



Aprodev Priorities for COP 15

Essential components of an urgent, adequate and equitable legally binding global climate change agreement

Introduction: Bridging the trust gap

Time is running out. The governments of the world must urgently come up with an effective, realistic and just agreement on how to collectively tackle and cope with climate change without undermining the right to development of the world's poor people. The upcoming sessions of the UN climate talks will be major stepping stones towards the next phase of global action on climate change – due to be agreed at COP 15 in Copenhagen in December 2009.

The current climate negotiations are fraught with risks and distrust. Unless enhanced political will is mustered, we are heading towards a possible breakdown.

Aprodev believes that renewed demonstrable EU leadership alongside more active engagement from other Annex 1 parties is a must and a pre-requisite to enable discussions to move forward – particularly in the areas of mid-term targets as well as climate finance and technology cooperation. Lack of progress on these issues is currently widening the trust gap between industrialized and developing countries and reducing the chances of an ambitious and equitable agreement being reached at COP 15. Annex 1 parties need to promptly acknowledge their responsibility for and capability to deal with the climate crisis and urgently commit to providing the required support for climate action in developing countries.

*APRODEV is the association of the 17 major development and humanitarian aid organisations in Europe, which work closely together with the World Council of Churches (Including Church of Sweden, Diakonia, Norwegian Church Aid, DanChurch Aid, Finn Church Aid, ICCO, EED, Brot für die Welt, Bread for All, and Christian Aid).

Shared vision: Urgency and equity (See each section below for further details)

The upcoming sessions of the climate negotiations presents Parties with a vital opportunity – and urgent necessity – to promptly agree a shared vision for the post-2012 agreement, which signals the sufficient level of ambition and enshrines the key principles of equity and climate justice.

Such a vision should establish ambitious long-term objectives, including numerical goals, for each of the four building blocks of the Bali Action Plan: mitigation, technology; finance and adaptation. It should provide the basis for deep global emission cuts and significant financing and technology cooperation mechanisms that will enable the developing world to limit emissions, without compromising the right of poorer countries to development. Unless equity lies at the very heart of that vision, developing countries will rightly resist signing up to any agreement.

1. In order to halt global warming well below a 2oC global temperature rise, the atmospheric concentration of CO₂ needs to be stabilised at 350 ppmv CO₂. Global emissions must peak by 2015 and be reduced by more than 80% by 2050. There must be built-in mechanisms in the new agreement that allows countries to adjust emission targets later to lower stabilisation levels as new science emerge.
2. The Shared Vision should build upon article 3.1 of the UNFCCC, in recognition of our common but differentiated responsibility and respective capabilities. Effort sharing principles for finance and mitigation should be based on historic greenhouse gas emissions (responsibility) and ability to pay for the necessary climate protection measures (capacity). An explicit development threshold should be included in any future effort sharing model.
3. Poverty reduction and sustainable development must be recognized as fundamental human rights, The recognition should be made that an agreement which takes gender considerations into account is not only a moral and legal obligation, but is also more likely to be effective.
4. A Global Technology Objective should be a key part of the shared vision, to guide technology cooperation under the new agreement. Technological solutions, existing and new, and for both mitigation and adaptation, must be transferred to those in need. The global technology objective should include a global public commitment to scale up public funding for research and development, capacity building, deployment and diffusion. There should also be global goals to scale up renewable energy market penetration. Special attention must be given to the most vulnerable countries and regions which in many cases lack access to markets and market driven technology cooperation.
5. Adaptation & mitigation must be treated as equally important and inter-related. Failure to undertake adequate mitigation in the near future will lead to future loss of livelihoods and increased adaptation costs. Adaptation is already a necessity in many poor countries, and will increase in importance with every year. Much enhanced support for adaptation is key to an equitable agreement.
6. Annex 1 countries have an obligation to provide adequate, sustainable and predictable finance to enable adaptation and sustainable development in developing countries. Climate finance should be new and additional to ODA.

*APRODEV is the association of the 17 major development and humanitarian aid organisations in Europe, which work closely together with the World Council of Churches (Including Church of Sweden, Diakonia, Norwegian Church Aid, DanChurch Aid, Finn Church Aid, ICCO, EED, Brot für die Welt, Bread for All, and Christian Aid).

Mitigation

1. Annex 1 countries must commit to an aggregate cut in their carbon emissions of more than 40 per cent by 2020 and more than 95 per cent by 2050. All reductions must be achieved exclusively domestically within those countries and not through carbon offsetting.
2. Effort sharing among Annex 1 should be comparable in nature and scale with each other, and based on the principles 'responsibility' and 'capacity'.
3. In addition to their domestic emission target, Annex 1 countries should commit to financing the full incremental costs of enhanced mitigation actions (expressed through NAMAs) in non-Annex 1 countries, as an International Mitigation Obligation (IMO). At COP 15, parties should agree an estimate in dollars of the aggregate IMO for A1 parties, assuming that they commit to 40% domestic reductions (collectively), and make up the residual cuts to keep below 2°C in NA1 mitigation.
4. If A1 countries do not comply with their domestic reduction targets, penalties should be enforced, including – but not limited to – a corresponding increase of the IMO.
5. Developing countries' obligation to plan for a low-carbon future (e.g. developing Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action Plans - NAMAs) should be contingent on financial and technological support from industrialized countries, to cover both initial capacity building needs as well as the subsequent full incremental cost of mitigation action. An international registry should be the basis for matching financial MRV support with NAMAs.
4. It must be recognised that even so-called 'no-regret actions' in developing countries will require financial support for capacity building, up-front investment costs etc.
5. Measures should be put into place to avoid double counting of actions supported by market means. Support for international mitigation action should not be allowed to offset domestic action, since that would undermine the domestic mitigation targets and reduce chances of staying under 2 degrees of global warming.

Equitable Climate Finance

Wealthy nations must in addition to ambitious domestic emission reduction commitments also support developing countries in achieving sustainable low-carbon development, and implementing effective, pro-poor adaptation measures to counter the impact of climate change. Based on the above and relevant provisions within the Bali Action Plan on financial resources we advocate the following:

1. The EU should provide its fair share of the total mitigation, adaptation and technology cooperation financing needs in developing countries, amounting to at least €35 billion/year.
2. Non-Annex 1 parties must participate fully in defining what is adequate, predictable and sustainable financial resources and financial and technical support. Top-down financing needs estimate must be complemented by a bottom-up approach where the accumulated financial needs being expressed in the NAMAs, National Adaptation Strategies and TNAs.
3. Financial resources for mitigation as well as adaptation, counted under the UNFCCC, should be new and additional to ODA commitments of 0,7 per cent of GDP, so as not to undermine ongoing efforts to reduce poverty and achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

*APRODEV is the association of the 17 major development and humanitarian aid organisations in Europe, which work closely together with the World Council of Churches (Including Church of Sweden, Diakonia, Norwegian Church Aid, DanChurch Aid, Finn Church Aid, ICCO, EED, Brot für die Welt, Bread for All, and Christian Aid).

4. Adequate financial resources must be made available for adaptation, mitigation and technology cooperation before the non-Annex 1 parties could be expected to commit to limiting their emissions below BAU scenarios.
5. To ensure predictability and accountability and ensure that the needs of the poor and vulnerable in developing countries are fully met, we believe that most of the MRV financial support for clean development and adaptation should be public finance.
6. The Financial Mechanism should operate under the authority and guidance of the UNFCCC and be fully accountable to the COP.
7. To achieve this, a scaled up version of the Norwegian auctioning idea should be merged with the Mexican fund proposal. An equitable effort sharing/cost allocation formula based on historical responsibility and capacity to pay should be used to differentiate each party's contribution. The level of AAUs held back for auctioning should be adjustable so the total revenue is made scalable.
8. Annex 1 countries should prior to December 2009 provide immediate support for near-term adaptation needs; including 2 billion USD to finance already existing NAPAs, as well as for capacity building support for the development of low-carbon development strategies (LCDS) in non-Annex 1 countries, with a particular focus on the poorest and most vulnerable countries.

Adaptation

Adaptation measures should enable vulnerable people to take charge of their future, and reduce their vulnerability to disasters and other negative impacts of climate change. Adaptation has two main dimensions, adequate financing and equitable implementation. Based on the above and relevant provisions within the Bali Action Plan on adaptation, we advocate the following:

1. Adaptation should foster the realisation of fundamental human rights (e.g. the right to food, to housing, to water etc). Gender considerations and gender balanced participation should be incorporated at all levels.
2. A guiding framework for adaptation: acceptance of the need for guiding principles or a guiding framework to determine how adaptation needs will be defined and how adaptation will be implemented and monitored at national and local level with active involvement from civil society groups.
3. Social justice for the most vulnerable populations: The inclusion of the need for processes or mechanisms that will help ensure funds are channelled towards the most vulnerable countries and vulnerable populations within developing countries. This needs to be supported by an independent and rights based monitoring framework at local level.
4. Effective and just mechanisms for rapid adaptation financing: The financial governance of adaptation funds - for both the raising of funds and the dispersion of funds - must be robust and accountable and under the auspices of the UNFCCC. It should include civil society representation. A specific, set-aside share of the funding should be directly accessible by vulnerable populations and national civil society groups.
5. Building on existing knowledge and strengthen local capacity: There is a pressing need to bridge the gap between science and practice:
 - a. Establishing regional knowledge transfer centres to provide accurate climate predictions and

*APRODEV is the association of the 17 major development and humanitarian aid organisations in Europe, which work closely together with the World Council of Churches (Including Church of Sweden, Diakonia, Norwegian Church Aid, DanChurch Aid, Finn Church Aid, ICCO, EED, Brot für die Welt, Bread for All, and Christian Aid).

early warning and capacity strengthening and can deliver this effectively to the local level.

b. Build upon and scale up existing frameworks and tools e.g. HFA (Hyogo Framework for Action), vulnerability and risk assessment methodologies etc.

c. Better coordination across approaches of Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), adaptation and sustainable development to end fragmentation and duplication.

6. Measures should be agreed to insure and adequately compensate people for whom adaptation is no longer an option. This should include in-country mechanisms as well as international or cross-border settlements and agreements.

Technology co-operation

Technology cooperation is one of the building blocks of the climate talks, and a key to enable any kind of progress within both mitigation and adaptation. Thus technology that may help low carbon development and adaptation must be shared with poorer nations. Based on the above and relevant provisions within the Bali Action Plan on technology cooperation we advocate for the following:

1. A comprehensive approach that includes cooperation around research, development, deployment, diffusion, and capacity building especially for the poorest and most vulnerable countries and people

2. Climate change technology should be low-emitting and contribute to sustainable development. Adaptation technologies should be addressed as part of an overall technology framework.

3. Capacity building and enabling environments should not directly or indirectly lead to trade liberalisations and Foreign Direct Investments (FDIs) being forced upon developing countries.

4. A fund should be created within the new agreement to facilitate technology cooperation and innovation in low-income countries, for both mitigation and adaptation.

5. The scale of technology should include: micro (village, community), medium (local grid, small and medium sized enterprises) and large scale (industrial, power grid).

6. A declaration on Intellectual Property Rights should be adopted at the COP 15; to manifest support and political will and assert that existing flexibilities in the TRIPS agreement could be used to facilitate developing country access to technologies needed for both adaptation and mitigation.

7. An overall framework on technology should build upon Technology Action Programs. These would be drawn up based on an identification of key technology needs, whereby global action programs would be created to scale up and promote technology cooperation. Technology needs should be expressed clearly in developing country NAMAs and NAPAs.

Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD)

1. Reducing deforestation must be additional to industrialized countries' actions to reduce their own emissions and must be demonstrably consistent with the two degrees goal. Therefore, forests must not be directly included in the carbon markets, which provide offset opportunities for industrialized countries.

*APRODEV is the association of the 17 major development and humanitarian aid organisations in Europe, which work closely together with the World Council of Churches (Including Church of Sweden, Diakonia, Norwegian Church Aid, DanChurch Aid, Finn Church Aid, ICCO, EED, Brot für die Welt, Bread for All, and Christian Aid).

2. Financing for REDD could stem from a Mitigation (MRV) window under a single UN Climate Fund. See finance section for details.

3. The mechanism must be designed in such a way that respects the right to land, use of resources and the practice of trade for indigenous and local communities and that sustainable development objectives are promoted and can be achieved. Gender-balanced access to design and implementation of REDD activities is key to maximize the impact.

4. Forest-dependent people should be directly engaged in the effective development and implementation of any mechanism and benefit from it so that they can continue their role as safeguards of the tropical forests in a dignified way. Key issues to be addressed are the right to self-determination and self-government, free, prior and informed consent, equitable benefit-sharing and the right to management and customary use of natural resources. Independent complaints and conflict resolution mechanisms must be incorporated in the overall framework.

5. The mechanism should provide sufficient annual funding to tackle tropical deforestation and make this funding available immediately for all countries with tropical forests including those with low rates of deforestation.

6. The mechanism must protect against leakage via national-level reductions in deforestation to prevent shifting deforestation from one place to another.

Clean Development Mechanism

The CDM is heavily flawed and requires a complete overhaul if it is to have any meaningful role to play in efforts to keep global warming below +2°C. Based on this the following points should be targeted:

1. A complete institutional reform of CDM for the post-2012 period (securing additionality, sector approaches instead of project base, better regional distribution, ecological and social integrity)

2. A future CDM should not serve as an offset mechanism for mitigation compliance purposes. It should not permit developed countries to evade emission reduction responsibilities and obligations. Therefore the credit-generating mechanism of CDM should be only used for emission reductions that go beyond binding commitments that have to be achieved domestically.

3. Financial and technological support to developing countries for mitigation and adaptation should be delivered independent from and additional to emission reduction obligations of developed countries.

4. Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation projects should not be part of a project-based CDM as it is not the appropriate mechanism to address reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation (REDD).

5. Nuclear power plants should not be eligible for CDM project investment.

For more information:

Nelson Muffuh, Christian Aid : nmuffuh@christian-aid.org, +44-7737721963

Mattias Soderberg, DanChurchAid: msd@dca.dk, +45-29700609

Marlene Grundstrom, Aprodev: m.grundstrom@aprodev.net, +32-485841991

*APRODEV is the association of the 17 major development and humanitarian aid organisations in Europe, which work closely together with the World Council of Churches (Including Church of Sweden, Diakonia, Norwegian Church Aid, DanChurch Aid, Finn Church Aid, ICCO, EED, Brot für die Welt, Bread for All, and Christian Aid).