Indeed, numerous studies have found CAFO contaminants in drinking wells near CAFOs.[15] These contaminants are harmful to human health. CAFO waste contains nitrogen, which is a source of nitrate pollution, and nitrates in drinking water are associated with birth defects and cases of the potentially fatal blood condition methemoglobinemia, or "blue baby syndrome," in infants under six months of age.[16] Nitrates are also associated with an increased risk for hyperthyroidism and insulin-dependent diabetes.[17] Thus, in communities that rely on wells, CAFOs can impair access to safe drinking water.

Along with threatening water quality, CAFOs can threaten a community's access to water. CAFOs use large amounts of water to maintain animals, clean confinement houses, and wash urine and feces into waste pits. For example, in 2017, 448 CAFOs in one state in the United States used a total of 8.7 billion liters of water.[18] This is enough water to meet the basic needs of at least 238,356 people for one year.[19] In areas where drought is common, community members fear that CAFO water use will prevent them from having access to the water they need.

2. Air pollution (Rights to Life, Personal Integrity, Health, and a Healthy Environment)

In addition to polluting surface water, groundwater, and well water, CAFOs generate contaminants that pollute the air and harm human health and well-being. When CAFO waste decomposes, it releases hydrogen sulfide, ammonia, and hundreds of volatile organic compounds,[20] along with methane and nitrous oxide, two potent greenhouse gases.[21] Waste pits, waste piles, and animal confinement buildings emit these gases and compounds into the air, as

---

[12] In addition to urine, feces, and wastewater from the facilities' operations, CAFO waste typically contains nutrients such as nitrogen and phosphorus, disease-causing pathogens, salts, heavy metals, trace elements, pharmaceuticals, antibiotics, pesticides, and hormones.

[13] *See* JoAnn M. Burkholder et al., *Impacts to a Coastal River and Estuary from Rupture of a Large Swine Waste Holding Lagoon*, 26 Journal of Environmental Quality 1451, 1451 (1997).

[14] *See* Burkholder et al., *supra* note 9, at 310.

[15] *See* Burkholder et al., *supra* nota 9, at 310; *see also*, Kenneth C. Stone et al., *Impact of Swine Waste Application on Ground and Stream Water Quality in an Eastern Coastal Plain Watershed*, 41 Transactions of the American Society of Agricultural & Biological Engineers 1665, 1670 (1998); Greenpeace Mexico, *La carne que Está Consumiendo al Planeta* 37 (2020), https://www.greenpeace.org/static/planet4-mexico-stateless/2020/05/0dad8ed4-resumen_granjas_web.pdf.

[16] *See* Burkholder et al., *supra* note 9, at 310.

[17] *Id.*

[18] Dara Meredith Fedrow, *Water Use in Confined Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) in Minnesota: Who's Keeping Track?*, Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers, 2019, at 44.

[19] This calculation is based on the World Health Organization's conclusion that a person needs 50 to 100 liters of water per day to meet their basic needs. *See* UN-Water Decade Programme on Advocacy and Communication and Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council, The Human Right to Water and Sanitation 2.

[20] *See* Virginia T. Guidry et al., *Hydrogen Sulfide Concentrations at Three Middle Schools Near Industrial Livestock Facilities*, 27 Journal of Exposure Science & Environmental Epidemiology 167, 167 (2017).

[21] Patricia M. Glibert, *From Hogs to HABS: Impacts of Industrial Farming in the US on Nitrogen and Phosphorus and Greenhouse Gas Pollution*, 150 Biogeochemistry 139, 139 (2020).

does waste applied to fields.[22] In addition, the large fans that CAFOs use to ventilate confinement buildings blow animal feed, skin cells, and feces into the air.[23] Gases, compounds, and particles from CAFOs produce noxious odors.[24] Exposure to CAFO air pollutants can cause nausea, headaches, dizziness, runny nose, scratchy throat, burning eyes, coughing, wheezing, and shortness of breath.[25] In addition, odors from CAFO pollutants can cause tension, depression, anger, confusion, and fatigue.[26] These pollutants and the odors they generate diminish communities' quality of life, as they prevent families from socializing, working, and playing outdoors.[27]

3. Spread of Dangerous Pathogens (Rights to Life, Personal Integrity, and Health)

In addition to the pollutants described above, CAFOs harbor and spread harmful pathogens, including influenza viruses, *Salmonella*, *Leptospira*, and *E. coli*, which cause illness in humans.[28] Holding large numbers of animals in close and unsanitary confinement allows pathogens to spread and mutate easily, putting the health of CAFO workers and community members at risk.[29] Many pathogens associated with CAFOs are becoming increasingly resistant to common antibiotics.[30] CAFO operators commonly administer antibiotics not for treating disease, but rather to increase profits by improving the efficiency of animal feed and promoting animal growth,[31] a practice that is prohibited in some countries. This consistent, low-dose exposure to antibiotics encourages bacteria to develop antibiotic resistance genes.[32]

4. Climate Change Impacts (Right to a Healthy Environment)

CAFOs both contribute to the global climate crisis and exacerbate climate impacts. They produce methane and nitrous oxide—greenhouse gases that are significant contributors to climate change. As of 2019, livestock manure management was the fourth-largest source of methane and nitrous oxide emissions in the United States, higher than emissions from fuel

---

[22] Guidry et al., *supra* note 20, at 167.
[23] *Id.*
[24] *Id.*
[25] *See* Kendall M. Thu et al., *A Control Study of the Physical and Mental Health of Residents Living Near a Large-Scale Swine Operation*, 3 Journal of Agricultural Safety and Health 13, 16–18 (1997).
[26] *See* Susan S. Schiffman et al., *The Effect of Environmental Odors Emanating from Commercial Swine Operations on the Mood of Nearby Residents*, 37 Brain Research Bulletin 369 (1995).
[27] M. Tajik et al., *Impact of Odor from Industrial Hog Operations on Daily Living Activities*, 18 New Solutions 193, 201 (2008).
[28] *See* Dana Cole et al., *Concentrated Swine Feeding Operations and Public Health: A Review of Occupational and Community Health Effects*, 108 Environmental Health Perspectives 685, 691–93 (2000).
[29] Michael Greger, *The Human/Animal Interface: Emergence and Resurgence of Zoonotic Infectious Diseases*, 33 Critical Reviews in Microbiology 243, 253–54 (2007).
[30] *See* Engeline van Duijkeren et al., *Transmission of Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus Aureus Strains Between Different Kinds of Pig Farms*, 126 Veterinary Microbiology 383, 387–88 (2008); Tushar Khanna et al., *Methicillin Resistant Staphylococcus Aureus Colonization in Pigs and Pig Farmers*, 128 Veterinary Microbiology 298, 301 (2008); Amy Chapin et al., *Airborne Multidrug-Resistant Bacteria Isolated from a Concentrated Swine Feeding Operation*, 113 Environmental Health Perspectives 137, 139–41 (2005).
[31] *See C*hapin et al., *supra* note 30, at 137.
[32] *Id.*

combustion for transportation.[33] CAFOs that store liquid manure in waste pits and spray it on fields are the largest sources of methane emissions from manure management.[34] Climate change will also exacerbate the damage CAFOs inflict on human health and the environment. Climate change causes stronger and more frequent storms, which increases the likelihood that waste pits will overflow and breach and that manure will wash off fields into surface water and groundwater. Climate change also causes habitat destruction, which further threatens species and ecosystems already at risk due to CAFO pollution.

5. Right to Food

The industrialization of meat production through CAFOs has impacts on the food chain and access to food that, in turn, portend numerous consequences for the right to food.[35] CAFOs consume an enormous amount of drinking water, soybeans, corn, and other cereals to feed and water animals. The production of genetically modified soybeans, considered necessary to satisfy the high demand for grain to feed industrially raised meat, has serious impacts on health and the environment, such as deforestation, land grabbing, and displacement of rural and Indigenous populations.[36] Water, the basis of the right to food, should be available in sufficient quantity for agriculture that builds food sovereignty, but access to this resource is increasingly restricted for peasant, family, and community agriculture because these activities must compete with CAFOs.

Alarmingly, food production models are increasingly moving away from sustainable livestock and agriculture, in which each people can produce and access food in a culturally appropriate manner—the basis of food sovereignty. CAFOs entail a setback in the advances of food sovereignty and sustainable food production required by communities, by depriving producers and consumers of a choice in how their food is produced and by favoring large-scale industry to the detriment of local production.

6. Rights to Information and Public Participation

Rights to access environmental information and public participation, which should include adequate procedures to ensure that the public can evaluate environmental impacts, are key components of State obligations to protect human rights in the face of potential environmental harms related to industrial activity like CAFO meat and dairy production.[37] For

---

[33] *See* United States Environmental Protection Agency, *Draft Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks*, ES-7–ES-8, Table ES-2 (2021).
[34] *See id.* at 5-12.
[35] The right to food is necessary for the enjoyment of the rights to life, human dignity, and other basic human rights, and to ensure the right to food, it is necessary to understand the impacts of the food supply chain. *See* Gustavo Gordillo & Obed Méndez Jerónimo, *Seguridad y soberanía alimentarias (documento base para discusión)*, FAO (2013). The Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas, adopted by the UN General Assembly on December 17, 2018, enshrines the right to food and food sovereignty, which includes the right of communities to define their own agri-food systems, participate in decisions on agri-food policy, and have healthy and sufficient food produced with ecological and sustainable methods. G.A. Res. 73/165, United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas Art. 15 (Dec. 17, 2018).
[36] *See* Friends of the Earth International, *¿Quién se beneficia con los cultivos transgénicos? Un análisis del desempeño de los cultivos transgénicos a nivel mundial entre 1996 y 2006* (2008), https://www.foei.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/01/foei-who-benefits-2008-esp-full.pdf.
[37] The Environment and Human Rights, Advisory Opinion OC-23/17, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R., ¶¶ 141-174 (Nov. 15, 2017).

countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, the Escazú Agreement further enshrines these rights into international law.[38] These procedural obligations are particularly important for protecting the rights of people and groups in vulnerable situations, including communities that are being harmed by the construction and operation of projects such as mega pig farms.[39]

Nonetheless, as we will demonstrate in this hearing, affected communities across the hemisphere have limited or no access to prior information on the potential social and environmental impacts of CAFOs. This lack of information limits their ability to participate effectively in decisions regarding environmental permits for CAFO construction and operation. The secrecy with which the industry operates—without disclosing information about practices in pig, poultry, and cattle CAFOs—puts people's health at risk. Particularly in the United States, laws limiting the ability to record, photograph, or document the operation of CAFOs severely restrict access to information and the ability of communities to defend their rights.

7. Rights of Indigenous Peoples

CAFOs have also affected the territory of Indigenous peoples without respect for their collective property rights under the American Convention on Human Rights. This is particularly true for many Mayan Communities in Yucatán, Mexico, and Indigenous communities in Chaco, Argentina, whose territories are affected by pig CAFOs that were authorized without adequate consultation processes or the communities' free, prior, informed and culturally appropriate consent. In this regard, the IACHR has recognized that the right of access to information for Indigenous peoples must be ensured "for proper exercise of democratic control of the State's affairs in the exploration and exploitation of natural resources within the territory of Indigenous communities, which is a matter of obvious public interest."[40] In addition, providing timely, clear and sufficient information to Indigenous peoples in their language about external interventions that may affect their territory "is an indispensable condition for adequately guaranteeing the exercise of their right to collective property over their territories."[41]

8. Protection of Environmental and Human Rights Defenders

Many of the communities and individuals who oppose CAFOs and defend their rights to water, health, land, and territory have been victims of intimidation, retaliation, defamation, and criminalization by agribusiness companies and governmental actors.

In Chile, the Freirina community's protests against a CAFO resulted in an excessive use of State security actors (acting in coordination with the company's private security force) to suppress protests on more than one occasion. This resulted in 13 people injured (one of whom

[38] On April 2021, the Escazú Agreement entered into force. This international treaty imposes that States have the obligation to guarantee the right of everyone to access environmental information, in addition to the establishment of actions for the promotion and public participation of citizens in environmental decision-making.
[39] The Environment and Human Rights, Advisory Opinion OC-23/17, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R., ¶ 67 (Nov. 15, 2017).
[40] IACHR, *The Inter-American Legal Framework Regarding the Right to Access to Information*, Second Edition, OEA/Ser.L/V/II, CIDH/RELE/INF. 9/12, ¶ 67 (2011), https://www.oas.org/en/iachr/expression/docs/publications/2012%2009%2027%20access%20to%20information%202012%20edits.pdf.
[41] *Id.* ¶ 69.

lost an eye), beatings, and the arrest of 24 people. Despite denunciations by the movement, those responsible for the repression continue to go unpunished.

In Argentina, the right to protest is limited by the defamation of those who oppose CAFOs and the closure of public space through intimidation by State security forces.

In Mexico, the Mayan community of Homún has suffered reprisals from authorities for their opposition to a CAFO and their defense of their traditional water sources. For example, the authorities have ordered the closure of tourist facilities owned by movement leaders. In addition, various media outlets have slandered human rights defenders.

Finally, in the United States, scientists have been victims of harassment and intimidation for their research into the environmental and health impacts of CAFOs. Forms of harassment have included industry representatives publicly impugning researchers' motives, aggressive threats of legal action, intimidating messages, death threats, and attempts to undermine employment and research funding. Community leaders and local environmental defenders resisting CAFOs in the United States have also been the target of harassment and intimidation. CAFO operators and meat industry representatives have tried to silence local opposition to CAFOs by threatening violence or legal action against advocates who have raised complaints.

D. The Situation of Human Rights and CAFOs: Country Summaries

1. Argentina

On July 6, 2020, Argentina was in the middle of a social, preventive, and compulsory isolation order ("ASPO") decreed by the national government due to the global coronavirus pandemic. Despite the emergency, on that day, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Culture announced in an official statement that the People's Republic of China and the Argentine Republic were signing a memorandum of understanding for the installation of pig CAFOs that would multiply Argentina's current pork production by 14 times and provide China with "absolute security in its supply of pork."

The official announcement met with a massive and widespread rejection by society, which materialized in public statements, discussions, protests at multiple times and places, requests for access to information, and legal actions of different types. In response, after several months, the national government announced that it would not move forward with the signing of the memorandum of understanding with China.

Nonetheless, negotiations for the installation of pig CAFOs continue directly with provincial governments. In this regard, the Province of Chaco has reportedly signed an agreement with a company to install the first three pig CAFOs in different parts of the province, including on Indigenous communities' land without prior consultation or consent. In response to a request for access to public information, the provincial authorities refused to provide information on the agreement. As a result, affected communities filed an amparo action for the denial of their right for access to information, which the court of first instance resolved in their favor. Despite the favorable ruling, to date, the provincial government has not delivered the information requested by the amparo suit. There is also an amparo action underway to prevent the advance of the installation of these mega swine farms in the province.

2. Ecuador[42]

In Ecuador, the PRONACA corporation has more than 30 industrial pig and poultry CAFOs in the province of Santo Domingo de Tsáchilas, and 115 additional operations in 10 other provinces of Ecuador.[43] The company has been denounced by affected communities due to the contamination of rivers with coliform bacteria from animal waste. This situation has seriously affected human health. Despite the violations of the affected communities' rights, the International Finance Corporation ("IFC") has financed the company with at least US$120 million[44] and, in the midst of the pandemic, approved an additional loan—despite the fact that CAFOs can contribute to new pandemics.

In 2010, local communities filed a formal complaint against PRONACA with the Compliance Advisor Ombudsman ("CAO"), the Independent Accountability Mechanism for the IFC, because the company was contaminating water sources, affecting soil and water quality, and endangering protected forest.[45] Unfortunately, the complaint was closed without a proper investigation and before an agreement could be reached with the affected communities.

The contamination produced by this company, according to complaints from the villagers, highlights the institutional weakness in prosecuting environmental crimes, some of which have been ongoing for more than 10 years. This led to a lawsuit before the Constitutional Court, which ordered, by resolution No. 0567-08-RA of July 16, 2009, the formation of an inter-institutional commission.[46] The commission's objective was to protect the rights of the inhabitants by monitoring PRONACA's industrial activity in terms of water consumption and the amount of organic and inorganic waste discharged into water sources. Unfortunately, this commission has failed to fulfill its responsibility due to a lack of political will; it has yet to even conduct a proper analysis of water in affected rivers. The expansion of industrial animal production farms puts the rights of communities, nature, and animals at risk, which is why the Ecuadorian State must stop financing these types of activities.

3. United States

Over the past fifty years, CAFOs have become the dominant method of meat and dairy production in the United States. As of 2020, there were at least 21,465 CAFOs operating across the country.[47] Though CAFOs exist in almost every state, they typically are clustered in

---

[42] *See* Acción Ecológica, *Pese a las denuncias de contaminación en Santo Domingo de los Tsáchilas PRONACA pretende seguir recibiendo fondos del Banco Mundial* (2021), https://www.accionecologica.org/pese-a-las-denuncias-de-contaminacion-en-santo-domingo-de-los-tsachilas-pronaca-pretende-seguir-recibiendo-fondos-del-banco-mundial/.

[43] These operations include 61 poultry and pig CAFOs, 18 processing plants, 4 distribution centers, 13 warehouses, and 3 laboratories. In addition, the Company holds many contracts with independent producers of poultry and pork.

[44] IFC information and data portal on projects with PRONACA: https://disclosures.ifc.org/enterprise-search-results-home/PRONACA; https://disclosures.ifc.org/project-detail/ESRS/26535/pronaca-expansion.

[45] Compliance Advisor Ombudsman, Ecuador / Pronaca Expansion-01/Santo Domingo de los Tsachilas (Español).

[46] Corte Constitucional. Demanda Por Contaminación Del Agua, Aire, Suelo, Resolución 567, Registro Oficial Suplemento 23 (Dec. 8, 2009) https://www.derechosdelanaturaleza.org.ec/wp-content/uploads/casos/Ecuador/Biodigestor-Case/Demanda%20por%20contaminacion.Amparo%20Biodigestores%20PRONACA.pdf.

[47] *See* EPA, NPDES CAFO Permitting Status Report: National Summary, Endyear 2020, completed 05/11/21, https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2021-05/documents/cafo_status_report_2020.pdf.

communities of color and low-income communities, where they cause disproportionate harm to community members. For example, as of 2019, the counties in Missouri with the highest number of CAFOs all had higher poverty rates than the state average.[48] In North Carolina, Black, Hispanic, and Native American people are nearly 1.5 times more likely than white people to live within three miles of a CAFO.[49] And in Ohio, regions with high densities of CAFOs also have higher proportions of Hispanic residents.[50]

The United States' decades-long history with CAFOs has made clear that CAFOs cause serious and widespread harm to human health and the environment. The following examples are just a few of the many instances in which CAFOs have polluted communities across the United States. In two counties in Maryland that are home to 209 CAFOs, at least 61,000 people may have been, and currently may be, exposed to nitrates in their drinking water at levels that are hazardous to human health.[51] In Lake Erie, manure from CAFOs is fueling seasonal harmful algal blooms;[52] a 2011 algal bloom covered nearly 120 miles of the lake and tainted drinking water for 2.8 million people.[53] In New York, a CAFO waste pit breach caused three million gallons of waste to spill into a river.[54] The contamination grew to roughly one-fourth the size of the infamous Exxon Valdez oil spill and killed vast numbers of fish.[55] In Oregon, a dairy CAFO with 52,000 cows reported emitting almost 2.5 million kilograms of ammonia in one year, more than the emissions from the country's largest manufacturing source of ammonia.[56] And in North Carolina, a hurricane caused at least 110 CAFO waste pits to either spill or threaten to spill waste.[57] Following the hurricane, water samples showed an increase in E. coli and fecal matter in well water.[58]

---

[48] Missouri Coalition for the Environment, *Injustice in Our Industrial Food System: CAFOs and Racial Inequity* (June 10, 2020), https://moenvironment.org/injusticecafos/.
[49] Steve Wing & Jill Johnston, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, *Industrial Hog Operations in North Carolina Disproportionately Impact African-Americans, Hispanics, and American Indians* 1 (Oct. 19, 2015).
[50] Julia Lenhardt & Yelena Ogneva-Himmelberger, *Environmental Injustice in the Spatial Distribution of Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations in Ohio*, 6 Environmental Justice 133, 137 (2013).
[51] Darya Minovi & Katlyn Schmitt, Center for Progressive Reform, *Tainted Tap: Nitrate Pollution, Factory Farms, and Drinking Water in Maryland and Beyond*, 1–2, 13 (Oct. 2020), https://cpr-assets.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/Tainted-Tap-FINAL-102120.pdf.
[52] Environmental Working Group, *Explosion of Unregulated Factory Farms in Maumee Watershed Fuels Lake Erie's Toxic Blooms* (April 2019), https://www.ewg.org/interactive-maps/2019_maumee/.
[53] Michael Wines, *Spring Rain, Then Foul Algae in Ailing Lake Erie*, N.Y. Times (March 14, 2013), https://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/15/science/earth/algae-blooms-threaten-lake-erie.html?.?mc=aud_dev&ad-keywords=auddevgate&gclid=CjwKCAjw7fuJBhBdEiwA2lLMY b2mcCBYEu8YV3S2iuBkJ_K2Jo78C9hmWniJ83C6URVvafmnCy925BoCQB0QAvD_BwE&gclsrc=aw.ds.
[54] Michelle York, *Workers Trying to Contain Effects of Big Spill Upstate*, N.Y. Times (Aug. 15, 2005), https://www.nytimes.com/2005/08/15/nyregion/workers-trying-to-contain-effects-of-big-spill-upstate.html.
[55] *Id.*
[56] *See* Michele M. Merkel, Senior Counsel, Environmental Integrity Project, before the House Subcommittee on Environment and Hazardous Materials of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, available at https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CHRG-109hhrg27001/html/ CHRG-109hhrg27001.htm.
[57] Kendra Pierre-Louis, *Lagoons of Pig Waste Are Overflowing After Florence. Yes, That's as Nasty as It Sounds*, N.Y. Times (Sept. 19, 2018), https://www.nytimes.com/2018/09/19/climate/ florence-hog-farms.html.
[58] John Murawski, *The Amount of E. coli and Fecal Matter in NC Wells Has Spiked Since Hurricane Florence*, (Oct. 25, 2018), News & Observer, https://amp.newsobserver.com/news/ business/article220561095.html.

In the United States, both the federal government and state governments have the authority to regulate CAFO pollution, but existing regulations fall short of protecting communities and the environment. This failure stems, in part, from a lack of access to even basic information on CAFOs. The United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") does not have comprehensive information on the number, locations, sizes, or waste management practices of CAFOs in the United States, which prevents it from adequately regulating CAFO pollution. Most states also lack comprehensive CAFO data.[59] This lack of information prevents communities from protecting themselves against CAFO pollution, as they have no way of knowing when or where it may occur. Beyond failing to obtain data on CAFOs, several states have passed laws prohibiting private citizens from collecting certain information on agricultural facilities.[60] These "ag-gag" laws generally prohibit individuals from taking photos or videos of agricultural facilities or collecting documents from them.[61] Thus, they are a significant impediment for communities seeking to access justice or otherwise hold CAFOs accountable. The United States' failure to protect communities and the environment from CAFO pollution also stems from federal laws that have not been interpreted or applied to address CAFO air pollution and that exclude certain forms of CAFO water pollution from regulation.

Many environmental defenders in the United States have been victims of harassment, retaliation, and intimidation for their work defending communities' health and the environment from CAFOs. These defenders are often scientists that have been targeted because their research shows that CAFOs are associated with environmental and public health harms. For example, in response to a study by Dr. Steve Wing in North Carolina demonstrating that CAFOs are disproportionately located in low-income communities and communities of color, the North Carolina Pork Council contacted Dr. Wing's employer and federal funder, actions Dr. Wing understood to be efforts at "harassment and intimidation."[62] Dr. JoAnn Burkholder experienced similar harassment in North Carolina after discovering a toxic organism linked to water pollution from CAFOs. According to Dr. Burkholder, on the day her research was released, her employer—North Carolina State University—received over "160 messages sent in by various representatives of the concentrated swine industry demanding that [she] be fired,"[63] and she personally received multiple death threats.[64] Pork industry representatives also have exercised influence behind-the-scenes to deter CAFO neighbors from participating in public health studies

[59] *See* D. Lee Miller & Gregory Muren, *CAFOS: What We Don't Know Is Hurting Us* 10–15 (Sept. 2019), https://www.nrdc.org/sites/default/files/cafos-dont-know-hurting-us-report.pdf.
[60] *See* Center for Constitutional Rights & Defending Rights & Dissent, *Ag-Gag Across America* 2–3 (2017), https://ccrjustice.org/sites/default/files/attach/2017/09/Ag-GagAcrossAmerica.pdf.
[61] *Id.* at 6.
[62] *See* Steve Wing, *Social Responsibility and Research Ethics in Community-Driven Studies of Industrialized Hog Production*, 110 Envtl. Health Persp. 437, 441 (2002).
[63] Alicia Allen, *ISU Graduate Claims Backlash Hurt Career*, Iowa State Daily (Dec. 4, 2002), http://www.iowastatedaily.com/news/isu-graduate-claims-backlash-hurt-career/article_00fd4c47-7e9b-5b6f-b86c-52c88a99afcd.html
[64] Perry Beeman, *Ag Scientists Feel the Heat*, Inst. Agric. & Trade Pol. (Feb. 2, 2003), https://www.iatp.org/news/ag-scientists-feel-the-heat; Allen, *supra* note 63 (expressing concern that "the backlash that resulted from her research on swine pollution has damaged her reputation and hurt her ability to receive grants").

and otherwise derail scientific research, including by demanding that researchers disclose the identities of study participants.[65]

Meat and dairy industry representatives have also intimidated community leaders to deter CAFO neighbors from raising complaints with government agencies.[66] In investigating a federal civil rights complaint filed by people living near CAFOs in North Carolina, the United States EPA found that CAFO neighbors who had filed complaints with the state had experienced retaliation, threats, intimidation, and harassment by CAFO operators and pork industry representatives.[67] In one instance, a CAFO operator entered the home of an elderly woman and threatened her and her family with physical violence if they continued to complain about the CAFO.[68] Similarly, in Ohio, a poultry CAFO filed a lawsuit against a community organization that had opposed CAFOs; the poultry CAFO also worked with the government to limit public participation the CAFO permitting process.[69] One former CAFO worker's words about the pork industry apply to the industry as a whole: "It's a mind game. The pork industry has got people scared thinking that they're so big and strong that we can't do without them."[70]

4. Chile: The Case of Freirina, a CAFO in the Middle of a Desert

The case of Freirina, a community in the Atacama Desert region of Chile, exemplifies how CAFOs can violate human rights without adequate oversight. In 2005, Chilean authorities granted a permit for a mega CAFO of 2.5 million pigs occupying 75,000 hectares in a desert, all without adequate regulation (for odor controls) or government capacity to oversee and monitor the company's activities. In 2011, the community faced severe impacts including the destruction of flora, indiscriminate use of water in one of the driest regions in the world, bad odors, the proliferation of pests such as flies and mice, social impacts from the influx of transitory workers during the CAFOs construction, and high truck traffic from the high number of large trucks needed to transport pigs and feed. Among the most severe impacts were the bad odors that caused nausea, gastrointestinal distress, and headaches, preventing the community from enjoying outdoor recreation or sports and affecting their rights to education and health. In addition, the CAFO had security forces that criminalized community members.

Community members contacted State authorities on several occasions and spoke with the company without obtaining a solution to the problem. As a result, they began an active protest in defense of their rights. In 2012, after several confrontations, the CAFO closed without compensating the community for the damages it suffered. During the protests, State security

---

[65] *See* Wing, *supra* note 62 at 441, 443 (reporting that "[i]n some areas, community members have been fearful of participating in the research because of the influence of the hog industry in local affairs").
[66] *See generally* Harassment and Intimidation Against Frontline Families Fighting the Factory Farm Next Door, http://www.farmsnotfactories.org/assets/Harassment%20and%20Intimidation%20Against%20Frontline%20Families.pdf (detailing harassment experienced by families that attempted to fight back against CAFOs across the United States).
[67] Letter from Lilian S. Dorka, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, to Marianne Engelman Lado, Yale Law School, Jonathan J. Smith, Earthjustice, and Elizabeth Haddix, UNC Center for Civil Rights 4 (Jan. 12, 2017), https://waterkeeper.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Letter-to-Complainants-in-Case-11R-14-R4-Forwarding-Letter-of-Concern-to-NC-DEQ-1-12-2017.pdf.
[68] *Id.* at 8.
[69] *See New Day Farms, LLC v. Bd. of Trs.*, 2009 WL 4016480 (S.D. Ohio Nov. 17, 2009); *Willams v. New Day Farms, LLC*, 2011 WL 1254942 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 31, 2011).
[70] *See* Wing, *supra* note 62 at 441.

actors repressed protesters from the community, and one person lost an eye from the impact of a rubber bullet. Despite the multiple human rights violations that this case shows, Chile is currently developing an odor regulation that favors companies over people and continues to promote CAFOs in other communities.

5. Mexico: Mayan Communities of the Yucatán Peninsula

In Yucatán, Mexico, pig production has accelerated by 39 percent.[71] Currently, in the Yucatán Peninsula, there are approximately 257 pig CAFOs registered in an official database, yet only 18 of them have an Environmental Impact Assessment. Despite this lack of oversight, many are located in environmentally sensitive areas: 44 CAFOs are located in protected natural areas (including one in a RAMSAR site), and 122 CAFOs are established in regions considered priority sites for biodiversity conservation.[72]

This massive expansion of pig CAFOs, with the support of the state government, is alarming in a region where environmental conditions are particularly vulnerable to CAFOs and water contamination. According to several studies, the karst soil (rocky, porous, and shallow) characteristic of this region facilitates the direct seepage of wastewater from pig CAFOs into the most important hydrological groundwater reserve in the country—the Cenotes Ring Geohydrological State Reserve—on which the entire population of the state depends. In addition, the area is highly biodiverse, yet 31 percent of the Yucatán Peninsula's current surface area, occupied by pig CAFOs, has been deforested. Pig CAFOs also disproportionately harm peasant and Indigenous communities, as 86 percent of CAFOs are located in Mayan-speaking regions and on or near communal property of Indigenous people ("*ejido* lands").[73] Despite environmental, social, and cultural conditions that should have prevented the expansion of the industry, the state government has facilitated the growth of pig CAFOs, the majority of which are affiliated with Grupo Porcícola Mexicano, S.A. de C.V. (Kekén), which accounts for 12.1 percent of Mexican pork production and ranks 20th in the world.

Several Mayan communities in the Yucatán Peninsula have publicly denounced the environmental impacts and the violation of their rights as Indigenous peoples caused by pig CAFOs in their territories. These communities are concerned about their right to water (many CAFOs use water directly from freshwater aquifers, as in the town of Sitilpech, where one CAFO is located less than one kilometer away from the town) and the protection of subterranean water bodies, called "cenotes," which are part of the cultural identity of the Mayan people. In the town of Homún, cenotes are crucial for people's livelihoods because they depend on sustainable tourism from the Cenotes Ring Geohydrological State Reserve and the Lagunas de Yalahau State Park (RAMSAR site). As a result, in 2018 a group of Mayan children filed an amparo lawsuit to protect their human rights against a 49,000-pig CAFO there. The Supreme Court of Justice of the Nation upheld a preliminary injunction halting activity at the CAFO to protect the rights to a healthy environment, water, and health of the Mayan children. However, there is still no ruling on the case's merits. This case exemplifies the problem of pig CAFOs in Mexico and has led several other communities to demand their rights. For their work defending their rights,

[71] Servicio de Información Agroalimentaria y Pesquera, 2017.
[72] Greenpeace Mexico, *supra* note 15.
[73] *See* Center for Biological Diversity et al., Brief and annotated bibliography presented as Amicus Curiae in relation with the Review of the Suspension Order, File No 4/2020, before the Supreme Court of Justice (May 5, 2021) https://earthjustice.org/sites/default/files/files/amicus_scjn_homun_5may_sefa_647_2019.pdf.

environmental defenders from the organization the Guardians of the Cenotes have also received reprisals from the State.

In relation to land rights, in some cases where communities face pig CAFOs (as in Homún, Chapab, and Kinchil), the lands on which the CAFOs were built were *ejido* lands or national lands used by the *ejido* members that were transferred to private property in a non-transparent manner. The pig industry has also caused many local impacts, including damaging bee farms, harming neighboring plots of land, and generating flies and odors. These impacts harm the livelihoods of local communities, thereby exacerbating inequity and poverty.

Finally, it is important to mention that neither the company nor the State consulted with communities, nor did they provide information on the social and environmental impacts that the mega pig CAFOs could cause. For this reason, the communities of Kinchil, San Fernando, and Celestún—all affected by mega pig CAFOs—in July 2021 held their own Indigenous consultations as a tool to exercise their constitutional and international human rights to autonomy and self-determination as Mayan peoples.[74] These self-consultations took place in a climate of intimidation and threats against community members, demonstrating the company's interference in the communities' decisions.

III. Request

Based on Articles 61, 62 and 66.1 of the Commission's Rules of Procedure, we respectfully request a hearing on the "Human rights situation of persons and communities affected by CAFOs in the hemisphere" with the participation of the petitioning organizations, in which we will present in detail the information set out above.

The petitioning organizations will coordinate presentations at the hearing and will inform the IACHR of the delegates who will give testimony, in the event that the IACHR decides to grant the hearing.

IV. Notifications

We ask that all notifications be sent to the following email addresses:

Jacob Kopas, Earthjustice; jkopas@earthjustice.org

Karen Hudlet Vazquez; KHudletVazquez@clarku.edu

Sincerely,

1) ARTICLE 19 México y Centroamérica
2) Acción Ecológica
3) Asociación Interamericana para la Defensa del Ambiente (AIDA)

[74] *See* Artículo 19 and the Centro de Derechos Humanos Miguel Agustín Pro Juárez, *Informe de la Misión de Observación de la Autoconsulta sobre las Mega Granjas de Cerdos en Yucatán*, https://articulo19.org/mision-de-observacion-de-la-autoconsulta-sobre-las-mega-granjas-de-cerdos-en-yucatan-llama-a-respetar-derechos-de-pueblos-indigenas/.

4) Cátedra Libre de Soberanía Alimentaria de la Escuela de Nutrición de la Universidad de Buenos Aires
5) Center for Biological Diversity
6) Centro de Información sobre Empresas y Derechos Humanos (CIEDH)
7) Colectivo de Derechos Humanos Yopoi
8) Conciencia Solidaria
9) Earthjustice
10) Indignación, Promoción y Defensa de los Derechos Humanos (Indignación)
11) Kanan Derechos Humanos
12) Guardianes de los cenotes "Kanan Ts'ono'ot"
13) Greenpeace México
14) Movimiento Socioambiental Valle del Huasco
15) Museo del Hambre
16) Red de Abogadas y Abogados por la Soberanía Alimentaria (REDASA)
17) Representantes de la Infancia de Homún
18) Seminario sobre el Derecho Humano a la Alimentación Adecuada de la Facultad de Derecho de la UBA
19) Waterkeeper Alliance

Organizations supporting the request:

1) Acción por la Biodiversidad
2) Actrices Argentinas
3) Adapa Rafaela Acción de Defensa Animal y protección Ambiental
4) Agroecológica Mallarauco
5) Agrupación Biodiversidad de Paillaco
6) Agua para Todos Capítulo Guerrero
7) Alianza de Derecho Ambiental y Agua
8) Alianza Nacional de Campesinas
9) American Sustainable Business Council
10) Animal Legal Defense Fund
11) APDH
12) APDH Argentina- Regional Río Tercero
13) Apdh Esquel
14) Apdh Rosario
15) Arca de Noé
16) Asamblea de vecinxs
17) Autoconvocadxs por el cierre del incinerador
18) Asamblea El Algarrobo
19) Asamblea Permanente por los Derechos Humanos - Regional Tucumán
20) Asamblea socio Ambiental
21) Asociación Argentina de Abogados y Abogadas Ambientalistas
22) Asociación departamental de mujeres Campesinas Indígenas de Santander - ADEMUCIS SANTANDER
23) Asociación Nacional de Mujeres Rurales e Indígenas ANAMURI
24) Assateague Coastal Trust
25) Cabildo Indígena Zenú

26) Cacique MEXIÓN
27) Campesinos del Desierto
28) Cape Fear River Watch
29) CartoCrítica - Investigación, mapas y datos para la sociedad civil
30) Cátedra de Agroecología y Soberanía Alimentaria. UNPSJB. Esquel
31) Cátedra Libre de Soberanía Alimentaria - UNLP - Argentina
32) Cátedra Libre de Soberanía Alimentaria de 9 de Julio
33) Cátedra Libre de Soberanía Alimentaria Río Cuarto
34) Cátedra Libre de Soberanía Alimentaria UNR
35) Cátedra Libre de Soberanía Alimentaria y Agroecología de la Universidad Nacional de Misiones
36) Catskill Mountainkeeper
37) Centro de Derechos Humanos Miguel Agustín Pro Juárez (Centro Prodh)
38) Chacra Las Robinias
39) Chubut Climate Save
40) Círculo de Soberanía Alimentaria UNSAM
41) Climate Save Argentina
42) Colectivo Agroecológico La Verdecita
43) Colectivo Luciérnagas
44) Colectivo Reciclador
45) Colectivo Soberanía Alimentaria Punta Indio
46) Colectivo Sociosanitario Andrés Carrasco- Fesprosa
47) Colectivo Tierra Viva Bolívar
48) Comité Ciudadano Defensa del Agua y Territorio de Baja California
49) Community Water Center
50) Comunicación y Educación Ambiental SC
51) Comunidad Cocina Soberana de Buenos Aires de Slow Food Argentina
52) Comunidad Crianza Agroecológica
53) Comunidad Slow Wine Valle Marga Marga
54) ConCiencia Agroecológica 9 de Julio
55) Consejo Ciudadano por el Agua de Yucatán
56) Contraloría Ciudadana del Agua de La Laguna
57) Cook Inletkeeper
58) Cooperativa La Yumba
59) Cooperativa Sersano
60) Coordinadora Nacional Agua para Todos Agua para la Vida Corriente Agraria Nacional y Popular (CANPO)
61) Corriente Nuestra Patria
62) Cortland-Onondaga Federation of Kettle Lakes
63) Dignidad
64) EDUCE-cooperativa
65) Environmental Justice Community Action Network
66) Escuela de Agricultura Ecológica U Yits Ka´an
67) Ex presos políticos por la Existencia sustentable
68) Farmworker Association of Florida
69) Friends of the Earth

70) Food & Water Watch
71) Fundación Ecosur
72) Fundación Encuentro por la Vida: Cultura y Democracia Ambiental
73) Fundación GEP
74) Germ
75) Germinar Autonconvocadxs L.N.Alem
76) Grupo de Etnobiología - Buenos Aires
77) Guardianes del agua, Hunucma
78) Hijos de Gaia Madre Tierra
79) Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
80) Interhuertas
81) Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future
82) Liga Argentina por los derechos humanos
83) Maestría de Derechos Humanos y Garantías del Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM)
84) Más Derechos por Más
85) Melga Chiloe
86) Mercado de la tierra Región de Coquimbo
87) Minhoca Trama de la Tierra
88) Movimiento Campesino Liberación
89) Mundo y Conciencia
90) National Family Farm Coalition
91) Naturaleza Limpia Berisso
92) Natural Resources Defense Council
93) North Carolina Environmental Justice Network
94) Ovic
95) Pachamama
96) Patria Grande
97) Pilgua
98) Preservando Hudson
99) Programa de Investigadores para la Sustentabilidad de la UAM
100) Propuesta Tatu
101) Proyecto Timón Verde
102) Public Justice
103) Rebelión o Extinción Argentina
104) Recicla
105) Red Brujas Feministas
106) Red Ciudadana por la Sostenibilidad de Yucatán
107) Red de Desarrollo
108) Red Federal de Docentes por la Vida
109) Red Semillas de Libertad de las Américas
110) Río Mapacho Waterkeeper
111) Russian Riverkeeper
112) San Antonio Bay Estuarine Waterkeeper
113) San Luis Obispo Coastkeeper
114) Santa Fe Climate Save

115) Seminario de Soberanía Alimentaria y salud socioambiental. Facultad de Ciencias Médicas. Universidad Nacional del Comahue
116) Siese Manuel Ugarte
117) Slow Food Chile
118) Slow Food Chile Asociación Gremial.
119) Socially Responsible Agriculture Project
120) Sostenible de Colombia
121) SVyAsoc Trazabilidad
122) Sussex Health & Environmental Network
123) Tennessee Riverkeeper
124) Toxic Free North Carolina
125) UPVA "Unidos por la Vida y el Medio Ambiente"
126) USIN. Colectivo por la Soberanía Alimentaria y la Salud de los Territorios de Tierra del Fuego AeIAS
127) Vecinos autoconvocados por no a la incineración en Marcos Paz

Academics, scientists, and individual supporters:

1) Dr. Yameli Aguilar Duarte - INIFAP
2) Dr. Christian Appendini UNAM-II
3) Dr. Francisco Bautista Zúñíga - CIGA UADY
4) Dr. Larry Cahoon, University of North Carolina, Wilmington
5) Teresa Denegre-vaught Charruf, MS
6) Dr. Mike Dolan Fliss, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
7) Claudia Duran Miranda, MS
8) Dr. Ella Fanny - INAH
9) Cuauhtémoc Jacobo Femat, MS
10) Dr. Alfonso Lorenzo Flores - UASLP
11) Karla González Ávila, BS
12) Dr. Jill Johnston, Keck School of Medicine of the University of Southern California
13) Ana Sofía Lázaro Salazar, MS
14) Dr. Robert S. Lawrence, Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future
15) Dr. Susana Liberti- SUAYDEY- Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales UNAM
16) Giovanna Marisol López, BS
17) Dr. Gustavo Adolfo Monforte Méndez, Cuerpo Académico Desarrollo Regional Sustentable
18) Dr. Rodrigo Patiño - Cinvestav
19) Dr. Tania Gabriela Rodríguez Huerta - ITAM
20) Dr. Margarita Theesz Poschner
21) Dr. Gabriela Torres Mazuera - CIESAS
22) Dr. D'Ann Williams, Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future
23) Dr. Sacoby Wilson, University of Maryland
24) Alejandra Maitén Rancaño
25) Graciela Hermoso
26) Gabriela Polischer
27) Araceli Sívori

28) Karina Ocampo
29) María Angélica Kees
30) Laura Piaggio
31) Miguel Angel López
32) Patricia Lizarraga
33) Ana Valeria Pietraccone
34) Alicia Marta Iglesias
35) Patricia Rosas Gallardo
36) Alfredo Rubin
37) Paula Silveira
38) Jennifer Sankovi
39) Georgina Scardino
40) Natalia Retamar
41) Lisia Ana del Valle Carrizo
42) Eduardo Luján
43) Javier Flax
44) María Marta Bunge
45) Celina Font
46) Val Zapata
47) Jorge Secreto
48) Ana Julia Menna
49) María Teresita Isla Larrain
50) Elba Rossi
51) Omar Urso
52) María Rosa Fogeler
53) Melina Tres
54) Mónica Chapela
55) Ana Zanotti
56) Claudia Andrea Gotta
57) Débora Natalia Castro Vila
58) Carlos Alberto Rangel Sucre
59) María Natalia Penda
60) Christian Krieghoff
61) María Pérez Schubert
62) Paula Fernández Ruiz
63) Florencia Torcivia
64) Susana Machin
65) Alicia Noemí Schwartman
66) Ramón Luján Miño
67) Patricia Kandus
68) Analía Claudia Colombo
69) Inés Quilici
70) Delfina Del sel
71) Mercedes Isabel Martínez
72) Verónica Adamo
73) Julieta Lavarello

74) Manuela Suárez
75) Rocío Ximena Varela
76) Beatriz Giobellina
77) Mariana Aguado Casal
78) Ana Castilla
79) Marcela Ascuaga
80) María Luisa Pizzi
81) Rosa Elena Soler
82) Laura Emilce Barbieri
83) María Natalia Echegoyemberry
84) Mirtha Masi
85) Hilda Leticia Sánchez
86) Anahí Lindstrom
87) Raquel Bessio
88) María Teresa La Valle
89) Pedro Edmundo Rueda
90) Natalia Viera
91) Jorge Luis Lopumo
92) Erika Regner
93) Angela Fructuosa Cardella
94) Ale Todaro
95) Facundo Márquez
96) Federico de la Villa
97) Sarai Alvarez Riveros
98) Melina Sidero
99) Juliana Orihuela
100) Jorge Pablo Escalante
101) Silvia Dos Santos
102) Mónica Faleano
103) Alejandra Sánchez
104) Fernando Bargas
105) Margarita Lira
106) Milagros Alvarez Imaz
107) Solange Villalva
108) Juan Yahdjian
109) Erico Ricardo Barney
110) Augusto González Navarro
111) Guido Prividera
112) Cecilia Haydee González Navarro
113) P. Alejandra García Aráoz
114) Mariana Jaroslavsky
115) María Cristina Rey Gómez
116) Manuel Siñeriz
117) Rosa Pobor
118) María Victoria Gobet
119) Emilce Isabel Quiñonez

120) Laura Gisele Cardozo
121) Pablo Hernán Sendra
122) Florencia Agostina Paz
123) Laura Marissa Duarte
124) Mirka Elizabeth Fernández
125) Salina Cristóbal
126) Natalia Sericano
127) Nadia Soledad Romero
128) Sol Triano
129) María Cristina Rey
130) Odin Pinar Moreno
131) Rebeca Moreno
132) Mariana Lescano Hughes
133) Paola Capponi
134) Gabriela Mataloni
135) María Teresa del Carmen Ferrigno
136) Silvia Gómez
137) Verónica Spinazzola
138) Virginia Toledo López
139) Gabriela Ester Soler
140) Susana Josefina Brussa
141) María de los Milagros Bullón
142) Tanya García
143) Carlos Augusto Ramos
144) Roxana Steed
145) Mirta Busnelli
146) María Luciana Scioli
147) Néstor Hugo Malacalza
148) Pablo Martín Fernández Barrios
149) Jesusa Rodríguez
150) Guillermo Folguera
151) Dave Ardnt

V. Annexes:

- Artículo 19 and Centro de Derechos Humanos Miguel Agustín Pro Juárez (2021), Informe Misión de Observación de la Autoconsulta sobre las mega granjas de cerdos en Yucatán, https://articulo19.org/mision-de-observacion-de-la-autoconsulta-sobre-las-mega-granjas-de-cerdos-en-yucatan-llama-a-respetar-derechos-de-pueblos-indigenas/

- Center for Biological Diversity et al., Brief and annotated bibliography presented as Amicus Curiae in relation with the Review of the Suspension Order, File No 4/2020, before the Supreme Court of Justice (May 5, 2021) https://earthjustice.org/sites/default/files/files/amicus_scjn_homun_5may_sefa_647_2019.pdf

- Fundación Fundación Heinrich Böll (2021). Atlas de la Carne, https://mx.boell.org/es/atlas-de-la-carneDetrás de la carne. 2020.

- Indignación (2021) Dossier de Prensa Homún: Pueblo Maya Guardían del Aguga. Caso Emblemático en la defensa del agua, la salud y la infancia, http://indignacion.org.mx/homun-dossier-0521/

- Soledad Barruti, Inti Bonomo, Rafael Colombo, Marcos Filardi, Guillermo Folguera, Maristella Svampa, Enrique Viale. (2020), 10 mitos y verdades de las megafactorías de cerdos que buscan instalar en Argentina, https://www.biodiversidadla.org/Recomendamos/10-mitos-y-verdades-de-las-megafactorias-de-cerdos-que-buscan-instalar-en-Argentina

- Xavier León (2012) Impactos económicos y sociales de la agroindustria avícola y porcícola en las poblaciones rurales de Santo Domingo de los Tsáchilas. Thesis for Masters in Rural Territorial. FLACSO. Dec. 2012, https://repositorio.flacsoandes.edu.ec/bitstream/10469/5951/2/TFLACSO-2012XALV.pdf

- Detrás de la carne. 2020. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YZVB-LQndfo&t=513s (23:14 min).

- Pig Business (2009) La destrucción silente, Ecuador, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LG0KCkCIGfs

- Pig Business (2012) Chile, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9MEQ9sl-2_8