



Security Council

Seventy-sixth year

8926th meeting

Monday, 13 December 2021, 10 a.m.

New York

Provisional

<i>President:</i>	Mr. Abarry	(Niger)
<i>Members:</i>	China	Mr. Zhang Jun
	Estonia	Mr. Lipand
	France	Mr. De Rivière
	India	Mr. Tirumurti
	Ireland	Ms. Byrne Nason
	Kenya	Mr. Kimani
	Mexico	Mr. De la Fuente Ramírez
	Norway	Ms. Juul
	Russian Federation	Mr. Nebenzia
	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Ms. King
	Tunisia	Mr. Ben Lagha
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland . .	Dame Barbara Woodward
	United States of America	Mrs. Thomas-Greenfield
	Viet Nam	Mr. Pham

Agenda

Maintenance of international peace and security

Climate and security

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the translation of speeches delivered in other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-0506 (verbatimrecords@un.org). Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org>).

21-39234 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Maintenance of international peace and security

Climate and security

The President (*spoke in French*): In accordance with rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chad, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, the Federated States of Micronesia, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Nauru, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, the Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Uruguay and Vanuatu.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2021/990, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chad, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy,

Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, the Federated States of Micronesia, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Nauru, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, the Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Uruguay and Vanuatu.

The Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it.

I now give the floor to those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the vote.

Ms. Byrne Nason (Ireland): I take the floor on behalf of Ireland and the Niger, the co-penholders for draft resolution S/2021/990, which is before the Council for its consideration this morning.

Many months of effort have gone into bringing this text to the Council table today. However, as we all know, it has taken years of leadership and engagement by many countries to reach this point. I thank colleagues around the table for their engagement and support.

Today, we come to the Council to ask it to take the modest first steps to strengthen its ability to begin to assume its own responsibility on the defining issue of this generation: climate change. The draft resolution is aimed at responding to the climate-related security risks affecting the conflicts on the Council's agenda — no more, no less. We have no doubt as to the appropriateness of the Council considering this topic. It is argued by some that the Council is not the right forum and that, in addressing climate change and its impacts, the Council would establish a separate process to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. We respectfully but resolutely disagree.

The draft resolution is about enabling the Security Council to address climate change with the tools it has within its mandate. The Council has already taken steps to integrate climate-related security risks into

some of its mandated operations. However, we must go further. It is long overdue for the principal organ of the United Nations dealing with international security to take responsibility for integrating climate-related security risks across its conflict resolution, prevention and mediation work.

It could not be clearer from discussions at the twenty-sixth session of the Conference of the Parties to the Climate Change Agreement that we are facing a climate crisis. It is a crisis of today, not only of tomorrow. The Glasgow Climate Pact, adopted by consensus last month, is clear that, as temperatures rise, impacts from climate and weather extremes, as well as slow-onset events, will pose an ever-greater social, economic and environmental threat. Glasgow recognizes the importance of coherent action to respond to the scale of needs caused by the adverse impacts of climate change. This coherent action, which the international community collectively has called for, must include the work of this important organ. It is inconceivable that the Council should look away.

Today, 113 Members of the Organization have joined in co-sponsoring this draft resolution. Council engagement on this issue would reflect the will of the majority of United Nations Member States. As an elected member that is here to represent the interests of all United Nations Member States, we see it as our responsibility to bring this draft resolution to the table today. We have heard first-hand the voices of those living the reality of climate-related insecurity around this very table, many times now, not least from the presidency of the Niger, representing a country tragically impacted.

It has been suggested that there is no clear scientific basis for linking climate change with international peace and security. We refute this. The data is there and it is compelling. What the Council needs is a framework to enable the capture and consideration of this evidence. We need to better understand this link. Ignoring or rejecting the facts will not achieve that.

This is not an issue facing only one region or only one country. We need to look at it globally, as well as in regional and country contexts. Regional action is, of course, important. Many organizations recognize the importance of addressing the security implications of climate change, including the African Union, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Pacific Islands Forum, the League of Arab States,

the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the European Union. Every one of us here today has a role in one or another of those regional organizations and is part of the work under way there. It is now time that the Security Council also step up.

Finally, Ireland and the Niger are firmly of the view that consideration of the draft resolution must proceed this morning. Time is not on our side in any aspect of climate issue. We cannot afford to delay in addressing the ways in which climate-related security risks are undermining international peace and security. Doing so would leave the Council weakened in its ability to deal with this issue. Over 113 Member States have now co-sponsored this draft resolution today — a clear, majority of the countries of the world sharing our collective determination to take this important step and adopt this draft resolution. Not all Security Council members share or are of the same views on this question, but we hope that we can recognize the common ground in our positions and allow the draft resolution to be adopted.

Our plea — a plea backed by the majority of the members of the General Assembly — is for all Security Council members to support this text.

Mr. Nebenzia (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): As we have said earlier and repeatedly, draft resolution S/2021/990, on climate and security, is unacceptable to Russia. I shall once again explain our position in detail.

The sponsors did not and do not want to listen to our clarifications. They did not want to talk about this issue in substance. They did not want to hear any arguments, either from us or from other members of the Security Council or States Members of the United Nations. We oppose creating a new area in the Council's work that would establish a generic, automatic connection between climate change and international security, turning a scientific and socioeconomic issue into a politicized question.

The provisions of the draft resolution integrating such a connection as “a central component into comprehensive conflict-prevention strategies of the United Nations” (*S/2021/990, para. 2*) and into the mandates of peacekeeping and political missions could bring with it a whole range of consequences.

First, positioning climate change as a threat to international security diverts the attention of the

Council from genuine, deep-rooted causes of conflict in the countries on the Council's agenda. This is convenient for those countries that are actively helping these conflicts to erupt or that have undertaken military activity as a diversion from the Security Council mandate, or simply do not want to provide the countries in need with the necessary practical help in the area of development.

That having been said, the lamentable position of many of the most vulnerable States, from a climate perspective, is a direct consequence of previous colonial policies from Western donors. I would tell them directly how well they have devised this idea of blaming greenhouse-gas emissions, and the Sun and the Moon as well, and of suggesting that the responsibility lies with developing countries themselves. They have not, however, managed to convince us of that today.

We also note that our Western partners, who are presenting climate change as a source of political instability, prefer not to draw attention in the Council to the other side of their arguments, namely, the negative consequences of conflict and their impact on the environment. The loss of biodiversity, deforestation, the effect of chemical substances and soil pollution as the result of military activity and intervention in the domestic affairs of States require measures to restore the environment over decades and hardly contribute to the fight against climate change. We stand ready to actively draw the Council's attention to the issue.

Secondly, the instability of specific countries and regions is owing to a range of specific reasons that can differ from each other in their makeup and scale. The draft resolution is not aimed at helping countries or work on any specific situation. Instead, it takes a general approach to climate, contrary to the principles of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. We have drawn the attention of those who wish to shift the blame. It is clear what they are trying to do.

I will address myself specifically to those countries that, following the examples of the blame-shifters, have come to believe that such a one-sided approach — assessing everything through the climate lens — might in some way be effective. I should like to cite Pushkin, our famous poet, who wrote better than many on the subject of love. In one of his poems,

he writes, "Ah, it is easy to deceive me!/I long to be deceived myself!"

It is completely possible that many of the countries in need that are awaiting help from donors entertain fanciful notions concerning their potential saviours. In that regard, it is difficult to offer any advice other than that they turn to history, which, unfortunately, illustrates that donors rarely respond in kind to any favourable good intentions. However, we accuse no one and are even quite understanding. Many countries simply do not have a choice when donors impose a certain viewpoint on them. Besides, it is always easier to blindly follow than it is to work out the subtleties of this or that issue.

Returning to attempts to create an entire range of mandates for political experts on climate, I will explain in detail why that is unacceptable. It is implied that peacekeepers are qualified to assess the impact of climate change on specific locations after undergoing some sort of training within a short period of time. It is also suggested that the results of that dubious analysis — the impact of climate change on peace and security — are presented to the Council in reports of the Secretary-General. The quality of such analyses and especially their conclusions would be questionable, to say the least.

Furthermore, such an approach would be a ticking time bomb. Its purpose would be to have a way to include virtually any country on the Security Council's agenda if it is deemed to be undesirable by someone. It would be easy to find a pretext, as the whole world feels the impact of climate change. Real climate change research should really be the prerogative of climate and weather experts. Such analytical work requires the appropriate training of experts, technical equipment and a great deal of time.

Members will agree that giving political workers the task of rapidly drawing conclusions that could lead to intervention in the domestic affairs of States is simpler than strengthen monitoring and early warning systems to respond to natural disasters in developing countries without any political agenda, especially than actually providing the funds that were promised for those purposes.

Thirdly, the fight against climate change and adaptation to its negative consequences are a question of sustainable development. The connection between climate and socioeconomic challenges in one form

or another, was supported by the absolute majority of countries whose representatives have spoken during specialized open debates that have recently been organized by the Niger presidency of the Security Council, but which more closely resembled meetings of the Second Committee and the Economic and Social Council. For that reason, the substantive work should be carried out within expert forums, the main one of which is the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

It is particularly sad to see the attempt to force the adoption of the draft resolution when there is currently a clear lack of consensus among the members of the Security Council, as countries have a hard time agreeing on how to implement the Paris Agreement, as we saw in Glasgow, and on truly needed measures to fight climate change. The climate agenda should provide a unifying role to ensure success in carrying out individual and joint activities, not to sow discord, particularly for political ends.

You know, Sir, that there is no consensus on the draft resolution that has been put to the vote. You have received a number of letters from delegations — both members and non-members of the Security Council. Dissent was also expressed earlier, during the aforementioned open debate on the subject. We call on you not to sow discord within the Security Council on such an important subject. It is the presidency's responsibility to push towards effective decisions instead of sowing discord.

In so saying, we are not just rejecting this; instead of this one-sided approach, we are proposing an alternative, guided by a comprehensive approach that takes different countries and regions into account. We have been impressed by the number of States that have expressed deep concern about the issues facing the Sahel. Let us look at our alternative draft resolution. As has already been said, that region is being held hostage to a complex range of not only climate challenges, but also social, economic and political threats that are exacerbated by terrorism and must be looked at holistically, while considering the specific circumstances of the region. If we really want to ensure that the United Nations and its Security Council will help, then we must be guided by that approach now and in the future.

The President (*spoke in French*): I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Estonia, France, Ireland, Kenya, Mexico, Niger, Norway, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam

Against:

India, Russian Federation

Abstaining:

China

The President (*spoke in French*): The draft resolution received 12 votes in favour, 2 against and 1 abstention. The draft resolution has not been adopted, owing to the negative vote of one permanent member of the Council.

I now give the floor to those members of the Council who wish to make statements after the voting.

Ms. Byrne Nason (Ireland): Ireland is deeply disappointed that the Security Council has failed to adopt draft resolution S/2021/990, on climate and security. We regret the decision of certain countries to use their right of veto to block the adoption of this groundbreaking draft resolution. We believed that the weight of evidence and clarity of argument would bring the Council to a consensus.

However, despite months of consultations — I underline that, months of consultations — and the strong support of the majority of United Nations Member States, that was sadly, not the case. Today could have represented a point of inflection. Today should have represented a point of inflection. Today was an opportunity for the Council to recognize for the first time the reality of the world that we are living in and that climate change is compounding insecurity and increasing instability. That is a real and present threat to the maintenance of international peace and security. We could have met our responsibility to accept this reality in our work.

Adopting the draft resolution would have been a modest first step, enabling the Council and the Secretariat to understand more clearly the impact of climate-related security risks, start asking the right questions and seek to identify answers. Instead, we have missed the opportunity for action and we look away from the realities of the world we are living in.

Ireland's view is clear: the veto is an anachronism. We regret the use of the veto in all circumstances and we very much regret its use today. The fact that the majority of the United Nations membership — 113 countries — co-sponsored the draft resolution that the Council has now rejected is telling. Today is another reminder — as though we needed one — that the Security Council sorely needs reform.

Ireland, with our co-penholder, the Niger, did not set out on the process thinking we would see a veto. We believed that the weight of evidence would bring the Council to consensus. We worked tirelessly to deliver on that. Sadly, despite months of discussion, we did not achieve the result that we and 113 other United Nations Member States wanted to see.

We continue to believe that bringing forward the draft resolution was the right thing to do. Discussions on the topic have been ongoing for 14 years, but today is the first time a thematic draft resolution has been tabled for adoption. Today was the first opportunity for the Council to show the international community that it is ready to take on its responsibilities.

As we have worked with partner countries both inside and outside the Council in the past year, we have become more convinced than ever that the United Nations must understand and take action on the security implications of climate change. The support of the 113 United Nations Member States that co-sponsored the draft resolution demonstrates the expectation among the majority of United Nations Member States that the Security Council should factor the security risks of climate change into its decision-making processes.

Through the processes that brought us to this point today, we have consolidated support at the United Nations and can galvanize work to focus on the issue in the future. For our part, we remain undaunted.

Despite the result today, let us be clear: climate change is already firmly on the Security Council's agenda. The Council has recognized its impacts on peace and security in a number of country-specific and regional contexts. The Council can and must continue to build on that to ensure that climate-related security risks are addressed as part of the Council's work.

Ireland will continue to press for a strong and robust approach to climate and security across the entire Council agenda.

The President (*spoke in French*): I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of the Niger.

Due to its responsibility to safeguard international peace and security, the Security Council is obligated to consider all situations that have or could potentially have an impact on global security. Resolution 2535 (2020), which was adopted by the Council at the initiative of France and Tunisia, constitutes a clear example in that regard.

For the 113 countries that sponsored draft resolution S/2021/990, on the impacts of climate change on conflict situations, a link clearly exists in the sense that climate degradation serves to exacerbate security challenges, especially in the Sahel and Lake Chad basin regions. For landlocked countries, their very existence as geographical entities is at stake. That is a fact and the reality. The force of the veto can block the adoption of a text, but it cannot hide that reality — the truth.

During the high-level debate on the issue held on 9 December in the Council (see S/PV.8923), some were unwise enough to call us short-sighted. On the contrary, we can see very clearly. We have never considered situations of insecurity exclusively in terms of the impacts of climate change, nor have we minimized the role of those forums already comprehensively addressing the issue. However, no one can prevent us from stating that climate change is an exacerbating factor among the root causes of insecurity, because we live that reality every day. That is why we insist upon it.

Some have claimed that including the impacts of climate change on security on the Council's agenda is irrelevant, given that other structures are already addressing the issue. In that case, why did the Council adopt resolutions related to the coronavirus disease pandemic while the World Health Organization exists and is more than capable? Those who did not support our initiative, which enjoys the broad consensus of Member States, are perhaps the short-sighted ones. We are fully aware that the opposition to change in which some indulge is the principal reason that keeps the Council from innovating.

To the rest of the membership, we are proud to have made our contribution to raising awareness on the issue, which has an impact not just on security but also on the future of our planet. It is up to those permanent members of the Security Council and those who will succeed us to make their own contribution.

I resume my functions as President of the Council.

Mr. Tirumurti (India): I take the floor to submit India's explanation of vote.

India is second to none when it comes to climate action and climate justice, but the Security Council is not the place to discuss either issue. In fact, the attempt to do so appears to be motivated by a desire to evade responsibility in the appropriate forum and divert the world's attention from an unwillingness to deliver where it counts.

In line with our tradition of living in harmony with nature, Prime Minister Modi announced, last month in Glasgow, an ambitious climate action vision in the form of five nectar elements, or *Panchamrit*.

First, India will take its non-fossil energy capacity to 500 gigawatts by 2030.

Secondly, India will meet 50 per cent of its energy requirements for renewable energy by 2030.

Thirdly, India will reduce its total projected carbon emissions by 1 billion tons from now until 2030.

Fourthly, by 2030, India will reduce the carbon intensity of its economy to less than 45 per cent.

Fifthly, by the year 2070, India will achieve the target of net-zero emissions.

India now ranks fourth in the world in installed renewable energy capacity. India's non-fossil fuel energy has increased by more than 25 per cent in the past seven years and has reached 40 per cent of its energy mix. Alongside that, India has also provided institutional solutions to build cooperation at the international level. We initiated the International Solar Alliance and the Coalition for Disaster-Resilient Infrastructure. Those are noteworthy initiatives that will make a real difference.

The world is also developing awareness that lifestyle change plays a critical role and my Prime Minister has called for the principle of lifestyle for environment as a mass movement.

Today, India may be moving forward on the subject of climate change with great courage and high ambition, but India also understands the challenges of fellow developing countries, which it shares fully, and will continue to voice their concerns and expectations. The international community, particularly the developing and the least developed countries and

small island developing States, have striven, for the past two decades under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) process, to make common but differentiated responsibilities a basic principle of global climate action. That is at the heart of climate justice.

To move forward decisively, affordable access to climate finance and technologies has become critical. Developed countries must provide climate financing of \$1 trillion at the earliest. It is necessary that climate finance be tracked with the same diligence as climate mitigation. The reality is that developed countries have fallen well short of their promises. It is particularly important to recognize that because today's attempt to link climate with security really seeks to obfuscate the lack of progress on critical issues under the UNFCCC.

We are also concerned by the manner in which this issue has been brought before the Security Council. Over the past nearly three decades, all Member States have negotiated collectively and with consensus an elaborate equitable architecture to combat every aspect of climate change. In arriving at far-reaching consensual decisions, we tried to accommodate each other's interests and specific national circumstances. That comprehensive process has, in fact, been carried out under the United Nations-led UNFCCC, with the participation of all Member States. In turn, the UNFCCC has been informed by members' priorities. It addresses both the immediate needs of developing countries and the commitments of developed countries. It seeks a balance among mitigation, adaptation, financing, technology transfer, capacity-building, et cetera. In effect, it takes a holistic view of combating climate change that is equitable and fair.

We therefore need to ask ourselves what it is that we can collectively do under draft resolution S/2021/990 that we cannot achieve under the UNFCCC process. Why is it that one needs a Security Council resolution to take action on climate change when we have commitments, made under the UNFCCC, to concrete climate action? The honest answer is that there is no real requirement for this draft resolution except for the purpose of bringing climate change under the ambit of the Security Council. The reason for that is so that decisions can be taken without the involvement of most developing countries and without recognizing consensus. All that can be done in the name of preserving international peace and security.

Let us therefore be clear about the issues today. Decisions regarding climate change are sought to be taken out of the wider international community represented at the UNFCCC and given instead to the Security Council. Ironically, many of the Security Council members are the main contributors to climate change due to historical emissions. If the Security Council takes over the responsibility for this issue, a few States will have a free hand in deciding on all climate-related issues. That is clearly neither desirable nor acceptable.

We recognize the fact that climate change has impacted the lives of many people and may even have exacerbated conflicts in the Sahel and other parts of Africa. India remains committed to peace, security and development in Africa and the Sahel region, both bilaterally and within the United Nations. Many projects in those geographical areas testify to our sincerity. However, viewing conflicts through the prism of climate change is misleading. The oversimplification of causes of conflict will not help to resolve them; worse, it can be misleading. That is the reason that India supported a draft resolution focusing exclusively on the Sahel, but that was not considered by the sponsors for reasons best known to them.

Today's draft resolution attempts to undermine the hard-won consensus that we reached in Glasgow. This draft resolution will only sow the seeds of discord among the larger United Nations membership. It sends the wrong message to developing countries that, instead of addressing their concerns and holding developed countries responsible for meeting their commitments under the UNFCCC, we are willing to be divided and sidetracked under the guise of security. This draft resolution is a step backwards from our collective resolve to combat climate change. It seeks to hand over that responsibility to an organ that does not work through consensus or reflect the interests of developing countries. India had no option but to vote against it.

In conclusion, let me state that there should be no confusion about our determination to combat climate change. We will always support genuine climate action and serious climate justice. We will always speak up for the interests of the developing world, including Africa and the Sahel region, and we will do that in the right place — the UNFCCC.

Ms. Juul (Norway): Norway deeply regrets that draft resolution S/2021/990, on climate and security,

was not adopted today. We remain steadfast that the adverse effects of climate change matter to conflict and peace and that they should therefore also matter to the Security Council. Climate change is not a problem of the future. It is here now and it affects every region in the world.

At last week's open debate (see S/PV.8923), we heard first-hand accounts of the many different ways in which climate change manifests itself on the ground. There were urgent calls for the Security Council to consider its various impacts on peace and security and recommend ways to prevent and manage climate risks.

It has been 10 years since the Security Council first acknowledged climate change as an emerging risk factor for global peace and security. In that time, United Nations peace missions have found themselves operating in increasingly complex environments, where non-traditional threats, such as climate change, must be factored in. The Council needs a better understanding of the potential effects of climate pressures and shocks on such efforts to build and sustain peace for the sake of preparedness, resilience and the protection of civilians, as well as the ability of its missions to operate.

Let me also reiterate that the climate security agenda is, at its heart, a preventive agenda. Including climate risk in analyses and responses can only enhance our peacebuilding and peacekeeping efforts. The aim is to climate-proof conflict prevention and peace and security efforts, not to take on the task of other United Nations bodies.

A thematic resolution on climate and security would have helped to guide the Security Council's work. While disappointed by today's result, we will continue to work with all Council members on improving both our understanding of and approaches to climate-related security risks.

Mr. Nebenzia (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We sincerely regret that your presidency, Sir, has been overshadowed by the division that we warned about. But we need to move forward.

I reiterate that, as a responsible member of the United Nations and its Security Council, the Russian Federation, together with India and China, does not share the approach imposed by Western States, which has already led a large number of States that are awaiting assistance to believe in it.

The sponsors of draft resolution S/2021/990 speak of 113 countries supporting the draft resolution. What about the 80 countries that did not support the draft resolution? Many colleagues have criticized maintaining the veto in the Security Council, saying that we have seen yet another example of its abuse by Russia, which ignored the opinion of 113 States. I will provide another interpretation of what happened.

The international community is deeply divided on climate issues. We saw that in Glasgow, but at that time the need to achieve a consensus forced our Western colleagues to behave democratically and consider the positions of all countries. Now we see an anti-democratic attempt to ignore the opinion of those 80 Member States that did not support the draft text and to impose on them the position of climate activists. That would be a very divisive action, which would result in a setback in combating climate change. Only our negative vote was able to stop this process, which is insurance against this kind of scenario. This is the best indication of the fact that the veto is a key piece of insurance for our work and similar unacceptable scenarios.

Furthermore, it became even clearer that the domination of the Security Council by Western countries, in trying to evade responsibility for their own actions by using the climate as a cover, is an anachronism. In our discussions of Security Council reform, we must strengthen the voice of developing countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America, and not the collective West, to correct this course, but we are seeking a solution with a comprehensive approach and that does not indulge attempts to shift the blame.

We recognize the fact that there are a range of different interconnected problems: climate change, natural disasters, poverty, weak local authorities and terrorism. Those are a very heavy burden for some countries and regions and each situation is unique. As was shown by the open debate on 9 December (S/PV.8923), the international community is focused on all the real concerns about the Sahel. The Council needs to work in other regions as well. In line with that approach, Russia, together with China and India, proposed a draft resolution on assistance for the Sahel region. Our draft resolution, unlike that of the Niger and Ireland, includes the whole panoply of problems that the region faces and is aimed at mobilizing international efforts, including financing, to provide multilateral assistance to those who need it.

We are ready for a substantive and constructive working relationship with all members of the Council.

Dame Barbara Woodward (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom, too, regrets the outcome of the voting on draft resolution S/2021/990.

For more than 75 years, across thousands of resolutions, the Security Council has sought to address the greatest challenges to international peace and security. It is clear that climate change is such a challenge. In the past few years, the political consensus has caught up with the scientific consensus that climate change is caused by human activity and the burning of fossil fuels and that those changes have a direct impact on peace and security.

Member States on the forefront of climate change, like those in the Sahel, where temperatures are rising 50 per cent faster than global averages, are acutely aware of this. They know we do not have the luxury of time. Small island developing States, where sea levels are rising faster than global averages, know we do not have the luxury of time. Mountain States, whose glaciers are melting, know we do not have the luxury of time.

At the twenty-sixth Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, we saw that countries can work together to take decisive action. And today, well over 100 Member States, including many developing countries, as well as countries outside the Security Council, sponsored this draft resolution.

We welcome steps taken by all Council members and Member States to combat climate change, but actions must follow words. The Security Council can play its part. More frequent reporting on the links between climate and security would be a good start.

Climate change is a threat to us all. The consequences of inaction will be catastrophic. We must act now. We must all act now. We must all act now. The United Kingdom therefore strongly supported this draft resolution and will continue to support further action across the United Nations, including in the Security Council, to combat climate change.

Mr. Kimani (Kenya): We thank you, Mr. President, as a co-penholder, and Ireland for your efforts to bring draft resolution S/2021/990 to the floor and to the wider United Nations membership for its co-sponsoring of the draft resolution.

Kenya is disappointed at the use of a veto. We believe that the importance of this measure can still enjoy progress on the basis of consensus. We are ready for further efforts in this regard and shall engage on the draft resolution submitted by the Russian delegation.

Kenya voted in favour of draft resolution S/2021/990, but did not co-sponsor it, not because it did not support its aim, but because it is profoundly convinced of the importance of taking just action on climate change. We had hoped for and advocated consensus. Our reticence on moving forward without consensus came from understanding that there is a profound risk in the adoption of the draft resolution without that broad-based agreement.

In the coming years, the effort that has been undertaken by the co-penholders, and perhaps by the Russian Federation, will be built on, and it is crucial that further efforts make sure that its course is correct, as I shall explain. For the record, we want to be clear on Kenya's reasoning.

We listened carefully to the draft resolution's detractors. Even while disagreeing with some of their points, we saw that there were important arguments that they were making that could have been included. In addition, we sought consensus because it has been the primary mode of decision-making in regard to climate change action. It underpins the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change.

At the twenty-sixth Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC in Glasgow, our need to embrace consensus meant that we, as part of Africa, had to swallow a bitter pill, as previous commitments on climate change action were reversed. In Glasgow, previous commitments made by countries whose economies have been the primary cause of climate change were dialled back. Dangerous obstacles to energy access and development were put in the path of developing countries that are suffering most disproportionately from climate change. If only the outcome in Glasgow had been voted on, but it was not. Where was the commitment to climate finance and to the development path of developing countries in Glasgow?

In Glasgow, we embraced consensus and agreed to an outcome that while deeply dissatisfying, at least kept the process alive. It must be said that the reversals in Glasgow were supported by some of the very members of the Security Council that are today the strongest

supporters of the draft resolution. It leaves us now to wonder what has changed between Glasgow and the Security Council Chamber. What is it that they hope will be achieved on climate change in the Security Council beyond the UNFCCC? What commitment can they now proclaim with such strength in New York that they could not in Glasgow?

We must also recall the Security Council's consistent resistance to taking ambitious action to enable United Nations support for African missions to effectively respond to escalating terrorism threat in regions, such as the Sahel. On the one hand, you have resistance to just climate change action, on the other, to bold action against terrorism. Yet there is a seeming enthusiasm for a draft resolution that combines climate change and security. If climate change is indeed the code red for humankind, as the Secretary-General put it — and as it certainly is in the shorter term to members such as small island developing States — it is clear that it will be a fundamental challenge to peace and security. We hope that future work on this issue will focus as much on the countries impacted by climate change as those with the leading responsibility in causing it.

As the Council seeks to undertake actions to resolve wars escalated or even caused by the effects of climate change, we call on it to have the moral courage to also deal with the major emitters. We look forward to the Security Council reforms that may one day ensure that countries disproportionately affected by climate change are represented by permanent or veto-wielding members.

Kenya will continue to champion advancing the climate and security nexus. As next year's co-Chair of the Informal Expert Group on Climate and Security, our delegation will do all it can to enable discussions that embrace balance, consensus and ambition. We will also advocate for this issue to enjoy a more comprehensive science-policy interface in the work by the United Nations Environment Programme and related bodies, in the hope that it enjoys a consensus that enables clear commitments and actions. We now encourage the delegations that have professed the importance of this issue to once again re-engage on other proposals that have been put forward or, indeed, put forward further proposals, which the Kenyan delegation will be happy to consider on the basis of consensus.

Mr. Pham (Viet Nam): Viet Nam thanks Ireland and the Niger for the important draft resolution

(S/2021/990) that the Security Council just voted on. Had it been adopted, it would have provided a framework for the Council's consideration of, and response to, the security implications of climate change on issues on its agenda. It would also have allowed the Council to integrate climate-related security risks in conflict prevention, peacekeeping, peacebuilding, post-conflict reconstruction and humanitarian efforts. It could have been a major step forward for the international community, including the Security Council, to take concrete actions on an issue of great concern and urgency for humankind and the countries, communities, groups and peoples vulnerable to climate-related security risks.

Viet Nam is among the countries most vulnerable to the adverse impacts of climate change, including sea-level rise. Combating climate change has consistently been our priority during and prior to our term on the Security Council, and it will continue to be so beyond our term in the Council and within other international forums in the framework of comprehensive efforts to support strong and meaningful climate action. We concur that the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change remains the primary and inclusive forum for negotiating climate action.

However, a matter of such multifaceted significance requires urgency and the enhanced efforts of each and every country in the whole Organization, including with regard to the security dimension. It therefore does not exclude the role of the Security Council as the primary organ in charge of the maintenance of international peace and security. The Council must tackle the security challenges of climate change, including through its most effective tool of early warning systems and preventive diplomacy. That is essential if we are to effectively and proactively address this defining challenge of our time.

That is why Viet Nam voted in favour of the draft resolution. We commend Ireland and the Niger for their efforts in engaging with all 15 Council members and presenting a carefully drafted text. We deeply regret that the Security Council could not reach consensus on such a significant matter at this pivotal moment. The unity of the Council would have contributed to a more system-wide coherent response to the adverse impacts of climate change, including security-related aspects, which are crucial to ensuring sustainable peace in situations on the Council's agenda.

Although consensus did not prevail on this thematic draft resolution today, given the urgency of these critical issues, we believe that all Council members should commit to ongoing discussion, cooperation and engagement in order to reach consensus. On many occasions, the Security Council has demonstrated its solidarity, unity and agility in taking collective actions in the face of global challenges. Let it not fail the expectations of the international community and its people.

To that end, we will continue to be actively involved in all constructive activities and initiatives to advance this agenda in the spirit of consensus, solidarity and mutual understanding. There are concrete measures that the Council and the United Nations wider membership at large can undertake to bolster effective climate action.

Mrs. Thomas-Greenfield (United States of America): I thank the delegations of the Niger and Ireland for their efforts to advance this critical issue.

By vetoing this draft resolution (S/2021/990), Russia has stopped the world's most important organ from maintaining international peace and security from taking a small, practical and necessary step to combat the impacts of climate change.

The climate crisis is a security crisis — one of the most pressing of our time. It is a threat to every person in every nation on every continent. That is why combating the climate crisis is a top priority of our Administration. As Secretary-General Guterres put it: either we stop it — or it stops us. We categorically reject the notion that Security Council action undermines the Paris Agreement on Climate Change and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). In fact, it does exactly the opposite. The Security Council can and should complement support and reinforce our collective work under the Paris Agreement and the UNFCCC in ways that are necessary to fight the security threat. Only the Security Council can ensure that the security impacts of climate change are integrated into the critical work of conflict prevention and mitigation, peacekeeping, peacebuilding, disaster-reduction and humanitarian response.

Specifically, this text would have been a modest but meaningful move forward on those goals. It provided the Council with practical, actionable steps to equip the States Members of the United Nations and numerous United Nations bodies, including peacekeeping

missions and special political missions, with tools to better address the security implications of our changing climate.

That is why we are dismayed that Russia blocked the Council from taking this important step to combat the consequences of the climate crisis. Given the enormity of the challenge, adopting this draft resolution was the very least we could do. Today, the veto of this resolution has let the world down, and there is no justification for taking that action.

Nevertheless, I want to recognize that a majority of Council members voted in favour of today's draft resolution. A clear majority of Member States endorse Security Council action on this issue. The fact that more than 113 countries co-sponsored the draft resolution signals the overwhelming support for the text within the United Nations membership.

Russia may have blocked this draft resolution, but our global movement cannot be stopped. The momentum will only build from here. I therefore once again thank all the members that supported the draft resolution and the many that co-sponsored it. Their support reaffirms that we must address the climate crisis and its impact on peace and security. And we will do it together, despite efforts by some to stop us.

Mr. Zhang Jun (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation abstained from voting on the draft resolution contained in document S/2021/990 on climate and security, submitted by Ireland and the Niger. I would like to explain China's voting position as follows.

First, China has always attached great importance to tackling climate change, actively participated in relevant international cooperation efforts and played a responsible and constructive role. We have made important contributions to the conclusion, entry into force and follow-up implementation of the Paris Agreement. At a time when the Paris Agreement encountered serious setbacks, China did not change its mind and unswervingly acted as an activist to implement the Agreement. China has also taken practical measures within the framework of South-South cooperation to do its very best to help other countries cope with the challenges of climate change. On the issue of climate change, China will do its utmost to fulfil all the commitments it has made. China has always taken a positive attitude towards anything that

is conducive to global environmental governance and to developing countries.

Secondly, climate change is a by-product of humankind's pattern of unsustainable development since the industrial revolution. Only in the process of green transformation and sustainable development can this problem be fundamentally addressed. Climate change has the potential to affect peace and security, but the nexus between climate and security is very complex.

It is relatively clear that compared with the microconcept of climate change, environmental degradation, droughts and floods, food shortages and unfair distribution of resources are the most concrete and direct factors that may lead to tensions and conflicts. In contrast, the transmission mechanism from climate change to security risks is far from clear. The analysis of drivers of climate factors on security risks must be put into two specific contexts before it is possible to draw a conclusion of any practical significance.

We will not avoid serious discussion of this issue, while efforts must be made to avoid securitization of climate issues by those who arbitrarily believe that climate change is their only human security challenge or the main challenge. That is not a scientific attitude. It is not good either for international cooperation in addressing climate change nor for effective conflict resolution. On the contrary, it may actually water down attention to the core issues, and it may actually have a negative impact.

Thirdly, the most important way to deal with the impact of climate change is to significantly reduce greenhouse-gas emissions until net zero is achieved. In this regard, the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities is an unshakable cornerstone. No matter which platform and from which angle the climate issue is discussed and dealt with, it cannot deviate from this basic principle. Developing countries, especially African and small island countries, are faced with special difficulties and situations brought about by climate change. And developed countries have the responsibility to help them strengthen capacity-building and enhance their economic and social resilience.

The draft resolution did not address any of these important issues. Obviously, the discussion of this fundamental dimension has not been pursued, and this is not fair. We feel that it is concerning that, if we continue on this path, developed countries will have new excuses not to take up their historical responsibilities

and not honour their commitments. In addition, the African Union Peace and Security Council adopted a communiqué on 9 March 2021, setting out specific propositions on the common expectations of African countries on climate and security issues. Unfortunately, these were not fully reflected in the draft resolution.

Fourthly, the judgment of the value of the Council's actions on the climate issue does not depend on how big a step we take or how loud we talk about it, but on the practical significance of our efforts. What we need is not more written reports, but measures to provide real help to regions and countries in conflict. At present, what developing countries are most concerned about, which Secretary-General Guterres has repeatedly stressed, is that developed countries earnestly implement their commitments in the areas of climate, finance, technology transfer and capacity-building.

What the Security Council needs to do is not a political show. If some countries are really paying good attention to climate change, then they should support the Council to use its unique authority to establish a monitoring mechanism and help developed countries fulfil their obligations and ensure that their commitments are honoured.

If the Secretary-General is to be asked to take action, then he should appoint a new special envoy to oversee climate finance and promote technology transfer. Commitments should not be only words. This is the most pressing, most important issue right now.

It is not true that the Security Council is not doing anything on climate change. The fact of the matter is the Security Council has already dealt with climate issues in the context of a number of country-specific matters on the Council's agenda. We advocate that the Council continue on this path and deal with climate issues from the perspective of peace and security.

On the basis of accurately grasping the mechanism of climate-driven security risks, we need to study targeted responses. Climate change has had a serious impact on the Sahel region, and countries in the region are looking for practical help from the international community. China, Russia and India have jointly submitted a draft resolution focusing on security issues in the Sahel region, including climate-change challenges, the aim of which is to effectively respond to the specific concerns of the countries in the Sahel region. We hope that members of the Council will constructively participate in the consultations on this

draft resolution. We also hope that those present and those who are not present, namely, members of the General Assembly, will co-sponsor this draft resolution. Just like the response to global challenges, the handling of climate issues needs greater cooperation but certainly not confrontation.

Mr. De la Fuente Ramírez (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*) We thank Ireland and the Niger for their work as authors of the draft resolution contained in document S/2021/990, in particular for having presented a reasonable draft, showing flexibility on several of its provisions and addressing most of the concerns expressed throughout the consultations, including those of my country.

However, despite that, the draft resolution was blocked, thereby giving us an opportunity to recall that, since the establishment of this Organization in 1945, Mexico has disagreed with the inappropriately named so-called right of veto, predicting that it could lead to paralysis in the Security Council. That does not promote dialogue or debate — on the contrary, it hinders it.

The draft resolution before us responds to a pressing threat to the international community today, as we were able to see less than a week ago in the open debate held on the issue in this Chamber (see S/PV.8923). The draft also recognizes the central nature of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and focuses on the comprehensive analyses entrusted to the Security Council for taking action.

For all of those reasons, Mexico regrets the fact that the draft resolution has not been adopted, despite enjoying the support of 12 of the 15 members of the Security Council and the co-sponsorship of 113 States Members of the United Nations.

Mr. Ben Lagha (Tunisia) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, I would like to thank Ireland and the Niger for tabling draft resolution S/2021/990, on which the Council has just voted. I would like also to reiterate our gratitude to them for their efforts to advance the adoption of the draft resolution.

My delegation regrets the fact that the Council was unable to adopt the draft resolution today. Once again, it is unfortunate that the Council could not speak with one voice on such an inclusive issue pertaining to collective security.

My country's delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution, based on our conviction that climate change

is one of the factors affecting international peace and security in many regions, including the Sahel. The Security Council must therefore take those threats into consideration in an integrated and systematic manner as it shoulders the primary responsibility for maintaining peace and security.

During its term on the Council, my country has sought to include unconventional threats, such as climate change and pandemics, on the Council's agenda. That is because we are convinced that those phenomena pose a threat to collective security and therefore should not be overlooked by the Security Council.

Since peace and security are interlinked with many factors, it is necessary to take an evolving approach as we address those factors that fuel conflicts and violence. We hope that we can continue to work within and outside the Informal Expert Group on Climate and Security to reach a consensus on the active role to be played by the Council in addressing climate threats. We stress the need for that to be done with unity of the Council, consensus and distribution of roles in complementarity with other United Nations organs and bodies.

Mr. Lipand (Estonia): Estonia voted in favour of draft resolution S/2021/990, presented today by Ireland and the Niger, and co-sponsored by a clear majority of the United Nations membership because the effects of climate change pose a clear and serious threat to international peace and security, to stability and, in some cases, even to the existence of States. We firmly believe that the United Nations Security Council has

a critical role to play in responding to climate-related security risks. Therefore, the outcome of today's vote is disappointing.

The draft resolution presented would have ensured a more structured and systemic approach and created the necessary tools to enable the United Nations to do its part in preventing and resolving conflicts that are driven by the effects of climate change. We know that there is no credible answer from those Council members that have chosen to ignore those challenges that pose a threat to international peace and security, which is the Security Council's primary responsibility.

By adopting the draft resolution, the Security Council would have sent a strong message to thousands of Pacific islanders from across the Blue Pacific who have been repeatedly saying that climate change is the most persistent and gravest threat to peace and security in their region. We would also have shown all others most vulnerable to the effects of climate change that their voices are being heard.

While Estonia's term as an elected member of the Security Council will soon come to an end, we reiterate the importance of keeping this most important topic on the Security Council's agenda and weigh on the conscience of other current and incoming members to continue to do so.

The President (*spoke in French*): There are no more names inscribed on the list of speakers.

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.