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This document welcomes the Swedish presidency to enhance action on adaptation in the context of climate change policy in the run-up to COP 15 in December 2009, and highlights a number of policy priorities, concrete recommendations for action, and suggestions for increased collaboration.
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1. Introduction

As representatives from civil society organizations from Europe, the Americas, Africa, Asia and the Pacific region and specialized in adaptation policies and programs, many of us belonging to the Climate Action Network Adaptation Working Group, we warmly welcome the Swedish Presidency’s decision to prioritize adaptation in the context of EU and global climate and development policy. Sweden has huge potential to influence policy development in this area, against a background of decades of leadership on environment and development.

The impacts of climate change are already being felt around the world, and worst in the poorest and most vulnerable countries. Despite being responsible for just 3% of total global emissions, five hundred million people in the countries most vulnerable to climate change are already directly threatened by the impacts of climate change. Adaptation to climate change is thus not an option, but an essential priority. We are in need of global leadership now, above all from those countries who are most responsible for carbon emissions and have most capacity to act.

In solidarity with the poorest and most vulnerable countries, communities and people, we believe that adaptation must remain a top-level priority in international negotiations for a post 2012 deal. A global Adaptation Action Framework under the UNFCCC must be agreed to strengthen international activities and commitments to deal with current and future impacts of climate change in developing countries. This framework should massively increase support to vulnerable developing countries to adapt to climate change, reduce their vulnerability and build resilience to the already now unavoidable impacts of climate change. There will be no fair global deal if developed countries do not live up to their responsibilities to deliver public financial support, beyond what is currently promised through ODA commitments.

We therefore call for strong Swedish leadership on adaptation and public adaptation finance, not only in the context of development policy, but first and foremost in the UNFCCC negotiations leading up to COP 15 in Copenhagen in December 2009. We strongly believe that an ambitious initiative on adaptation and public adaptation finance is needed urgently to re-gain momentum in this very critical negotiation phase at both the EU and the UNFCCC level. We welcome the report of the independent Swedish Commission on Climate Change and Development (CCD), chaired by the Swedish Minister of Development, which has led some highly important and groundbreaking work in this area. We hope that this work will feed into the Swedish Presidency’s official positions on the road to Copenhagen and that the Swedish government will continue to play a leading role advocating for the needs and priorities of the world’s poorest and most vulnerable people.

We look forward to continued dialogue with you and others within the Swedish Presidency on prioritizing adaptation in the context of EU and global climate and development policy. In particular we look forward to continuing the pattern of joint meetings between the EU expert group on adaptation (EGAD) and the CAN Adaptation Working Group which have developed through previous EU presidencies. The principle objective of these joint meetings would be to share analysis around key issues and discuss options to increase support for adaptation in the context of the negotiations.
2. EU Leadership on Adaptation: Critical Policy Priorities for the Swedish Presidency

Urgent action on adaptation is critically needed. Please find below a number of policy priorities and actions, some of which build upon the recommendations of the CCD, which should be part of a strong adaptation agenda for the Swedish Presidency during the coming six months.

a) Near-term finance for adaptation: developing a two step approach

To build trust in the UNFCCC negotiations, Annex 1 countries must fulfil the pledges to fully fund the actions addressing the immediate impacts of climate change in the Least Developed Countries between now and 2012, as identified in the national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs). The EU must provide immediately and unconditionally its fair share of the back-payment of US$2 billion (€1.5 billion) for rapid implementation of existing NAPAs in the LDC Fund, amounting to around € 500 million. We emphasise that this should not be used as a bargaining chip in the Copenhagen negotiations, but as fulfilment of an eight year old promise. It should also not distract from the need to deliver much larger amounts of finance for adaptation as part of the Copenhagen Agreement.

b) Provide sufficient and predictable long-term adaptation financing

Total finance provided by developed countries for adaptation in developing countries should be at least US$50–86 billion (€40–65 billion) per year. This commitment must be a binding part of the Copenhagen agreement for the post-2012 framework, but with funding starting before 2013, new and additional to the US$2 billion needed for implementation of the NAPAs, and steadily increasing thereafter. The scale of new and additional finance to be provided should be regularly updated in light of new emerging science, financial estimates and the degree of emissions reductions achieved.

In addition, a combination of innovative finance raising mechanisms and an effective compliance regime are needed to ensure the finance needs for adaptation are met. These mechanisms should be judged against their ability to provide adequate, predictable and sustainable funding that is additional to ODA commitments. The proposed international auctioning or sale of set-aside Assigned Amount Units (AAUs) should be combined with raising funds from aviation and shipping through international mechanism, such as auctioning or the air passenger adaptation levy proposed by the LDCs.

c) Ensuring reliable streams of funding

To ensure reliable and predictable funding streams into recipient countries, adaptation finance should be delivered in principle in the form of regular flows of periodic grant installments to match in-country processes for adaptation planning and implementation on an ongoing basis. Countries would be entitled to receive such regular flows, rather than having to apply for funding for measures, although the system should include sufficient flexibility to allow countries to access finance on programmatic and project level, where a country considers such channels more appropriate.

---

1 The ‘two-step approach’ to adaptation funding is proposed by the CCD, as a way to narrow the trust gap between industrialized and developing countries. It encourages the financing of immediate adaptation needs (1.2 billion USD), importantly recognizing that this additional contribution must not come at the expense of current ODA flows.
d) Ensuring additionality to ODA commitments

The CCD calls for climate finance for adaptation to be new and additional to existing ODA commitments. We echo and emphasize the importance of this recommendation. It would be totally unacceptable to count adaptation funding as contribution to the fulfillment of ODA commitments, given that climate change is presenting an additional burden on developing countries, which was not taken into account when ODA targets were agreed and would risk the diversion of funds for health and education spending in developing countries. Climate financing for adaptation is a responsibility of developed nations to deal with the damage caused by their historic emissions, it should not compete with the achievement of other development goals. Whilst adaptation finance and ODA can at times be coordinated through joint delivery mechanisms on the ground, it is important that they are separate at the financial sourcing stage to ensure the full additional costs of adaptation are met.

Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, Denmark and Luxembourg are the only countries who meet the 0,7 % GNI commitment. We call on the Swedish presidency to unite forces with these four countries who as a group could be a potential broker between developed and developing countries in the crucial coming six months.

e) Equitable governance of adaptation funds

We welcome the CCD recognition that future mechanisms for adaptation funding must go beyond fostering traditional donor-recipient relationships. We urge Sweden to push for governance principles for financial architecture that build upon the experience of the current Adaptation Fund, principles which are also put forward by the CCD – direct access, representative and equitable governance and transparency. An effective, functioning Adaptation Fund could merge into or provide the model for adaptation financing post-2012, where the focus should increasingly be to support national adaptation plans and adaptation integrated into national development plans, while giving priority to the most vulnerable countries and people and their livelihoods within these countries. Climate funds must come under the authority of the Conferences of Parties to the UNFCCC (COP). We encourage Sweden to evaluate existing institutions against these principles and to be open to the creation of new institutions if these criteria are not fulfilled.

f) Supporting adaptation at the local level

We welcome the emphasis in the CCD report on the local level and its importance to improve resilience against the adverse impacts of climate change. Poor communities in rural areas generally depend more directly than others on natural resources, which in turn makes them very vulnerable to changing environmental conditions. A major constraint for the implementation of adaptation and risk reduction is the lack of resources at the local level for both local government and civil society. We encourage Sweden to incentivise local level partnerships to increase access to resources.

Community-based adaptation is an efficient, effective and targeted approach to improve poor people's resilience. We encourage the Sweden to work within the EU to foster community-based adaptation initiatives by collecting, documenting and sharing best practices, improving access to resources, encouraging recipient governments to make community-based adaptation a central part of their adaptation strategies, and co-operating directly with civil society actors who are working at the local level. Common ownership is a crucial element of community-based adaptation.
g) Monitoring the implementation of adaptation

Civil society organizations and community-based institutions can play an important role in both implementation and monitoring of adaptation at the national and local level. We encourage Sweden to push for the involvement of civil society and community-based institutions in an independent local level monitoring framework as part of an adaptation framework. In this context, significant upfront capacity-building support will be vital to enhance the ability of civil society and local poor communities to access, use and monitor adaptation funding.

h) Gender and adaptation

A gender-sensitive approach to adaptation needs to be incorporated at all levels. Women need to be given equal access to the knowledge, resources and technology necessary to influence decision-making in the context of climate change.

Key findings of the IAASTD (International Assessment of Agricultural Science and Technology for Development) report and other relevant recent conferences and reports on adaptation and gender should be built upon and incorporated into Presidency/EU positions in EU and UNFCCC contexts. In particular, it is important to recognize that women are not only victims of climate change, but also effective agents of change in relation to both mitigation and adaptation. Women have a strong body of knowledge and expertise that can be used in climate change disaster reduction and adaptation strategies.

Relevant recommendations include gender-sensitive communication, priority-setting in research, changes in discriminatory laws, and protecting Intellectual Property Rights that recognize women’s technological knowledge.

i) Building on and expanding disaster risk reduction

We welcome the efforts that Sweden has already made to link adaptation and risk reduction including through the CCD report. Adaptation should build on existing capacity and experience to increase the resilience of the most vulnerable communities. We therefore strongly encourage Sweden to ensure that the adaptation framework builds on and expands existing strategies and mechanisms for disaster risk reduction (DRR), making use of the disaster risk management community’s transferable, practical experience in addressing hazards. The adaptation framework should ensure that substantial and additional human and financial resources are available and consistent with the priorities of the Hyogo Framework for Action. Disaster preparedness, emergency response and recovery from climate change related disasters, epidemics and plagues should be an integrated element.

Sweden should ensure that the language in the negotiating text on adaptation is changed to move away from the current focus on risk transfer and risk sharing towards a stronger recognition of

---

2 See Annex IV: IAASTD Synthesis report: Women agency in agriculture p.117 ff

3 Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference, 5-11 July, www.cpaukbranch.org; looks into how CC impacts are mediated by gender and social location;

the key role of risk reduction and preventive action. The framework should also encourage ongoing, systematic dialogue, information exchange and joint working between climate change and disaster reduction bodies, focal points and experts.

In this context we also think that the EU should support the establishment of an international insurance mechanism to assist developing countries in coping with the impacts of extreme weather events, as a complement to an ambitious adaptation regime and also as a means to incentivise pro-active adaptation and disaster risk reduction.

j) Climate-related migration and resettlement

We recognize that even with hard and fast emissions reductions there will be substantial climate damage, and in some instances this threatens the future survival of some nation states.

This is a live issue in the negotiations and one which needs particular leadership to ensure that Small and Vulnerable Nations are not the first to be sacrificed. Support to victims of climate change is a highest priority and is an expression of the principle of responsibility and capability. We call upon the Swedish presidency to champion this debate and the search for tangible options (in line with existing parties' submissions) which can address this glaring omission in the UNFCCC process. The discussion on resettlement as well as compensation of migrants affected by climate change must be coherent with the human rights of these people as well as with human rights obligations of States. An optional protocol to the Copenhagen treaty could be one option, amongst others, to define the legal status of these people and respective rights and obligations. The issue of climate compensation, climate change-related migration and resettlement are areas which could also be further explored in the future work of the CCD.

k) Ecosystem-based adaptation

We urge the Swedish Presidency to support ecosystems-based adaptation, aligned with agreements under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the UN Convention to Combat Desertification, the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, and other relevant international commitments. Ecosystems should be viewed as a cross-cutting theme for adaptation, and should be incorporated into national adaptation strategies and action plans, including NAPAs.

l) Adaptation technology

The most vulnerable countries have emphasised that adaptation technologies must be given as much priority as mitigation technologies in a future agreement on climate change-related technology cooperation. Successful adaptation to climate change will not be possible without effective technology cooperation. The EU’s position on technology must address the institutions, barriers (including IPR and especially for areas such as food security and health) and financing necessary to ensure the effective innovation and diffusion of technologies for adaptation.

---


5 See Annex II: CAN Adaptation Submission, April 2009;

m) Rights-based approach to adaptation

Swedish and all other EU member states are state parties to the Covenants on Civil and Political as well as Economic, Social and Cultural Human Rights. In implementing adaptation there must be respect for, protection and promotion of fundamental human rights as outlined in the UDHR, ICESCR and ICCPR and other relevant conventions and treaties. We encourage the Swedish Presidency to advocate for a rights-based approach to adaptation in both the EU and the UNFCCC process, in order to:

• function as a strong reference system to qualify adaptation measures without creating new conditionalities
• create common ownership on standards and procedural rights
• empower vulnerable people as rights holders and prioritising action to assist these people.

Since most of the developing countries are also Parties to the aforementioned Covenants, a rights-based approach to adaptation does not impose conditionalities from outside onto developing countries.

n) Right to development

Adaptation should not be viewed in isolation, but rather in the broader context of sustainable development. In this context it is crucial to recognize the inherent link between mitigation and adaptation. Early strong action to mitigate climate change will help reduce future costs of adaptation, whilst a failure to mitigate sufficiently and urgently will make adaptation increasingly difficult, if not impossible.

The responsibility to reduce emissions should largely be born by developed countries, based on their historical responsibility for climate change and capacity to pay for emission reductions. In this context it is important to recognize the right of poorer countries to development.

We welcome the CCD recognition of the right of poorer countries to development as a key principle that must be recognized to close the trust gap between industrial and developing countries. This is important not only in the context of adaptation, but also for mitigation. Sweden historically being a development champion and having done successful domestic work on Policy Coherence for Development, should make sure that the development perspective permeates the Presidency and the EU’s positions in the UNFCCC negotiations not only in the context of adaptation but also in the context of mitigation and global effort sharing. Coherence between mitigation and adaptation policies and recognition of the ‘Right to Development’ are necessary building blocks of a fair and equitable global agreement.

We also recommend the Swedish Presidency/CCD to undertake more substantive policy work on the practical implications of a recognition of the ‘Right to Development’ in the context of not only adaptation but also mitigation policies in the UNFCCC negotiations, an area which was mentioned but not covered in great detail in the final CCD report.

---

6 See Annex V: ‘A Rights Based Approach to Adaptation’, Submission by Bread for the World, Care International & Germanwatch; December 2008


3. Roadmap for Presidency initiatives/actions on Adaptation

- **at ECOFIN (budget) 10th July**
  - agree EU’s share of US$2bn for rapid implementation of the most urgent actions identified by the Least Developed Countries in the NAPAs.

- **at G8 / MEF 8-10th**
  - make public commitment to ensuring NAPA implementation.
  - agree in MEF conclusions on predictability, sufficiency and equity as key principles for future adaptation finance mechanisms, which also should reflect developed countries’ historical responsibility for climate change.

- **at informal climate workshop 13th July**
  - present and agree Presidency’s roadmap to CPH

- **EGIF/EGAD meeting in Stockholm 15-16th July:**
  - prepare input for EU offer on adaptation finance, to be agreed by extraordinary European Council or an extraordinary Environment/ECOFIN Council in early September
  - evaluate progress on earmarking of auctioning revenues under the EU ETS for adaptation in developing countries

- **at informal ENV/ENERGY Council 24th-25th July**
  - present joint Pres-Cion paper on adaptation as basis for EU offer on adaptation under CPH, based on the elements outlined in section 2

- **Early September:**
  - call an extraordinary European Council or an extraordinary Environment/ECOFIN council to agree on an EU adaptation finance offer to be presented at the high level UN Climate Summit in New York on September 22
  - make commitment to earmark auctioning revenues under the EU ETS for adaptation in developing countries

- **Mid-September:**
  - organize a joint session with EGTECH/EGAD to discuss the EU strategy to remove barriers for cooperation on adaptation technology as a part of an overall technology
  - Invite GenderCC – Women for Climate Justice (global network of gender experts working on climate justice) or the Global Gender and Climate Alliance (GGCA) to Brussels and invite them to present key findings at potential joint EGTECH/EGAD meeting as well as at public event.

- **at high level UN climate summit in New York on 22nd September**
  - put EU offer on adaptation CPH regime on the table, and play leadership role in seeking early agreement on adaptation parts of CPH agreement;
  - organize EU-sponsored high-level event on ‘the Right to Development’ in the context of international climate change negotiations
- at informal ECOFIN 1\textsuperscript{st}-2\textsuperscript{nd} October
  o discuss outstanding issues on adaptation finance

- at UNFCCC session in Bangkook 28\textsuperscript{th} SEPT – 9\textsuperscript{th} OCT
  o finalise details of offer on adaptation with international partners
  o take the initiative to prepare the details of an optional protocol to the Copenhagen treaty to define the legal status of people displaced due to climate change, and respective rights and obligations.

- at Stockholm Conference on climate and security 15\textsuperscript{th} OCT
  o if no agreement on adaptation at high level UN summit in September, call for commitments from other Annex 1 parties to match those of the EU
  o organize high-level event on climate-related migration and implications for security

- 22\textsuperscript{nd}-24\textsuperscript{th} October European Development Days
  o within the framework of the EU Global Climate Change Alliance, present a joint EU-ACP declaration on the 'Right to Development' in the context of global climate change negotiations, recognizing the implications for both mitigation and adaptation building blocks in the run-up to Copenhagen
  o organize an EU/Presidency side event on adaptation technology
  o organize a high-level seminar on migration and climate change

- at ENVI Council 23\textsuperscript{rd} OCT
  o conclusions on the UNFCCC-related elements of EU adaptation policy, including outstanding issues on adaptation finance, additionality to ODA commitments, recognition of right to development as key principle, specific wording on adaptation technology, key aspects on delivery mechanisms for adaptation finance including civil society planning, implementation and monitoring and a gender-sensitive approach.

- at European Council 29-30\textsuperscript{th} OCT
  o HoSG commit to attend CPH and take personal ownership of historical opportunity and outcome;
  o Endorse 'right to development' and adaptation as EU priorities for post-2012 agreement

- 16-17\textsuperscript{th} NOV GAERC
  o GAERC conclusions on the development-related elements of the Presidency-Commission adaptation paper. Should include, among other things: additionality to ODA, human-rights approach, gender-sensitive approach, right to development, emphasis on community-based adaptation, civil society role in implementation, monitoring and evaluation, link to DRR and ecosystems, adaptation technology.
4. Further Reading (enclosed to e-mail)

I. CAN proposals on AWG-LCA First Draft Adaptation text, June 2009

II. CAN Submission on Adaptation; April 2009

III. CAN Ecosystems-based Adaptation Briefing Note, May 2009

IV. IAASTD Synthesis Report, November 2007


http://www.sei-us.org/climate-and-energy/GDR.html

VII. ‘Hang Together or Separately’, Oxfam Briefing Paper June 2009
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