

The Role of Diplomacy in Preventing Climate Conflicts

¹Dr. Ismail Adaramola Abdul Azeez and ¹Shazmah Fatima

¹ Riphah Institute of Public Policy, Riphah International University, Islamabad

Email: ismail.adaramola@riphah.edu.pk

Abstract

Climate change has become a priority threat multiplier, which increases existing vulnerabilities and creates new conflict opportunities in the twenty-first century. The current research examines how diplomatic strategies can play the role of reducing the climate-based conflicts by using a systematic literature review that is performed following PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items to Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) recommendations. The study reviewed peer-reviewed articles, institutional reports, and policy documents that were published in 2020-2026 and were found in Google Scholar, PubMed, and institutional repositories. Out of the original identification of 847 records, 23 studies that met the strict inclusion criteria were included in the final synthesis after being screened and evaluated in a systematic manner. The study aims to trace how the framework of climate diplomacy has evolved, how effective the international institutions have been in dealing with the climate-security nexus, and what challenges and opportunities exist in dealing with the issue of the climate-security nexus through diplomatic intervention. The evidence suggests that climate diplomacy is no longer a peripheral issue, but it is becoming central to the concept of security, and that the international organizations are increasingly incorporating climate aspects into their peacebuilding and conflict-prevention policy. Some of the important diplomatic vehicles are the multilateral forums like the United Nations Security Council, regional organizations like the European Union and ASEAN, and specialized groups like the Arctic Council. This research contributes to the existing knowledge about the role of diplomatic instruments in strategic use to become the conflict

prevention tool and the tool of sustainable peace during the time of rapid environmental change.

Keywords: climate diplomacy, conflict prevention, environmental peacebuilding, hydro diplomacy, multilateral cooperation.

Introduction

Climate change is one of the most topical issues of the 21st century, which completely changes the situation in international relations and security. The climate change and conflict intersection has become the topic of growing scholarly interest, policymaking, and international organizations since the environmental degradation, the lack of resources, and the migration caused by climate introduce certain new vulnerabilities and intensify existing tensions (Busby, 2021). This understanding that climate change is a threat multiplier has transformed the way the international community treats the regulation of the environment. The management of conflict requires new forms of diplomatic solutions that are no longer bound by traditional distinctions between the domain of environmental management and that of the security issue.

The last ten years have been characterized by a significant change in the way climatic diplomacy is perceived, as it has gone from a marginal trend of international relations to the very center of the global governance of discourse. International organizations, such as the United Nations Security Council, and regional institutions, such as the European Union and ASEAN, have increasingly incorporated the concern of climate in their approach to security and peacebuilding (Bremberg et al., 2022). This shift can be seen as a growing recognition that climate change is not merely an environmental inconvenience but a serious threat to international peace and stability through various channels, which, in other words, include resource competition, displacement, food insecurity, and loss of state capacity (Nevitt et al., 2021).

Climate diplomacy is a continuum of mechanisms, establishments, and practices that were established to respond to the climate-security nexus by working together internationally. They are multilateral negotiations within the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) framework, specialized forums like the Arctic Council, regional environmental cooperation undertakings, and integration of climate concerns in peace agreements and post-conflict reconstruction initiatives (Fowler, n.d.). The defining feature of climate diplomacy is its transboundary nature, which requires the organization

to operate on many different governance levels, sectors, and stakeholders to address issues that are not confined to national boundaries and traditional policy areas.

Although the debate about climate security has become widespread among global organizations, the question of converting this awareness into action is still a problem (Odgaard et al., 2023). Geopolitical stresses, opposing national interests, institutional disintegration, and the multifacetedness of climate-conflict associations are the important obstacles to diplomatic activities. Despite this, new trends in environmental peacebuilding, conservation diplomacy, and climate-sensitive conflict prevention can provide some promising potential to leverage diplomatic tools to build resilience and prevent climate-related conflicts (Pandit, 2025; Sommer et al., 2024).

Research Objectives

1. To examine the development of climate diplomacy frameworks and mechanisms used to avert conflicts.
2. To assess the viability of the international institutions in tackling the climate-security nexus
3. To explore the challenges and opportunities presented by the process of diplomatic interventions to promote climate resilience and sustainable peace.

Problem Statement

Despite the increased role attributed to climate change as a security issue and the wider debate on climate security, which is currently spreading in the exact institutions of the international system, there are still significant gaps in understanding the necessity of climate change as a security concern and the necessary steps that should be taken to prevent climate-related conflict. The global community is faced with basic challenges to convert climate-security issues into effective diplomatic actions, to organize the responses of heterogeneous institutional designs, and to overcome geopolitical dilemmas that impede cooperative action. Also, the multiple and roundabout causal mechanisms by which climate change is a factor in conflict create great challenges in the development of specific diplomatic policies. A rational interpretation of the ways in which diplomacy can be effectively used to prevent climate conflicts requires a logical analysis of the existing mechanisms, evaluation of their achievements and shortcomings, and discussion of the

circumstances under which diplomatic interventions can have the most significant impact on boosting resilience and avoiding violence in climate-prone settings.

Research Significance

The study is both a theoretical and practical contribution to the area of climate governance and conflict prevention. In theory, it adds to the emerging interdisciplinary literature that challenges the climate-security nexus by overarching modern literature and clarifying the trends in diplomatic reactions to climate-related risks of conflict. It progresses the understanding of how international institutions have adaptive capabilities to address the transboundary environmental issues and transformations in the diplomacy practice in dealing with new security threats. Practically speaking, the findings will provide practical policy, diplomatic, and practitioner information to those working at the nexus of climate change and peace and security. Outlining the success of diplomatic processes, institutional innovations, and best practices in preventing climate conflicts, the study contributes to the empirical recommendations of enhancing international cooperation and building stronger and more durable structures of governance. Of relevance to the implications are international organizations, regional organizations, national governments, and actors in civil society, which seek to enhance their own capacities to exclude climate-related conflict and promote sustainable peace as environmental change accelerates. In addition, the current research fills a knowledge gap that is essential because there is a lack of information about the concept of climate diplomacy as it is applied to conflict prevention. Although there is abundant literature on the effects of climate change and conflict relations in single studies, there is a dearth of literature on key aspects of diplomatic intervention that are directly aimed at preventing climate-related conflicts. By questioning current events, analyzing their effectiveness, and tracing the avenues of improving diplomatic solutions, the research will aim to address that gap and help prioritize one of the most pressing problems of humanity.

Literature Review

Climate diplomacy is based on the conceptual background of the linkage between climate change and international peace and security. The history of climate security as a discipline and policy as a practice, including how climate security has moved out of the fringes and to the central agenda in the last fifteen years. Climate security is a novel practice that has grown a bit more institutional within international institutions, which still recognizes that there are still debates about the nature and the intensity of climate-conflict connectivity (Busby, 2021). This development is part of a wider understanding that climate change is a threat multiplier and that it worsens the existing weaknesses instead of directly sparking conflicts.

Climate change is a threat to international peace and security by discussing the legal and institutional consequences of viewing climate change through the prism of security. The conflict over climate change is an environmental issue that needs to be mitigated and adapted to, and it is perceived as a security issue that needs to be prevented. The implications of this framing debate on the institutions that take leadership in managing the risks involved in climate change are profound, and the policy instruments that should be used (Nevitt et al. 2021).

The conceptualization of climate change in various aspects of international relations includes the economy, security, development, and the presence of new actors. This multidimensional analysis appreciates that climate-conflict nexuses have multifaceted routes of functioning that include resource scarcity, economic disturbance, migration, and state vulnerability and should hence be accompanied by the nexus-deserving diplomatic solutions (Lee, 2022).

The Climatization of International Organizations and Institutional Responses

The incorporation of climate into the mandate and work of international institutions referred to the concept of “climatization” (Maertens et al., 2021). The examination of the United Nations Security Council demonstrates that there has been a slow but contentious rise of the climate issues into the council agenda, with the member states having differing views on whether climate change is within the mandate of the council in the upkeep of

global peace and security. This institutional controversy is a projection of wider conflicts between the old state-centered conceptualizations of security and the new transnational environmental insecurities. The examination of divergent responses by member states to the nexus of climate security within the United Nations Security Council identifies the groups of states that advocate for integration of climate security and those that stand to oppose it (Hardt et al., n.d.). These compartments make it difficult to create coordinated diplomatic actions, as the consensus of body decision-making on multilateral forums may be immobilized by underlying differences in definition of problems and institutional priorities.

A systemic approach to global reactions to climate security in various international bodies, discursive framing, institutional design, and policy actions. It indicates that there is a substantial diversity in the conception of climate security risks and responses, along with their application by various organizations in practice with coordination and effectiveness of implications. Such institutional variations need to be comprehended to increase coherence among the humanitarian nexus, the development nexus, and the peacebuilding nexus (Bremberg et al., 2022).

The European Union has become a very dynamic participant in climate security diplomacy. The EU foreign policy's reactions to climate security focus on the responsibility to prepare to prevent conflicts. The EU has created comparatively advanced systems of incorporating the considerations of climate in the process of the prevention of conflicts and the removal of peace, despite the difficulties in implementation. This activism is indicative of the EU as both vulnerable to climate-related security threats in its neighborhood and of its general affinity to multilateralism and environmental leadership (Heras, 2020).

Mechanisms of Diplomacy and Environmental Peacebuilding

The diplomatic tools that are used to integrate climate-related issues into the conflict-prevention efforts. Using a specific example of the collaboration between the Arctic Council and the International Maritime Organization to create the Polar Code, show how international organizations can help reduce environmental and security risks despite the divergent views of the member states. There are three fundamental requirements of

diplomatic effectiveness: clear recognition of those responsible, great powers' vested interest in resolving the problem, and a favorable socioeconomic environment (Odgaard et al., 2023). This instance provides instructive lessons to the general practice of environmental peacebuilding.

The viability of integrating climate issues into peace accords requires that “climate diplomacy” in mediation contexts be capable of establishing sustainable peace by addressing the causes of environmental conflicts and stipulating a sense of resilience in post-conflict rebuilding (Fowler, n.d.). This view recognizes that peace accords would offer critical avenues of reforming resource governance and institutionalizing environmental cooperation systems as well as reduce climate vulnerability that would otherwise revive hostilities.

The concept of environmental peacebuilding has become a leading guideline on how environmental cooperation can be used to maintain peace and prevent war. Consider environmental peacebuilding as a praxis that does not only conclude violent conflicts but also seeks to maintain peace by working together and collaborating with the environment to govern (Sommer et al., 2024). It highlights the increasing importance of environmental issues as the potential interlocutrice gateways even during political conflicts, thus developing the confidence and problem-solving actions that can be further applied to other areas.

The idea of “conservation diplomacy” in the paradigm of multilateral approaches to global peace and sustainability assumes that the activities of biodiversity conservation can play the functions of a diplomacy that develops trust and builds international cooperation as well as challenges the common environmental challenge (Pandit, 2025). This position broadens the scope of climate diplomacy to include broader environmental governance as one form of preventing conflicts and peacebuilding.

Issues, constraints, and the Discourse-Action Gap

Though the issues of environmental challenges have become better understood, little effective and coordinated action has been pursued, which has been attributed to inherent barriers to transforming awareness to policy effects. These challenges are the free-rider

issue in international environmental politics, competing against national interests, and the challenge of organizing collective action against diffuse, long-term threats (Odgaard et al., 2023).

One of the challenges is the preparation of security risks associated with climate in the conditions of uncertainty, when it is not always clear when, where, and how much impact the climate will have. This ambiguity complicates the diplomatic work to develop a consensus on preventive action because states might disagree on the assessment of risks and the response to the risks. The necessity of adaptive governance practices can respond flexibly to the changing climatic security issues (Heras, 2020). Another major challenge to climate diplomacy is the existence of geopolitical tensions. The great power rivalry, especially between the United States and China, complicates multilateral climate collaboration and climate security programs. The possibility of an increase in international cooperation or conflict due to climate change, pointing to the fact that geopolitical competition may disintegrate the collective action even in a situation where there is an overlap of interest in resolving climate threats (Budiana (n.d.)).

Climate diplomacy has more difficulties with institutional fragmentation. The emergence of institutions, forums, and initiatives to solve climate and security problems poses a challenge in coordination and duplication of efforts is likely. The improved coordination can be observed throughout the humanitarian-development-peacebuilding nexus to enable consistent responses to the threat of climate insecurity, but such coordination is challenging due to institutional mandates, cultures, and resource constraints (Bremberg et al., 2022).

Future Directions and Emerging Trends

Scholars analyze how human security views can be integrated into climate diplomacy and find that the solutions should be approached not only to focus on the security of a state but also on that of individuals and communities (Jayaram et al., 2022). The presented human security framing highlights the necessity of diplomatic actions that fulfill the climate vulnerabilities on various levels and empower the affected populations. It is found that a transition from the formerly state-centric approaches to the more inclusive models that include non-state actors, such as cities, corporations, and civil society organizations, is

occurring. This shift to multi-stakeholder climate diplomacy is an indication that efficient ways of addressing the climate security risks demand the mobilization of various actors and resources outside conventional diplomatic processes (Idibekzoda, 2024).

The international environmental cooperation can help to establish sustainable peacebuilding with the focus on the necessity of approaches that should encompass the environmental considerations throughout the conflict cycle, including prevention up to the post-conflict reconstruction. There are ways to enhance connections between climate action and peacebuilding to develop mutually reinforcing results (Albakjaji et al., 2025).

The literature demonstrates a transitional field where the issue of climate change is increasingly being perceived as a core security issue, influencing institutional change and diplomatic creativity. Nevertheless, there exists a major disjuncture between discourse and action, and the underlying institutional discontinuities and the multiplicity of climate-conflict interactions are yet to be surmounted. These dynamics have been discussed in more detail below based on the analysis of recent research findings.

Methodology

The effectiveness of using diplomacy in reducing climate-related conflicts in developing countries was explored using a qualitative systematic literature review. The systematic review approach was selected because of its ability to provide an overview and a coherent and reproducible synthesis of existing academic knowledge in an interdisciplinary domain that experiences rapid changes (Snyder, 2019). Because of the complexity of the climate-security nexus and the variety of diplomatic logic that can be employed in different contexts, a qualitative research approach was the most appropriate to add subtle insights, detect trends, and combine theoretical and empirical work that is not sufficiently covered by quantitative meta-analytics (Gough et al., 2017). The systematic review was conducted as per the guidelines of Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) 2020 (Page et al., 2021), which are the internationally accepted guidelines for reporting systematic reviews. The PRISMA framework allowed for methodological rigor, as relevant literature was identified, screened, and appraised in a systematic manner and minimized selection bias, thus increasing findings' credibility. The research goals of the study, especially following the development of the climate diplomacy frameworks, evaluating the effectiveness of the institutional arrangements in dealing with the climate-security nexus, and determining the challenges and opportunities of diplomatic conflict-prevention interventions, were especially consistent with this approach.

Eligibility Criteria

Prior to deciding on the selection of studies, explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria were set to direct the selection of studies and thus consistency in the decision-making exercise. The inclusion criteria were (1) the study was published between January 2020 and February 2026; (2) it is in the English language; and (3) the study is based on empirical evidence, theoretical analysis, or policy assessment that is substantively related to climate diplomacy, climate security, environmental peacebuilding, or other issues based on their explicit connection to conflict prevention.

The studies excluded if they (1) was not published within the given period; (2) was not written in English; (3) was an opinion piece, editorials, or blog posts where the institutional affiliation and/or peer review was not present; (4) had not been directly relevant to the intersection of climate change, diplomacy, and conflict prevention; (5) was a duplicate study or preliminary drafts of studies that was ultimately published; or (6) had a severe methodological flaw or no clear documentation of methodology and evidence. These

criteria helped ensure that the review had good-quality and relevant literature, and it was feasible considering the resources available.

The search strategy and information sources

To find the literature that was published in the period between January 2020 and February 2026, a detailed search plan was developed. This temporal scope was chosen to be able to capture the modern trends in climate negotiations and to have enough literature maturity to analyze it. The six-year timeline reflects the years in which the topic of climate security penetrated the realms of mainstream discussions in the international organizations and international diplomacy as the global community began to pay closer attention to security risks posed by climate changes. Several electronic databases and institutional repositories were systematically searched to have breadth and depth of coverage. The main databases were Google Scholar, due to the presence of a multidisciplinary focus, and PubMed, due to the aspects of health security and environmental health of climate-related conflicts. Institutional repositories, such as the United Nations Digital Library, European Union Publications Office, ASEAN Digital Library, and Arctic Council Repository, were also searched to retrieve grey literature in the form of policy reports, institutional evaluations, and diplomatic structures that were not published in peer-reviewed journals.

The search strategy used Boolean operators and controlled vocabulary to help maximize the retrieval of relevant studies. The main search query was designed in the following way: (climate diplomacy OR climate security OR environmental peacebuilding OR conservation diplomacy OR hydro diplomacy) and (conflict prevention or peacebuilding or conflict resolution or security governance) and (international cooperation or multilateral or regional organizations or diplomatic mechanisms). The additional string was used to get a wider conceptualization: (climate change) AND (security) AND (diplomacy) OR (environmental cooperation) AND (conflict) OR (climate-induced conflict) AND (prevention). Additional search strategies were used to improve the level of understanding. Seminal articles located during the initial searches were tracked forward and backward through citation tracking and reference lists of the included studies were computer-aided manually to determine other relevant sources. The use of expert advice provided by scholars in the field of climate

security and environmental diplomacy also served to guarantee that important contributions could be included, stressed by the databases of search.

Process of Study Selection (PRISMA Flow)

The PRISMA flow diagram used in the study selection consisted of four stages: identification, screening, eligibility assessment, and inclusion. The identification stage realized results of 847 records of systematic searches in all databases and repositories given. After elimination of 224 duplicate records with reference management software (Zotero), 623 unique records were left to be screened.

During the screening stage, two blinded reviewers determined titles and abstracts of the 623 records in line with the pre-established inclusion and exclusion criteria. The Cohen kappa coefficient was used to assess the inter-rater reliability and produced $\kappa = 0.85$, which was found to suggest substantial inter-rater reliability (Landis and Koch, 1977). The discrepancies were resolved by discussing, and where the consensus was not possible, by consulting a third reviewer. The outcome of this process was 284 records being promoted to full-text eligibility assessment.

At the stage of eligibility assessment, the full-text articles were retrieved and assessed by two reviewers. Any studies that did not correspond to all the inclusion criteria were dropped, and the reasons were systematically recorded. Out of the 284 full-text articles that were evaluated, 261 were deemed unsuitable due to the following reasons: the inadequate focus on diplomatic mechanisms ($n = 112$), absence of explicit conflict prevention perspective ($n = 89$), methodological and/or quality of evidence limitations ($n = 38$) and duplication or draft versions ($n = 22$).

The inclusion phase finally led to 23 studies being included in the study with all the eligibility criteria and quality enough to be included in the quality synthesis. The last sample included peer-reviewed journal articles ($n = 17$), institutional reports of international organizations ($n = 4$), and conference proceedings ($n = 2$).

Quality Appraisal

The qualitative research checklist, the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) was used to conduct a systematic evaluation of methodological quality and credibility of the

studies that participated in the current review (CASP, 2018). The CASP framework considers the studies on various scales, such as the clarity and the appropriateness of the research purposes, the adequacy of the research methods, the suitability of the research design, the transparency of the data-collection processes, the strength of the research study, the clarity of the study findings, and the relevance of the research contribution.

Two reviewers independently rated each study, and the quality rating was high, moderate, or low based on the extent to which the CASP criteria were met. High-quality studies (n= 17; 73.9%) satisfied all or the majority of the criteria but with few limitations. The moderate quality of studies (n= 5; 21.7% satisfied most of the criteria) had significant limitations in their methodology or reporting. Only one study (4.4 %) was considered to have low quality due to several methodological flaws; the study was, however, included, as it provided exclusive geographical information that could not be found in other studies, and the findings were cautiously interpreted. The synthesis process was informed by the quality appraisal because it allowed the possible differentiating weighting of the evidence based on the methodological rigor. The quality of a study was highly rated when developing a conclusion, and the results of low-quality studies were supplementary or exploratory ones.

Data Analysis and Synthesis

The systematic thematic analysis was used to extract and analyze the data based on the six-phase framework suggested by Braun and Clarke (2006). A standardized data-extraction form was prepared and tested 5 studies before being fully implemented. Data that were extracted were bibliographic, study characteristics (design, methodology, and geographical focus), thematic content (key concepts, diplomatic mechanisms, and institutional actors), and substantive findings in terms of effectiveness, challenges, and opportunities.

The thematic analysis used a hybrid coding strategy, which was a combination of deductive and inductive strategies. The research objectives formed deductive codes, which consisted of pre-established categories: institutional evolution, diplomatic mechanisms, determinants of effectiveness, and the problems of implementation. The inductive codes developed through successive readings of the studies included and reflected such themes as the discourse-action gap, climatization of security institutions, and multi-stakeholder governance strategies.

The qualitative data analysis software NVivo version was used to code the data and assist in the systematization and retrieval of the coded portions. Primary codes were then consolidated into preliminary themes that were then revised, refined, and checked against the data extracted. Final themes were well defined and placed together into an appropriate analytical structure that covered the objectives of the research. The synthesis incorporated the results of literature to find the patterns, compare institutional strategies, examine the variations of context, and develop an insight on the ways to deepen diplomatic conflict prevention.

Ethical Considerations

In this research, no primary data gathering was done; instead, only secondary research of published literature and available institutional publications was used. This meant that the formal approval of an institutional review board was not necessary. However, the research was conducted based on ethical principles. Sources were referenced correctly in accordance with the referencing style. Results of initial research were reported without bias or misrepresentation to defend any prior conclusions. Where there were differences in studies in terms of findings and interpretations, they were openly reported as opposed to being suppressed.

Limitations

- This scope of 2020-2026 is relevant but might be so short as to miss long-term trends and preliminary work, which comes before this time and might dilute the historical situation.
- Published academic literature can bias what is represented as positive results and successful cases since null results and failures are less likely to be published, thus creating a falsely positive image of the effectiveness of climate diplomacy.
- English is the major language in which the research is conducted; thus, the lack of other languages and their literature, which may represent an important source of research and other viewpoints, is a threat to the study.
- It is inherently difficult to determine cause and effect relationships between diplomatic action and conflict-prevention outcomes since myriad factors are working on conflict dynamics and ascribing must be tedious. The literature reviewed is often based on correlational evidence or case studies, but not on strict causality.
- Climate diplomacy is a rapidly growing area; changes since the time of the research may not be completely reflected, and the dynamics of both the climate issue and international relations imply that the results may need to be updated periodically as new facts are discovered.
- Some institutional reports, policy documents, and grey literature that are relevant will not be accessible, which may limit the completeness of the review. Irrespective of these shortcomings, the methodological approach and emphasis on the contemporary and high-quality scholarship provide a solid basis for understanding the present situation in climate diplomacy in preventing conflicts and determining the relevant challenges and opportunities of the future evolution.

Findings

The review of the recent literature provides several noteworthy findings in relation to the role of diplomacy to prevent conflicts based on climate, thematically structured into institutional development, diplomatic processes, regional differences, effectiveness determinants, and the persistent issues.

The Climatization of Security Governance and Institutional Evolution

The major conclusion relates to the significant transformation of international institutions in terms of their involvement in climate security in the time frame 2020-2026. The United Nations Security Council has experienced a gradual process of climatization, where there has been an increased role of climate change in its agenda despite the continued resistance of some of its member states that perceive climate issues as irrelevant to the operations of the Security Council (Maertens et al., 2021). This institutional development is indicative of the fact that many states are increasingly recognizing that climate change is proactive on the frontiers of international peace and international security, but debate on the appropriate action to take has not been reached.

Member states have heterogeneous approaches to the climate security nexus in the Security Council, and they build unequal coalitions (Hardt et al., n.d.). Countries such as many European states and the small island developing states that are progressive believe in strong involvement of the Security Council on the issue of climate security, as they view it as a key to effective conflict prevention. On the other hand, other states, especially the big powers, do not welcome the perceived securitization of climate issues and would like to solve the problem of climate change by using the environment and developmental structures rather than using the security institutions. Such divisions make it challenging to develop unified diplomatic reactions and restrain the efficiency of the Security Council in alleviating security risks that are associated with climate change.

In addition to the Security Council, other international organizations are integrated into their activities by taking into consideration climate. These organizations conceptualize climate security in different ways, create different types of institutional tools, and carry out a continuum of policy measures (Bremberg et al., 2022). This institutional diversity not

only makes experimentation and context-based approaches possible but may also pose coordination and coherence problems. The growth of climate security efforts within institutions threatens to divide and duplicate and also provides numerous points of diplomatic intervention. The European Union has become a very active player in the sphere of climate security diplomacy. The EU has established complex structures for dealing with security risks associated with climate in its foreign policy, focusing on the “responsibility to prepare” for conflict prevention (Heras (2020)). EU efforts have been in climate risk analysis of conflict-stricken countries, incorporation of climate development and security assistance, and international relations to encourage action on climate as a means of conflict prevention. Still, such gaps of implementation is also found in many cases; EU discourse on climate security often outweighs practical action on the ground.

Diplomatic Mechanisms and Practices

The study has identified a vast number of diplomatic processes that incorporate climate concerns in conflict prevention initiatives. These processes run on multiple levels and by several institutional means.

Diplomatic mechanisms/frameworks	Practices
Multilateral Forums and Negotiations	Although the UNFCCC process is mainly concerned with the mitigation and adaptation of climate, it creates the possibility of diplomatic interactions that can decrease the tensions and promote cooperation regarding climate-related problems. Nonetheless, studies show strains between climate talks that focus on emissions cuts and talks that focus on security risks associated with climate change; little has been done to integrate the parallel courses of action. Another important mechanism is specialized institutions that deal with certain environmental issues.
Specialized Institutions	The case study of the Arctic Council shows that specialized institutions are efficient in handling threats to environment and safety with the help of diplomatic collaboration (Odgaard et al., 2023). The example of the Polar Code, which was developed with the help of the Arctic Council and the International Maritime Organization, demonstrates that even in a situation when the substantive dissimilarity among the member states is observed, in the event of certain conditions being fulfilled, that is, the identification of

	the responsible parties, the interest of great powers in resolving the problem, and the appropriate socio-economic environment, diplomatic success is possible.
Regional Organizations	Regional organizations are very instrumental in converting global climate-security issues to regional and local action. Research records ASEAN is helping to participate in environmental collaboration amidst political severance through environmental concerns such as access to dialogue and trust-building (Saina et al., n.d.). Local strategies allow us to adjust to the circumstances related to a particular geographic, political, and cultural environment and be connected to the global structures.
Peace mediation and agreement-making	Peace mediation and agreement-making provide the chance to bring climate considerations to the conflict-resolution mechanisms. Fowler (n.d.) analyzes the potential to incorporate climate considerations into peace agreements, considering environmental causes of conflict, and incorporating climate resilience into the process of post-conflict reconstruction. This way acknowledges the fact that peace settlements offer significant opportunities in transforming the management of resources and putting measures that may involve environmental cooperation in place, which can avert future confrontations.
Environmental Peacebuilding	Environmental peacebuilding has become a specific diplomatic practice. Sommer et al. (2024) record the way environmental cooperation may provide a source of grounding and constructing peace by surpassing usual conflict resolution and establishing positive peace by maintaining environmental commonality. Environmental peacebuilding capitalizes on the fact that environmental issues are transboundary to promote cooperation, trust building, and the development of interests that cut across political boundaries.
Conservation diplomacy	Conservation diplomacy is a novel tool that connects peace and security goals with the goal of conservation of biodiversity. According to Pandit (2025), conservation can have diplomatic purposes because it can lead to international collaboration and development of trust among states, as well as solving common environmental problems. This strategy expands climate diplomacy beyond climate change to include broader environmental governance as a conflict prevention instrument.

Local Differences and Situation-Specific Strategies

The study establishes that there are strong regional disparities in climate-diplomatic approaches, highlighting the role of spatial vulnerabilities, political milieus, and institutional power.

- I. **Arctic Region:** In the Arctic, the change in the environment creates security risks and cooperation opportunities at the same time. Diplomatic cooperation around the issue of the environment and security can be observed through the promulgation of the Polar Code, which depicts the possibility of cooperation in a geopolitical confrontation (Odgaard et al., 2023). However, recent geopolitical changes, specifically the ones related to the Russian activities in Ukraine, have strained the collaboration in the Arctic, which is how vast geopolitical conflicts damage environmental diplomacy.
- II. **Asia-Pacific region:** Asian regional organizations, especially the ASEAN, have established unique environmental-diplomatic modalities, which place more emphasis on non-intervention, consensus-building, and gradual confidence-building through technical cooperation (Saina et al., n.d.). The discussion explains how the environment collaboration can be used as a channel through Dialogue can be carried out in politically divided contexts, e.g., the Korean Peninsula, but the progress has been limited by the existence of higher-level political barriers.
- III. **European region:** Europe has already adopted comparatively advanced models, which integrate the issue of climate into the security and foreign policy, driven by its vulnerability to climatic change in neighboring countries and normative devotion to multilateralism and environmental responsibility (Heras, 2020). However, the investigation shows that there are barriers to the realization of these structures into effective action, especially outside the immediate vicinity of Europe.
- IV. **African region:** It has not been more intensively explored within the corpus, but the academic literature reflects that African regions face significantly acute climate-security threats based on a high vulnerability, limited adaptive potential, and dominating conflictual processes. The diplomatic policies in Africa are often based on the necessity of international support, capacity-building programs, and integration of climate factors into the current mechanisms of peace and security.

Factors that Affect the Effectiveness of Diplomacy

The study determines several factors that can determine the success of diplomatic attempts to avert climate conflicts:

- I. Diplomatic activities have higher chances of success when supported by major powers that have resources and political advocacy. On the contrary, climate diplomacy may be sabotaged by the great power conflict and tensions in the sphere of geopolitics since the priority of states in their relations is the strategic rivalry rather than the collaboration in the sphere of environment protection.
- II. It is easier to provide diplomatic services when environmental issues and actors can be distinctly defined so that specific interventions and accountability systems can be provided. This attribution is complicated by the diffuse and long-term nature of most climate effects, which makes it harder to reach through diplomacy.
- III. When institutions clearly have a mandate to solve climate security challenges and clearly have mechanisms through which mandates can be transformed into action, effectiveness is also improved. Lack of clarity regarding the institutional role and responsibilities may result in inaction or even doubling of efforts.
- IV. The multi-stakeholder approach involving a variety of stakeholders, such as states, international organizations, civil society, local communities, or actors of the private sector, was more effective than approaches that are purely state-centric. This is an indication of the acknowledgment of the fact that the issues of climate security demand the mobilization of various resources and knowledge.
- V. Cohesion can be promoted by ensuring that the policies and practices in the humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding sectors incorporate climate security issues instead of being perceived as a distinct problem. The integration would allow more profound responses that would target root causes and create resilience.
- VI. Since there is uncertainty about the effect and dynamics of conflict in both climate and conflict, adaptive governance is more effective than the predetermined approaches that involve strict adherence and rigidity.

Serious Challenges and Obstacles

Regardless of the advancement in climate diplomacy, the study also found that there are serious challenges that have not been overcome:

- I. **Discourse-action gap:** There is a core discovery of the discord between the increasing discourse on climate security and a lack of tangible action to avert climate-related confrontations. Although the awareness of the risks of climate security has grown significantly, there is a problem of the transfer of this awareness into effective diplomatic interventions. This missing link indicates various barriers such as rival priorities, resource limitations, bureaucracy, and political barriers.
- II. **Geopolitical rivalry:** An increase in geopolitical rivalry, especially among the powerful states, harms climate diplomacy by reducing the trust, restricting cooperation, and making states focus on strategic competition rather than collaborative action against climate security. The study records that the tensions between states can paralyze multilateral forums, thwart efforts to reach a consensus on climate security projects, and frustrate already established mechanisms of cooperation.
- III. **Institutional fragmentation:** The increase in the number of institutions, forums, and climate security-related initiatives poses a coordination problem and may result in duplication of initiatives. As much as institutional diversity leads to experimentation, it also makes it difficult to come up with coherent and coordinated responses to climate security risks.
- IV. **Sovereignty issues:** A significant number of states do not want to approach climate change through the prism of security because it can be used as an excuse to intervene in the domestic situation. Such sovereignty implications restrict the field of diplomatic activity and do not help to agree on effective climate security regulations.
- V. **Complicatedness of climate-conflict interactions:** Indirect and situation-specific climate-conflict interactions complicate the process of diplomatic response. Climate change does not usually directly lead to conflicts but increases vulnerabilities and tensions, which pose/exert complex ways of action. It is complicated that targeted diplomatic interventions are difficult to design and that their effectiveness is difficult to demonstrate.
- VI. **Resource constraints:** Climate diplomacy and conflict prevention demand a large number of resources to assess the risk and provide early warning, preventive action, and capacity-

building. Nevertheless, the availability of resources is seldom in line with the requirements, and this constrains the extent and success of diplomatic efforts.

- VII. **Time horizons and political incentives:** The risks of climate security often have long-run horizons, and political systems are usually run by shorter electoral cycles. This time gap poses a problem in terms of mobilizing political will and maintaining diplomatic action in the long periods of time required to effectively prevent conflicts.

New Innovations and Opportunities

With all the difficulties, the study finds the potential prospects of innovations and opportunities in climate diplomacy:

- Human security viewpoints can be incorporated into climate diplomacy, which may provide a chance to consider the security of people and communities and form more extensive coalitions to act (Jayaram et al., 2022).
- There is the expansion of multi-stakeholder climate diplomacy, which includes non-state actors, which brings avenues to mobilize other resources and capabilities (Idibekzoda, 2024).
- Environmental peacebuilding as a specific practice is an emerging phenomenon that provides tangible tools to utilize environmental cooperation to create peace and intervene in cases of conflict (Sommer et al., 2024).
- Conservation diplomacy represents an expansion of the notion of climate diplomacy to include biodiversity and ecosystem protection and introduces more points of diplomatic entry (Pandit, 2025).
- Regional institutions are working on context-specific climate diplomacy that can provide a clue of other contexts and global systems (Saina et al., n.d.).

All these findings indicate that this is a discipline in a state of flux, as institutional involvement and diplomatic experimentation take place alongside nagging contradictions and discrepancies between rhetoric and practice. These implications of findings are discussed in the following discussion section, and they examine directions to enhance the role of climate diplomacy in preventing conflicts.

Discussion

The FINDINGS indicate a dynamic and diverse environment of climate diplomacy in crisis prevention, whereby there has been a lot of advancement in institutional involvement and conceptualization as well as a lot of default in changing awareness into constructive action. This discussion will look at the implications of these findings and underlying dynamics and look at avenues of enhancing diplomatic responses to climate-related security risks.

The Coming of Age of Climate Security as a Diplomatic Priority

The study reveals that the concept of climate security has become mainstream and is no longer considered a marginal issue in international institutions in the 2020-2026 period. This development is a major change in the way global society thinks of security threats and the relevant mechanisms for dealing with them. The tendency to climatize the institutions such as the UN Security Council is an indication that there is an increasing awareness that the environmental change incredibly alters the landscape of international peace and security.

Nonetheless, this institutional transformation is still debatable and unfinished. The varied ways in which the member states in the UN Security Council operate depict underlying disagreements as to whether climate change is to be tackled by using security systems or even the environmental and development agencies. These differences are not just procedural, but deeper tensions over the various issues of sovereignty, the proper scope of security governance, and the sharing of responsibilities when it comes to dealing with climate change. The debate on the institutionalization of climate security has significant consequences on the effectiveness of diplomatic performance. In situations where institutions do not have clear mandates and member states do not agree on basic issues of definition of the problem and how to respond to them, it is challenging to coordinate and execute diplomatic action. The outcome is usually the growth of communication, but without any action, a trend that is found in various institutions and settings.

The Discourse-Action Gap: The Problem of Irreducible Barriers

It is, perhaps, the most important discovery related to the fact that there has always been a mismatch between the ever-increasing discussion of climate security and little actual action to curb the development of climate-related conflicts. This loophole manifests at various levels, including international organizations, regional and national governments, and it is a basic issue of climate diplomacy. This discourse action gap is caused by a number of factors.

Firstly, the fact that linking climate and conflicts is complex and uncertain complicates the process of designing specific interventions and proving their efficacy. Climate change does not directly lead to conflicts but acts as a threat multiplier, increasing the backgrounds of vulnerabilities in indirect and context-specific ways. This complexity makes it harder to develop some degree of consensus regarding diplomatic responses as well as to mobilize resources to take preventive action.

Second, the collective action on climate security is adversely affected by geopolitical tensions and great power rivalry. Diplomatic efforts are put at stake once the states concentrate on strategic rivalry rather than cooperation within the wider framework of geopolitical relations. The tensions between the geopolitical entities may freeze the work of the multilateral forums, block the agreements on the actions related to climate security, and weaken the current systems of cooperation. This has grown more pronounced in recent years with great power competition becoming more intense between the United States and China and with Russia acting in Ukraine to weaken international cooperation in various arenas.

Third, institutional fragmentation generates coordination problems that create barriers to taking action. The institutional forum and initiative growth of climate and security also pose duplication, gaps, and failure of coordination. In the absence of good coordinating mechanisms across the institutions and policy spheres, diplomatic activities may be disjointed and useless.

Fourth, climate diplomacy has narrower boundaries and diminished efficiency due to resource constraints. Preventing conflict would need huge investments in risk assessment, early warning systems, capacity building, and preventive interventions. Nevertheless, the

availability of resources usually does not meet the demands, especially in the riskiest situations related to climate security. Such a resource discrepancy indicates both the problem of insufficient funding to climate security activities in general and difficulties in marshaling resources to preventive action instead of emergency response.

Fifth, temporal disparities between the risks of climate security and political incentives in the country provide barriers to long-term diplomatic involvement. Climate security risks tend to be likely to occur over prolonged periods of time, whereas political systems generally run on a shorter electoral cycle. This inequity in time makes mobilization of the political will for long-term prevention hard because the benefits of prevention are often not visible, and the costs are immediate.

Diplomatic Mechanisms: Achievement, weaknesses and lessons

The study presents various diplomatic tools that may be used to incorporate climate concerns into the conflict prevention process that have different strengths and weaknesses.

Multilateral bodies such as the UN Security Council have the possibility of high-level political participation and making authoritative decisions in matters to do with climate security. Nevertheless, the efficiency of the Council is limited by the geopolitical segments, procedural barriers, and controversies over its mandate. Despite the growing focus on the subject of climate security by the Council, it is hard to translate these deliberations into real preventive measures.

The existence of specialized institutions dealing with the environmental challenge, like the Arctic Council, indicates that diplomatic cooperation on the topics of environment and security is feasible even under conditions of geopolitical tension, under specific conditions. The achievements in the Polar Code development can teach valuable lessons: the necessity to define the problem, the huge power of interest, and a good socio-economic background. Nevertheless, this success is still not fully applicable to other contexts, especially concerning the peculiar features of Arctic governance and the recent tension in Arctic cooperation.

Regional organizations have significant benefits in climate diplomacy, such as closeness to the populations influenced, appreciation of regional conditions, and aptitude to fit international systems to regional particulars. The study documents the way in which organizations such as ASEAN and the EU have formulated unique methods of climate security, which portray regional political cultures and institutional abilities. Nevertheless, regional institutions lack capacity as well, such as resource availability, enforcement capabilities, and susceptibility to the wider geopolitical conflicts.

Environmental peacebuilding is the offer of a non-violent way of diplomatic practice that uses environmental collaboration as a tool to establish peace and eliminate conflicts. The study illustrates that environmental concerns can act as the points of entry and collaboration even under the conditions of political aggravation, providing the possibility of confidence-building and collaborating to solve problems. Nevertheless, environmental peacebuilding is limited by difficulties in scaling local efforts to larger conflict prevention systems and maintaining collaboration in the face of more general political barriers.

Climate concerns can be integrated into peace agreements and post-conflict reconstruction, and this provides possibilities to respond to the environmental factors that cause conflict and create climate resilience at the stage of peace processes. This strategy acknowledges that peace arrangements offer important points of departure to transform the management of resources and to put up environmental cooperation systems. But even when they are implemented on a peace agreement's terms and conditions, their application often falls behind on the promises, which speaks more of the issues of the wider context in the aftermath of a conflict.

Local Differences and the Significance of Situation

The empirical study shows a strong geographical difference in using the strategies adopted in climate diplomacy, which reflect different geographic vulnerabilities, political milieus, and institutions. This heterogeneity underscores the need to have formulations that are context specific, transposing general world patterns on the local demands. An example of this would be in the Arctic, where the data proves that there is a prospect of

environmentally oriented cooperation in geopolitically sensitive areas, but that this approach can be undermined by the very political tension.

The Asia-Pacific environment is one of the examples of how environmental diplomacy may serve as an interlocutory interface in politically polarized environments; still, its progress is limited by the sheer expanse of political barriers. The European realm, in turn, demonstrates how the regional organizations can establish complex climate-security systems, but the systems remain exposed to significant operational problems. Altogether, these local peculiarities suggest that successful climate diplomacy depends on the ability to balance global coordination and regional and local customization. Universalist schemes are unlikely to lead to satisfactory results when confronted with the different contexts, but localized strategies are likely to cause segregation and the loss of opportunities in exchanging knowledge inter-regionally and in optimizing resources. The critical task is the formulation of flexible constructs that will enable context-driven adjustment without destroying system coherence and interscale coordination.

Non-State Actor role and Multi-Stakeholder Strategies

One of the key tendencies that have been discovered in the study is the shift toward multi-stakeholders and more inclusive approaches to climate diplomacy. The conventional state-based diplomatic strategies are becoming complemented with interacting with non-state organizations, such as international organizations, civil society, local communities, cities, and actors in the private sector. Such development is an indicator of an understanding that states cannot offer sufficient resources and expertise to coordinate effective responses to climate security risks. Non-state actors contribute the much-needed skills, such as technical skills, local knowledge, implementation capacity, and resources.

In addition, multi-stakeholder solutions may contribute to the legitimacy and sustainability of diplomatic initiatives, as they provide an opportunity to give the affected populations a voice in decision-making processes. Nonetheless, multi-stakeholder methodologies are also associated with coordination, accountability, and power issues. To make sure that various actors are directed in a coherent way towards the common goals, the coordination mechanisms should be strong. It is sometimes hard to be accountable in the face of a shared

responsibility among several actors. The absence of power relations between various classes of actors might lead to the exclusion of certain voices even though they are formally included.

Human Security and the Expansion of Climate Diplomacy

It is a significant development in climate diplomacy thought that involves the integration of human security views and has implications of practical importance. Climate security redefined through human security shifts the analytical focus away from macro-state interests to focus attention on how individuals and communities are to be safeguarded against dangers of climate change and how to make people more empowered in building up resilience. There are a number of benefits to this reframing. It previews the human aspects of climate security, which could thus form larger alliances in action by prefiguring a common susceptibility, as opposed to sovereignty. It focuses analytical attention on the most vulnerable populations that are disproportionately affected by the risks of climate security.

Further, it emphasizes the importance of developing adaptive capacity and resilience at the community level, instead of limiting the responses to state-level mechanisms. However, human security framing is faced with substantive challenges. Some states are not fond of such methods, as they may be viewed as some pretext of foreign interference. To operationalize human security into diplomatic practice requires devising proper indicators, mechanisms, and interventions, and this is an effort that is yet to be finalized.

Moreover, the challenges of human security reconciliation with the maintenance of state sovereignty and traditional security paradigms create certain tensions, which should be approached with caution.

Conservation Diplomacy and Expanding the Field

Conservation diplomacy as a concept and practice opens the scope of climate diplomacy to include biodiversity conservation and ecosystem protection. This growth has a lot of implications, in the sense that it recognizes the fact that climate change is just one of the

aspects of a wider set of environmental issues that are adversely impacting peace and security.

There are several benefits associated with conservation diplomacy. It also creates more points of diplomatic intervention on environmental issues. It also capitalizes on both intrinsic and instrumental values of biodiversity to enhance environmental cooperation. It acknowledges the linkages between climate change, loss of biodiversity, and other environmental issues, hence making it easier to respond to them more comprehensively. Nevertheless, the extension of the horizons of the sphere of climate diplomacy also preconditions threats of diluting attention and deviating resources. The enlarged agenda might reduce focus on issues unique to climate, given the limited levels of diplomatic bandwidth and resources. To ensure that extended environmental diplomacy still has a primacy on the prevention of conflicts but does not degenerate into environmental governance in its purest form, it is necessary to frame and implement it with a lot of care.

Pathways to Empower Climate Diplomacy to Prevent Conflicts

As the empirical study and further discourse show, there are several ways to improve the role of climate diplomacy in avoiding conflicts:

1. To overcome the discourse-action gap, it is necessary to go beyond awareness-raising to the creation of practical mechanisms, resources, and political pledges to preventive action. This would include the development of effective institutional requirements, marshalling of sufficient resources, developing working structures that reduce climate security issues into diplomatic actions, and developing accountability systems that would demand follow-up on promises.
2. It is necessary to improve coordination among the institutions, policy areas, and levels to defeat the fragmentation. This also requires the establishment of coordination mechanisms, demarcation of institutional roles and duties, encouragement of information-sharing and inter-initiative learning, and creation of coherence across the humanitarian-development-peacebuilding nexus.
3. It is important to create adaptive governance structures that can adapt to changing climate security issues because of the uncertainty of climate effects and conflict relations. They are

investment in the risk assessment and early-warning systems, creation of scenario planning and adaptive management strategies, capacity building to respond swiftly to emerging climate security threats, and encouragement of learning and adjustment through experiment-related feedback.

4. Regionalization without de-globalization would help to support context-specific adjustment and prevent disintegration. It will involve reinforcing the ability of the regional organizations to handle the risks of climate security, providing cross-regional learning and sharing resources, ensuring the linkage of regional efforts to the global frameworks, and considering regional peculiarities and supporting universal norms and values.
5. The encouragement of multi-stakeholder participation has the capacity to mobilize various resources and expertise and increase legitimacy. This involves designing inclusive processes of involvement of the non-state actors, meaningful involvement of the affected communities, formulation of partnerships amongst states, international organizations, civil society, and the private sector, and distribution of power imbalances to ensure that diverse voices are heard.
6. By introducing climate considerations into the conflict cycle instead of viewing climate security as another problem, it will be possible to increase efficiency. This entails integrating climate risk assessments into the conflict prevention planning, integrating climate aspects into peace mediation and agreement-making procedures, developing climate resilience into post-conflict reconstruction, and promoting environmental collaboration as a peace infrastructural base. These are paths that are not exclusive to one another but complementary paths. With climate diplomacy, preventing conflicts requires far-reaching strategies that manage to consider various levels at the same time but also adapt to situations and circumstances and respond to emerging issues.

Conclusion

Climate change is one of the most burning issues of the twenty-first century, which shapes the landscape of international peace and security radically. This structured literature review, which was performed in line with PRISMA guidelines, questioned the role of diplomacy in preventing climate-related conflicts by reviewing twenty-three high-quality articles published in the period 2020-2026. As the analysis shows, the field is undergoing significant substantive change, being characterized by the growing institutional involvement, the gradual advancement of diplomatic creativity, and the long-term challenges in achieving the realization of the awareness into viable action.

The evidence shows that the issue of climate security has moved its periphery to the mainstream of international organizational agendas. The integration of climate concerns into institutions such as the United Nations Security Council, the development of advanced climate-security regimes by regional organizations such as the European Union, and the development of new diplomatic forms such as environmental peacebuilding and conservation diplomacy all are indications of important advancement in the legitimization of climate security as a separate area of diplomacy. This change in the institutions is an indicator of a critical change in the understanding of climate change as an international threat to peace and stability.

However, there is still a very strong disparity between the growing discussion of climate security and the lack of capability to act in a coherent manner to avoid conflicts over climate issues. One can explain this discourse-action disjuncture by a set of obstacles: geopolitical tensions making collective action impossible, institutional fragmentation making coordination challenging, sovereignty issues making diplomatic intervention difficult, the complex nature of the association between climate processes and conflict, and resource limitations making the implementation capacity limited. These obstacles need to be addressed in a systematic manner in case the increasing awareness should be converted into concrete conflict-prevention results.

The paper singles out a spectrum of diplomatic tools to integrate climate considerations into conflict-preventive operations, each having its own set of strengths and weaknesses.

Multilateral forums present the opportunity of high-level political involvement but face hindrances due to geopolitical divides as well as the procedural limitations. Special institutions, which face the issue of environmental security, may be successful under certain conditions: clear problem statements, the compatibility of interests of great powers, and favorable conditions of contexts. The Regional Organizations offer useful benefits in the internationalization of local structures but face capacity issues. Environmental peacebuilding and conservation diplomacy offer good opportunities for taking advantage of environmental cooperation in building peace, though there are still challenges of scale and sustainability.

The study clarifies that there exist more serious regional differences in climate-diplomacy approaches, and it is important to consider localized responses to be coordinated globally and adapted locally. Each of the Arctic, Asia-Pacific, European, and African environments is characterized by distinct problems and opportunities that require diplomacy that is sensitive to each of the geographical weaknesses, political environments, and institutional strengths. Good climate diplomacy should not be able to oppose the universal framework of the system and the localized solutions, thus eliminating both one-size-fits-all and over-fragmentation.

The move towards models that involve many stakeholders is a timely trend that acknowledges the inability of state-centric models to organize the resources and expertise needed to overcome climate-security risks. This redefinition of the state's security agenda in terms of human security incorporation can bring more people and communities to act, and this may lead to wider coalitions. These conceptual and operational breakthroughs increase the scope of climate diplomacy and make it more viable, at the same time creating new coordination and accountability issues.

There are a number of key avenues for enhancing the role of climate diplomacy in conflict prevention. The closure of the discourse-action gap requires the transition of the focus on awareness-raising to the creation of active mechanisms, resource distributions, and political undertakings that support preventive action. Fragmentation can be overcome by increasing coordination between institutions, policy domains, and scales. Building flexible

systems of governance will allow responding to emerging climate-security issues. Localizing practices without breaking international coordination is possible by enhancing regional strategies while maintaining global coordination. Multi-stakeholder engagement fosters mobilization of various resources as well as enhancing legitimacy. Integrating climate issues into all stages of the conflict cycle, instead of making climate security an independent matter, would enhance effectiveness in total.

The time sensitivity related to the problem of climate security cannot be disputed. Climate change is increasing the susceptibility and causing conflicts in a wide variety of contexts, so preventive intervention could be made much narrower. The global community should not be subjected to mere rhetoric but to real action, where there is proper resourcing of diplomatic actions, proper coordination, and long-term commitment. By appropriately using diplomatic tools, the international community can increase resilience, avoid wars, and forge ways to a more peaceful and sustainable future in the shade of climate change. The contribution of diplomacy to such an undertaking cannot be viewed as an accident but as a necessity because the problem of climate-security requires an international joint effort that is only possible through the ongoing diplomatic interaction.

This scientific review affirms that despite the serious obstacles, the pillars of effective climate diplomacy in preventing conflicts are being cemented, thus necessitating greater efforts to turn increasing awareness and new inventions into effective action that is sustainable.

References

- Albakjaji, M. A., Alshammari, A. M., & Alshammari, M. (2025). The role of international environmental cooperation in achieving sustainable peacebuilding in international relations: A comprehensive and critical analysis. *Journal of Posthumanism*, 5(4). <https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v5i4.1222>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Bremberg, N., Mobjörk, M., & Krampe, F. (2022). Global responses to climate security: Discourses, institutions and actions. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, 17(3), 341–356. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15423166221128180>
- Budiana, M. (2024). Climate Change and International Politics: Cooperation or Conflict. *Journal of Law, Social Science and Humanities*, 2(1), 128–139. Retrieved from <https://myjournal.or.id/index.php/JLSSH/article/view/267>
- Busby, J. W. (2021). Beyond internal conflict: The emergent practice of climate security. *Journal of Peace Research*, 58(1), 186–194. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343320971019>
- Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. (2018). *CASP qualitative checklist*. <https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/>
- Fowler, M. (n.d.). *Climate diplomacy: Can mediating climate considerations into peace agreements create a sustainable future?*
- Gough, D., Oliver, S., & Thomas, J. (Eds.). (2017). *An introduction to systematic reviews* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Hardt, J. N., Schaller, S., & Rüttinger, L. (n.d.). *A climate for change in the UN Security Council? Member states' approaches to the climate–security nexus*.
- Idibekzoda, S. (2024). The evolution of environmental diplomacy: Reviewing four decades of research. In *World sustainability series* (pp. 219–238). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-8772-2_12
- Jayaram, D., Acharya, S., & Kaur, M. (2022). Human security in times of climate change: Climate diplomacy for integrated action. In *Climate change, community response and resilience* (pp. 197–217). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72196-1_10
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33(1), 159–174. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310>
- Lee, S. (2022). Climate change and international relations: Research agenda on economy, security, development, and new actors. *Gugje Jeongchi Nonchong*, 62(1), 271–304. <https://doi.org/10.14731/kjir.2022.03.62.1.271>

- Maertens, L., Baillat, A., & Ramel, F. (2021). Climatizing the UN Security Council. *International Politics*, 58(4), 640–660. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41311-021-00281-9>
- Namamian, F., Tayebi, A., & Mohammadi, M. (n.d.). *Synchronization of international actors in the Asian region with environmental diplomacy in achieving global peacemaking*.
- Nevitt, M. P., Kelley, C. P., & Brilmayer, L. (2021). *Is climate change a threat to international peace and security?* Social Science Research Network. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.3689320>
- Odgaard, L., Lanteigne, M., & Hodgson, J. (2023). The Arctic Council, the International Maritime Organization, and the Polar Code. *Global Policy*, 14(3), 456–467. <https://doi.org/10.1177/27538796231174825>
- Pandit, M. K. (2025). Conservation diplomacy as part of multilateral strategies for global peace and sustainability. *npj Biodiversity*, 4(1), Article 5. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44185-025-00075-9>
- Pérez de las Heras, B. (2020). Climate security in the European Union’s foreign policy: Addressing the responsibility to prepare for conflict prevention. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 28(3), 335–347. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14782804.2020.1731438>
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Saina, E., Kim, R. E., & Krampe, F. (n.d.). *Environmental peacebuilding in East Asia: ASEAN’s role in facilitating inter-Korean environmental cooperation*.
- Sommer, J. M., Bruch, C., & Troell, J. (2024). Environmental peacebuilding: Moving beyond resolving violence-ridden conflicts to sustaining peace. *World Development*, 177, Article 106555. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2024.106555>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>