Oil and gas activity on coastlines and at sea adversely impacts the human rights of small-scale fishers and fish workers. From exploration and drilling in the seabed, to coastal processing, subsea pipelines, and overseas shipping of fossil fuels—offshore oil and gas activity poses a growing threat to the rights, livelihoods, and food security of fisherfolk around the world. Offshore projects are growing in number, and today represent more than 30% of global oil and gas production. Because offshore oil and gas activities are inherently difficult to monitor and manage, many adverse impacts go unnoticed and unmitigated, from leaks, well blowouts, and other emergencies, to everyday harms associated with industry operations and infrastructure.

Every phase of the offshore oil and gas lifecycle threatens the rights of small-scale fisherfolk and fish workers on the frontlines, and imperils the marine and coastal ecosystems on which they depend.

1. Noise pollution caused by seismic surveys used to locate undersea oil and gas reserves during exploration can seriously, and even fatally, harm marine life—from microorganisms to whales—with devastating consequences for the coastal and aquatic food webs of which small-scale fisheries are a part. In fact, seismic airgun blasting has been shown to decrease catch rates of commercial fish species by about 50% on average over thousands of square miles, with even greater losses closer to the source.

2. At the production phase, the greatest danger is from well blowouts during drilling, which increases the deeper the water, and can trigger massive oil spills capable of devastating fisheries. The installation of offshore infrastructure is also often accompanied by the creation of exclusion zones that prevent fisherfolk from accessing fish stocks critical for both income generation and subsistence, leading to loss of livelihood and food insecurity.

3. The transport of oil and gas via pipelines and vessels carries the risk of oil spills from ruptures or collisions, allisions, groundings and sinkings. Undersea pipelines can also create safety hazards to fisherfolk by entangling fishing equipment and vessels, endangering life and property. Routine discharges from transport vessels contaminate oceans with hydrocarbons, toxic metals, and dangerous chemicals in a rampant practice called “bilge dumping.” These harmful substances can bioaccumulate in the tissues of marine life that are eventually consumed by fishing communities, leading to cancers and other health impacts. Noise generated by transport vessels also contribute to ecological disturbances, while the vessels themselves facilitate the spread of invasive species that can outcompete native species and wreak havoc on marine and coastal ecosystems.

4. Even after an offshore project is closed at the decommissioning phase, unplugged or poorly plugged wells and abandoned infrastructure can continue to leak oil, radioactive materials, and other toxins into the ocean, contaminating the ecosystems on which fishing communities depend.

Offshore oil and gas activity also harms fishers and fishworkers through its climate impacts. Offshore projects have outsized yet largely underreported climate footprints due to emissions from the common industry practice of gas flaring, methane leaks from offshore and coastal infrastructure, and the massive amounts of energy needed to power production operations. They also release enormous quantities of greenhouse gases during transport and through the emissions that are the inescapable consequence of the end use of the produced oil and gas as intended. By accelerating climate change and increasing CO2 atmospheric concentrations, oil and gas activity exacerbates sea level rise, ocean warming, ocean acidification, and other impacts already adversely affecting food production from fisheries and shellfish aquaculture, and
jeopardizes communities’ physical property as well as their spiritual and cultural connections to their coasts and oceans.\textsuperscript{19}

The local and global impacts of offshore oil and gas activity undermine fundamental human rights at both the local and global scales. Small-scale fisheries account for at least 40\% of the world’s total fisheries catch.\textsuperscript{20} In endangering them, offshore oil activity can jeopardize the food security of entire regions and the livelihoods of roughly 500 million people.\textsuperscript{21} By driving the climate crisis, imperiling entire marine ecosystems, and leading to economic and physical displacement, offshore activity thus threatens the rights to food,\textsuperscript{22} an adequate standard of living,\textsuperscript{23} health,\textsuperscript{24} work,\textsuperscript{25} a healthy environment,\textsuperscript{26} and culture,\textsuperscript{27} among other rights.

States have a duty to protect the rights of fishers and fish workers from such harm. States have a duty under international human rights law to prevent and mitigate foreseeable threats to rights,\textsuperscript{28} including those posed by the conduct of private actors.\textsuperscript{29} Their continued approval and financing of offshore oil and gas activity—given its inherent risks to fundamental human rights—violates this well-established duty.

In light of the above, we, the undersigned, respectfully urge the U.N. Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, in addressing the human rights situation of small-scale fishers and fish workers in his forthcoming report, to:

(1) highlight the ongoing and growing threats posed by oil and gas activity in and on oceans and across the offshore lifecycle;
(2) recommend that States carefully assess and disclose through thorough impact assessments and good faith public consultations the impacts of proposed offshore oil and gas activity on local fisheries and fisherfolk rights—including through their climate impacts—and require the mitigation of such effects before approving or financing any such projects; and
(3) call on States to reject the advancement of and/or suspend any offshore oil and gas projects that deprive affected fisherfolk and fish workers their enjoyment of fundamental human rights, including the right to food.

We thank the U.N. Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, Michael Fakhri, for the opportunity to present this input. For any questions or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact ukhatri@ciel.org.
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