

# Review of: "International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) in Humanitarian Field: why and how to engage with Planetary Health?"

Pascal Boireau<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Agence Nationale de Sécurité Sanitaire de l'Alimentation, de l'Environnement et du Travail

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Davide Ziveri, Muhammad Asaduzzaman

International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) in Humanitarian Field: why and how to engage with Planetary Health?

The authors address an eminently important subject: how to understand in a global and pragmatic way a subject as important as global health on Earth. Massive industrialization and the economic engine are leading humanity to its doom. The INGOs want to react. The authors define a new term namely "Planetary health". The definition is not easy and it is not really given in the article.

My main criticism is that: Adding words to others does not advance the very serious problem described. I don't see the advantage of the term "Planetary Health" over the more frequently used and equally general "One Health".

Paragraph "Climate crisis is a humanitarian crisis" is surprising. There is a focus on what is not linked to climate change: SARS-CoV2, urbanization. This paragraph should have its title changed or should be rewritten. SARS-CoV2 is described as an "unprecedented disaster". This is incorrect, the real impact take place in Europe and North America at the starting, it was less in Africa. Before the emergence of this virus, I recall that global human mortality due to infectious pathogens was 25%; COVID has not changed this percentage very significantly. In other words, "rich" countries had forgotten before COVID that infectious diseases kill. It would be these aspects that should be emphasized rather than seeing SARS-CoV2 as the biggest disaster. SARS-CoV2 is a sign for the West in fact.

Paragraph: humanitarian response to the climate crisis: It is rightly emphasized that the desire for decarbonization falls short of what is vital. Basic actions are not put in place like "flyskam". It would have been interesting to make the link between "fossil energy consumption-massive production of CO2-temperature-climate change" beforehand or to cite a general publication in the field with an illustration. Reference 13 reflects the work of the UN for major cataclysms in general. Some of these cataclysms are not linked to the climate crisis. In fact, what is described weaknesses the understanding of the action to be taken.

Paragraph: Climate Crisis is also a crisis of humanitarian aid Environmental degradation is associated with the impact of climate change. The title of the paragraph could be changed.

Paragraph An imaginative gap :

-« future is difficult to forecast, but not to imagine”. To cancel. An evidence.

-Reference 24 is not only the notion of multiple truths (we must specify what this is referring to) but a farewell to the truth. So this very important notion illustrates why what we know about the predicted disaster is not taken into account as a scientifically established fact.

The 6 planetary limits exceeded are the issue and I think that the article would have benefited from focusing on this global rupture instead starting with climate changes.

Paragraph Planetary Health: A roadmap for tackling climate-related humanitarian crisis?

The problem of infectious diseases is taken up again with the distorting lens of SARS-CoV2. Distorting because it is not the only problematic virus in the world, distorting because if we had decided to block the planes immediately the epidemic would have been very significantly slowed down (see publications on the epidemiology of SARS-CoV2). So indeed, the originality of the SARS cov2 epidemic is that it is the only one that humans wanted as they did not want to stop it immédiatly. A virus that does not spread more than 2m is controlled by blocking planes (by boat the duration of the journey destroys the virus).

The very positive aspect of the paragraph is to show that the concept is above all a watchword, a practical organization. But this is well illustrated by the One Health concept (I cite the authors “Accounting for One Health: Insights from the social sciences” Jérôme Michalon, 2020). Concerning the theme “supporting efforts for decolonization” I suggest the reading “Linking humans, their animals , and the environment again: a decolonized and more-than-human approach to “One Health” Nicolas Lainé and Serge Morand, 2020.

“economic ideology as a crucial topic in the field of health”. It is the key and we have it at the end of the paragraph. It should be more ahead. The “Limits to growth” (Meadows report) should be cited. How we can have zero growth? It is the driver of all the other solutions that the INGO can propose. Think tank like “Shift project” (<https://theshiftproject.org>) proposed several pragmatic solutions concerning the economical organization of a country with decarbonation. They should be indicated as an example of solutions.

Paragraph: Barriers to adoption of the Planetary Health framework in the humanitarian field

**There is not specific items with those used for the One Health epistemic watchword.**

### **Paragraph: Applying Planetary Health lens to humanitarian action: a challenging reframing**

1) Reframing the issue of the climate crisis: It is not only a health problem. Impact on the biodiversity is another serious topic. It should be changed

2) Open dialogue within humanitarian organizations and networks, planetary health researchers and practitioners.

Autochtone knowledge is indeed important. Dialogue without protected jurisdiction is a real challenge. Note that the One Health concept was re-used in the 2000s to ensure a “buffer” effect for the three international bodies: OMSA, FAO, WHO.

3) how to operationalize: The “Meadows report, 1972” should be cited. There is a global approach in the report.

Points 5 and 6 are very relevant and included in the “Shift project” approaches.

Everything is relevant but nothing is proposed regarding the economy which is the driving force behind the disaster.

The subject developed is particularly important. It is also very large and complex. Many very relevant elements are presented. It is therefore an article deserving publication with proposed changes. Authors can take into account the comments for the various paragraphs.

NB Bold characters are due to an error in the writing system , I cannot change it. there is no bold characters.

