



Quaker United Nations Office

13 Avenue du Mervelet
CH-1209 Geneva, Switzerland

Tel +41 (22) 748-4800

Fax +41 (22) 748-4819

Friends World Committee for Consultation (FWCC)

Interventions made during the 55th meeting of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) by Lindsey Fielder Cook, QUNO Representative for the Human Impacts of Climate Change, on behalf of FWCC.

14-17 February 2022

This meeting oversaw the approval for the Summary for Policy Makers (SPM) of the Working Group II contribution to the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report (AR6), **Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability**.

The IPCC collates the climate science worldwide, and approximately every 7 years produces an Assessment Report of over 1000 pages. Hundreds of scientists are involved, nearly all (except the Secretariat and Technical Support Unit, TSU) voluntarily, and the content of these chapters cannot be changed. However, the SPM, some 40 pages summarizing the findings, is exposed to this process of being approved by Governments. The IPCC has the right to refuse Country delegate suggestions to the SPM if the wording compromises ‘the integrity of the science’. In our observer role we seek to help support the scientific findings, help protect the integrity of the science, help ensure language on transformative, sustainable, and just approaches remains, and seek language that most clearly communicates findings and their gravity to policy makers.

The Representative on Climate Change played a number of roles, including; expert reviewer of earlier SPM drafts, coordination with UN Human Rights staff to engage on rights language, preparation for interventions based on past and new SPM drafts, and attendance during the two week negotiations, 13 hour days (two breaks).

FWCC is the only active accredited faith-based organization at the IPCC. We are one of three observers who choose to speak, including the European Union, Climate Action Network (representing 100s of CSO groups), and FWCC. For most of the session, the IPCC co-chairs stopped saying ‘FWCC’, and simply gave the floor **‘to the Quakers’**. During this IPCC Meeting, we made 29 interventions on behalf of FWCC.

This report includes an ‘outcome’ section, if the language FWCC helped raise, had a clear influence.

FWCC Interventions:

1. Monday 14 February (Written submission) SPM 2

FWCC Written Intervention - *As this is our first time, we wish to express our gratitude to the scientists and IPCC as a whole for this body of work, and to the German government for supporting this meeting. Concerning the SPM, what was so helpful in the earlier version, was the clarity in symbols – an arrow pointing up to show where the impacts are increasing. Now we have a slash – or minus sign as we are taught in math class in school – this could be a dangerous confusion for policy makers. Could the authors please consider using the earlier sign, or a PLUS sign, to ensure clarity in the figure when impacts are increasing? We also wish to thank the authors for including mental health in these figures.*

2. Monday 14 February (written submission):

B.1.3 - *We welcome the reference to the Sustainable Development Goals as States have committed to these goals and their extraordinary framing for a healthy world. Maintaining this language helps us understand what global warming is threatening profoundly. Also, we suggest that we include the word 'insecurity' into the glossary to help with understanding, since the word 'insecurity' is commonly used in this scientific area and is appropriate here.*

B.1.4 - *We welcome the focus on physical and mental health and the underlying science and urge the IPCC authors to maintain the language of their important findings. This includes the list of physical diseases both to people and nature, and mental health challenges.*

B.1.5 – *we hope this language is not changed as it reflects significant research through the IPCC and also the Human Rights Council.*

B.1.6 *We value this focus on economic damages and consider this language appropriate. We also value the focus on human livelihoods affected, with the significant IPCC findings in the main text, and thank you for this.*

B.1.7 *As experts in the climate/conflict nexus, we think the language of 'contributing to humanitarian crises where climate hazards interact' is excellent and reflects both IPCC and wider findings. We thank the IPCC for the language on displacement and involuntary migration, which is critical to highlight and reflects widespread research.*

3. Tuesday 15 February 2022 (ORAL INTERVENTIONS FROM NOW ON)

FWCC intervention – *FWCC (Quaker) thank the IPCC and the authors for this report and thank Germany for hosting this meeting. As civil society, we work hard to communicate IPCC findings, and in the role of communication, we believe a word here is missing, the word is 'sustainable'. We hear confusion being expressed over 'climate resilient development' and we ask if including the word 'sustainable' be included, to read 'sustainable and climate resilient development', to help link language with the Sustainable Development Goals to which policy makers have been focused on for a number of years now.*

Outcome: *final definition language – SPM D - Climate Resilient Development integrates adaptation measures and their enabling conditions (Section C) with mitigation to advance sustainable development for all.*

4. 15 February B.2.1

FWCC intervention – *wish to thank Norway for highlighting focus on management, to integrate ecosystem, holistic management across systems. And on this point, I would add that rights-based approaches, or human rights-based approaches as clarified by the OHCHR, that these include just transition, gender, and protecting biodiversity, human rights, and Indigenous Peoples rights, and that rights-based approaches lead to more effective, sustainable, legitimate and coherent climate action. I am quoting the UN Special Rapporteur here. There is extensive literature on how HRBA lead to more effective climate action, and this is based on findings from extensive literature. We hope the science will not be diluted but will continue to reflect the extensive literature.*

Outcome: *‘rights-based approaches remain in the final text (see below)*

5. 15 February

FWCC intervention – *reflect on point on the need for ‘sustainable consumption’, and to again note that a missing word here is ‘sustainable’ alongside ‘climate resilient development’, and to highlight the importance of integrating development language with Sustainable Development Goal language which policy makers have been integrating now for years.*

Outcome: *see intervention #3*

6. 15 February (B.1.2)

FWCC intervention – *Would welcome re-inclusion of kelp forests – also, on the mention to list positive aspects of climate change, we are reminded of the IPCC SR 1.5C listing the loss of thousands of species, livelihoods, food insecurity even between a 1.5C and 2C, with the profound suffering this would bring it is hard to talk about the positive aspects of climate change.*

Overall outcome: *B.1.2 – ‘positive’ language allowed in relation to some Arctic areas, but language remains strong on negative – “Hundreds of local losses of species have been driven by increases in the magnitude of heat extremes (high confidence), as well as mass mortality events on land and in the ocean (very high confidence) and loss of kelp forests (high confidence). Some losses are already irreversible, such as the first species extinctions driven by climate change (medium confidence).”*

7. 15 February (B.1.3.)

FWCC intervention – *thank the author David from Chapter 3, for articulating that what may be ‘positive’ in some fishing migration for one country, is a negative impact to other countries losing their fishing stocks, and how this could drive food insecurity and conflict. We appreciate his highlighting of the human impact, and the human suffering that may follow as a result of changes.*

Overall outcome: *despite push by one country for ‘positive effects of climate change’, the language on B.1.3 remains strong on negative affects to societies.*

8. Wednesday 16 February D.1 D.2 – breakout room – 6am

FWCC Intervention – *as civil society communicators of the report, and as a native English speaker, the proposed words ‘may or can’ are very different – ‘may’ is quite weak, ‘can’ is better but this whole report is outlining the human impact of climate change and we would have serious concerns about the use of ‘may’.*

Outcome - TOOK OUT MAY/CAN – back to what it was.

9. 16 February Contact group on C.2.2

FWCC (Quakers) *we thank the IPCC authors, Rachel, for this language on agroecology and listing its benefits – food security, health, well-being, biodiversity – as we are seeing significant increases in research on positive agroecology outcomes and we are very pleased to see this language here.*

Overall outcome: *‘agroecology’ taken out, ‘agroecological principles’ accepted, but overall sentence keeps spirit of approach: Agroecological principles and practices, ecosystem-based management in fisheries and aquaculture, and other approaches that work with natural processes support food security, nutrition, health and well-being, livelihoods and biodiversity, sustainability, and ecosystem services (high confidence).*

10. Thursday 17 February – Section D

FWCC Intervention — Thank you co-chair, we wish to express our support for the call for least developed countries to be included in the list of vulnerable countries, both in resilience and in experiencing debt burdens.

11. Thursday 17 February - D.1.1.

FWCC Intervention – *As communicators of the science, we find the language in yellow as misleading – or ‘false optimism’ as was stated. We have concern for the integrity of the science. The Author has expressed preference for language of warming levels along the proposal. He clarified that the 1.5C language is consistent with the overall message of D. Yet in the D section, we do not see the 1.5C language until the end, in D.5. This will be confusing to policy makers and is a great loss to the message.*

Overall outcome: *language of 1.5C kept in earlier reference, D.1.1*

12. 17 February D.4.2

FWCC Intervention - *We appreciate the author’s explanation on their cautious and appropriate use of Nature Based Solutions (NBS), and we appreciate the current stress on ecosystem adaptation, language which better reflects the outcome needed. Finally, this SPM’s emphasis throughout on restoration is highly appreciated, as restoration reflects what at core is needed for unprecedented levels of degraded nature, and the unprecedented rate of species extinction in human history.*

Overall outcome: *NBS remains a concern to a number of countries, and kept to a footnote (44)*

13. 17 February D.5.3.

QUNO Intervention – *This SPM focuses on ‘impacts, adaptation and vulnerability’, and this last paragraph is a profound witness to vulnerability. It also captures the powerful message of Working Group 1 on planetary health. We thank the authors for this last paragraph and consider it one of the most important in this report.*

(Note: we spoke again on this sentence, intervention #24)

QUNO Intervention – C.2.4 – on communicating ‘natural areas’

14. Saturday 19 February – B4

QUNO intervention – *We wish to follow on with our colleagues that this paragraph is important, powerful, and factual, and we thank the authors for this. My comments link to language – as we work to help communicate these findings to policy makers. While we understand the use of the word ‘risk’ is commonly used, we appreciate an earlier suggestion to use the word ‘avoid’, as this language helps stress the species we can save if we act urgently and healthily now.*

Again, on language – the word ‘damage’ is clear, while the suggested word ‘transformation’ has a more positive intuitive sound to a reader it would be bizarre to reflect what is being described.

Finally, we do not see 3C as an extreme example. If today’s GHG emissions rates were to continue, we would reach 3C and so this is not alarmist, it is a reality check.

Outcome – see intervention 16

15. 19 February B.4.7

QUNO intervention – *Thank the authors for this paragraph. There is increasing research on the relationship between climate change and conflict – we just held the 2nd International Conference on Environmental Peacebuilding. The language here is ‘climate change will affect drivers of climate change’, the language often used is that ‘climate change is a threat multiplier of conflict’, and we recognize the example of ‘poverty’ as being only one driver. There are many drivers of conflict, including systemic abuse of human rights. Finally, as we appreciate the authors are trying to tell us, climate change as a threat multiplier of conflict at 1.5C will be far greater as global temperature rise.*

Outcome: see below

16. 19 February C and B section references to conflict (in several place)

FWCC Intervention – (offered clarification on climate change and conflict – that current research views climate change and conflict not as a direct link (driver), but a threat multiplier of existing drivers of conflict. We quoted several resources. ENB quoted us as: *FWCC highlighted that the recent Second International Conference on Environmental Peacebuilding, held from 2-4 February 2022, concluded that climate change is a threat multiplier that increases as other drivers of conflict increase.*

Outcome: The language relationship with conflict is not great but okay – but thankfully not eliminated as some States wished – *“Compared to other socioeconomic factors the influence of climate on conflict is assessed as relatively weak (high confidence). Along long-term socioeconomic pathways that reduce non-*

climatic drivers, risk of violent conflict would decline (medium confidence). At higher global warming levels, impacts of weather and climate extremes, particularly drought, by increasing vulnerability will increasingly affect violent intrastate conflict (medium confidence).”

17. Monday 21 February B.4.1.

QUNO Intervention – *Thank you, as I have already shared in a previous intervention concerning this sentence, for communication’s sake, the word ‘transformation’ does not reflect the word ‘damages’, which was taken out. We believe that damages is very clear in reflecting, for policy makers, the risk being portrayed.*

Outcome: Sentence is stronger, following my intervention and discussion– ‘transformation’ was as altered to ‘damage, degradation and transformations’.

18. Tuesday 22 February - Approving D1 and D2 with strengthening in equity and justice language! D.2.1

FWCC Intervention – *We are glad there is a footnote for ‘low regrets’, to help with communication, but we express our regret that the last footnote version was deleted. We understand the AR5 language is already accepted, but the AR6 has done such remarkable work on research for equitable and just adaptation approaches, and we express our sadness that this is lost in the footnote.*

19. Wednesday - 23 February B.1.7

Indirect (via negotiators) engagement during huddle, where observers are not allowed to speak. The concern is that, in current language, conflict drivers were being defined as only ‘socio-economic’. We expressed concern these not remain the only reasons for conflict, as conflicts are also often political reasons and include systemic abuse of human rights – and this fed into a huddle discussion that resulted in improved language: *While non-climatic factors are the dominant drivers of existing intrastate violent conflicts, in some assessed regions extreme weather and climate events have had a small, adverse impact on their length, severity or frequency, but the statistical association is weak (medium confidence).*

Outcome: Authors then went from ‘socio-economic’ to ‘non-climatic factors’

QUNO Intervention allowed – *Thank you Co-Chair, just to say that what the authors have written here, is what we are seeing in research worldwide – in the Geneva Peacebuilding Conference, and just two weeks ago the International Environmental Peacebuilding Conference, and this sentence reflects appropriately what research is finding.*

20. Wednesday 23 February B.4.7 – ‘by increasing vulnerability’ – harsh discussion here

FWCC intervention – *on a communications level, if helpful to the discussion, the way I read the sentence is more about vulnerability and less about climate change increasing the conflict, but about climate change/drought increasing the vulnerability of the people, or citizens, already affected by the conflict.*

Outcome: IPCC Author – I find the point made by the Quakers very helpful. The sentence was moved around for greater focus on vulnerability, and for conflict to ‘violent conflict’.

21. Thursday 24 February C.2.11

FWCC Intervention – *‘We very much appreciate this sentence and thank the authors for their clarifications. We have only one question – and this came up in this morning’s Huddle - would it help to put ‘sustainable’ before the word ‘development’, as ‘unsustainable development’ can lead to conflict, not just violent conflict but conflict within societies facing unsustainable development, so my question is if it reflects the scientific research to place ‘sustainable’ before ‘development’.*

Outcome: Authors come back with new language, influenced by our intervention. “Some development reduces underlying vulnerabilities associated with conflict”.

22. Thursday 24 February On definition of climate justice

FWCC Intervention – *Thank you co-chair. In addition to what my colleagues from CAN have said, could the authors check if ‘human centred approaches’ is the best language here, as we believe this sentence linking development and human rights is relating to ‘rights based approaches’. This language is already in the SPM and, and rights-based approaches is more than ‘human centred’ as it integrates both human rights and also protection of biodiversity/environmental integrity. Rights-based approaches language was outlined by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights earlier this week, and research by the UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and the Environment is extensively used in the Human Rights Council and is in the underlying literature in the chapters here.*

Outcome – ‘human-centred approaches’ is changed to ‘rights-based approaches’

23. Friday 25 February - SPM B2

FWCC intervention – *thank you Co-Chair. Concerning the language in this paragraph, we note that the AR5 Synthesis Report identified economic growth as one of the main drivers of CO2. Would this language (finding) as relate to the main drivers of vulnerability as described in this paragraph, in relation to the discussion on unsustainable development?*

24. Friday 25 February B.6.1

FWCC Intervention – *overshoot from 1.5C – Thank you, we wish to stress how extraordinarily important this sentence is, with its focus on the multiple and severe impacts of overshoot. We have the findings from WG1, and in these chapters, and of course in the Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5C, which outlined the loss of human life, and significant increase in species extinction, as well as food security, etc. These are severe multiple impacts – you cannot bring the dead back to life.*

25. Friday 25 February D.5.3

FWCC Intervention – *thank you, if you take out ‘liveable’, you take out the level of seriousness that this report is trying to convey. The situation we face is profoundly difficult and that is exactly why the seriousness of the language is needed, calling for us to step up. We thank previous delegations for requesting to keep ‘liveable’ in.*

Outcome: language of ‘Liveable’ remains

26. Saturday, 25 February D.4.2. – supporting the EU concern that afforestation of peatlands could actually create more emissions.

FWCC Interventions – *If I was not in this CG and may speak, we appreciate the concern expressed, that afforestation of peatlands can create an adverse affect and actually increase GHG emissions, and this would be important for policy makers. Would an additional sentence on peatlands be of help?*

Outcome: improved but not enough – result - ‘intended land-based mitigation measures

27. Saturday, 25 February D.4.1

FWCC Intervention – *Thank you co-chair, concerning the need to protect the rights of Indigenous Peoples already living in these conservation areas, we already have, in D2, the recognition of rights-based approaches which integrates rights of Indigenous Peoples, human rights, protection of biodiversity – a holistic approach – and I ask if this language could be helpful here in protecting rights of Indigenous Peoples alongside nature conservation.*

Outcome - authors offers improved in recognition of protecting community rights, offering – “effective and equitable conservation”

28. Saturday evening (now 24 hours over schedule)

FINISHED 22:30 – I asked if I could speak and thanked the TSU, the Secretariat, the authors for all their hard work, and if we could put on our cameras and clap for them.

Outcome: People put on cameras, big smiles, clapping – ENB photo -

29. Sunday – 27 February

FWCC Intervention – *Thank you Chair, we follow in support of our civil society voices just shared. As Quakers, we thank the IPCC for your work – it is a gift to humanity. We thank the IPCC Secretariat, the TSU, the authors, and the governments who support multilateral efforts to build a more peaceful, sustainable, and just world. We hold in our hearts all people worldwide who experience oppression. This report focuses on the vulnerability of people and nature to climate change. It highlights what is at stake, and what we do today and how we act, can help protect the most vulnerable now and all future generations. Finally, we want to thank you all for your efforts to include human rights, Indigenous Peoples rights and rights-based approaches, because these are essential in building a more sustainable and just effort in transforming the root causes of climate change. Thank you.*