



Quaker United Nations Office

13 Avenue du Mervelet
CH-1209 Geneva, Switzerland

Tel +41 (22) 748-4800

Fax +41 (22) 748-4819

Submission to the Article 6.4 Supervisory Body

Grounding meaningful engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities with the latest scientific findings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Sixth Assessment Report (AR6).

Submission by The Friends World Committee for Consultation (FWCC)

November 2023

The Friends World Committee for Consultation (FWCC), Quakers, offers this submission to the Article 6.4 Supervisory Board to ground meaningful engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) AR6 Summary findings, approved by States in 2021, 2022, and 2023.

FWCC is an accredited observer of both the UNFCCC and IPCC, as well as an expert reviewer of IPCC Reports.

In addition to FWCC expertise, we have collated findings directly referenced from the IPCC AR6 Reports. We hope that this collation will help guide the Supervisory Board to ground its work in the best available scientific research, strengthening efforts to establish meaningful engagement with Indigenous Peoples and local communities. This is critical to avert exacerbating existing structural inequities, especially when considering land-based carbon credits in areas of Indigenous land tenure or where land tenure is insecure. In this submission, we highlight IPCC findings that not only emphasize the risks associated with failing to engage meaningfully with Indigenous Peoples and local communities but also offer approaches to minimize such risks through monitoring and reporting; capacity-building; or incorporating Indigenous knowledges and human rights-based approaches. Below are our responses to questions set by the 6.4 Supervisory Board.

RESPONSES TO SET QUESTIONS:

1. What are the **current or anticipated challenges** Indigenous Peoples and local communities face in engaging with the Article 6.4 mechanism?

Indigenous Peoples and local communities may face challenges engaging both with the 6.4 mechanism Supervisory Body as well as in the potential activities of the 6.4 mechanism. Related to the former, the 6.4 mechanism Supervisory Body does not have a space for Indigenous Peoples or local communities, see below, and is not an inclusive space given the limited opportunities for meaningful engagement with the Body. Related to the latter, 6.4 mechanism activities have the potential to impact Indigenous Peoples and local communities, especially related to land tenure and mal-process. Indigenous Peoples and local communities possess critical knowledge and solutions for better climate action and respecting the rights of Indigenous Peoples, including their right to free, prior and informed consent, and human rights is critical for all 6.4 mechanism activities.

Land Tenure:

“AFOLU carbon sequestration and GHG emission reduction options have both co-benefits and risks in terms of biodiversity and ecosystem conservation, food and water security, wood supply, livelihoods and land tenure and land-use rights of Indigenous Peoples, local communities and small land owners. Many options have co-benefits but those that compete for land and land-based resources can pose risks. The scale of benefit or risk largely depends on the type of activity undertaken, deployment strategy (e.g., scale, method), and context (e.g., soil, biome, climate, food system, land ownership) that vary geographically and over time. **Risks can be avoided when AFOLU mitigation is pursued in response to the needs and perspectives of multiple stakeholders to achieve outcomes that maximize co-benefits while limiting trade-offs.**”¹

Role in healthy land management:

“Indigenous Peoples, private forest owners, local farmers and communities manage a significant share of global forests and agricultural land and **play a central role in land-based** mitigation options. Scaling successful policies and measures relies on governance that emphasises integrated land-use planning and management framed by SDGs, with support for implementation (*high confidence*).”²

Mal-process leading to abuse:

“Afforestation or production of biomass crops for BECCS or biochar, when poorly implemented, can have **adverse socio-economic and environmental impacts, including on biodiversity, food and water security, local livelihoods and on the rights of Indigenous**

¹ IPCC, 2022: Summary for Policymakers. In: *Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA, p. 33, https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGIII_FullReport.pdf

² Ibid., 34.

Peoples, especially if implemented at large scales and where land tenure is insecure (*high confidence*).”³

“**Maladaptation especially affects marginalised and vulnerable groups adversely (e.g., Indigenous Peoples, ethnic minorities, low-income households, informal settlements)**, reinforcing and entrenching existing inequities. Adaptation planning and implementation that do not consider adverse outcomes for different groups can lead to maladaptation, increasing exposure to risks, marginalising people from certain socioeconomic or livelihood groups, and exacerbating inequity.”⁴

Maximising synergies:

“Maximising synergies and avoiding trade-offs pose particular challenges for developing countries, vulnerable populations, and Indigenous Peoples with limited institutional, technological and financial capacity, and with constrained social, human, and economic capital. Trade-offs can be evaluated and minimised by giving emphasis to capacity building, finance, governance, technology transfer, investments, and development and social equity considerations **with meaningful participation of Indigenous Peoples and vulnerable populations**.”⁵

“**Enhanced monitoring, reporting and verification capacity, and the rule of law**, are crucial for land-based mitigation in combination with policies also recognising interactions with wider ecosystem services, could enable engagement by a wider array of actors, including private businesses, NGOs, and Indigenous Peoples and local communities. (*medium confidence*).”⁶

“**Equitable partnerships** between local and municipal governments, the private sector, Indigenous Peoples, local communities, and civil society can, including through international cooperation, advance climate resilient development by addressing structural inequalities, insufficient financial resources, cross-city risks and the integration of Indigenous knowledge and local knowledge (*high confidence*).”⁷

“**Effective and equitable climate governance** builds on engagement with civil society actors, political actors, businesses, youth, labour, media, Indigenous Peoples and local communities (*medium confidence*).”⁸

³ Ibid., 36.

⁴ IPCC, 2022: Summary for Policymakers. In: *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, NY, USA, p. 27, https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg2/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGII_SummaryForPolicymakers.pdf

⁵ IPCC, 2022: Summary for Policymakers. In: *Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change*. p. 40, https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGIII_FullReport.pdf

⁶ Ibid., 34.

⁷ IPCC, 2022: Summary for Policymakers. In: *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability*. , p. 32, https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg2/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGII_SummaryForPolicymakers.pdf.

⁸ IPCC, 2022: Summary for Policymakers. In: *Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change*. p. 45, https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGIII_FullReport.pdf

“**Engaging Indigenous Peoples and local communities using just-transition and rights-based decision-making approaches**, implemented through collective and participatory decision-making processes has enabled deeper ambition and accelerated action in different ways, and at all scales, depending on national circumstances (*medium confidence*).”⁹

“Adaptation and mitigation actions, across scales, sectors and regions, that **prioritise equity, climate justice, rights-based approaches, social justice and inclusivity**, lead to more sustainable outcomes, reduce trade-offs, support transformative change and advance climate resilient development (*high confidence*).”¹⁰

“**The extent to which** civil society actors, political actors, businesses, youth, labour, media, Indigenous Peoples, and local communities are engaged influences political support for climate change mitigation and eventual policy outcomes.”¹¹

2. What **mode of communication** could facilitate better dialogue between the Supervisory Body and Indigenous communities?

The most effective mode of communication to facilitate better dialogue is to ensure representatives of the Indigenous Peoples’ and Local Communities constituencies are members of the Supervisory Body. Representatives must be determined by the constituencies themselves. This could be coordinated through the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform, LCIPP.

Additionally, the Supervisory Body could facilitate better dialogue by producing documents in languages other than English, providing documents significantly more in advance of their meetings and give more than a week for the submission of comments and inputs, and facilitate participation in the meetings of the Supervisory Body (i.e. providing financial support for participants to attend, having observers present in the meeting room, providing space for Indigenous communities to comment on topics being discussed beyond the limited 1 hour for engagement with observers).

3. How would you envision **meaningful long-term engagement and active participation from Indigenous Peoples and local communities** on the work of the Supervisory Body and the mechanism?

As above, we would envision meaningful long-term engagement and active participation when the Supervisory Body includes representatives from the Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities constituencies (determined by the constituencies themselves), of a membership level enabling an equal voice in decision making.

⁹ IPCC, 2023: Sections. In: *Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Core Writing Team, H. Lee and J. Romero (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, p. 52, https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/syr/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_SYR_FullVolume.pdf

¹⁰ Ibid., 101.

¹¹ IPCC, 2022: Summary for Policymakers. In: *Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change*. p. 46, https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGIII_FullReport.pdf

This is because Article 6.4 would be best served by those most aware of/closest to potential abuses to human rights and Indigenous Peoples Rights related to mal-implementation of Article 6.4 processes and those most aware of/closest to the most effective climate action.

Submitted by Anna Aguto and Lindsey Fielder Cook, The Human Impacts of Climate Change, Quaker United Nations Office Geneva and Friends World Committee for Consultation.

November 2023