



UN Special Rapporteur on human rights and the environment
Thematic Engagement, Special Procedures and Right to Development Division
UNOG-OHCHR
CH-1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland

June 27, 2019

Distinguished Special Rapporteur:

Our Children's Trust writes to draw the attention of the Special Rapporteur on human rights and the environment ("Special Rapporteur") to the substantive obligations of states under international human rights law to ensure the protection of human rights in the context of a warming climate. Children disproportionately suffer from the dangers and catastrophic impacts of global climate change. In light of children's particular vulnerabilities to climate change impacts, the substantive obligations necessary to preserve the human right to a safe climate should be linked directly to *temperature and atmospheric greenhouse gas concentration standards based on the best available science*. These standards would provide a clear benchmark to states and businesses for the protection of human rights in a climate change-affected world. According to the best available science, these standards should be *no higher than 1°C above pre-industrial temperatures and 350 parts per million ("ppm") CO₂* to ensure that young people and future generations have access to a safe climate and can realize all the human rights that a safe climate underpins.

This submission is structured as follows. First, the submission contextualizes the human rights implications of climate change through the experiences of four adolescents, who are plaintiffs in the ongoing *Juliana v. United States* litigation in the United States of America ("U.S.").¹ Second, the submission justifies the need for a scientific, as opposed to political, standard for human rights-compliant climate change mitigation. Third, the submission sets out the actions necessary to align concentrations of atmospheric carbon with the 350 ppm standard and thereby prevent, reduce, and eliminate the adverse impacts of climate change.

I. Climate Change Adversely Impacts Children and Adolescents in the United States

The effects of global climate change implicate an array of human rights recognized under international human rights law. State action and inaction has resulted in dangerous levels of

¹ *Juliana v. United States*, No. 6:15-cv-01517-TC (D. Or., 2015).

greenhouse gas (“GHG”) emissions, which have in turn caused and contributed to: (1) widespread food and water shortages; (2) more frequent and intense extreme weather events; (3) increased rates of disease; and (4) loss of access to a safe and secure community structure.

Harms from climate change impact all aspects of a child’s life, and children are especially and disproportionately vulnerable to many of these climate change impacts.² Specific rights implicated by climate change impacts include those to self-determination,³ life,⁴ health,⁵ water,⁶ means of subsistence,⁷ adequate standard of living,⁸ adequate housing,⁹ culture,¹⁰ property,¹¹ education,¹² parental rights,¹³ and freedom from exploitation.¹⁴ A more comprehensive list of environmental consequences of climate change, associated human impacts, and implicated human rights under international human rights law is provided in **Table 1**.

In the *Juliana v. United States* (“*Juliana*”) lawsuit, 21 young plaintiffs have alleged that the affirmative actions of the U.S. government have caused climate change and have violated children’s rights to life, liberty, and property; as well as failed to protect essential public trust resources.¹⁵ The injuries alleged by the *Juliana* plaintiffs correspond to the aforementioned human rights protected under international human rights law. The injuries of four of the plaintiffs, as set out in their declarations submitted to the court, are described below.¹⁶

Alex Loznak

Alex is 22 years old and was raised on his family’s 570-acre farm along the banks of the Umpqua River in Kellogg, Oregon. The financial security of Alex and his family depends on the continued productivity of their farm, which produces harvests of hazelnuts, plums, and timber.¹⁷

² See, e.g., World Health Organization, *Quantitative risk assessment of the effects of climate change on selected causes of death, 2030s and 2050s* (2014), available at: <https://www.who.int/globalchange/publications/quantitative-risk-assessment/en/> (last visited Jun. 25, 2019).

³ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights art. 1, Dec. 19, 1966, 999 U.N.T.S. 171. International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights art. 1, Dec. 16, 1966, 993 U.N.T.S. 3.

⁴ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights art. 6. Convention on the Rights of the Child art. 24, Sept. 2, 1990, 1577 U.N.T.S. 3.

⁵ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights art. 12. Convention on the Rights of the Child art. 24.

⁶ The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women art. 14, Dec. 18, 1979, 1249 U.N.T.S. 13. Convention on the Rights of the Child art. 24.

⁷ International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights art. 1.

⁸ International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights art. 12. Convention on the Rights of the Child art. 27.

⁹ International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights art. 12.

¹⁰ International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights art. 27. Convention on the Rights of the Child arts. 30, 31. Declaration on Rights of Indigenous People, arts. 11, 25, Oct. 2, 2007, U.N. Doc. A/RES/61/295.

¹¹ Universal Declaration of Human Rights art. 17, Dec. 10, 1948, U.N. Doc. A/810 at 71.

¹² International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights art. 13; Convention on the Rights of the Child art. 28.

¹³ Convention on the Rights of the Child arts. 7, 9.

¹⁴ Convention on the Rights of the Child arts. 34, 36, 37.

¹⁵ See *Juliana v. United States*, 217 F.Supp.3d 1224, 1233 (D. Or., 2016).

¹⁶ Citations are to the 2019 Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals docket for the *Juliana* case.

¹⁷ Declaration of Alexander Loznak in Support of Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgement, *Juliana v. United States*, No. 18-36802 (9th Cir., 2018), Doc. 115 at pp. 181-182 (¶¶ 10-13).

According to Alex, “climate change [...] adversely impacts the farm’s productivity,” as periods of extended drought and record-breaking heatwaves diminish the viability of future harvests and “threaten[his] financial survival.”¹⁸ Increased temperatures make timber susceptible to infestation by dangerous pests, and an extended wildfire season increases the vulnerability to the destruction of property.¹⁹ These adverse climate change impacts threaten Alex’s rights to self-determination (ICCPR; ICESCR, 1), property (UDHR, 17), and means of subsistence (ICESCR, 1).

Journey Mani Wanji Itacan Zephier

Journey is 19 years old and of Yankton Sioux descent. He resides on the island of Kaua’i, Hawai’i. Increasingly erratic and extreme weather patterns on the island have provoked periods of severe flooding, which has had a devastating impact on local infrastructure and the integrity of Journey’s home.²⁰ In 2012, intense flooding displaced Journey and his family from their home, forcing them into emergency shelter and causing Journey to miss a week of school.²¹ Erosion of coastal areas has diminished the productivity of agricultural lands and severely reduced the availability of freshwater supplies.²² Rising ocean temperatures have altered weather patterns and “increased the probability and severity of bigger storms”, exposing Journey to greater risk in the immediate future.²³ Collectively, the impacts of climate change threaten Journey’s rights to an adequate standard of living (ICESCR, 12; CRC, 27), adequate and secure housing (ICESCR, 12), water (CEDAW, 14; CRC, 24), and education (ICESCR, 13).

Isaac V.

Isaac is 16 years old and lives in Beaverton, Oregon. Isaac was diagnosed with asthma as an infant and his asthma attacks are triggered by pollution from dust and smoke, which makes him particularly vulnerable to the risks of an extended wildfire season provoked by extreme temperatures and drought.²⁴ On August 22, 2015, Isaac suffered a severe asthma attack, which was triggered by “wild fires happening in the Columbia River Gorge.”²⁵ Isaac states that his asthma “will continue to worsen as air quality becomes more polluted from dust and smoke from wildfires,” and continues that “it is very depressing and scary to know that [he] will have another severe attack” provoked by smoke from wildfires.²⁶ The effects of climate change have impacted Isaac’s right to health (ICESCR, 12; CRC, 24) and life (ICCPR, 6; CRC, 6).

Jaime B.

¹⁸ *Id.* at p. 182 (¶ 13).

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ Declaration of Journey Z. in Support of Plaintiffs’ Urgent Motion for Preliminary Injunction, *Juliana v. United States*, No. 18-36802 (9th Cir., 2018), Doc. 21-7 at p. 6 (¶ 15).

²¹ *Id.* at p. 6 (¶ 14).

²² *Id.* at pp. 9-10 (¶¶ 23-24).

²³ *Id.* at pp. 8-9 (¶ 20).

²⁴ Declaration of Isaac V. in Support of Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgement, *Juliana v. United States*, No. 18-36802 (9th Cir., 2018), Doc. 115 at pp. 160-161 (¶ 3).

²⁵ *Id.* at p. 161 (¶ 5).

²⁶ *Id.* at p. 161 (¶ 6).

Jaime is 17 years old and is a Diné (Navajo) person of Window Rock, Arizona. As a member of the Navajo nation, Jaime has a profound cultural and spiritual connection to the land on which she was raised, and that on which her ancestors have lived for generations.²⁷ However, due to extreme heat, extended drought, and a scarcity of potable water, Jamie’s cultural homeland has become uninhabitable, and she and her family were forced to flee and resettle to the urban center of Flagstaff. According to Jaime, “climate impacts [...] are already harming my ability, as well as the ability of my family and my tribe, to participate in traditional ceremonies”, and therefore threaten the survival of indigenous cultural practices.²⁸ Jaime expressed fear for her future and for the future of her family, and their traditions, dignity, and way of life.²⁹ The effects of global climate change have directly endangered her protected right to culture (ICCPR, 27; CRC, 30, 31; DRIP, 11, 25).

II. To Ensure a Safe Climate, States Must Abide by the Best-Available Science

Given that “urgent, effective and ambitious action” to ensure a safe climate is essential to protecting an array of human rights threatened by the impacts of climate change, states have an obligation to pursue scientific rather than political targets for climate change mitigation. The best available climate science provides a prescription for climate recovery that requires states to collectively decrease atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂) levels to below 350 ppm by 2100 and stabilize the long-term average global temperature increase at no higher than 1 degree Celsius (°C).³⁰ The Special Rapporteur should utilize this clear scientific prescription as the standard that states must achieve in order to uphold their legal obligations under international human rights law.

In contrast, the emission reduction pledges (“Nationally Determined Contributions” or “NDCs”) made by states pursuant to the Paris Climate Agreement, if achieved, would result in GHG emissions increasing through 2030 and would cause catastrophic climate warming of between 2.7 °C and 3.5 °C.³¹ Even the aspirational 1.5°C or “well below” 2°C benchmarks cited in Article 2 the Paris Agreement—which are commonly associated with atmospheric CO₂ concentrations of 425 ppm and 450 ppm, respectively—have not been nor are presently considered safe or scientifically-sound targets for present or future generations. The 2°C figure, for instance, was originally adopted in the political arena “from a set of heuristics” has retained this

²⁷ Declaration of Jaime B. in Support of Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgement, *Juliana v. United States*, No. 18-36802 (9th Cir., 2018), Doc. 115 at pp. 139-140 (¶¶ 2-4).

²⁸ *Id.* at p. 141 (¶ 12).

²⁹ *Id.* at p. 46 (¶ 33).

³⁰ Our Children’s Trust, *Government Climate and Energy Actions, Plans, and Policies Must Be Based on a Maximum Target of 350 ppm Atmospheric CO₂ and 1°C by 2100 to Protect Young People and Future Generations*, available at <https://www.ourchildrenstrust.org/s/20190411OCTWhy350Final.pdf> (last visited June 24, 2019).

³¹ Louise Jeffrey et al., *2.7°C is Not Enough—We Can Get Lower*, Climate Action Tracker Update (Dec. 8, 2015), available at <http://climateactiontracker.org/news/253/Climate-pledges-will-bring-2.7C-of-warming-potential-for-more-action.html> (last visited Aug. 10, 2016); Climate Interactive, *Climate Scoreboard: UN Climate Pledge Analysis*, available at <https://www.climateinteractive.org/programs/scoreboard/> (last visited Nov. 7, 2016).

predominantly political character ever since.³² In light of the IPCC's findings in its 1.5°C Special Report, as well as the mounting evidence leading to publication that 2°C is catastrophic relative to lower, achievable levels of warming, the international community has all-but-abandoned 2°C as a credible policy goal.³³

Additionally, from the standpoint of human rights law, state compliance with political targets such as those outlined in the Paris Agreement should not be deemed to constitute compliance with international human rights obligations in the area of climate change. While states have some discretion in setting environmental standards for the protection of human rights, such standards should be “consistent with all relevant international environmental, health and safety standards,” and “should take into account the best available science.”³⁴ Although there is a wealth of case law applying international environmental, health and safety standards in the area of environmental human rights,³⁵ in none of these cases did the state's actions meet or exceed purported domestic and international environmental, health and/or safety standards. Rather, the state's actions either did not comply with international standards (resulting in the court finding a human rights violation), or the applicant failed to provide evidence of non-compliance.³⁶ Nor should the doctrine of systemic integration lead to equating compliance with the Paris Agreement with compliance with human rights.³⁷ The doctrine of systemic integration is not universally applicable,³⁸ and is not appropriately-applied to the context of climate change. This is because parties to the UNFCCC rejected from the outset the idea that the UNFCCC would be systemically-integrated with or supersede more general, pre-existing international obligations.³⁹

³² Randalls, S. *History of the 2°C Temperature Target*. 1. WIREs Climate Change 598, 603 (2010); Jaeger, C. and J. Jaeger, *Three views of two degrees*. 11(Suppl 1) Regional Environmental Change S15 (2011).

³³ Roy, J., et al., *Sustainable Development, Poverty Eradication and Reducing Inequalities*. In *Global Warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty* at 447 (2018) (“Warming of 1.5°C is not considered ‘safe’ for most nations, communities, ecosystems and sectors and poses significant risks to natural and human systems as compared to the current warming of 1°C (*high confidence*).”).

³⁴ Report of the Special Rapporteur on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, Jan. 24, 2018, U.N. Doc. A/HRC/37/59 at 14.

³⁵ See, e.g., *Fadeyeva v. Russia*, n. 55723/00 (ECHR 2005), ¶69; *Borysiewicz v. Poland*, no. 71146/01 (ECHR 2008), ¶¶52-53; *Arrêt Tătar c. Roumanie*, no. 67021/01 (ECHR 2009), ¶¶93-97; *Kámok Kásek Indigenous Community v. Paraguay*, No. 214 (IACHR 2010).

³⁶ See, e.g., *Borysiewicz v. Poland*, no. 71146/01 (ECHR 2008), ¶ 53.

³⁷ Cf. Annalisa Savaresi, *Climate Change and Human Rights*. In *Routledge Handbook of Human Rights and Climate Governance* (2018, Routledge) 31.

³⁸ *Id.* 34.

³⁹ See Roda Verheyen, *Climate Change Damage and International Law* (2005, Martinus Nijhoff) 145 (“In sum, nothing in the negotiation history or the structure of the existing treaties [i.e. the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol] indicates that the rules of the regime are *lex specialis* vis à vis other rules of international law. This applies both to the level of primary rules and the levels of legal consequences for breach (secondary rules).”); Patricia Birnie et al., *International Law & the Environment* (OUP, 2009) 371 fn. 187 (“The governments of Nauru, Tuvalu, Kiribati, Fiji, and Papua-New Guinea made declaration on signature or ratifications stating that the Convention [i.e. UNFCCC] did not constitute a renunciation of any rights under international law concerning state responsibility for adverse effects of climate change or a derogation from the principles of general international law.”).

As a result, while state GHG emissions mitigation actions that fail to comply with the Paris Agreement’s temperature goals are irrefutably a violation of the right to a safe climate, it does *not* follow—and the relevant jurisprudence does not suggest—that state actions that merely comply with these temperature goals are sufficient to protect the right to a safe climate. As set out above, the best available science indicates that *even 1.5°C of warming above pre-industrial temperatures for any significant amount of time jeopardizes the right to a safe climate for future generations*. Consequently, more ambitious mitigation efforts are needed than those encompassed by the Paris Agreement.

III. Necessary State Actions to Reduce CO₂ levels to 350 ppm and Mitigate Adverse Effects of Climate Change on Human Rights

There is a small window of opportunity for states to fulfill their legal obligations by taking the urgent science-based action needed to protect human rights and mitigate the catastrophic effects of climate change. The process to reduce CO₂ levels to 350 ppm by the end of the century is twofold. First, CO₂ emissions must be reduced as deeply and rapidly as possible. Carbon dioxide emission reductions of approximately 80% by 2030 and close to 100% by 2050 are necessary to keep long-term warming to 1°C and the atmospheric CO₂ concentration to 350 ppm. To achieve these reductions, states must *immediately* cease actions supporting industries that extract, process, transport and burn fossil fuels, such as oil, gas, and coal, and must implement comprehensive climate recovery plans, programs, and policies to rapidly reduce GHG emissions in line with this trajectory.⁴⁰ Emission reduction targets that seek to reduce CO₂ emissions by 80% by 2050 are consistent with long-term warming of 2°C and an atmospheric CO₂ concentration of 450 ppm, which would result in catastrophic and irreversible impacts for the climate system and oceans.

Second, these actions to reduce emissions on the prescribed trajectory must be coupled with programs to sequester or “drawdown” excess CO₂ already in the atmosphere through natural sequestration projects, such as reforestation and improved agricultural and forestry practices.⁴¹ It

⁴⁰ James Hansen et al., *Assessing “Dangerous Climate Change”: Required Reduction of Carbon Emissions to Protect Young People, Future Generations and Nature*, 8(12) PLOS ONE 81648, 10 [hereinafter *Assessing “Dangerous Climate Change”*] (“Halting emissions in 2015 causes CO₂ to decline to 350 ppm at century’s end A 20 year [sic] delay in halting emissions has CO₂ returning to 350 ppm at about 2300. With a 40 year [sic] delay, CO₂ does not return to 350 ppm until after 3000.”). For an outline of an approach for states to take to successfully reduce emissions, see Mark Jacobson et al., *100% Clean and Renewable Wind, Water, and Sunlight All-Sector Energy Roadmaps for 139 Countries of the World*, 1 JOULE 108 (2017); Mark Jacobson et al., *Matching demand with supply at low cost in 139 countries among 20 world regions with 100% intermittent wind, water, and sunlight (WWS) for all purposes*, 123 *Renewable Energy* 236 (2018).

⁴¹ Hansen et al., *Assessing “Dangerous Climate Change,”* at 10; World Agroforestry Centre, *Credits where credit’s due: a guide to community-level carbon forestry project development* (2014); I. A. Janssens et al., *The Carbon Budget of Terrestrial Ecosystems at Country-Scale—a European Case Study*, 2 *Biogeosciences* 15, 23-25 (2005); Robert Lal, *Soil Carbon Sequestration Impacts on Global Climate Change and Food Security*, 304 *Science* 1623, 1623-1626 (2004); Rodale Institute, *Regenerative Organic Agriculture and Climate Change: A Down-to-Earth Solution to Global Warming*, available at <http://rodaleinstitute.org/assets/WhitePaper.pdf> (last visited Dec. 6, 2016); Bronson Griscom et al., *Natural climate solutions*, 114(44) *U.S. Proceedings Nat’l Acad. Sci.* 11645, 11648.

is important to emphasize that the 350 ppm target cannot be accomplished without this significant drawdown of atmospheric carbon and that such a drawdown is distinct from reducing emissions. *Both* CO₂ emissions reductions *and* substantial CO₂ drawdown are required to restore climate stability.

Research in the United States suggest that this transformation is both technologically available and economically feasible. Recent research by Deep Decarbonization Pathways Project and Evolved Energy Research produced sophisticated modeling demonstrating the feasibility of a near-complete phase out of fossil fuels in the United States by 2050.⁴² The authors describe six different technologically-feasible pathways to quickly and drastically cut reliance on fossil fuels and achieve the requisite level of emissions reductions in the United States while meeting forecasted energy needs.⁴³ All of the 350 ppm pathways rely on four pillars of action: (1) investment in energy efficiency; (2) electrification of everything that can be electrified; (3) shifting to very low-carbon and primarily renewable electricity generation; and (4) carbon dioxide capture as fossil fuels are rapidly phased out.⁴⁴ The six scenarios are used to evaluate the ability to achieve a 350 ppm-consistent transition even absent one key technology. Such a transition can and must be implemented in a way that respects, promotes, and upholds human rights.

The study also concludes that the cost of the energy system transition is affordable. The total cost of supplying and using energy in the United States in 2016 was about 5.6% of GDP.⁴⁵ A transition from fossil fuels to low carbon energy sources is expected to increase those costs by no more than an additional 2-3% of GDP. Even with this small and temporary added expense, the cost would still be well below the 9.5% of GDP spent on the U.S. energy system in 2009 (not to mention well below the harm to the economy caused by climate change).

IV. Conclusion

In the thematic report to the Human Rights Council, we respectfully urge the Special Rapporteur to address the substantive obligations related to the right to a safe climate in light of

⁴² Ben Haley et al., *350 ppm pathways for the United States* (2019), available at <https://www.ourchildrenstrust.org/350-ppm-pathways> (last visited Jun. 26, 2019).

⁴³ Unlike some other modelling of low emissions pathways, the *350 ppm pathways for the United States* report assumes the same level of U.S. economic growth and increased consumption of “energy services” as the baseline projections provided by the U.S. Energy Information Administration, which project demand to increase out to 2050. *Id.* 52. The choice of this assumption in the report should not be taken as an endorsement by the report’s authors or Our Children’s Trust of the desirability of increasing U.S. energy services demand in the context of a warming climate, particularly in light of the United States’ disproportionate share of historical cumulative CO₂ emissions. Were U.S. energy services demand to decrease in the future, the level of emissions reductions modelled in the report could be achieved more easily and rapidly.

⁴⁴ The use of CO₂ capture in some of the modelled scenarios should be considered a function of the increasing energy services demand assumption described in footnote 42. It should be emphasized that CO₂ capture is deployed in the modelling in conjunction with an extremely rapid phase-out of fossil fuels and therefore is in no sense enabling continued fossil fuel use. *Id.* 63.

⁴⁵ *Id.*, Figure 9.

the particular circumstances and vulnerabilities of children and adolescents. In particular, we call on the Special Rapporteur to recognize that (1) the best available science is clear that a climate beyond 1°C of warming above pre-industrial temperatures and 350 ppm CO₂ is not safe; and (2) as a consequence, marrying international political commitments to human rights standards risks depriving future generations of the safe climate those standards are supposed to secure. State action to reduce harmful GHG emissions and sequester atmospheric carbon as rapidly as is feasible is therefore the only way to ensure that young people and future generations have access to a safe climate and can realize all the human rights that a safe climate underpins. If requested, Our Children's Trust is happy to provide further information regarding this submission.

Table 1: Substantive Rights Threatened by Adverse Impacts of Climate Change

CLIMATE IMPACTS	HUMAN IMPACTS	RIGHTS THREATENED
<p style="text-align: center;">Glacier Melt & Sea Level Rise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding • Storm surges • Erosion • Salinization of land and water • Species extinction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of agricultural land and beaches • Damage to coastal infrastructure, homes, and property • Population displacement • Social disruption, civil unrest, and exploitation • Threat to economy, culture, and tourism • Drowning and injury • Lack of clean water • Increased disease and psychological distress • Disruption of educational services • Loss of biological diversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-determination [ICCPR; ICESCR, 1] • Life [ICCPR, 6; CRC, 6] • Health [ICESCR, 12; CRC, 24] • Water [CEDAW, 14; CRC, 24] • Means of subsistence [ICESCR, 1] • Adequate standard of living [ICESCR, 12; CRC, 27] • Adequate housing [ICESCR, 12] • Culture [ICCPR, 27; CRC, 30, 31] • Property [UDHR, 17] • Education [ICESCR, 13; CRC, 28] • Parental [CRC, 7, 9] • Freedom from exploitation [CRC, 34, 36, 37]
<p style="text-align: center;">Ocean Warming & Acidification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coral bleaching • Fisheries decline • Species extinction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food shortages and civil unrest • Threat to economy, culture, and tourism • Loss of biological diversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life [ICCPR, 6; CRC, 6] • Means of subsistence [ICESCR, 1] • Adequate standard of living [ICESCR, 12; CRC, 27]
<p style="text-align: center;">Temperature Increase, Changes in Precipitation, & Extreme Weather</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heat Waves • Droughts • Wildfire • Flooding • Higher intensity storms • Storm surges • Species extinction • Change in disease vectors • Increased allergens 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population displacement • Food and water shortages • Social disruption, civil unrest, and exploitation • Damage to infrastructure, homes, and property • Damage to agricultural lands • Threat to economy, culture, and tourism • Contamination of water supply • Delays in medical treatment • Outbreak and increased spread of disease • Increased respiratory illnesses and mortality rates • Increased psychological distress • Disruption of educational services • Loss of biological diversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life [ICCPR, 6; CRC, 6] • Health [ICESCR, 12; CRC, 24] • Water [CEDAW, 14; CRC, 24] • Means of subsistence [ICESCR, 1] • Adequate standard of living [ICESCR, 12; CRC, 27] • Adequate and secure housing [ICESCR, 12] • Education [ICESCR, 13] • Property [UDHR, 17] • Education [ICESCR, 13; CRC, 28] • Parental [CRC, 7, 9] • Freedom from exploitation [CRC, 34, 36, 37]