

ICC Bar Association Ecocide Working Group
Briefing Paper for the
ICC Bar Association General Assembly (26 September 2025)

To: ICC Bar Association Executive Council:

Philippe LaRochelle – *President*; Anand A. Shah – *Vice President for Victims*; Anta Guissé – *Vice President for Defence*; Audrey Mateo – *Vice President for Support Staff*; Natalie Von Wistinghausen – *Secretary*; Haneen Ghali – *Treasurer*; Megan Hirst – *Member*; Kate Gibson – *Member*; Haydee Dijkstal – *Member*.

Through: Dominic Kennedy – *ICC Bar Association Executive Director*

From: ICC Bar Association Ecocide Working Group (**EWG**):

Regina Weiss - *Chair*; Javier Ruiz; Drazen Plavec; Juan Carlos Manríquez; Kimberly Motley - *Members*.

Date: 23 September 2025

Re: Paper on Ecocide for presentation at the ICCBA General Assembly (26 September 2025)

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 The EWG was formed in February 2024 and hereby presents its second annual briefing paper to the ICCBA Presidency and Executive. The purpose of this paper is to update the Presidency and Executive on the global progression of the crime of ecocide and its relevance to the ICC.
- 1.2 As noted in the 2024 paper, ICC Member States Vanuatu, Fiji and Samoa formally introduced the crime of ecocide for consideration by ICC State Parties to the UN Secretary-General and the Working Group on Amendments of the Assembly of States Parties on 9 September 2024. A year has passed since that date, which triggered global discussions on the prospect of adopting ecocide as the fifth most serious crime of international concern for humanity.
- 1.3 The last 12 months have been a tumultuous time for the ICC and international law generally, with targeted attacks in the form of personal sanctions on staff and a concerted campaign to discredit the very institution established to bring to justice perpetrators of the gravest and most serious crimes threatening the peace, security and well-being of the world. **The EWG condemns the personal and institutional attacks on the ICC and its staff throughout the last 12 months in the strongest of terms.**
- 1.4 As a result, the ICC faces uncertain times, with the real risk of further court-wide sanctions a plausible threat in months to come. This becomes directly relevant to discussions relating to viability, capability and practicability of the inclusion of a fifth category of crime in the Rome Statute and in particular, the Court's ability to cope with the work that will ensue from the adoption of ecocide, which brings with it the need for specialised expertise and skills.
- 1.5 This paper sets out (1) the work of the EWG since September 2024; (2) progression of global ecocide discussions; (3) developments in international environmental cases and the impact on ecocide discussions; (4) how recent attacks on the ICC will affect the introduction of ecocide as a fifth crime in the Rome Statute; (5) the importance of

ICC Bar Association Ecocide Working Group
Briefing Paper for the
ICC Bar Association General Assembly (26 September 2025)

criminalising ecocide for the purposes of invoking universal jurisdiction; (6) the pros and cons of a carve-out stand-alone ecocide court; and (7) learnings for ecocide from the introduction of the crime of aggression in the Rome Statute.

2. Work of the ICCBA EWG in 24/25

- 2.1 The EWG members originate from Argentina, Australia, Chile, Croatia and the United States and thus met regularly online in the September 2024 to September 2025 time-period. EWG-only meetings were held on 29 October 2024, 17 November 2024, 7 January 2025, 6 February 2025, 10 April 2025 and 28 August 2025.
- 2.2 The EWG met for its second consecutive annual in-person symposium and workshop at the seat of the Court in The Hague on 17, 18 and 19 June 2025, with the meeting facilitated once again with the invaluable assistance of ICCBA Executive Director Dominic Kennedy. The EWG planned and discussed the content of this paper and heard from leading experts, which assisted with forming the views of the EWG contained within this briefing paper. The EWG notes that the views and conclusions in this paper are those of the EWG and discussions with experts were held under Chatham House Rules. **The EWG is most grateful** for the time given and invaluable insights of guest speakers at the June 2025 symposium.
- 2.3 Guest speakers included **Ms Jojo Mehta**, founder of Stop Ecocide Now International, **Professor Alex Whiting** of Harvard University and **Mr Philippe Sands KC**. EWG Chair Regina Weiss met with Jojo Mehta in London on 25 June 2025 to discuss future collaboration and an on-going relationship between Stop Ecocide Now and the EWG.
- 2.4 The EWG also hosted several guest speakers to brief the group on various ecocide-related topics throughout the past year and thanks them for their time, expertise and advice. On 26 November 2024, **Dr Matthew Gillett**, University of Essex, addressed the EWG on the state of play and future considerations of ecocide. Key points included the momentum in States implementing domestic legislation criminalising ecocide, the debate surrounding the *actus reus* of the current definition, the legality of the current definition, corporate responsibility and acts which constitute ecocide in non-conflict zones.
- 2.5 On 14 January 2025, **Ms Catherine Savard** addressed the EWG about her PhD work at Oxford University regarding the *mens rea* of ecocide including the rationale behind the definition adopted by the Independent Panel of Experts being the ‘knowledge that there is a substantial likelihood’ of severe and widespread or long-term damage to the environment, which was predicated on the principle of *dolus eventualis* and recklessness. Ms Savard also provided her views on derogating from Article 30 of the Rome Statute by applying negligence, recklessness and wilful blindness.
- 2.6 On 21 February 2025, the EWG provided written submissions in response to public consultation on the OTP Draft Policy on Environmental Crimes, with submissions available on the ICCBA website. To date, the updated OTP Policy on Environmental Crimes remains to be published.
- 2.7 Finally, **the EWG thanks** former EWG member Mr Thomas Hannis for his contributions to the EWG. Mr Hannis resigned from the EWG in September 2025, and the EWG remaining members wish him all the best for his retirement.

3. Progression of global ecocide discussions 24/25

- 3.2 Since the 9 September 2024 introduction of ecocide for consideration by Member states of the ICC, support internationally for its inclusion in the Rome Statute intensified. In October 2024, the Democratic Republic of the Congo became the first African State to formally and openly declare support for ecocide as an international crime under Article 7. In May 2025, Nigeria followed suit, as did the Republic of Congo and Burundi in July 2025. Discussions will continue within the Working Group on Amendments and at the ASP in 2025. At ASP 2024, a side event entitled 'A Fifth Crime of Ecocide: Opening Considerations' was held and featured speakers including Deputy Prosecutor Nazhat Khan and Mr Philippe Sand KC.
- 3.3 Domestically, introduction of legislation gathered momentum, with Azerbaijan, Scotland, Peru, Argentina, French Polynesia, Sardinia and Dominican Republic introducing bills to criminalise ecocide, with each at various stages of advancement at the time of this paper's submission. Domestic criminalisation of ecocide can be seen as part of a broader strategy for environmental and climate justice, especially for nations disproportionately affected by global environmental degradation.
- 3.4 The international community's interest will continue to be reflected in discussions at the ICC's Assembly of States Parties and other fora. On 3 December 2024, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Volker Türk stated that recognizing ecocide would promote human rights, including access to justice and a clean, healthy, and sustainable environment. The Council of Europe's Parliamentary Assembly passed a resolution on April 10, 2025, endorsing a Draft Convention on the Protection of the Environment through Criminal Law, which includes ecocide, with formal approval by the Committee of Ministers in May 2025, signalling growing regional support in Europe.

4. Recent developments in international environmental cases and the impact on ecocide discussions

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) Legal Advisory Opinion about Climate Change and the Ecocide and Environmental Crimes (2025 23 July General List No. 187)

- 4.1 In a landmark advisory opinion, the ICJ established that states have binding legal obligations under international law not only to protect the climate system and the environment, but also to prevent harm, cooperate across borders, and provide reparations when harm occurs.
- 4.2 The Advisory Opinion, commissioned by the UN General Assembly in 2023, is the result of a campaign initiated by a Pacific movement and driven diplomatically by the Pacific Island nation of Vanuatu, with the co-sponsorship and support of more than 130 countries.
- 4.3 The main legal obligations confirmed by the Court, and which are of primary relevance to ecocide and international environmental crimes, include:
- 4.3.1 Due diligence: "A State is obliged to use all means at its disposal to prevent activities carried out on its territory or in any area under its jurisdiction from

ICC Bar Association Ecocide Working Group
Briefing Paper for the
ICC Bar Association General Assembly (26 September 2025)

causing significant damage to the environment of another State" (para. 132, p. 48), and the standard must be "*strict*" (Pulp Mills on the River Uruguay *Argentina v. Uruguay*, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 2010);

4.3.2 Common but differentiated responsibilities: "*The principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities reflects the need to equitably share the burden of climate change obligations, taking into account, inter alia, States' historical and current contributions to cumulative GHG emissions, as well as their different current capabilities and national circumstances.*" (para. 148, p. 52).

4.3.3 Human Rights: "*The Court therefore concludes that, under international law, the human right to a clean, healthy, and sustainable environment is essential for the enjoyment of other human rights*" (para. 393, p. 114).

4.3.4 Cooperation: "*The duty of States to cooperate for the protection of the environment is part of customary international law*" (para. 142, p. 51). It derives from the principle that the conservation and management of shared resources and the environment are based on shared interests and are governed by the principle of good faith (see Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1996 (I), p. 264, para. 102; Nuclear Tests (Australia v. France), Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1996 (I), p. 264, para. 102; Nuclear Tests (Australia v. France), Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1996 (I), p. 264, para. 102), 1974.

4.3.5 Accountability: "*A responsible State has the obligation to make full reparation for the damage caused by the internationally wrongful act*" (para. 450, p. 128). Legal consequences include

- (a) the cessation of the wrongful acts or omissions, if they persist;
- (b) the provision of assurances and guarantees of non-repetition of the wrongful acts or omissions, if circumstances so require; and
- (c) full reparation to the injured States (para. 457(4), p. 132).

4.4 By affirming that the failure to prevent serious climate damage may constitute a violation of international law, the Advisory Opinion strengthens the case for recognizing ecocide as an international crime and makes a significant contribution to the jurisprudence that establishes environmental protection not only as a crime but also as a legal obligation based on existing international frameworks. The formal proposal to amend the Rome Statute and include ecocide as a fifth core international crime in September 2024 was a natural precursor to the ICJ finding.

4.5 Intentional destruction of the environment is not only reckless, but also unlawful. States have clear legal obligations to prevent such harm, and the ICJ strengthened the foundation for accountability, not only reinforcing state responsibility in international law but also providing a fundamental legal basis supporting the personal responsibility of individuals for serious environmental destruction within the framework of evolving international criminal law.

4.6 The Advisory Opinion shapes the normative and jurisprudential landscape that underpins efforts to criminalise ecocide and demand individual accountability, both

nationally and internationally. In this sense, ecocide emerges not only as the next legal frontier, but as a necessary evolution in the landscape of international justice.

European Court of Human Rights and Inter-American Court of Human Rights

- 4.7 The European Court of Human Rights (**ECtHR**) and Inter-American Court of Human Rights (**IACHR**) have issued key decisions linking environmental inaction to human rights violations, by framing ecological harm as a systemic threat.
- 4.8 On 9 April 2024, the ECtHR's Grand Chamber ruled in *Verein KlimaSeniorinnen Schweiz and Others v. Switzerland* (53600/20) that Switzerland's inadequate climate policies violated Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (**ECHR**), being the right to private and family life. Key to this landmark decision was the Chamber's finding that Switzerland was to establish a legislative framework for emission reductions aligned with the - 1.5°C goal underpinning the UN Paris Agreement (12 December 2015). It also set the standard for the other member states to the ECHR, and one would hope – a flow on effect to other states outside Europe. The reason this decision was landmark is because it was the first time and international court held a government accountable for climate inaction.
- 4.9 On 30 January 2025, the ECtHR ruled in the case of *Cannavacciuolo & Ors v Italy* (39742/14, 51567/14, 74208/14 and 24215/15), that Italy violated Article 2 of the ECHR, being the right to life, by failing to take sufficient measures to protect its residents from severe, long-term environmental pollution in the "*Terra dei fuochi*" (Land of Fires) region of Campania. This established a precedent for environmental cases, finding that systemic state failure to address hazardous waste and mitigate its impacts constitutes a breach of the fundamental right to life.
- 4.10 Complementing the ECtHR decisions, the IACHR's Advisory Opinion at the request of Chile and Colombia on *Climate Emergency and Human Rights* of 3 July 2025 (OC-32/25), affirmed the right to a stable climate as integral to the American Convention on Human Rights. It imposed "*enhanced due diligence*" on states to regulate corporate emissions, protect vulnerable groups (including Indigenous peoples), and ensure access to justice, information, and participation.
- 4.11 These decisions impact ecocide by eco-centrally interpreting rights to include environmental integrity, moving beyond anthropocentric harm. The ECtHR and IACHR rulings provide interpretive tools for ICC prosecutors to link ecocide to crimes against humanity including forcible displacement from environmental degradation. They bolster campaigns for ecocide's inclusion in the Rome Statute, by demonstrating how environmental destruction exacerbates human rights crises, justifying criminalisation of severe acts like industrial pollution or habitat loss.

5. Key issue: the ICC under attack – how will this affect the introduction of ecocide as a fifth crime in the Rome Statute?

- 5.1 The last 12 months saw staff of the ICC under personal attack by way of sanctions ordered by the United States, targeting judges and prosecutors, their families and colleagues. **The EWG notes and endorses** the public statements made by the ICCBA in response to the imposition of those personal sanctions. As noted in the ICCBA

media release dated 6 June 2025, “*such sanctions risk deterring international cooperation with the Court and puts its ability to carry out its mandate at risk.*” This leads directly to the question - is the ICC ready and equipped to take on a fifth crime of ecocide?

- 5.2 At present, the Court is facing significant hurdles in conducting the work it is already doing and adding to that workload by investigating and prosecuting ecocide will be difficult in its current state. Budgetary uncertainty and political pressure from key world leaders such as the US President could lead to the ICC struggling to survive. So why add ecocide to the Rome Statute? There are numerous reasons, not least the global support garnering momentum, as noted in [3] above.
- 5.3 The importance of the inclusion of ecocide as a fifth crime in the Rome Statute is based not only in the need for reckless or unlawful damage to be internationally recognised, but there is also vital overarching necessity that the Rome Statute brings with it.
- 5.4 By crystallising ecocide as a recognised international crime, jurisdictional challenges can be alleviated. It is not difficult to imagine that the consequences of ecocide can cross borders. One of the key intentions of the way the ICC operates is that it has jurisdiction over international crimes. In the same way a conflict can be international in context for it to fall within the jurisdiction of the Court, so too could the damage and destruction caused by ecocide. For example, the destruction of river systems that run through several sovereign states by an act of ecocide committed in another state could be prosecuted without the usual issues associated with sovereignty, particular in cases where neighbouring countries are not diplomatically aligned.
- 5.5 Another key benefit of criminalising ecocide under the Rome Statute is that it would automatically invoke universal jurisdiction, meaning that States could prosecute those persons allegedly responsible for ecocide in domestic courts, not unlike cases which have been successfully prosecuted under universal jurisdiction for genocide and war crimes in Germany and The Netherlands in recent years. Particularly at a time when the ICC is under attack, the invoking of universal jurisdiction has never been more important. The importance of universal jurisdiction *vis-à-vis* ecocide is elaborated on in [6] below.
- 5.6 As noted in the 2024 EWG paper, the consequential effect of including ecocide as a fifth crime in the Rome Statute means that Member States, by virtue of their obligations as treaty members, would be required to criminalise ecocide under the principle of complementarity in order to have a like-offence under domestic law. As noted in [3.3] above, states are getting on the front-foot, so to speak, and criminalising ecocide domestically well in advance.
- 5.7 Finally, echoing sentiments in the 2024 paper, criminalising ecocide as an international crime which occurs outside of conflict means that those acts of environmental damage that are not linked to war or conflict can still be prosecuted and perpetrators held accountable. It is notable that in the year since the last paper was submitted, no charges for environmental crimes have been brought against any suspect before the ICC and have not appeared on any public arrest warrant applications.

Is the ICC currently equipped to investigate and prosecute ecocide?

5.8 **The EWG is of the view** that the ICC, in its current state, and particularly in light of the risk of court-wide US sanctions which may grind the work of the court to a halt altogether, is not well-equipped to adopt ecocide as a fifth crime. With its current funding issues, political pressure, and indeed the unprecedented attack on the ICC by the US, the Court would presently struggle to fulfil its mandate *vis-à-vis* ecocide. To properly investigate and prosecute ecocide, the ICC would at a minimum require the expertise of environmental scientists and forensic ecologists. As noted in the EWG September 2024 paper, the Rome Statute's anthropocentric focus (protecting human victims) clashes with ecocide's eco-centric approach (protecting ecosystems). Amending the Rome Statute to accommodate ecocide would require redefining victimhood and reparations, which is not without its complexities.

5.9 Despite the current hurdles the ICC is facing, **the EWG is of the view** that the inclusion of ecocide as a fifth crime in the Rome Statute ought to be supported by the ICCBA. The need for it to become the fifth international crime of the gravest concern to humanity will ensure that impunity for ecocide is not tolerated for generations moving forward.

6. Key issue: criminalising ecocide before the ICC and the applicability of universal jurisdiction

6.1 Given the extraordinary scope of violations that may amount to international crimes, and considering that prosecutions of international crimes at the domestic level constitute an exception rather than the rule, some states have developed alternate mechanisms and procedures to deal with criminal accountability for international crimes. One of those mechanisms is under the principle of universal jurisdiction. When domestic jurisdictions invoke universal jurisdiction, they do so on behalf of the international community, or for the so-called *hosti humani generis*: the crimes that affects to all the humanity.

6.2 There are a number of factors obstructing the pursuit of justice for international crimes before domestic courts in countries where alleged crimes were committed. The most common reason is the lack of political will or political interference. Other pragmatic reasons include lack of capacity, skills, and resources to pursue international crimes.

6.3 International justice is prone to global, regional, and local political pressure. Such pressure can be exercised by government and nongovernmental actors at the jurisdictional and functional levels. Now more than ever, the ICC is facing pressure from external actors and states not complying with obligations to cooperate with investigations, prosecutions, the facilitation of arrests or compliance with judicial directions.

6.4 Invoking universal jurisdiction domestically may generally see the advancement of cases that might otherwise be obstructed by geopolitical pressure on international or regional judicial bodies. This is not to suggest that universal jurisdiction cases are entirely free from geopolitical pressure, but such cases are arguably less likely to be

the subject of such pressure, particularly when initiated in a jurisdiction with a strong and independent judiciary free from political interference.

- 6.5 As noted above, the ICC Prosecutor is yet to charge any environmental crimes since the OTP commenced operations some 20+ years ago. Article 8(2)(b)(iv) of the Rome Statute specifically allows for charges to be brought in the context of international armed conflict. As articulated by the EWG in its submissions to the Prosecutor on the OTP Draft Policy on Environmental Crimes, it was open to the Prosecutor to consider environmental crime charges in the Ukraine situation *vis-à-vis* the Kakhovka Dam incident in June 2023.
- 6.6 As international law currently stands, charges are limited to those which occur in the context of armed conflict. Ecocide envisages criminal accountability for crimes against the environment which are committed regardless of whether they occurred in armed conflict. As such, when ecocide becomes a fifth crime in the Rome Statute, it will be open for states to invoke universal jurisdiction to prosecute those crimes domestically, and they are not bound by the limitations which are currently in place, being in the context of an international armed conflict. In any event, no such crimes have ever been charged let alone prosecuted, so any advancement would be an improvement from where the record currently sits.
- 6.7 Universal jurisdiction is reserved to prosecute the most severe offending as recognised by the international community, to ensure that they will not go unpunished. **The EWG is of the view** that for the purposes of universal jurisdiction, there exists a global justification for ecocide to become the fifth crime in the Rome Statute. Even at a time where the ICC is under attack, universal jurisdiction will provide an avenue to prosecute ecocide as an international crime domestically once adopted.

7. Key issue: a separate court for Ecocide – the pros and cons

- 7.1 Noting the issues identified in [5] above and in particular [5.8], discussions on the establishment of a separate court for ecocide as an alternative to the inclusion of ecocide in the Rome Statute may be raised going forward. The purpose of this section is to provide **the EWG's views** on the pros and cons on the concept.
- 7.2 Creating a separate international court for ecocide, distinct from ICC, is a bold proposal to address severe environmental crimes, particularly those with cross-border impacts.

Pros of a Separate Court for Ecocide

- 7.3 Specialised Expertise: A dedicated ecocide court could employ environmental scientists, ecologists, and legal experts specialized in environmental law, ensuring accurate handling of complex cases involving ecological damage, corporate liability, and scientific evidence. Unlike the ICC, which is anthropocentric and focused on human victims, an ecocide court could adopt an eco-centric framework, recognizing ecosystems as victims and tailoring legal processes to environmental harm.
- 7.4 Focused Mandate: a separate court would prioritise ecocide, avoiding the ICC's competing priorities and current investigations on foot. The fact that to date, no

environmental crimes have ever been charged is indicative of ecocide-like conduct not being a priority for the OTP. This focus could lead to faster, more effective prosecutions and establish clear and consistent precedents.

- 7.5 Independence and efficiency: an independent court for ecocide may not fall under the political pressure the ICC is presently facing, although it would not be exempt from it. Smaller States with higher susceptibility to damage from environmental impact such as Fiji, Samoa and Vanuatu may find it easier to rally support for a stand-alone ecocide court without opposition from major powers wary of ICC expansion. A dedicated court would send a powerful message about the urgency of environmental protection and encourage global support for ecocide laws.

Cons of a Separate Court for Ecocide

- 7.6 Establishment costs and resistance: international agreement on funding and governance could prove difficult given geopolitical divisions and competing priorities such as humanitarian crises. In addition, resistance from high-wealth global industries (such as oil, mining and agriculture) may oppose a new court, fearing accountability for environmental harm and could resist or undermine its establishment. This anticipated resistance could also stymie treaty negotiations required to establish a separate institution, which would require broad global consensus.
- 7.7 Fragmentation of international criminal law: as per Article 1 of Rome Statute, the drafters and signatories intended for the ICC to “*be a permanent institution and shall have the power to exercise its jurisdiction over persons for the most serious crimes of international concern, as referred to in this Statute, and shall be complementary to national criminal jurisdictions.*” To carve out the crime of ecocide – which the EWG as previously noted falls into the category of the ‘most serious crimes of international concern’, risks fragmenting international criminal law and creating overlaps or conflicts with the ICC’s jurisdiction for example if and when environmental war crimes are charged. However, in light of risk of US sanctions on the entire court, an interim ecocide court may not be a fragmentation but rather promote continuity while the ICC deals with the attacks it is currently facing.
- 7.8 Enforcement challenges: not unlike the ICC, a new court would face the same challenges such as relying on cooperation of member states, which could result in non-compliant states evading accountability. As noted above, ecocide may be a cross-border crime, which means multi-state cooperation is crucial. The effects of oil spills or deforestation often cross borders, so jurisdictional issues of a new court may become a significant hurdle which the ICC – with 125 Member States – is closer to overcoming than a new, separate ecocide court.

8. Learnings from the introduction of the crime of aggression in the Rome Statute

- 8.1 The crime of aggression is the fourth and most recent crime to be included under the jurisdiction of the ICC. The process in reaching that point, however, was not a simple or easy one, with peculiarities and serious obstacles to overcome in amending the

Rome Statute to introduce the crime of aggression. Reflecting on the rationale and lessons learned, the crime of ecocide may have to forge its own path.

- 8.2 A key consideration is strategy garnering political support at each level of the process – this could be the decisive factor in ensuring that the campaign to criminalise ecocide internationally is effective and achieves its original objective. The inclusion of the crime of aggression in the Rome Statute followed a tacit practice of affirming customary norms as law and a permanent status of proposals and amendments.
- 8.3 Where ecocide differs from aggression is that with ecocide, a number of states that have passed national laws criminalising ecocide domestically (see [3] above) and a landmark ICJ Advisory Opinion further affirms the global recognition of international legal responsibility for the consequences of harm to environment, which goes hand-in-hand with the rationale behind the crime of ecocide. Even at this early stage of discussions about the inclusion of ecocide post the 9 September 2024 introduction, the starting point is already vastly advanced with a show of support from ICC Member States and collectives such as the European Union.
- 8.4 Procedurally, the first step in the progression of ecocide as an international crime involves a State Party's willingness to propose an amendment to the Rome Statute. The crime of aggression took 60 years to define and finitely include in the Rome Statute. **The EWG is of the view** that given the global focus on environmental issues – which arguably take precedence over war crimes and crimes against humanity in some forums – the commitment to inclusion in the Rome Statute will be smoother than the process for the inclusion of the crime of aggression.
- 8.5 Although it is difficult to place a time-frame on the process, particularly given recent attacks on the ICC, the EWG is hopeful that meaningful discussions leading to the inclusion of ecocide as a fifth crime in the Rome Statute will intensify in the next 12 months, with 2030 as the year which some experts have put forward for formal adoption.
- 8.6 Those promoting the amendment and wishing to avoid the same obstacles as the crime of aggression will need the political skill and resilience to ensure timely adoption, broad ratification with the fewest possible exceptions, and, ultimately, a prosecutable crime rather than one which is introduced as a 'tick-box' crime to appease ecocide activists. Strong forward-looking advocacy will be needed at every stage of the process to ensure that the crime of ecocide is effectively incorporated into the Rome Statute as it charts its course.

9. Next steps

- 9.1 The ICC is facing difficult times and at the time of submission of this paper, fresh attacks and threats of court-wide sanctions against it have been made by the US. That said, **the EWG resolves to continue its work**, which now more than ever is needed.
- 9.2 The EWG is open to continuing its work in advising the ICCBA Presidency and Executive for the 2025/2026 period and will continue to engage with experts in environmental and international law.
- 9.3 The **EWG is of the view** that ecocide is a crime of the most serious concern to humanity and bringing to justice individual perpetrators of ecocide is crucial to ensure global environmental protection and sustainability for generations to come. The EWG is pleased to contribute to the conversation which will assist in preserving the earth's precious and fragile environment.