

SCENARIO!

Read this fictitious story and decide how you can use the Special Procedures!

Monteluz – Environmental defence under pressure

Over the last five years in Monteluz, the Government has adopted a series of restrictive measures that have significantly narrowed civic space. A recently adopted law prohibits civil society organisations from receiving foreign funding for activities that are considered to fall outside, question, or undermine officially defined "national development priorities". These activities include and emphasise prosecuting those related to "strategic natural resources". Penalties for not following the rules can be significant, including large fines and even the loss of the organisation's legal standing. In serious or repeated cases, leaders of the non-profits could also face criminal charges.

In practice, these measures have been applied almost exclusively to environmental and land rights organisations, particularly those opposing large-scale mining, energy, and infrastructure projects promoted by the State as central to national development. While public meetings are not formally banned, hotels, universities, and community centres have increasingly refused to host events organised by environmental groups. Observers, including journalists and diplomats, report informal pressure and intimidation by local authorities.

Environmental human rights defenders (EHRDs) working with Indigenous Peoples and rural communities face heightened risks. Several community leaders opposing a proposed mining project have been subjected to surveillance and repeated police questioning. Two women environmental defenders have been publicly named in Parliament by five Members of Parliament, who accused them of being "anti-development" and "foreign agents" and warned that they should "stop interfering with national progress or face serious consequences".

At the same time, a foreign-owned mining company headquartered abroad continues exploration activities near Indigenous territories, despite allegations of a lack of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) and reports of intimidation by private security contractors.

Based on this scenario, decide:

- *Your advocacy objective: what do you think the UN system should do?*
- *Which Special Procedure(s) would you reach out to? Remember that you can reach out to more than one Special Procedure and can suggest different activities to address the different aspects of the scenario*
- *What would you ask them to do? Remember to think beyond the more obvious, official activities that Special Procedures can undertake*
- *What steps would you take to increase the chances that the Special Procedures will take the actions you seek? Why might Special Procedures not be able to do what you would like? How can you overcome those obstacles?*

[Other scenarios to review.](#)