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Abstract

Adaptation is a long-standing component of the climate policy agenda and becomes more relevant as climate change induced threats are increasing. The Paris Agreement presents a shift in the international climate regime, and incorporates adaptation as a fully independent subject, basing the policies on local needs and movements. Still, the Agreement faces critique, as the gap between decision-making level and individual level presents a lack of security and justice two dimensions, which incorporate the concerns for equality and effectiveness of adaptation actions.

The analysis of the PA through a combination of quantitative thematic textual analysis and qualitative content analysis highlighted the existing presence of security and justice dimensions in relation to adaptation; however, the presence of these dimensions does not come with the same level of impact, thus rendering them to be a rather minor consideration in global adaptation policy planning and implementation. Therefore, the gap between decision making level and affected level is an outcome of the lack of considerations regarding security and justice dimensions, which is an issue of wider GEG policy agenda, making one doubt the possibility of globally led individual-based adaptation approach which would serve for the well-being of individuals.

Word count: 12 094
Table of content

Abbreviations .................................................................................................................................... 4

1.Introduction ................................................................................................................................... 5

2.Literature review ......................................................................................................................... 8
   2.1.Environmental security ..................................................................................................... 8
   2.2.Justice ..................................................................................................................................... 12
   2.3.GEG .......................................................................................................................................... 15
      2.3.1.International environmental law ........................................................................ 17
   2.4.Summary ............................................................................................................................... 19

3.Methodology ................................................................................................................................ 21
   3.1.PA ............................................................................................................................................. 22
   3.2.Thematic textual analysis ............................................................................................... 23
   3.3.Qualitative content analysis........................................................................................... 25

4.Analysis .......................................................................................................................................... 26
   4.1.PA overview ......................................................................................................................... 27
   4.2.Direct presence and mentions ...................................................................................... 27
   4.3.Exploration of PA themes and indirect presence .................................................. 31
      4.3.1.NDCs and adaptation................................................................................................ 32
   4.4.COP24 in Katowice ............................................................................................................ 37

5.Conclusion ..................................................................................................................................... 40
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COP24</td>
<td>Conference of the Parties 2018 in Katowice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>Critical Security Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEG</td>
<td>Global Environmental Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDCs</td>
<td>Nationally Determined Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Paris Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGDss</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>The United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFCCC</td>
<td>The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

To say that environment issues and climate change are important to the field of International Relations is an understatement. Adaptation and mitigation strategies, debates and mechanisms are all developed at the international level. But so far the complexities of climate change make it difficult for international governance to control its impacts. Moreover, as climate change adaptation strategies and mechanisms are developed at the international scale, it is resulting in their saturation with the agency and structural problems of international politics and governance. This leads to the outcome that the effects of climate change will not be first experienced at the international scale but will instead affect the local level and individuals. Therefore, a certain paradox is created – the phenomena is felt at one level and the decision is made at another (Atkins and Sosa-Nune 2016:2). In the case of climate change adaptation this paradox can be especially felt through two points of view – security and justice. As the goal of adaptation is to ensure protection from environmental threats, it assumes a use of effective security practices. Justice, on the other hand, can be seen through two spectres – the opportunity of people at local level to be protected from environmental threats and the distribution of funds, based on the contributions to the climate and who are the most affected by it.

Previously, the international climate change regime established by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) stressed the importance of greenhouse gas emissions’ reductions. Thus, policy efforts were orientated towards designing laws and instruments to reduce emissions globally, but the effectiveness of this climate governance architecture has been contested, as it lacks context-dependent measures and overall detachment from impacts of other dimensions than environment (Biesbroek and Lesnikowski 2018:304).

Unlike mitigation, adaptation was considered to be further down the international agenda; an addition to the urgent issue of avoiding the problem in the first place. Even so, adaptation is a long-standing component of the climate policy agenda and becomes more relevant as climate change induced threats are increasing. As a result of the increasing need for adaptation practices to manage the climate change impacts, state and non-state actors have started to implement
adaptation in a self-organising fashion, which has led to creation of global adaptation practices.

The Paris Agreement presents a paradigmatic shift in the international climate regime, and incorporates adaptation as a fully independent subject, basing the policies on local needs and movements. Still, the Agreement faces similar critique as the whole global environmental agenda – need for context-dependence and lack of joint actions across the various sectors. Moreover, the separation of decision-making level and affected level brings out the issue of equality and effectiveness of such policy actions. The two dimensions – security and justice – which incorporate the concerns for equality and effectiveness of adaptation actions, should play an important part in shaping the Paris Agreement. To explore this notion, the research question goes as follows: how security and justice dimensions are taken account of in the Paris Agreement?

I approach this from critical perspective, focusing on the top-down approach of the Paris Agreement (PA) – the impact of security and justice dimensions on the global policy outcomes for individuals, comparing the discourse of the PA and its continuous implementation process to the critical ideas of individual-based approach to well-being.

The paper goes as follows. First, in the literature review I have examined the issue of climate change adaptation through the lenses of environmental security and justice and linked them to the agenda of global environmental governance (GEG), which is a foundation for the appearing themes and values in the PA. Critical perspectives stress the significance of even presence of all dimensions for healthy existence of individuals and communities, therefore focus on security and justice dimension can bring out the possible shortcomings in the PA.

The section on security focuses on the interconnectedness of social processes and the importance of acknowledging security as one of foundations for healthy functioning of society (Critical Security Studies). It argues for accepting the well-being of an individual as the starting point, from which global frameworks can be developed. Also, it argues against the overuse of economic dimension in relation to environmental and security issues, as it undermines the idea behind development.
The section on justice also accepts the well-being of an individual, which leads to abandoning the previous adaptation practices of ‘polluters pay’, thus avoiding the restrictions of the multicity of actors involved. Instead, state’s moral duties should lead the contributions of funding to adaptation, redirecting it to the communities worst-off.

The section on GEG gives an overview on the main themes in GEG agenda and unfolding historic development that has led to creation of the PA.

Lastly, literature review is finished by a comprehensive conceptual framework which concludes that top-down approach, which focuses on the well-being of individuals, starts with a globally represented institution or policy document, that would represent the contextual needs of various issues of adaptation process to secure the well-being of every individual. Context dependence and focus on individual implies that the aid is a right for those in need, boundaries of state cannot be decisive variable.

Methodology consists of two combined methodological approaches. Quantitative thematic textual analysis was used to create a unit of analysis in a form of key-words from discussed dimensions, number of which has been increased during the analysis, to determine the visible presence of these key-words in the PA.

Qualitative content analysis has been used to engage with the conceptual framework, thus comparing the content of the Agreement and the content of the implementation process with contemporary critical views on adaptation as a security and justice concern. Thus, more in-depth context for the obtained data from quantitative thematic textual analysis has been given and indirect presence of security and justice dimensions acknowledged.

The analysis part engages with the content of the PA and decisions made in the implementation process. By acknowledging the frequency of key-words and comparing their impact in the context of adaptation measures, it was concluded that aside from describing the issues in the PA by using language which contains security and justice related words, the security and justice dimensions do not have considerable influence over the policies and goals for ensuring safety not only to local level, but also state level. Second, the reappearing themes of adaptation vs mitigation and economic vs security dimension are explored, acknowledging the
impact and overlapping between them, which has led to considerable overinfluencing from mitigation and economic dimension respectively.

Finally, the conclusion summarizes the main findings, which indicate that while the security and justice dimensions play an important part in shaping the PA, they are not the driving force of adaptation. Moreover, although a comparison between the PA and latest decisions made on the implementation process has shown change, lack of security and justice dimensions indicates an issue in wider GEG adaptation policy agenda.

2. Literature review

I have built my literature review by linking the three key elements of security, justice and global environmental governance that are discussed by other scholars and that are connected to the issue of climate change adaptation. Thus I have discussed the interconnectedness of environmental security, following with the issue of managing just distribution of adaptation costs and concluding with a review on current global environmental governance and its agenda. Through this review I was able to set arguments for my conceptual framework which underlies the deeper connections and presence of security and justice dimensions. Also, it stresses a strengthened global response to adaptation process on a basis of security and justice dimensions as an alternative approach, due the fact that multi-factor interdependency is responsible for the uneven distribution of climate change threats within regions (Islam and Khan, 2018:314).

2.1. Environmental security

Climate change induced natural hazards are one of the most uncontrollable threats to environmental security. The latest research implies that each year for the past decade natural hazard-induced disasters have caused a total damage of about 13.1 billion U.S. dollars, killed more than 92 thousand people, and affected 223 million people (Khunwishit et al. 2018:44).
The discourse of environmental security emphasises the uneven global distribution of social vulnerability, highlighting societal groups and regions that will be asymmetrically affected by climate impacts. As the root cause of social vulnerability is a combination of complex social factors, including inequity, poverty, high crime rates, poor education and limited access to healthcare, climate change acts as an amplifier of these pre-existing conditions of social vulnerability. Therefore, adaptation is understood as a reduction of social vulnerability (Biesbroek and Lesnikowski 2018:305), which is dependent on a particular context of each community.

This observation of interconnectedness in relation to other dimensions of environmental issues has been used to argue for wide reach of security dimension and significance of security in adaptation process. Moreover, the interconnectedness helps to determine the concepts that are relevant, when discussing environmental security. Therefore, now I will discuss how various concepts are part of environmental security agenda, and how their usage impacts the adaptation discourse of policy documents.

Already mentioned vulnerability of climate change and disaster adaptation embody in itself more than being an outcome of socio-economic threats. Focusing on vulnerability from the security perspective gives the advantage to provide wider context for the causes of the vulnerability and thus deal with it accordingly with proper resilience building measures.

Resilience is closely related to adaptation where adaptation to the climate change induced threats is the actions taken to diminish the vulnerability and the adverse impacts of anticipated climate change on multiple levels, either on an individual, a population group or on a system level (Islam and Khan 2018:300). Therefore, the level of resilience describes a system’s ability to get back to a reference state after a disturbance or negative environmental impact.

But more importantly, high level of resilience implies the system’s capacity to withstand or absorb current and recurrent external shocks and threats; to maintain functions and structures despite the disorder (Islam and Khan 2018:300). Which implies planning a global long-term adaptation strategy with responsive context-based security measures.
However, this kind of strategy would imply discarding the traditional ‘problem-solving approach’ and, as scholars of Critical Security Studies have argued for, a study of security that seeks to undertake the problem of the very status quo (Peoples and Vaughan Williams 2014:32). In practice, such attempts illustrate the unfixed nature of security practices (Nyman 2018:124), making the context a main variable for security actions (Peoples and Vaughan Williams 2014:44). Unlike other critical approaches which also argue against traditional problem-solving, CSS has added focus on human emancipation (Peoples and Vaughan Williams 2014:35) which is irreplaceable when discussing adaptation, for it puts the well-being of every individual at the centre of attention and focus on equal respective contextual needs of these individuals.

Thus, security perspective should be a critical part of the content of the PA and should stress the importance of context dependence and how security dimensions reflects justice and socio-economic dimensions through deeper assumptions about the nature of politics (Peoples and Vaughan Williams 2014:34), if the PA represents an inclusive top-down adaptation policy for the benefit of individuals. However, the fact that various levels of actors do not engage in continuous communication, results in adaptation practiced at one level and the adaptation policies made at another (Atkins and Sosa-Nune 2016:2). As a consequence, adaptation measures are being planned based on limited community knowledge and expert engagement, without reliable future climate scenarios (Vij et al. 2019:572).

Not only local community’s security is at risk, but also the justice for individuals to be equally able to build resilience. But in many cases environmental issues are attached to discussions about economics, development and sustainability, mostly because environmental issues are overlapping and deeply connected to other dimensions of society (Biesbroek and Lesnîkowski 2018:307). But, without focusing on environment as a primary concern, these issues are used for political or economic gain rather than to protect the environment and people depending on it.

The economic gain is also one of the reasons adaptation has received less attention as a security issue but more as an economic issue. Even empirical evidence, supporting the re-focusing on environmental security as a primary
concern for basic necessity of human survival, is often viewed from an economic standpoint. Until now I have not mentioned the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) although their agenda allows us to perceive the globally acknowledged value based movements and are the UN’s cornerstone for improvement and inclusion, which means that the values presented in the SDGs can be found in the GEG agenda. While it is not my purpose to analyse the security and justice aspects in SDGs, it is useful to acknowledge the economic oversight on them to connect it to the trends in environmental security.

As Moore puts it, there is a problem with the conception of development, which currently implies focusing on and measuring the economic growth. Instead, he argues that a well-being of communities is not about wealth and gross domestic product, but ‘is about flourishing, the health of society, inclusive political institutions, a guarantee of human capital development and civil liberties’ (Moore 2015:803). And, while the SDGs are of enormous importance, the framework and restricted idea of development behind them gives insufficient recognition to the realisation that we need new theories of society and of social change (Moore 2015:803). Thus, the human well-being should stress the values, culture, and diverse forms of social innovation, reducing the dominance of economic dimension. Based on the current conception of development, for the purposes of this thesis when acknowledging the overlap of security and economic dimensions in the PA, it will be attributed mainly to the economic dimension.

Returning to the point of the significance of the security dimension in climate change adaptation, it plays a vital role in creation of proactive environmental agenda. A natural hazard, for example in a form of an approaching storm becomes a natural disaster if a community is vulnerable to its impact (Crnčević and Lovren 2018:107), therefore it is necessary to acknowledge the limitations of current security system and putting human at the centre as the referent object. Following the discourse of CSS, it would imply that due fighting for immediate survival, marginalized communities have not been able to ensure the existence of mechanisms that would allow them to have higher resilience facing increasing climate change induced threats and give capacity for required adaptation measures.
This could lead to a desire to securitize the adaptation process. Securitization implies cycle of labelling an issue as a security threat and the return to its normal position; moreover, securitization focuses on middle scale limited collectivities, e.g. states (Buzan et al. 1998: 36). While adaptation is and can be seen as a threat, it is also having an increased influence on everyday practices. Thus, adaptation threats are part of current socio-economic system and are part of mainstream discourse, embedded in practices, without a need to label it as a current threat. Also, adaptation affect multiple actors, therefore implying world-wide securitization on all levels would contradict the initial reason for bringing up an issue for increased attention.

Although CSS argues against the idea of providing universal, fixed response for climate change adaptation, universal, but flexible response to adaptation is in order by linking justice perspective to security dimension. Without engaging with adaptation practices as a united effort and establishing just distribution of funds across the globe, local security which would lead to well-being of individuals is hard to achieve. CSS, making normative claims on justice by accepting the material existence of individual human beings as a priority, already engages with these issues. Thus, adding more in-depth view on just global adaptation process provides the missing link to acquire universal, but flexible response. And, instead of focusing on the environmental security of socio-economic systems, we can identify threats and adaptation process to particular community. But there is a need for actors beyond the state in providing security (Nyman 2018:124), to secure every individual by global monitoring and distribution of funds, which currently is the UN.

2.2. Justice

Climate justice is concerned with the just distribution of benefits, rights, burdens and responsibilities associated with climate change, as well as the equal involvement of all actors in the effort to address the encountering challenges (Okereke 2018:321). Reflecting its historical core framing as an international problem as well as the dominant role of the United Nations (UN) and Framework
Convention on Climate Change (FCCC), the concern for justice is rooted in several kinds of asymmetries, related to contributions, impacts and participation. As arguments regarding distribution of adaptation funds show, these injustices have a deep impact on current adaptation policies.

Until recently, distribution of funds was based on historical responsibility and equal per capita emissions, but currently multiple of the arguments is seen to be flawed (Santos 2017, Risse 2012, Caney 2010), the most dire flaw being combining mitigation and adaptation practices. The Polluter Pays Principle (PPP), adopted by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) which says that states responsible for environmental damage should bear the cost of solving the problems and repairing the damage (OCDE 1992) and the Beneficiary Pays Principle (BPP), which suggests that the states that benefited from the activities that contributed to climate change should bear the costs of both mitigation and adaptation to compensate states affected by them (Santos 2017:3).

The most relevant objections to such principles is the multicity of actors involved, starting from the ones whose actions contribute to the climate change, ending with the ones experiencing the consequences. Corporations, for example, are not bound to moral duties, as states are. Moreover, determination of the causal contribution of each actors’ action to climate change and the assessment of its costs is quite speculative task (Caney 2010:217), and actors like corporations may not be held responsible due the fact that they have been closed.

Thus, it is not about finding the right way of shifting blame and demand retribution. While various practices, such as carbon pricing could help adapting through direct certain amount to the communities, it would still reinforce the idea of blame-shifting, thus being more useful when approaching mitigation than adaptation. Improving the situation and putting individual at the centre of attention gives a chance to look past the unpractical and stagnant attempts to achieve universally recognized principles of adaptation distribution costs.

For the just distribution of costs, I have drawn from the model of Risse, who argues that states have a duty to compensate those that have been harmed, with a priority to the poorest ones or the ones in most dire circumstances. Such compensation could include financial or technological aid (Risse 2012:204), which would go beyond a general duty of aid and be part of international obligations.
Note, that this argument does not establish a causal link between provider of harm and receiver of compensation. Instead, it suggests that all states are part of this distribution process and, depending on context, gives or receives aid.

Although Risse does not address the issue of multicity of actors involved, he refers to global distribution for individuals (207:2012), which is implying fixing the asymmetries of contributions, impacts and participation by equal representation and needs-based approach.

The reason for states to join global individual-oriented adaptation practices also lays on moral grounds, and as Broome suggests, there are two different types of moral duty: duties of goodness and duties of justice. He argues that our moral duties of justice in particular require us not to harm other people, thus duties of justice are extremely topical in a case of the emissions of greenhouse gas (Broome, 2014:50). However, the justice dimension of the climate change adaptation cannot be fully supported by this argument. First of all, there is no direct harm done in failing to participate in adaptation process through various means, i.e. there is no action which results in harm, rather it is the absence of action that can lead to harm. Second, as adaptation process partially comes as a consequence to the pollution of the greenhouse gas, it creates a problem in weighting the distribution of harm during the pollution period and adding it as another variable.

Third, the process of adaptation is highly context dependent from geographical location and to socio-economic structure, which results in uneven distribution of climate threats and need for external support. It reflects the need to understand how problems of fairness are implicated at local climate governance, with all the diversity that characterise such geographies, as well as rights-based approaches to climate justice, which focus on the links between adaptation actions and individuals’ rights to well-being (Okereke 2018:324).

Forth, a profit-driven environmental negligence from corporations, that can maneuver through domestic and international regulations. Thus, the moral duty of goodness needs to be included in the discussion as well, for it expands the boundaries of justice dimension and what principles should drive global governance to achieve equality.

However, connecting duties of justice and goodness is quite challenging, because there are no universal boundaries of goodness, or what it implies. If
justice can be presented as avoiding harm or compensate for harm done, then there is no drawn line for duties of goodness. From government and governance position there is also a clash between the duties of justice and goodness, according to Broome, when the sake of overall good is at stake (2014:64). This has led to the lack of initiative from states to sacrifice their industries and economies for reducing emissions, as well as distributing funds to foreign adaptation programs, for it is not in the interests of state and its citizens (utilitarian approach), at least not in the immediate economic interests. Since duty of goodness bears mostly on the state (Broome 2014:64), it is a responsibility of state system to ensure the goodness being adequately fulfilled.

But the participation in the international system needs to be just as well, to be able to express and receive through the individual moral duties of states. Otherwise, the lack of meaningful participation increases the possibility that adaptation policies may be ‘designed in ways that fail to address the interests of the poorest countries and, in doing so, exacerbate global inequalities’ (Okereke 2018:322), which is in direct contradiction to adaptation policies, including the PA.

2.3.GEG

Just as climate change adaptation and resilience building has expanded the reach of environmental security, the institutions and agencies has also expanded to handle the issue of climate change adaptation. However, the main emphasis for scholars seems to be limited to topics of formation, functioning, interplay, and effectiveness of environmental institutions (Boas et al. 2018:108), most notable being UN and its partner organizations, which from the methodological point of view are engaged mostly on a global issue areas or very specific case studies with minimal reflection in between. However, through a review of the wider South Asian adaptation literature and the analysis of fieldwork undertaken in rural Nepal, Ensor et al. argues that alternative epistemological starting points for adaptation practice are not only possible but essential for more effective response to climate change (2019:228).

Similarly to Clapp (2014) who seeks to fill the missing links by using critical political economy approaches within GEG literature to provide insights into the
dynamics of patterns of consumption, trade and finance, and the associated problems of injustice, using critical security study approaches can bring insight into the wider trends of contribution to the global warming, the rising cost of consequences and the vulnerability, and following injustice.

To provide deeper and more critical insight into the GEG, Boas et al. (2018) gives an example of how the approaches of critical political economy within GEG light upon the issues of inequality and injustice through the patterns of consumption and wider dynamics of trade and finance. The core idea of this example is that global system is managing the unsustainable production from which all of the everyday environmental problems arise (Boas et al. 2018:108). This ‘everyday environmental problematique’ as they refer to it, includes various topics from hazardous waste to deforestation and unsustainable urbanisation. Similarly, the global adaptation measures seem to be unable to approach everyday environmental problems, distancing itself from security and justice considerations.

When environmental governance is approached through these topics, it is logical to add the insights of political economy to fully understand the subject, since most of these environmental problems, most noticeably hazardous waste and deforestation is man-made and in direct link to daily manufacturing and consumption. However, the adaptation and resilience building as a direct impact of climate change, is more detached from specific actors and entities, lacking the accountability in their actions. While almost all of the UN’s programs, specialized agencies and funds recognize an environmental dimension to their mandate, the tool of exercising their power in form of international climate law is weakened by loopholes and dubious flexibility mechanisms (Conca 2015:3).

While the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the PA on Climate Change has put considerable effort to respond to environmental threats inclusively, the measures taken are mostly in reactive form, rather than proactive. The mitigation of consequences in addition to lacking hands-on practice (Islam and Khan, 2018:310) hinders GEG to develop a universal and flexible agenda.
2.3.1. International environmental law

International law is one of the tools available for the UN, but the international environmental law is rather non-binding and flexible to use for self-interest of states. This paper does not intend to explore in detail the complexities of the international environmental law, but the main themes of ideology and ethical grounds of these environmental laws will be discussed to explain the current laws affecting adaptation implementation and how they express notions of global justice through them.

For one, Bosselmann has pointed out, politicians and so-called global elite are ‘not normally concerned with the philosophical foundations of environmental law’ (2011:204). Environmental issues are considered to be rationally solvable complications; a secondary part of production and consumption cycle instead of perceiving the various ecosystems (and environment as a whole) as a united, integral system, making the well-being of environment a primary concern. Thus, the inherent design flaw is the lack of a generally accepted rule to not harm the integrity of ecosystems. For Bosselmann, the loss of ethical reasoning in legal debates comes from certain cultural and philosophical traditions in European history, and, although the Enlightenment traditions and secularization of state has contributed to the fall of the old traditions, in current times most of the valued mindsets and religious convictions of previous centuries would be redundant, most likely standing in a way of development. However, if we consider consumerism as a culture, then it would explain the trade between ethics and consumption.

Second, cultural and philosophical traditions have a considerable impact on current political thought. As Hasan points out, environmental issues have been covered in various international hard and soft law instruments such as treaty, declaration, convention etc. Principles of international environmental law have been recognized as the foundation of making laws to develop the quality of environmental laws (Hasan 2013:3). But the problem here is that these foundational principles are the problem. The current consumption levels are not sustainable and growing expansion of markets might increase the creation of legal frameworks favouring institutions of state and corporations, not the environment,
for environmental issues, just as institutional issues, is seen to be dealt with in a practical, rational manner (Bosselmann, 2011:204).

Coeckelbergh reflects similarly to the current political atmosphere by examining the motivations or lack thereof for environmental change, coming to a conclusion that when neo-liberalism and political conservatism are actively promoting environmental change, it is done ‘in the wrong direction’ by leaving social and environmental matters to the marker’ [emphasis original] (2015:57). How can climate change adaptation be addressed in a globally inclusive manner when wider environmental thought is too narrow and too focused on economic dimension? Even the UN in the first ever report on Environmental rule of law admits that support is focused on a particular areas of the environment, but seems to neglect topics which at first glance are not directly linked to or only partially linked to environment (Environmental rule of law 2019:3), although in reality the environmental insecurity is foundation for these issues. Therefore, as the concluding point, I will address the gap between decision making level and individual level in the UN environmental agenda within a context of the past international agreements and treaties, namely the UN-led environmental regime and its values in the Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Kyoto Protocol and its Doha Amendment (Wirth 2017:187).

This historic narrative is necessary to understand the trends in GEG and how, in particular, building upon them have influenced the usage of security and justice dimensions while mapping the adaptation approach in the PA.

The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) 1992 in Rio de Janeiro was mostly a procedurally oriented instrument for reporting and information sharing in an obligatory manner. Although the Convention articulated broad substantive principles, it contained few if any binding commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (Wirth 2017:189). Regarding adaptation, FCCC establishes two subsidiary bodies, but it does not set out for the adoption of protocols (Wirth 2017:190). Moreover, the security concerns were expressed to acknowledge the problem, but were not present in the actual policies.

Later, Kyoto Protocol (1997) ‘introduced’ shared obligations, but additional conditions (which is not relevant to this discussion) on these obligations rendered them, in practice, to be to narrow and symbolic in nature. Moreover, the lack of
sensitivity towards relative criteria for a fair distribution of costs (Santos 2017:9) reflected the still-going debate about just cost distribution. Drawing on conclusion, it is clear that there has been problems of compromising and joint action in GEG, which has led to rather abstract, superficial and state-focused outcome of global environmental treaties. Although the PA manages to overcome most of these problems, it still follows the same approach of focusing on importance of procedures, not locally adaptable practices (Santos 2017:11).

2.4. Summary

Generally, climate change adaptation policies can be divided as holding onto consideration of four main pillars: economic, security, justice, human (Conca 2015:6), with human dimension being an overlapping dimension which in the end results in the well-being of individuals. As, according to multiple scholars, security and justice dimensions are being marginalized, a critical perspective stresses the significance of even presence and impact of all these dimensions for healthy continuation of individuals and communities. Thus, critical focus on security and justice dimension can bring out the possible shortcomings in GEG agenda. Below I have proposed a model of how according to security and justice perspectives a global decision-making for adaptation planning can lead to the well-being of individuals, leading to explore these dimensions and context they create within the PA.

First, engaging with the justice and security issues in relation to adaptation on a global level trespasses the boundaries of actors while being responsible for the well-being of each individual, thus focus on globally enforced human-centred approach can avoid restrictions of the multicity of actors involved, as well as filling the gap between the global and individual level.
Justice argument goes from global approach of Risse (2012), who argues that states have a duty to compensate those that have been harmed, with a priority on the poorest ones, to Caney (2010), who transcends the global level and argues against using causal assessment of each actors’ action and its respective costs, and Broome (2014), who argues for global justice retribution to individuals through states’ more active involvement. By not considering establishing causal link and historic responsibility as significant variables (although it can be considered as part of actors' view on their moral duties), it is possible to move forward from finding a suitable solution for all to equally distribute costs through the UNFCCC.

As individuals has moral duties for themselves and other individuals, they can be carried most effectively through state. But, since it is quite unheard-off (that state would put the overall well-being of its citizens at risk for foreign citizens), Risse's argument for providing the communities that are worst-off brings compromise. Thus, state’s due their moral duties of goodness and their citizens’ will (including the variables that motivate these duties) can contribute adequate funding to adaptation costs and redirect it to the states and communities worst-off.

While the justice argument allows to argue for the course and receivers of the adaptation funds, it does not function without a reason for equal chance to adopt to climate change, which is the security concerns. By transcending the borders and having an international agreement for securing the well-being of each individual, the contextual needs of various issues of adaptation process can be explored. And,
through exploration of various needs, it can be determined, which states or communities receive aid. The argument of CSS is also the reason why I have not specified the receiving or providing actor. Context dependence and focus on individual implies that the aid is a right for those in need, boundaries of state cannot be decisive variable. From this it is possible to argue for the opposite action – it does not need to be state giving additional adaptation funds, nor the communities suffering from climate change has to spend on the well-being of other communities. Rather, it is the moral duty of those actors that can contribute to contribute. However, GEG still needs binding agreement to secure funding distribution for the individual well-being.

3. Methodology

After addressing how adaptation has been perceived through dimensions of environmental security, environmental justice and GEG, in this section I have explained how the analysis of the PA has been approached and how the issue of environmental adaptation has been presented in the current international environmental policy. In order to do that and to answer the research question of how security and justice dimensions are taken account of in the PA, I have combined two methodological approaches, thus dividing the discussion into how directly, i.e. visibly dimensions appear in the PA content, and how indirectly, i.e. through concepts and relations dimensions appear in the PA.

First, I turn to quantitative approach of textual analysis to create a unit of analysis in a form of key-words representing each discussed dimension and adaptation as an issue. Key-words contains concepts ‘security’ and ‘justice’ or synonyms and derivations such as ‘threat’ and ‘equality’; identifying the frequency, and thus, how the frequency signals the volume of the most notable presence of security and justice dimensions in the PA content through its used vocabulary.

Second, following the previous research of Santos (2017), Conca (2015) and Kubanza et al. (2017), I have focused on the normative questions using the
qualitative content analysis to further evaluate and analyse more in-depth the context of the presence of security and justice dimensions in relation to adaptation within the existing environmental governance regime, thus exploring the hidden or indirect aspect of presence of security and justice dimensions.

While the issues approached by other research are more connected to my issue area (except for Santos), their methodology is not sufficient is regards to my research question. Instead I have adopted these two methods to explore the context of the presence of security and justice dimensions in relation to adaptation within the content of the PA.

3.1.PA

As stated before, my main analysis material is the PA, as well as the report on the adopted decisions in Katowice 2018 as a part of the implementation process of the PA. PA had been chosen, because it is the outcome of decades long negotiations between states to create international framework for tackling the issues related to climate change, which makes PA one of the most influential reference for adopting climate friendly policies. While most of the attention in the Agreement is paid to mitigation, i.e. future guided reduction CO2 emissions, the topic of adaptation, i.e., dealing with the consequences, has received less attention, even though issues of adaptation are more urgent and tend to require immediate response. Articles 9, 10 and 11 in the PA (2015:13-15) explicitly call for joint action in disaster relief, adaptation, and capacity building, but mostly in development terms, lacking a profound connection between adaptation practices, Articles and various dimensions.

Further on, allowing states to pursue their own goals within the limits of PA, has rendered disaster relief and adaptation to climate change to have no global enforcement, leaving communities to protect themselves from the impacts of global warming according to their possibilities in resources, jurisdiction, technology and capacity. Thus, positioning critical arguments against the adaptation agenda in PA and evaluating it as through security and justice context, can give an opposing view based on the emancipation and well-being of individuals in a face of environmental adaptation. Considering that the PA can be
seen as becoming out-of-date material, as rapid increase in natural disasters and endangered territories may render the Agreement insufficient for acting upon growing issue, as well as it has been created at the very beginning of SDGs and the shift in the UN agenda it brings, it can be troublesome to connect the finding within the Agreement to the wider agenda within GEG. Therefore, a separate document from the latest conference of the PA implementation process is also examined, comparing the influence of security and justice dimensions on the planning and implementation process.

Identifying the security and justice dimensions in the PA, however, had a few obstacles. Due the usage of economic tools to shape overall GEG agenda and thus the PA, other two dimensions lack direct representation. Therefore, concepts that are relevant to this discussion in both security and justice dimensions has been laid out. Vulnerability, resilience, capacity building can all be partly expressed through economic means while belonging to security discourse, thus expanding the limitations of engaging with the PA from security perspective. Similarly, duties of goodness and human rights represent justice dimension. Although the direct appearance of these terms implies the importance of respective dimension, such conclusions would lack deeper understanding of how all three discussed dimensions are intertwined.

Therefore, two steps process are in order. While searching for the number of various forms of how security, justice, and (with more direct concepts) economic dimensions appear in GEG landscape, examining the established relationships between them and how UN ideational frameworks can constrain or enable institutional actions (Conca, 2015:192) will examine the impact behind the usage of these concepts.

3.2.Thematic textual analysis

Now I have discussed the two methodological approaches and how they complement each other for an effective analysis. I have approached the PA by applying thematic textual analysis and acquiring quantitative data in a form of data matrix, which indicates the number of occurrences of a theme within a specific part of text. This method and the obtained data have been analysed
independently, and then also used as a data reference in the following content analysis.

Engaging with thematic textual analysis instrumentally has allowed me to interpret the text in terms of the previously discussed theoretical frameworks, whereas understanding texts representationally would lead to identification of the authors’ (in this case the institution of UN) intended meanings (Roberts, 2000:262). Already acknowledging the lack of urgency and focus on adaptation issues in the UN-led GEG, showing flaws in the UN environmental agenda, therefore it is more fruitful to focus on how these documents can be presented through security and justice perspectives. The data has been extracted semi-automatically by Nvivo 12 qualitative data analysis computer software which is commonly used in social-science research (Arnold et al., 2017).

Unlike research that uses this software for coding the text for themes, concepts, and variables, and then synthesizing the patterns that emerged from the textual analysis, as, for example, has been done by Arnold et al., 2017, I have used the software to identify the frequency of previously determined key-word as representatives of focus dimensions. After identifying frequency of key-words, quantitative comparison between the frequency of them has been presented and examined, and thus direct and visible presence of focus dimensions have been determined.

The quantitative analysis consisted of two steps. First, frequency of nominal concepts, such as ‘security’, ‘justice’, ‘economy’ is controlled, then adding the number of times concepts appear that are synonyms, derivatives or are related to one of the dimension, e.g. ‘security’-‘threat’, ‘justice’-‘rights’. When adding synonyms, derivatives and contextual key-words, the Nvivo software identified them in relation to focus dimensions with specialization and within narrow context. As at this point direct appearance is what I have been looking at, therefore concepts must be closely and clearly within the context linked back to their dimensions.

The inclusion of the economic dimension has been added during the analysis, since it was frequently overlapping with security and justice dimensions and exclusion would lead to excluding formed meaningful relationships within the
Agreement. Moreover, overall impact of the economic dimension can be held as a comparison for the impacts of security and justice dimensions.

This way the overall direct presence of focus dimensions is controlled. In the second step I have narrowed the scope and determined the frequency of the focus dimensions in relation to the adaptation; i.e. each mention of ‘adaptation’ within the PA has been examined and the context within which the concept had been found, has been divided into referring to certain focus dimension. As this process has been done manually, to determine the focus dimensions within the context, the previously controlled key-words have been used, to strengthen the validity of produced data. In the end, the data have been compared and the direct presence through key-words of focus dimensions is argued for. Moreover, the produced data supplemented the second part of analysis, to stress the possible predominance of one focus dimensions and the relationship between focus dimensions and adaptation.

3.3. Qualitative content analysis

The qualitative content analysis has been done by applying original conceptual framework to the PA. The framework draws on Santos’ qualitative content analysis on justice and equity, which examines the context of the main concepts in the PA, narrowing the scope of analysis in regards of focusing on justice dimension in relation to adaptation. Similarly, through the original framework the main themes of the PA will be examined from security and justice perspectives in relation to adaptation. Then, stepping back from Santos’ approach, I have also examined the ideological context behind themes and concepts found in the textual analysis to determine whether frequency of appearances coincide with the level of importance assessed from the context.

Since the goal of this theses is to examine the trends of the global environmental policy agenda and their reflection on global agreements through various dimensions, I have not used case studies as a basis for the research as, for example, Ensor et al., (2019) has done with the case of Nepal. Rather, using their and other scholar reflections of the GEG can add to my conceptual framework and argue for global emancipation and recognising high context-dependence as a part of global
environmental agenda. After determining the frequency of concepts with thematic textual analysis, I have been able to continue with an in-depth analysis of how security and justice dimensions affect the presented conceptual relationships of perceiving and dealing with adaptation issues and how their frequency impact the agenda for adaptation.

The qualitative content analysis is concluded by examining the report of decisions made in the COP24 2018 in Katowice, as a follow up to the implementation process of the PA. Due to the reporting nature of the document and large amount of bureaucracy-related decisions, the quantitative approach of textual analysis is not suitable for correctly representing the frequency of keywords in a comparable manner. Instead, the qualitative content analysis of the document, with special focus on three sections: Preparations for the implementation of the Paris Agreement; National adaptation plans; Report of the Adaptation Committee.

4. Analysis

After engaging with climate change adaptation as a three-dimensional issue and creating a conceptual framework, which emphasizes the need for serious security and justice consideration to implement top-bottom adaptation strategies that would ensure the well-being of individuals, this section has strived to examine how security and justice dimensions are accounted for in the PA, alongside the economic dimension, as it is heavily linked and influences the normative assumptions and practices of security/justice dimensions. Moreover, the analysis also focuses on the different security and justice themes between adaptation and mitigation.

First, thematic textual analysis produced quantitative data in a form of keyword frequency determining the visible presence of security/justice/economic dimensions throughout the text. Second, while using the data gathered in thematic textual analysis, the qualitative content analysis examined the key-words within their context through the conceptual framework to determine if there is a deeper influence and implication of these dimensions in relation to notions presented in
the PA, and what it means for the representation of focus dimensions in the Agreement.

4.1. PA overview

Paris Agreement is considered to start a new course in the effort for global climate participation. After decades of Conventions and the establishment of Kyoto Protocol (Santos 2017:9), the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP21) on 12 December 2015 was able to reach a landmark agreement to join efforts in combating climate change. For the first time all nations and parties to the UNFCCC have undertaken the ambitious effort to mitigate, adapt and enhance support (UNFCCC$^1$), as before the designing of global environmental governance institutions had met deadlocks with reference to the normative questions in the time period from 1992 to the Paris Conference (Santos 2017:8).

The main emphasis of the success being on the undertaken the effort, since precise details of implementation and financing has been postponed for later Conventions. The last one, COP24 2018 in Katowice aimed and succeeded at putting in place implementation arrangements of modalities, procedures and guidelines, thus the outcome enabled the global community to enter into ‘full implementation mode of the Paris Agreement’ (UNFCCC$^2$ 2019).

This language is highly descriptive, qualified and adjectival in character. By contrast, Wirth have suggested that adaptation and mitigation implementation is understood to require firm, quantifiable, and reportable actions by states (Wirth 2017:188). Thus, although binding under international law, creating obligations and rights for parties under the Agreement, it is virtually impossible to implement in a uniform and meaningful fashion without further elaboration.

4.2. Direct presence and mentions

The initial assumptions of the analysis (based on literature review) were that security and justice dimensions are less represented than the economic dimension, with emphasis on descriptive and adjectival nature of (text) character, instead of firm and concrete character. This was determined without prior in-
depth examination to acquire unbiased view on the frequency of key-words found in the PA.

In the first stage, I have identified the frequency of nominal and direct representation of security/justice/economic dimensions. Also, frequency and placement of direct mentions of ‘adaptation’ have been identified in order to determine the frequency of security/justice dimensions present in relation to it. The obtained data are as follows (Table 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(TABLE 1) DIRECT MENTIONS OF DIMENSIONS IN THE PARIS AGREEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice, 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency of ‘adaptation’ within the Agreement is quite high and have been used later on in establishing links between security/justice dimensions and adaptation. However, Table 1 does not show enough information to make conclusions about the amount of presence of the security/justice and economic dimensions, due lack of inclusiveness of concepts and key-words that are part of these dimensions and connects adaptation with security/justice dimensions. However, the low frequency of direct mentions indicates that the Agreement is more inclined to present security/justice and economic dimensions by adjective and descriptive means. Therefore, in Table 2, I have presented the frequency of indirect mentions of dimensions within the PA, i.e. key-words with specialization in narrow context (including derivatives, synonyms).
Table 2 allows to see the key-words that have been found in the PA for each dimension, thus expanding the visible presence of these dimensions. As for the key-word of ‘development’ being included in the economic dimension, I have argued in previous sections that development has been perceived in mostly economic manner, and ‘developing’ implying states with low GDP and need to progress towards economic growth. ‘Development’ and ‘developing’ is not exclusively part of economic dimension, they can be linked to security/justice dimensions and adaptation practices, exemplifying the current economic oversight. Therefore, ‘development’ is a crucial variable in determining the overlapping presence of security/justice dimensions in the PA.

However, without deeper examination of the context ‘development’ appears in, it is too early to draw conclusions on how much security dimension takes part in shaping development practices as independent dimension.
While it may seem that adaptation and justice/security dimensions overlap, due to the considerable high frequency of keywords, it does not give sufficient information on the extend the security/justice dimensions are present in determining adaptation agenda. Thus, I have manually examined and linked each mention of ‘adaptation’ to 4 categories: mitigation, security, justice and economy. Category of mitigation is included to present the amount of inseparability between mitigation and adaptation in GEG agenda. Also, the fifth category represents the number of times ‘adaptation’ has not been mention in relation to any of assigned categories and is mention in relation to bureaucratic practices and formalities.

The results are gathered in Table 3. While adaptation is frequently mentioned throughout the Agreement, considerable amount of the mentions are related to either mitigation or bureaucratic practices, underlying two issues. First, adaptation is still linked to mitigation, which could imply sharing similar approaches to these different issues. Second, adaptation may be noticeably visible and present, but the actual adaptation policies and agenda may be significantly less in the content. However, the amount of security links is surprising, as it exceeds the economic relations, but it could be because of the descriptive and adjectival nature of the text.

While it could be possible to establish more direct interconnected links between ‘adaptation’ and categories based on the frequency of relations of categories to the same individual mention, it does not further the acknowledgment of presence of security/justice dimensions. Therefore, the next section continues the analysis with different methodological approach.
4.3. Exploration of PA themes and indirect presence

There are some obstacles to analyse the presence of justice/security dimensions in adaptation agenda, foremost being that adaptation is perceived by the same means as mitigation (Risse 2012). As presented in Table 3, this issue is also present in the PA. Thus, first engaging with main themes in the PA and the security/justice aspect within them helped to link security/justice aspect to adaptation.

As the main goal for the PA is to mitigate the threat of climate change by keeping the rise of the global temperature below 2 degrees Celsius (UNFCCC1), the adaptation comes as a second to the issue of mitigation. It is undeniable, that reduction of CO2 emissions is vital for pursuing the effort of limiting global temperature increase to 2, or even more ambitiously, to 1.5 degrees which still is predicted to cause significant damage and exposure of threats (IPCC 2018). Therefore, reduction of emissions is necessary to avoid even more increased risk damage and endanger more communities.

However, looking at the current rate of threat exposure (IPCC 2018), adaptation and resilience building is a more dire and immediate concern, suggesting that the time of mitigation for improving the environmental situation is over, now it is time to look forward and deal with the already existing and soon to be encountered consequences, as the scale of transformation is daunting, but so is the time frame for action.

Unfortunately, the principle of ‘nationally determined contributions’ (NDCs), which is one of the reasons for the success of the PA in terms of global participation and joint action, is also the one producing a chance to neglect the justice, human rights and security dimensions.

Again, NDSs is focused in terms of emission levels, which need to be reported regularly (UNFCCC1), but there are no binding or otherwise required actions to acknowledge a truly global response to combating climate change by engaging with wider set of issues. If previous frameworks followed a specific UN-modelled climate regime structure, then the pattern of the PA is believed to disrupt this agent-structure relationship model by leaving the legal and institutional
relationship largely unstated, and to a considerable extent uncertain (Wirth 2017:187).

Countries like China, the US and Russia do not want to accept legally binding obligations when matters of national sovereignty is involved, such as the preservation of their domestic spaces over international agreements. Due such position, the PA, while a legally binding instrument to the review and the assessment of duties, is not binding in terms of states’ financial contributions and emissions. (Santos 2017:10). It is worth mentioning that while PA refers to the involved states as parties, I will remain to referring to them as states, because states are units which can be examined, which have similar internal processes of justice, security and human rights that can be linked to external processes of the same dimensions. States have boundaries and character, whereas parties tend to have more neutral shape. Moreover, referring to parties as states strengthens the perception of actor individuality and indivisibility, instead of well-being of separate individuals.

4.3.1. NDCs and adaptation

The main goal of NDCs is to bring all states together in joint effort to combat climate change. As Article 2, paragraph 2 states: ‘[t]his Agreement will be implemented to reflect equity and the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in the light of different national circumstances’ (Paris Agreement 2015:3). While the ‘different national circumstances’ are generally referred to the possibility to reduce emissions and advance sustainable technological development, it can only partially be referred to the climate change adaptation process. As clarified in previous sections, reverse projection of equity and justice is challenging to achieve, i.e. NDCs project contributions of individual states to, first of all, themselves, and, secondly, for the global community. This is the process of mitigation costs. Adaptation, however, requires global community to distribute funds, capacity, technology etc. (Risse 2012:204,208) to individual states, if equity and justice is the goal of such agreement. Since NDCs are not binding (Article 4, paragraph 2 explicitly calls for NDCs to be in presented and confirmed in mitigation measures, whereas Article 7,
paragraph 11 refers to adaptation plan as a part of communication documentation) where adaptation is concerned, the distribution of funds is left to the moral pressure of duties of goodness and justice for each individual state.

References to national adaptation plan (in Article 7) deepens the focus on this individualistic approach. States are encouraged to engage in adaptation planning process without explicit indications that national adaptation plan should include joint actions within the region or even across the regions. Although communication and cooperation between states are multiple times stated to be vital part of implementation of the adaptation plans, it does not hinder states to pursue goals which are only in their national interests, which in most cases is perceived in material (economic) terms. As it is the duty of state to maintain the well-being of its citizens (Broome 2014:65), there is no denying the right for states to first of all attend to the national mitigation and adaptation process planning and implementation. However, the peculiar and multidimensional issue of climate change calls for further action in joining forces in the same attentive manner as in dealing with national planning and implementation process.

For one, when duties of goodness are involved, it generally refers to the actions of state, not individuals. However, citizens and activist groups can pressure government to increase the support for humanitarian actions and act in a 'good' way (Broome, 2014:65), equalizing the differences of communities. Second, the threats of ignoring the security dimension. Until now I have not mentioned the security in relation to the PA for a simple reason – security as a part of the challenge to combat climate change is not mentioned in the Agreement. The most serious threat of ignoring the security dimension in planning national adaptation strategy is exposure to foreign-originated threats. Interconnected in nature, lack of environmental security can lead to massive socio-economic changes. Good example already mentioned island state of Tuvalu. Due rising sea levels, saltwater intrusion and drought, more than 70% of households in Tuvalu assumes that migration would be a likely response if their environmental security worsens (UNU-EHS 2017). For Tuvalu and similar island states the numbers of migrants are comparatively tiny, but increased migration flows from other regions, such as Northern Africa of Middle East would very likely cause a crisis in the destination states. In failing to provide resilience building capacity, individually positioned
states are indirectly being the cause of such problem for themselves and region as a whole.

Explicit reference to security in relation to direct policy shaping appears only once in the PA, in relation to UN’s goal to eradicate world hunger - safeguarding food security from particular vulnerabilities of food production systems. Thus, aside from describing the issues in the PA by using language which contains suggestive security-related words, as concluded in the key-word search, the security dimension appears to serve only through raising the level of urgency throughout the Agreement, instead of influencing the policies and goals for ensuring safety not only to local level, but also state level. Lack of security perspective, as argued on the previous section, endangers the well-being of states as a result of nationally determined adaptation planning; argument, which could appeal to the most self-interested (realist) states to engage in financial, technological or otherwise supportive actions with less developed or increased-risk states, avoiding the unpleasant consequences.

An opposite argument, appealing to the humanity and moral duties of justice and goodness would perceive security as foundation for human rights. Food security, undeniably, is part of this foundation and eradication of world hunger is largely depending on the current and future conditions of the environment. But why food security is the only side of environmental security dimension mentioned in the Agreement, and is that connected to the call for engaging in more intensive humanitarian actions? Most possible answer is that food security has nothing (by nothing I mean general practices and outcomes; assumptions of individuals who are working with these issues may have different sentiments) to do with global human rights of decent living but rather an economic point of reference.

If states individually are not inclined to support states that are in disadvantage, the GEG, or more specifically, an UN agency which under the PA should take on the role of distributing the resources according to needs of individual states. The proposed mechanism of implementing adaptation process and distributions of funds towards this goal is rather dubious. Article 6, paragraph 4 provides an indication of a mechanism to contribute to the mitigation and sustainable development which is established under the authority and guidance of the Conference of the Parties. Paragraph 6 continues, that this mechanism will be used
to ‘assist developing country Parties that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change to meet the costs of adaptation’ (Paris Agreement, 2015:8). This vague reference to a higher authority which could correct the injustice in environmental sphere fall apart if few things are considered.

First, the Conference of the Parties consists of the same states that are less than inclined to support other states, barely managing to adapt their national adaptation plans. Second, the voluntary aspect also applies here, which enforces the previous statement. Third, in what ways a state could qualify for an assistance? Possibly through consideration of the development and economic growth indicators, since the planning and implementation of NDCs are built on the same measures, which would imply that environment is perceived through these two dimensions. Adding the lack of environmental security risk assessment opens a new argument about why it is impossible to argue for adaptation planning based on economic perception. Disregarding the unequal distribution of climate change induced damage across the states, the internal distribution of damage within the states is also an issue to be considered.

Based on the previously discussed notions of environmental indivisibility and focus on the well-being of individual, state borders should not be interfering with which person gets to live in vulnerable environment and which one gets to enjoy the resilience-enhanced environment. Also, if state does not want to participate in global adaptation planning process, as Russia (which has not ratified the Agreement), or the US (which will leave the Agreement by 2020), what does it imply for those communities that will suffer, if states themselves will not put in place adherent adaptation mechanisms? Even the Risse’s argument that I have taken as a model for distribution of adaptation costs, which expresses that states have a duty to compensate states that have been harmed, priority being the poorest ones (Risse 2012:204) cannot give answers to how proceed, i.e. dominance of economic dimension. Similarly, Article 4, paragraph 15 runs into the same issue, stating that implementation of Agreement has to be done in consideration to economies most affected, but to include all environment and social damage into economic terms is challenging, falling back to the debate about what is development and how it should be measured (Moore 2015).
While Agreement is sensitive and supportive to the context-dependence (NDCs, shared but different responsibilities), in most cases context-dependence is mentioned in relation to mitigation efforts, not adaptation, causing usage of the same approach for the both issues. Following the thought of who gets the assistance, Article 4, paragraph 19 states that in formulating long-term development strategies, common but differentiated mitigation responsibilities and capabilities should be considered in the light of different national circumstances. Since there is no other mention of distribution of assistance based on specific grounds, except for the one above, does the different national circumstances and capabilities regarded for developing mitigation plan is then used to reflect the possible receivers of assistance? The transferred focus on economic dimension from mitigation to adaptation planning brings unwanted consequences of accepting the mitigation and adaptation to be one and the same, but it would explain the emphasis on economic dimension in the Agreement. Mitigation, as in reducing CO2 emissions, can be captured through economic lens by relying on prediction of reduction costs and technological advancement, whereas adaptation, being the consequence of previous mitigation efforts or lack thereof, cannot follow the same route. Adaptation is more interdimensional issue, depending on both internal and external factors more heavily than mitigation and linking more directly to justice and security. But, since climate change adaptation from the PA standpoint can be perceived as something supplementing and continuing mitigation process, not independent issue, the importance of economic dimension is passed over to the adaptation process as well.

If the purpose of the PA was to unify all nations in reducing emissions, then the focus on economic side, although incomplete and outdated, could be justifiable. However, the true purpose, proclaimed by the UN, is ‘to undertake ambitious efforts to combat climate change and adapt to its effects’ (UNFCCC3). Therefore, lack of adaptation inclusion in the Agreement (not mentioning the disturbing lack of security and justice references to the adaptation process) is inconsistent with the values promoted of UN. While the two dimensions of security and justice play an important part in shaping the PA, they are not the driving force of adaptation. They are taken account of when describing the problems, but not as a part of solutions. Therefore the gap between decision making level and affected level is
an outcome of the lack of considerations regarding security and justice dimensions.

### 4.4. COP24 in Katowice

The PA is a declaration of international community that brings forth the intended aims and goals adaptation practices, among other issues. Searching for security and justice dimensions thus reflects the intentionality of how relevant and/or significant these dimensions are in shaping and determining policies. However, implementation of these policies can shift the relevance and affect the intended outcomes, which, with the PA can be tested by exploring the decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties COP24 in Katowice.

The primary agenda of the conference was most visibly disclosed in sections of *High-level ministerial dialogue on climate finance, Implementation and ambition, Special Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, and *Talanoa Dialogue*, while the two sections of *National adaptation plans* and *Report of the Adaptation Committee* can be directly compared to the adaptation agenda and implementation in PA.

Unlike the PA, the discourse gives strong signals of the impact of both security and justice dimensions, as well as discusses the issue of adaptation more frequently and direct. Is more urgent and detailed in form of decisions and actions needed for security reasons, as well as clearer indications of using various actors to distribute and acquiring the funds necessary for adaptation and mitigation measures. The difference, however, is that these sections do not present the final outcome of the policy implementation, except for the section on *Implementation and ambition*, and are still very much in advice form and future-oriented, lacking strong foundation for immediate security actions.

Also, the section on *Implementation and ambition* runs into similar problem as the PA concerning NDCs. The propositions on advancing the growth and communications about the contributions still without explicit indications how national adaptation plan should be communicated within the region or with the UNFCCC: ‘to communicate or update by 2020 the contribution and to do so every five years thereafter’ (UNFCC 2018:5). Five years are too large of a period between communicating or updating the national contribution planning. From
security and justice perspectives, such planning is unresponsive to quite rapidly changing needs and is at odds with the recommended urgent action taking, separating NDCs from global commitment for equal opportunity of growing environment resilience.

However, the section on National adaptation plans addresses few of these issues and acknowledges that ‘countries are at different stages of the process’, ‘there is not enough information to assess the extent to which the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans is reducing vulnerability to climate change, strengthening resilience and building adaptive capacity’, ‘the value of engaging non-Party stakeholders, including civil society, the private sector’ (UNFCC4 2018:35-36). The acknowledgement of flaws in current process of implementation, therefore engaging with wider set of actors from various levels is can lead to improving the conditions both nationally and redirecting the funds to the states and communities worst-off (Risse 2012:205). And, unlike previous sections and PA, National adaptation plans has a strong security-based approach in setting priorities, mapping scenarios and understanding the adaptation progress, which is a pre-condition for creating suitable and flexible adaptation practices (Vij et al. 2019:573).

While National adaptation plans seems to be more security-inclined than in the PA, the Report of the Adaptation Committee reflects more economic than security dimension, especially through liking ‘the process to formulate and implement national adaptation plans [...] with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals’, ‘strengthen linkage with the monitoring systems of the Sustainable Development Goals’ (UNFCC4 2018:38-39). A positive change from the PA is a direct note to ‘mainstrea[m] adaptation in development planning (UNFCC4 2018:38), leading states to accept the changing status of environmental threats and the impact of adaptation on all levels of actors (Nyman 2018:124).

Nevertheless, the justice dimension in the report is as visible as in the PA, i.e. it has minimal direct presence and insufficient indirect presence. The importance of NDCs is in stark contrast of non-existing references to global adaptation planning and fund distribution according to needs. While the acknowledgement of countries being at different stages of the implementation process refers back to the context-dependency of NDCs’ goals and contributions, it does not refer to or
ensure global and joint adaptation security measures, which is a primary goal for justice dimension in being able to distribute funds sufficiently.

Some dynamic changes in the agenda regarding the presence of security/justice dimensions were noted. Between the PA and the report on the decisions made in COP24, the urgency of security dimension has increased, decreasing the economic dominance in security/economic issues in multiple occasions, as well as accepting the multi-level interdependency of actors for ensuring context-based adaptation approaches. On the other hand, the presence of global justice dimension in the report of COP24 appears to be minimal, instead being presented through superficial phrases and nationally determining issue. Thus, it is not clear whether currently implemented adaptation policies can fulfill the moral duties of human population against themselves and ensure equal chance at environmental security.
5. Conclusion

The Paris Agreement and its follow-up of the implementation process form COP24 have failed to properly base their agenda and policies on the pillars of security and justice. Since the climate change adaptation as the phenomena is felt at one level and the decisions related to it is made at another, it requires special consideration for local contexts and implementation of practices and measures that would make individuals equally capable of building resilience and reduce vulnerability. Before the PA, lacking comprehensive top-bottom approach, adaptation practices to manage the climate change impacts has been done independently by state and non-state actors, with varying success, depending on available technology and knowledge. But even now the PA encourages individual approach through NDCs, focusing on states as the receivers of help, instead of acknowledging the unequal distribution of climate change induced damage across the states and the internal distribution of damage within the states.

As a non-binding principle, NDCs avoids being imposed by force, but it does not incorporate significant security and justice considerations that would lead to global equality in ensuring security and aid for those in need, where boundaries of state is not decisive variable for the well-being of individual. Moreover, the proposed mechanism for implementing adaptation process and distributions of funds towards this goal with the NDCs is rather dubious. As the planning and implementation of NDCs are built on the same considerations as development and economic growth indicators, ensuring security and thus, equal chance for security, is based on economic principles of action, which is in conflict with the notions of prosperity and well-being. Overlapping economic and security dimensions have caused the security reasons for adaptation to be viewed through economic lens, excluding the justice dimension from discussion. Thus, it is not clear whether currently implemented adaptation policies can fulfill the moral duties of human population against themselves and ensure equal chance at environmental security.

While at first it may seem that both security and justice dimensions, as well as adaptation, are noticeably present, if not directly, then through words that they are associated with, the presence of these dimensions does not come with the
same level of impact on the actual themes and actions proposed within the PA, thus rendering them to be a rather minor consideration in global adaptation policy planning and implementation. Thus, aside from describing the issues in the PA by using language which contains suggestive security and justice related words, the security and justice dimensions appear to serve only through raising the appearance of urgency and call for equality throughout the Agreement, instead of influencing the policies and goals for ensuring safety not only to local level, but also state level.

Unfortunately, a more significant part of analysis had to be dedicated to the mitigation measures, alongside adaptation, although adaptation was intended to be the main focus. While adaptation is a separate issue, in many cases it was still closely linked to mitigation, especially in relation to economic concerns, presenting deeper problems in separating the two issues and applying normative values to adaptation. Nevertheless, it served as a reminder that mitigation practices are being projected onto adaptation, explaining the implementation of state-based measures.

The PA is less inclusive and unequipped to implement global adaptation practices that would meet the security and justice concerns of individuals on a local level. While the two dimensions of security and justice, which incorporate the concerns for equality and effectiveness of adaptation actions, play an important part in shaping the PA, they are not the driving force of adaptation. They are taken account of when describing the problems, but not as a part of solutions, therefore the gap between decision making level and affected level is an outcome of the lack of considerations regarding security and justice dimensions. Although the continuous process of the PA implementation has indicated improvement, this issue is part of wider GEG policy agenda, making one doubt the possibility of globally led individual-based adaptation approach which would serve for the well-being of individuals.
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