

OUTREACH

a multi-stakeholder magazine on environment and sustainable development



THE GLOBAL CLIMATE REGIME AND THE GLOBAL TRADE REGIME

BY AARON COSBEY

THE CURRENT STATE OF PLAY WHERE DO WE STAND?

BY ALEX STARK

Contents

01 The global climate regime and the global trade regime

02 Indigenous peoples' rights in a Cancun climate decision

04 The Current State of Play
Where do we stand?

06 Saving the world is a joke:
Re-framing perceptions of climate change through laughter

07 Ursula of Carteret Islands in Cancun

08 Profile: Dr. Ana Gúezmes

09 Rio 2012: Another opportunity for making Progress on Climate Change

10 Untidy Reality: Elephant's Still Under Rug

01



04



06



09



OUTREACH

EDITORIAL TEAM

Editorial Advisor
Felix Dodds
Stakeholder Forum

Editor
Nicola Williams
Stakeholder Forum

Political Editor
Sabrina Chesterman

Design and Layout
Cesar Huerta
www.coroflot.com/cesarhuerta

CONTRIBUTING WRITERS

Aaron Cosbey
International Institute for Sustainable Development

Alex Stark
Adopt a Negotiator

Karine Pellofy

Derek Osborn
Stakeholder Forum

Nicola Williams
Stakeholder Forum

OUTREACH is produced by:



Outreach is a multistakeholder Magazine which is published daily at COP16. The articles written are intended to reflect those of the authors alone or where indicated a coalition's opinion.

An individual's article is the opinion of that author alone, and does not reflect the opinions of all stakeholders.

Submitting stories to Outreach

Outreach is a multi-stakeholder magazine on environment and sustainable development produced by Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future at various intergovernmental conferences. At COP16, Outreach will be distributed in the negotiations area at the official publication table, in the side events area for civil society groups and stakeholders, and online for those unable to attend the conference. You can submit articles for potential publication in Outreach via the Editor, Nicola Williams, at nwilliams@stakeholderforum.org. Submissions should be between 500-750 words (+image if available) and letters to world leaders approximately 200 words.

The global climate regime and the global trade regime

By Aaron Cosbey,
Associate and Senior Advisor,
International Institute for Sustainable Development



Q: What do the global climate regime and the global trade regime have in common?

A: We won't know any time soon

This is gallows humour; the WTO and the UNFCCC are both struggling to advance on an urgently needed international agreement, and it is tough to see the light at the end of either tunnel. That's a problem when we so badly need strong multilateral institutions to tackle complex emerging challenges, especially those that cut across issue areas. Based on current trajectories the trade and climate regimes are headed for conflicts that neither seems capable of avoiding, and consequently they are missing important potential synergies.

Potential conflicts

Green subsidies: This September, Japan began proceedings in the WTO against Canada, complaining that the province of Ontario's generous feed-in tariffs for renewable energy violate WTO subsidy law. The problem is the fact that they are only available to producers using locally manufactured inputs; Ontario is hoping to build up expertise and economic activity in the green power sector at the same time as it engages in mitigation. But WTO law prohibits subsidies that are conditioned on the use of local inputs.

This is the first such WTO challenge, but probably not the last. The US is investigating a number of Chinese loan and grant programs that have similar domestic content requirements, or that are contingent on export (also WTO-illegal). Most countries that consider greening their power sectors also consider ways to develop their domestic capacity in that sector. For many, developing an infant industry is a selling point without which they couldn't muster the political will to dole out financial support.

When everyone is doing something, and it is illegal, it's probably time to sit down and come to a new consensus on what is appropriate behaviour. The appropriate venue in this case is the WTO. But that won't happen for years, because the long-suffering Doha Round precludes all other negotiations.

Border Carbon Adjustments (BCAs): One of the most intractable obstacles to strong climate action in industrialized countries is the fear that domestic firms will lose market share to under-regulated foreign competitors, and that the desired emission reductions will instead be emission displacement to other countries. The evidence shows that this is a legitimate concern in a very small (but powerful) handful of sectors, including steel, cement, aluminum, pulp & paper and some chemicals. One proposed solution is to impose a levy at the border that removes any advantage the foreign firms might have gained through domestic climate regulations: border carbon adjustment. It can take the form of a requirement to buy into a domestic cap and trade regime (as included in the US Clean Energy and Security Act), or a tax equivalent to a domestic carbon tax.

The Devil is very much in the details. How do we actually calculate the embodied carbon in imported goods? Current methodologies for product carbon footprinting are in their infancy (and some argue that they will never mature). How do we account for regulatory costs the exporting country has imposed the exporting firms? How do we respect common but differentiated responsibility in a scheme that aims to level the playing field?

And there is WTO law to worry about. Opinion is deeply divided on whether such measures could be legal or not, but there is no doubt whatsoever that they would be challenged if they came into force.

There are still traces of this debate in the latest AWG-LCA text, but the language there basically punts the issue back to the WTO, using guidelines taken straight from WTO law. As with energy subsidies, the ideal solution would be international agreement on good practice in this area, but it is not likely to come from either the WTO or the UNFCCC any time soon.

Potential synergies:

Green goods: One of the most obvious contributions the trade community could make to climate change is lowering tariffs and non-tariff barriers to trade in climate-friendly goods. Indeed, there is a mandate in the Doha negotiations along similar lines, but focusing on environmental goods more broadly, with few of direct relevance to climate change.

Seems simple enough? But what exactly is an environmental good?

Most countries have proposed lists of goods that are suspiciously in line with their current comparative advantage. And how do we deal with goods that have dual uses, such as pipes that can be used either for concentrated solar or for nuclear? And what about countries that want to build up green infant industries? They have no interest in lowering tariffs in those sectors.

A strong WTO might be able to surmount these problems and widen the scope to include more climate-friendly goods. But today's WTO is struggling.

Fossil fuel subsidies: Eliminating fossil fuel subsidies could save governments an estimated \$500 billion a year and significantly reduce global carbon emissions. Trying to address climate change while subsidizing fossil fuels at those levels has been likened to driving with feet on the accelerator and the brake at the same time.

But where is the institutional home for what would have to be a global effort? The WTO could argue it has a mandate, given the precedent of its efforts to reduce environmentally damaging fisheries subsidies. The UNFCCC could argue it too has a mandate, if not to be prescriptive at least to help garner international agreement (and NAMAs may offer some hope for support to national efforts). But neither institution seems up to it at the moment, leaving the ground to less viable

institutions like the G-20 (whose resolve to address the issue is of course welcome).

Moving forward

Ideally green subsidies and BCAs would never come to WTO dispute settlement; it's hard to envision good outcomes for either the trade or the climate regime. Ideally we would be using trade policy to lower tariffs on climate-friendly goods and lower subsidies for fossil fuels. Governments seem unable to do any of that in the near term, yet the conflicts will not wait, and the urgency of mitigation grows ever stronger. Is there a role for non-governmental actors to help make progress at the nexus of trade and climate policies?

I believe there is, for example the production of principles of good practice

in elaborating and implementing border carbon adjustment. If this production is successful policy makers will gain a useful set of benchmarks for assessing potential schemes and perhaps a starting point for reaching agreement on what is an acceptable practice.

Perhaps the most important thing we can do as a community of practice is to continue raising the public profile of climate change. When politicians are forced to concede the importance of climate change as an issue, it will reduce the tensions between climate goals and economic goals that fuel most of the difficulties described. This would make it feasible, for example, to implement a feed-in tariff as a strictly environmental measure.

None of that is easy, I admit, but it's all necessary.

Indigenous peoples' rights in a Cancun climate decision

On Tuesday The Indigenous Peoples' Network on Climate Change and Sustainable Development (IPCSSD) welcomed the document (FCCC/AWGLCA/2010/CRP.3).

We welcome the inclusion of paragraphs 7 and 8 which recognize the need for effective participation of indigenous peoples and fully respect human rights in all climate change related actions. We firmly believe that it is an imperative to adopt the human-rights based approach and ecosystem-based approach to climate change mitigation and adaptation.

We are also encouraged that the texts on REDD (Section C; Paragraphs 65-75 and Annex 11) still retained language on safeguards which:

- recognizes indigenous peoples' rights and knowledge and notes the adoption of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP);
- affirms the need for full and effective participation of stakeholders, in particular indigenous peoples and local communities;
- stresses that actions are consistent with the conservation of natural forests and biological diversity;
- calls for transparent and effective national forest governance structures.

The REDD Plus text also recognizes the need to address the drivers of deforestation drivers of deforestation, land tenure issues and forest governance issues.

We reiterate that it is important to include clear mechanisms for monitoring and reporting how Parties are complying with the safeguards. We propose that a new subparagraph of para 68 be inserted which says "**A system for monitoring and informing on how the safeguards are being addressed and respected throughout the implementation of activities referred to in Para 67.**"

We support the introductory paragraph of Section C that adequate, sustainable and predictable funding for REDD Plus from Developed Countries should be made available. But we want to ensure that funding should not just go to States but also, directly, to indigenous peoples and local communities.

On adaptation, we are against the moves of some Parties to differentiate which of them are most vulnerable to climate change and therefore should receive the greatest part of Adaptation Funds. More focus should be put on vulnerabilities of peoples. Indigenous peoples, whether they are from Small Island States, Least developed countries or middle income countries, all suffer from the adverse impacts of climate change and they should have access to funds, appropriate technologies and technical assistance to allow them to adapt. We support the setting up of the Adaptation Committee and we call on Parties to consider the participation of indigenous peoples in both the Adaptation Committee and the Adaptation Fund Board.

As far as the Kyoto Protocol we decry attempts by some Developed Country Parties to kill this or to merge KP into LCA and have one legally binding agreement. We are also alarmed that there is yet no clear commitment for a Second Commitment Period when the first period is ending in 2012. The KP remains the only legally binding agreement that sets targets of industrialized countries to lower their greenhouse gas emissions. Failure to agree on the second commitment period will ensure that industrialized countries, who are the main culprits in climate change, are freed from any legally binding commitments. The danger of business-as-usual for these countries are all but guaranteed once the Kyoto Protocol is killed.

We reiterate our call that indigenous peoples' participation in all UNFCCC processes and mechanisms at the global, regional and national levels be institutionalized. We recommend that an Indigenous Peoples' Advisory Group be established which can provide advice to the UNFCCC.

Indigenous peoples are not only vulnerable to climate change impacts, they also provide long-lasting solutions to climate change as long as their rights to their lands, resources and territories are secured, their right have their free, prior and informed consent is respected and financial, technological and technical support are provided to them.



Network of Regional Governments for
Sustainable Development

THE °CLIMATE GROUP

Plans and pilots: an international axis for low carbon
development strategies at subnational level

50% to 80% of the decisions impacting upon carbon emissions
are implemented at regional or local level, according to UNDP

Subnational governments from the North and the South are addressing climate change
and turning the global economic difficulties into an opportunity to move towards a green
economy by putting in place concrete innovative actions and cooperating together to
build more inclusive, sustainable, and less resource intensive communities

We have the pleasure of
inviting you to this side
event co-organised by
nrg4SD and T°C°G on

Thursday 9 Dec 2010

18:30-20:00

Cancun Messe

Hall C Room: Sandía

www.nrg4sd.org

www.theclimategroup.org

Speakers:

Mrs Jane Davidson

Minister for Environment, Sustainability and Housing,
Welsh Assembly Government, UK

Mr Philippe Henry

Minister for Environment, Spatial Planning and Mobility,
Wallonia, Belgium

Mr. Charles Larochelle

Vice Minister for Climate Change, Air and Water, Québec,
Canada

Mr Andrew Mawéjje

Chief Administrative Officer, Mbale, Uganda

Mrs. Joseline Ticianelli Vannuzini Ferrer

Executive Secretary of the Programme for Climate
Change PROCLIMA of São Paulo, Brazil

Mr. Salvador Samitier

Director of the Climate Change Office of Catalonia, Spain

The Current State of Play

Where do we stand?

By Alex Stark



Above: Lord Nicholas Stern moderated a heads of state roundtable

Negotiators have been working feverishly over the past several days trying to prepare an unbracketed negotiating text with several options clearly outlined on the most contentious issues. The text will be turned over to high-level ministers to resolve these remaining issues by Friday. On Monday and Tuesday, negotiators worked behind closed doors in small groups and bilateral discussions on the different issues, passing on a finalized version of their piece of the text to the chairs of the KP (Kyoto Protocol) and LCA (Long-term Cooperative Action) tracks, who worked overnight to pull together two coherent texts to present to the entire Conference of the Parties in an informal stocktaking session this morning. The COP insiders daily Earth Negotiations Bulletin newsletter reports that “the mood remained constructive in some informals groups, while in the others, some parties reported ‘a complete lack of progress.’” Where do the issues stand now in the LCA text, what contentious problems remain and where is the United States in all of this?

Mitigation/MRV

When the LCA Chair issued her compromise text at the beginning of these talks, the section on MRV was noticeably lacking. The text has since “evolved...

from an empty 36-word shell to a real basis for negotiation,” according to Eco. Todd Stern said yesterday at a press briefing that the U.S. sees this issue as being the furthest behind and that the text is insufficiently developed. The United States wants developing countries to agree to regular reporting on how they are making progress on reaching their mitigation goals and a mechanism for the international community to review these reports.

Finance

The finance text has been cleaned up with several options clearly outlined on the most important issues remaining to be discussed. One of these is the role of the World Bank and other international financial institutions in the new green climate fund’s governance. The current options in the text would either “invite the World Bank to serve as the interim trustee... [x] year after the operationalization of the fund” or “decide that the trustee shall be selected through a process of open and competitive bidding.”

The U.S., the UK and other developed countries would prefer the World Bank to be involved in the creation of the fund, arguing that this would make it more effective and give donors confidence in its work, while developing countries argue that this would automatically give

developed countries a greater say in how the fund is run and would prefer the fund to be established under the guidance of the UNFCCC. According to a U.S. negotiator, they are close to a definition in the text of precisely what the World Bank’s role as trustee would be. The governance of this fund- how many board members would come from developed vs. developing countries, or civil society members and other stakeholders- is still undecided.

Another set of options regarding how much developed countries will donate to the fund is also in the text. One would have Parties commit to jointly mobilize \$100 billion per year by 2020, as many countries agreed to last year under the Copenhagen Accord, while the second option would have developed countries commit to give “1.5 per cent of their gross domestic product per year by 2020” (considering that the United States hasn’t yet managed to mobilize 0.7% of GDP for total ODA per year, it seems unlikely that they would agree to this option). A final concern is transparency. Several negotiators and civil society organizations have charged the United States with pushing developing countries to be transparent on their mitigation actions without agreeing to a corresponding degree of transparency on how climate funds would be allocated and disbursed.

REDD

The text for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and land Degradation in developing countries has largely been finalized and is waiting for the other issue areas to catch up. The few remaining issues are expressed in clear options.

Adaptation

The adaptation text only has small changes from the original and has also largely been finalized. It contains an option to establish an adaptation committee or to “decide to further consider how to strengthen, enhance and better utilize existing institutional arrangements, and the need for new institutional arrangements, as appropriate.” A negotiator told me that the U.S. prefers the second option rather than the first, which they say would duplicate existing efforts. A section on loss and damage for small islands and other vulnerable countries still needs more attention from the negotiators before it can be passed on.

Technology Transfer

The word in Tianjin back in October was that this issue was nearly decided,

but it seems there has been significant backsliding since then. This text made little progress in the past few days, and most negotiators blame the United States for blocking progress in this working group.

The primary issue here has to do with intellectual property rights (IPR) that would accompany mitigation and adaptation technologies: developed countries don't want to give them away, while developing countries say they wouldn't be able to afford them and the technology would therefore be useless anyway.

According to a developing country delegate, the U.S. and others are “not interested” in giving the technology executive committee, a body that will hopefully be established through these talks, the authority to discuss the IPR issue.

There is also some discussion still on what that committee would look like: developing countries want a majority developing country board, while developed countries would prefer a 50/50 split. Civil society organizations are also reporting that the United States recently inserted the words

“consider to establish” before the clause about a technology committee, weakening the text considerably.

Yesterday afternoon at a heads of state roundtable moderated by Lord Nicholas Stern, Prime Minister of Ethiopia Menes Zenawi said that if climate change negotiations fail, no other multilateral negotiations will be successful, saying “we all know that we will perish or survive together.”

Negotiators should keep these words in mind as they move forward in these negotiations.

Alex Stark is a negotiations tracker with the Adopt a Negotiator Project, representing the United States.

To view her blogs and those by other youth from 13 countries, please go to: <http://adoptanegotiator.org/>

Local Governments and Municipal Authorities Press Briefing

The recognition of local and subnational governments in climate negotiation

CGLU -NRG4SD

Thursday December 9th 13.00-13.30

Room Luna (AZTECA)



Network of Regional Governments
for Sustainable Development

Since Bali conference in 2007, the international networks of local governments have been strongly involved in the UNFCCC negotiation process, through a common climate roadmap.

We invite you to a press briefing on Thursday December 9th, 13.00, in order to:

- Provide an update on the significant breakthrough obtained here in Cancun, in the field of the recognition of local and subnational governments action in the UNFCCC process.
- Express our views on the global negotiation
- Stress the support of local and subnational governments towards the fight against climate change.

Will participate to this briefing:

M. Ronan Dantec

Deputy Mayor of Nantes, Climate spokesperson for United Cities and Local Governments

M. Loganathan Naidoo, Deputy Mayor of Durban, South Africa

Ms. Jane Davidson,

Minister for the Environment, Welsh Assembly Government

M. Abdulaye Sene,

Regional Councillor and Member of the National Assembly of the Fatik region, Senegal

Contact: Thomas Quero +33678068839

Saving the world is a joke:

Re-framing perceptions of climate
change through laughter

By Karine Peloffy

The problem

Climate change is a super wicked problem. To effectively tackle it in a way that preserves current gains in human development and justice requires nothing less than a revolution of how we conduct economic activity and more fundamentally how we collectively conceive of abstract concepts such as risk and prosperity. Needless to say this cultural revolution is not happening fast enough and the COP process has done very little to quicken the pace. Or, it might actually have made it worse after the debacle of Hopenhagen and the slow momentum of Cancun.

Whilst most polls show that a majority of people in many countries are now aware that climate change is a real, human-induced serious problem, this awareness is also very superficial. Survey evidence from the UK showed that as little as 1% of citizens identify climate change as a priority when not prompted. This low level of engagement is due to a maladaptive emotional reaction to climate change information rather than insufficient information.

The human brain affectively tags virtually all objects and concepts brought to mind. Where affective processes (approach / avoidance mechanism) and cognitive (true/false question) processes conflict, the former is biologically designed to win over the latter. Since automatic and most affective processes occur below the consciousness threshold we over attribute our

behaviour to cognitive processes. Importantly, risk perceptions, inherent in climate change communication, are more influenced by affect-driven processes than they are by analytical processes.

How we communicate and act

This is especially relevant considering that climate change is overwhelmingly communicated in the media through a fear-based, catastrophic framing. Whether intentioned to stimulate engagement or to increase newsworthiness, this framing activates a strategy of social avoidance of unpleasant emotions leading to widespread maladaptive psychological responses such as denial, apathy or justifications for disengagement from the issue. Even where fear does successfully engage a small minority of the public, its psychological effect of focusing attention on the threat in order to flee, freeze or fight is ill-adapted to deal with an issue of the complexity and long term nature of climate change.

Put simply, if we want people to act on climate change, we need them to positively feel they are able to deal with it. Why? Because positive emotions have powerful psychological effects such as increased openness to information, enhanced creativity in problem solving, inclusive and integrative patterns of thoughts, preference for variety and an acceptance of a broader array of behavioral options. Positive emo-

tions can prompt individuals to “discard time-tested or automatic (everyday) behavioural scripts and to pursue novel, creative and often unscripted paths of thought and action. That sounds like the kind of people equipped to take on the monumental challenge of peacefully tackling climate change within our lifetime.

Still, how do we communicate a complex and scary problem such as climate change in a way that gives a clear picture of the issues yet makes people feel happy?

We make them laugh.

The role of humour

Humor can uniquely convey very clear and critical perspectives of painful realities whilst generating the emotional high of mirth. Indeed, humour is an important emotion regulation mechanism that can reframe anxiety-arousing issues to seem less threatening and allow them to be experienced as challenges to be approached in a playful way. From the American Great Depression and cancer patients, humour has been used as a tool of psychological and social resilience to overcome fear and better deal with problems.

Humour is an adaptation unique to our species which evolved to manage social conflicts, facilitate communication and social learning. Still today it is often the weapon of choice to communicate socially uncomfortable topics. Beyond emotional

reactions, humor has the ability to enable the radical imagination necessary to communicate a problem that cannot be directly experienced by most people today.

Communication needs to be about capturing the imagination of the public at large and enabling it to play (in the Freudian sense) with theories and concepts. Indeed, there is a dire need to decode expert and scientific messages about climate change with 'bridging metaphors' to the popular culture. Jokes can make the unimagined imaginable.

In the humorous frame, the complexities, uncertainties, oppositions and interpretative multiplicities of climate change become resources rather than problems. Humor's capacity for radical imagination creates a mental space for potential change but also comes with a loss of control as it breaks taboos and turns the order of reality upsi-

de down and inside out. Indeed, because of this ability to destabilize the established order, George Orwell stated that every joke is a tiny revolution. It denudes power of its authority, which is true of those that we oppose but also those that we cherish. Using humor to communicate on climate change means that scientists and environmentalists lose the monopoly on framing climate change and even risk becoming the butt of the joke. However uncomfortable, this may be necessary if we truly want the public at large to take ownership of the issue.

Still, humor is risk and not all forms of climate change related humor will be adaptive. A wise stand up comedian interviewed spoke of a humor / psychological management bell curve where an inability to laugh at something signals an inability to deal with it whilst laughing too much signals its denial. I would posit that both environ-

mentalists and climate denials currently sit on opposite ends of this curve. Very little humor is applied to climate change, and where it is, it mostly serves to deny the issue. How we reach the optimal point where the right amount and kind of humor is used for optimal psychological engagement is a matter of experimentation and moral judgment. It is on this very exciting quest that I have embarked on...to find the joke that will save the world!

Karine Peloffy, is a former corporate litigation lawyer with an Msc from the University of Oxford. She runs an online web project entitled Emission impossible documenting efforts to start a public conversation through humor on the legal and financial implications of climate change for pension funds' investment in energy.

Ursula of Carteret Islands in Cancun

By Nicola Williams, Stakeholder Forum

Carteret Islanders have been fighting a battle against the ocean for over 20 years. As it rises, they have responded by building sea walls and planting mangroves. However, these days, the encroaching sea waters have trounced such measures, contaminating their fresh water wells and turning food supplies into a swampy breeding ground for malaria. With estimates that the islands will be uninhabitable by 2015 due to sea level rise, even the island's elders, ever reluctant to leave, have resigned themselves to become 'climate change refugees'.

In Cancun at COP16, I meet with one of Carteret's treasures, Ursula Rakova, the Executive Director of Tulele Peisa — "sailing the waves on our own" — a local community organisation in Papua New Guinea that is trying to relocate the whole island community of the Carterets to nearby Bougainville because of the impacts of climate change.

At COP16 Ursula aims to highlight the urgency for climate solutions in her region; "If we continue the way we are many of the Pacific Islands will be gone in 10 years time...World leaders need to start taking action, not just talking. Otherwise, these COPs are just going to be adding to their carbon foot-print. Why are people here? To see friends? Enough talk has gone on."

Ursula's experience at the coalface of climate change impacts provides her regio-

nal knowledge and with a practical solution. Her message to leaders is therefore clear: "I would like to leave a message to adaptation funds to recognise the communities that have plans and are doing such work already, without the support of their governments. Many funds direct all money straight to governments and this needs to be addressed."

Ursula's trip to Mexico has been made possible by the Mary Robinson Foundation – Climate Justice (MRFCJ), which aims to support education and advocacy to secure global justice for those many victims of climate change who are usually forgotten - the poor, the disempowered and the marginalised. The first project undertaken by the Foundation focussed on the development of Women's Leadership and Climate Justice in preparation for COP16.

Upon meeting Ursula at Cancunmesse, her mixture of earnestness and strength is quickly apparent. Ursula is well-versed and polite. She speaks softly but with determined focus. She is no stranger to interviews and for several years she has served as an international spokesperson for her island's cause and it is largely due to Ursula's voice that the story of the 'sinking islands' has been told via a chorus of media across the world.

Despite the press encomium that follows Ursula abroad, and the ubiquitous coverage of the 'sinking small islands', such affection and interest has failed to drive



substantial policy shifts or influence funders to adapt to the impacts of climate change through the local organisations themselves.

As Ursula has indicated; "we now want to see the media headlines translate into practical assistance for our relocation program. And we hope our carefully designed and community-led action plan can serve as a model for communities elsewhere that will be affected by climate change in the future."

For more information on Ursula's organisation Tulele Peisa please go to <http://tulelepeisa.org/> or for further information on the Mary Robinson Foundation – Climate Justice (MRFCJ) please go to www.mrfcj.org

Profile

Climate and Gender:

Talking with Dr. Ana Güzmes of UNIFEM (part of UN Women)



Dr. Ana Güzmes

Nationality: Spanish

Country of residence: Mexico

Organisation: UNIFEM, part of UN Women

Current Position: Regional Director for Mexico, Central America, Cuba and Dominican Republic

How long have you been in this position?
1 year (6 years in the UN in total)

What do you believe should be achieved at COP16?

Work continues in Cancun, as it does in every corner of the planet to meet our common objectives of a greener and more just world. I am pleased to see Governments increasingly reinforce references to gender equality and other social dimensions of climate change in the text under negotiation. This reflects a much-needed people centered approach. This is a difficult process, but we are establishing a strong foundation here in Cancun for a just agreement.

How should gender be addressed within the UNFCCC?

The UNFCCC, including the COP, have made some concrete efforts to advance gender equality and these should be recognized. Of course there is always more that can be done but there are some strong signals that Parties understand the imperativeness of an inclusive process. As far back as COP-7 (Marrakesh, 2001) Parties delivered Decision 36/CP.7, "Improving the participation of women in the representation of Parties in bodies established under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol of the Parties" that 'urges Parties to take the measures necessary to enable women to participate fully in all levels of decision-making relevant to climate change', and identifies actions both the Secretariat and Parties can take to this end.

Moreover, there are now references to this Decision in the LCA text CRP.3 related to the Technology Executive Committee, which we sincerely hope are retained. Additional references related to other governance and decision-making bodies

under negotiation, especially related to climate finance, would also be welcome by gender advocates.

How do you foresee the outcomes of these negotiations impacting the lives of women and the advancement of gender equality?

As challenging as it may be, the climate crisis and these negotiations presents us with an opportunity — to positively transform our global economy, advance sustainable development, and simultaneously advance social and gender equality.

Indeed, to a great extent, these depend on each other. A primary responsibility in this process is providing the resources to enable developing countries to reduce carbon emissions without sacrificing their ability to close the development gap. To date, developed countries have made significant pledges to this end. Gender equality advocates are demanding that climate finance take gender issues into account at all stages, including the identification of sources of finance; within the governance bodies of climate finance mechanisms; during planning and implementation; and in monitoring and evaluation.

A gender-sensitive approach towards climate finance and programming is both practical and fair. It will help ensure equal access and benefits for women on the ground. It will enable women to afford and profligate green technology; ensure that disaster planning does not place women at undue risk; improve rural women's livelihoods improve and agricultural production; and ultimately enhance food security while decreasing carbon emissions and helping to conserve our precious environment.

What jobs have you held that have led to the role you are in today?

I am a public health professional and I have over 20 years of experience in management of social projects focusing on social systems and policies, development and funding frameworks. She has also acquired sound experience in working with Multi lateral, bilateral, civil society and government institutions. I have worked as a consultant for several organizations: WHO, UNFPA, PAHO, DFID, AECID, IPPF, IPPF, and women's NGO, amongst others.

What is your message to world leaders?

To collectively realize this vision and overcome efforts to maintain the status quo, we need the contributions and engagement of all national leaders and all global citizens—women and men. Much of this depends on the realization of women's human rights: rights to own property and land; to engage in political decision-making; rights to education and equal opportunities for economic empowerment. Governments and development partners increasingly recognize the symbiotic relationship between advancing gender equality and reducing poverty and the connection is no less essential between women's empowerment and a comprehensive approach to climate change. Women are leaders on multiple fronts and in many fields. They are the backbone of many households and communities. Half the world's population is poised to contribute to climate solutions as well as enhance the resiliency of their families, communities and nations. Thus the climate change framework, including funds and programmes it spurs or creates, needs to respond appropriately to this reality on the ground.

Favourite quote:

"We truly believe that Climate change, in the light of the current global financial, economic, environmental and food crises, can represent an unprecedented challenge and opportunity for humanity to transform global economic, political, social, cultural relations to live in balance with Mother Earth." STATEMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL INDIGENOUS PEOPLES FORUM ON CLIMATE CHANGE -September 28, 2009

Rio 2012

Another opportunity for making progress on Climate Change

By Derek Osborn, President Stakeholder Forum

The new Earth Summit that is to take place in Rio in May 2012 (Rio + 20) will be one key opportunity. Climate change is a key challenge for the world. But it needs to be seen and handled in context alongside all the other sustainability challenges of the future. Rio 2012 provides an outstanding opportunity for this.

The Earth Summit of 1992 shaped and animated the world's total sustainability agenda for a whole generation. It also constrained the climate change negotiators of those days to conduct their work on the founding framework convention (UNFCCC) in a sustainability context and to complete it in time for the world leaders to sign it at Rio as part of a grand sustainability deal.

A big Summit like Rio 1992, Johannesburg 2002 or Rio 2012 can achieve some things that are beyond the scope of the more regular sequence of international meetings on specific topics such as the Climate Change COP meetings.

A Summit can:

- Heighten global awareness about the state of the planet and the scale and urgency of the totality of the sustainability challenges facing mankind
- Affirm or reaffirm the values and ideals that the world needs to follow as it grapples with these problems, e.g. through inspirational declarations such as the Rio principles or the Earth Charter, generating hope, ambition and commitment
- Create a global deal for action that recognises the common but differentiated responsibilities which every country, every organisation and every person shares for the actions needed
- Strengthen alliances and partnerships between governments, business and many different civil society organisations to transform society in a sustainable way
- Build consensus around the key measures that need to be taken to incentivise more sustainable patterns of development, e.g. proper pricing of damaging externalities such as carbon, or proper valuation and protection of global goods such as biodiversity
- Strengthen governance for sustainability at international, national and more local levels, with stronger machinery for ensuring implementation of promises and deals.

The first PrepCom for Rio 2012 has already identified the promotion of the green economy and governance for sustainability as two major themes for that event. Now is the time to explore how those themes can be handled so as to advance action on specific sustainability agendas such as climate change.

For example how could Rio shape a general agreement on a green economy in a way that will encourage more general use of carbon trading or carbon taxation? Or how could specific funds for climate change adaptation or forest protection take their place within a general framework for promoting the MDGs and sustainable development co-operatively in the world? Or how could a general agreement on strengthening international governance for sus-

tainable development assist specifically with managing climate change issues better on a global scale? Or how can business, or local government or other civil society actors be enabled, and encouraged or required to play a more sustainable role?

As the climate change community pack their bags at Cancun let us hope they will focus some of their next efforts on Rio 2012 – what new agreements on aspects of climate change they may be able to bring to Rio for recognition and endorsement; and what a good and well-prepared result at Rio could do to strengthen international and societal action on climate change, and place it firmly within its broader sustainability context.

Key information on Rio+20

Official slogan: Making it Happen

Alternative slogan: One Planet Living

Objectives of Rio20

- Secure renewed political commitment
- Assess progress and gaps in implementation of agreed commitments
- Address new and emerging challenges

Themes for the Summit

- A green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication
- Institutional framework for sustainable development

Key people

- Secretary General of Rio20: Sha Zukang
- Chairs of the Bureau for Rio20: Ambassador John Ashe and Ambassador In-kook Park
- Executive Coordinators for Rio20: Elizabeth Thompson (former Minister of Environment of Barbados) and Brice Lalonde (former Minister of Environment of France)
- Head of Secretariat: Tariq Banuri

European Presidency: Hungary then Poland

Chair of G77: Argentina
G20 and G8: France

Key dates in 2011

10-11th January
Intersessional for Rio20 (New York)
21st to 25th February
UNEP Governing Council (Nairobi)
7-8th March
Prepcom 2 for Rio20 (New York)

16-17th April: Spring Meeting of the Bank and IMF and Development Committee
3-5th September
64th UN DPI Conference – Rio+20 (Bonn) – this will be the main stakeholder global conference to prepare for Earth Summit 2012
27 September– 2 October
European Prep Com Rio20 Astana, Kazakhstan
10-21st October
UNCCD (republic of Korea)
Nov. 14-15 Africa prepcom for Rio20 Addis Ababa, Ethiopia Addis Ababa Ethiopia
14-16th November
Intersessional (New York)
November
Water in the Green Economy focusing on Energy and Agriculture (Bonn)
28th November– 9th December
UNFCCC (Durban)
Dec 15-16 Latin America and Caribbean prepcom rio+20 no venue yet
Dec 19-20th
ESCWA Rio+20 prepcom Cairo

Key web sites

UN Rio20: www.uncsd2012.org

Stakeholder Forum's
www.earthsummit2012.org

UN DPI Conference information:
Sign up for Stakeholder Forum monthly Earth Summit Network News

Untidy Reality: Elephant's Still Under Rug

By P.J. Puntteney (Environmental & Human Systems Management)

The UNFCCC COP meetings have become a global focal point to gather around the issue of climate change, creating many venues to dialogue, exchange information, protest, provide input into a potential UN global agreement on climate change, and work diligently to showcase work. The new LCA text on Saturday culminated in months of working in groups to craft text for a document to be approved during COP 16. Down from 199 pages to a much more agreeable length and form, aren't congratulations in order as the "bosses" arrive this weekend?

The Cracks in the Sidewalk

During the 2007 COP 13 meeting in Bali, a simple policy briefing was circulated by the UN Commission on Sustainable Development Education Caucus Climate Change delegation calling for the need to address the missing 5th Building Block, the "Human Dimensions" meaning a well-prepared society through Environmental Education. This is based upon the Rio Principles, the Rio Declaration, Agenda 21 and the mandates that followed.

The policy briefing shared with government delegates and delegations, UN agencies, and the UN family of international organizations, created an echo in the plenary room with delegations speaking, echoing each other, and agreeing this priority should be addressed within the Bali Action Plan. It was that important.

Yet great attention about potential climate change agreement(s) is given to inputs to the procedures of addressing the four building blocks, cooperation and coordination among nation states, capacity building, without attention to the larger, interdependent whole.

That was then, This is now

We are living in a moment of tremendous opportunity, uncertainty and risk.

Societies are already feeling the impacts of degraded ecosystems and the global economic crisis. Some of the opportunities to confront these challenges in terms of water are coming from a new generation of leaders in business, government, and civil society worldwide. The major uncertainty is whether we have the political and popular will, for example, to stem the tide to prevent human interference with the climate system. The risk being these efforts to mitigate and create adaptation strategies will be insufficient, haphazard or fragmented exacerbating or worsening other critical global issues and local realities.

COP 16: Week 2

The costs and uncertainty about the magnitude of building a well-prepared society in terms of management, capacity building, and climate change adaptation is a barrier in our current approaches. There is substantial disagreement from a few billion dollars a year to billions of dollars a year by 2100. How do we determine a reliable way to measure the costs of acting to achieve our goals against the cost of not acting? How is it the engagement of society is missing from the negotiated documents on Long-term Cooperative Action? Where are the deliverables to meet the deadline of Friday December 10th as a key outcome from COP 16?

A framework within the potential agreement(s) on climate change is needed that will engage society in such a way, we understand and can transform our knowledge into sustainable climate change strategies that lead to action, and simultaneously identify, evaluate, and monitor what is working, what is not and where do we go from here.

Success in these requisites are limited to the extent that the "Human Dimensions"

and Environmental Education components are either ignored or simply thought of as limited to terms such as schooling and related non-formal activities, awareness raising, training, the medial, IT, and/or knowledge dissemination or resource centers.

Climate Change policy frameworks, planning and management strategies, and programmes of implementation within the current Bali Plan of Action/Building Blocks benefit a 20th Century model of the interface between environmental protection and social and economic development. Necessarily, the successes of current efforts to mitigate the impacts of climate change have been insufficient, haphazard, or fragmented exacerbating or worsening other critical global issues and local realities. *The 20th century model of unidirectional knowledge delivery has given way to the 21st century model of a multi-stakeholder-intergenerational-intersectoral platform that engages people in sustainability.*

Deadline December 10th, 2010

The responsibility for reorienting society to climate change through mitigation, adaptation, technological and financial strategies in the 21st century is complex and daunting. The way forward requires participation from everybody. It also requires equity and justice. Implementation of every environmental policy, strategy, and planning and implementation program comes down to the same common denominator -- Environmental Education and the development of learning communities. At the core of achieving the FCCC aims of a well-prepared society, is the heart of any global agreement spelled out clearly in terms of the interdependence between the local, national, regional, and global levels.

OUTREACH is made possible through the generous support of:



Network of Regional Governments
for Sustainable Development

The Department of the Environment, Heritage
and Local Government, Ireland



Comhshaoil, Oidhreacht agus Rialtas Áitiúil
Environment, Heritage and Local Government



REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA
MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS



BioRegional

solutions for sustainability



To view previous and today's issue of Outreach please go to www.stakeholderforum.org/sf/outreach