



FIAN
INTERNATIONAL



Human Rights Council, 51st session
Interactive Dialogue with the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee - Item 5
29 September 2022

Thank you Mr. President.

The Center for International Environmental Law, FIAN International and Earthjustice would like to share some concerns regarding the Advisory Committee's study on "impact of new technologies for climate protection on the enjoyment of human rights", which is currently being drafted.

With reference to the process that the Advisory Committee has followed, we regretted to see that no consultations were conducted with Indigenous Peoples' organizations. The informal meeting that took place ahead of the 28th session of the Committee and was organized by CIEL and a partner organization with very few Indigenous Peoples' experts (not representatives of organizations) cannot be considered a consultation. We are concerned that it has been misguidedly referred to as an event with Indigenous Peoples representatives in the resolution 28/1 adopted by the HRC Advisory Committee at its last session, despite very explicit directives from these experts stressing that they only joined this conversation on an informal basis and should not be considered as representatives from their peoples.

Due to patterns of environmental injustices and to the perpetuation of colonial extractivism, Indigenous Peoples and their lands are often on the frontlines of geoengineering experiments and projects, along with peasants and other rural communities. Thus, in order to adequately inform the Advisory Committee's study regarding human rights risks associated with geoengineering, it is essential that meaningful consultations be conducted with a wide range of Indigenous Peoples organizations and rural communities, and that these consultations take place sufficiently early in the process to provide a meaningful opportunity for these inputs to be duly taken into account in the drafting of the Advisory Committee's report.

More broadly, it is crucial that the Advisory Committee proactively seek inputs from a wide number of other actors - including States, HRC Special Procedures, and UN scientific bodies - before sharing any draft study.

We thank the Advisory Committee for sharing the outline of their study. We however have serious concerns about the approach that the Committee appears to be taking vis-à-vis high risk new and unproven technologies. The term used by the Advisory Committee for its report is not "geoengineering" (a well-established term agreed with consensus in the Convention on Biological Diversity), but "new technologies for climate protection", which is deliberately vague. The outline as it currently stands appears to be very biased, as it assumes that geoengineering will happen and will have benefits. In light of the Committee's mandate, the report needs to demonstrate an objective analysis of the profound, large-scale, foreseeable and irreversible human rights impacts of geoengineering research, testing and potential deployment.

Thank you.