

Towards a comprehensive and ambitious post-2012 climate change agreement

1. Background information

I reply:	On behalf of an organisation or an institution
----------	------------------------------------------------

I reply on behalf of	NGO (international, national, regional or local)
----------------------	--------------------------------------------------

Full name of organisation and Register of interest representatives ID number

APRODEV

What is your country of residence/country where your organisation or institution is based?	Belgium
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

2. The climate change challenge - a shared vision for the 21st century development

Would this aspirational long term goal be appropriate in the light of the 2007 IPCC reports and latest scientific knowledge? (max 4000 characters)

It is the experience of the member organisations of Aprodev that people in developing countries are already suffering considerable impacts from the changes in the climate that the IPCC attributes to manmade greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. For the poorest and most vulnerable people dangerous climate change is already a reality. Clearly in this case the UNFCCC - and the EU which often drives the ambition of the UNFCCC - must limit anthropogenic interference in the climate to the lowest possible level. Keeping global warming as far below 2 °C is therefore a vital and important goal for the climate talks. However the 50% reduction in global emissions is based on a stabilisation goal for GHGs of 450ppm which the IPCC reports suggest only has a 50% chance of keeping us below 2 °C. Science produced after the IPCC report indicates that such a goal is to conservative and the EU should raise it's ambition to a far more precautionary level. Aprodev recommends that the EU seeks a global emissions pathway that peaks before 2015 and declines rapidly to some 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. This would offer a maximal probability of around 25% of staying at or below 2 °C. Clearly such a global pathway requires an heroic effort, but it is necessary if the world is serious about staying below the two degrees target. Such a pathway implies that the EU must commit to an urgent and rapid decarbonisation of its economy, of the order of a 40% cut on 1990 levels by 2020 and an at least 80% cut - but preferably more like 95% - by 2050. But its responsibilities cannot end there. In order to achieve such a global pathway emissions will have to come down in a number of countries that do not have significant historical emissions but do have a significant burden of poverty that needs to be their priority. The EU, and other industrialised countries must commit to support emissions cuts in developing countries in order to achieve this global pathway without the injustice of shifting its burden onto the backs of those who are poor and have least ability to pay. The less action the EU and other industrialised countries take at home the greater the burden on them to support emissions cuts overseas. For more information see: http://www.ecoequity.org/GDRs/GDRs_presentation_with_notes.ppt

Is there a need for other elements to be part of the shared vision in order to ensure the transition to a sustainable low carbon economy? (max 4000 characters)

Yes. Limiting the changes in the climate is required in order to limit the impacts on global society, not as an end in itself. While populations in industrialised countries like the member states of the EU have the resources and the resilience to bear the short term costs of cutting carbon emissions and the costs associated with the impacts of climate change this is not the case in many poor countries. Therefore a long term climate goal only makes sense if it is placed in the context of actions that explicitly safeguard the right to economic development for the poorest and most vulnerable - those who have contributed least to the problem we now face. The transition must be a fair and equitable one. Therefore the shared vision must include substantial financial, technical and capacity support for developing countries to ensure that they can both decarbonise their economies (mitigation) and cope with the impacts of climate change (adaptation) without significant additional costs that would undermine their development aspirations.

3. Mitigation commitments by developed countries

What should be the criteria for allocating emission reduction efforts among developed countries, considering also the need to ensure the "comparability of efforts" as agreed in Bali? (max 4000 characters)

Aprodev believes that - in accordance with the UNFCCC statement that dealing with climate change calls on all countries to cooperate based on 'common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities' - all countries should be asked to take action on climate change that is commensurate with: • Their responsibility for climate change - based on the quantity of historical emissions they are responsible for; • Their capacity to act - based on income per person; • And above all not violating the right to development - anyone below a basic development threshold has to concentrate on escaping poverty and cannot be reasonably expected to contribute to tackling climate change. The Greenhouse Development Rights framework, developed by EcoEquity, the Stockholm Environment Institute and the Heinrich Boll Foundation, with the support of Aprodev member Christian Aid gives an indication of how emission reduction efforts could be shared out globally on this basis. The EU view is insufficiently ambitious in two senses to deliver its own stated long term goal of limiting global warming below two degrees. Firstly, as discussed above, action of the order the EU is proposing is based on insufficient level of global action and carries an unacceptable risk of catastrophic levels of climate change. Secondly action of the order the EU is proposing shifts far too much of the burden on to other countries - who still need to focus on the issue of development. These countries who have limited responsibility for the emissions currently changing the climate and who have the majority of the world's population, as well as significant burdens of poverty, can not be expected to take on unreasonable share of action on climate change. Therefore leadership by industrialised countries must require significant decarbonisation - 40% cuts by 2020 and 80-95% cuts by 2050 - and significant support to allow cuts by developing countries.

4. Mitigation actions by developing countries

What type of mitigation actions should developing countries undertake? How should these be measured, reported and verified? What should be the scale and legal nature of these actions? How should differences in responsibility and capability of different developing countries be taken into account? (max 4000 characters)

While Aprodev believes - as set out above - that all countries should contribute to action on climate change at a level commensurate with their responsibility, capacity and need to respect their peoples' right to development, the slow and inadequate response of developed countries - that must take the lead in this - must be taken into account. Until developed countries can be shown to have met their responsibilities - both in delivering significant cuts in their emissions and in providing finance, capacity and technology support to developing countries it is inappropriate to make demands for significant action from developing countries. However there is a need for significant action from developing countries. This dilemma is the heart of the problem in unlocking a solution to climate change. Developing countries can be asked to take no regrets measures and sustainable development policies and measures (SDPAMs). However the only way to unlock the sizable cuts in developing country emissions that will be necessary is for developed countries like the EU to prepare a dramatic platform of measurable, reportable and verifiable (MRV) finance, capacity and technology support for developing countries. Developing countries have set out a willingness to engage in MRV actions in response to this. In this case differentiation is unnecessary as the support would be associated with mitigation actions and so would take place in those countries that have the most cost-effective and greatest mitigation potential.

To what extent and how should those actions be supported by technology and financial assistance from the developed countries? What kind of supporting tools could be developed at the international level to support domestic action and should there be respective roles for the public and private sector, including the carbon market? (max 4000 characters)

See above. While the carbon market may be an appropriate tool for some elements of the required assistance it is inappropriate for all of them. A market mechanism is unlikely to deliver support to technology transfer or capacity building at the right level or in the right locations. Controlling emissions from land use, land use change and forestry should not be dealt with through a market mechanism. Alternative - probably public funded, although possibly funded from levying the carbon market - tools will need to be developed to provide support in these areas. The multilateral climate change fund proposed by the G77 and China may be a useful mechanism, although the details of how it is funded needs to be resolved. Where the carbon market is expected to finance mitigation efforts in developing countries developed country targets must be strengthened to ensure that the process of cutting emissions in developed countries is not traded off against

action in developing countries, but instead both actions add up to sufficient global action.

How should technology and financial assistance by developed countries to developing country mitigation and adaptation actions be measured, reported and verified and should they be compared? (max 4000 characters)

5. Carbon market

How should the existing Clean Development Mechanism and Joint Implementation be improved in order to increase their environmental integrity and effectiveness? (max 4000 characters)

What new market mechanisms could be developed to improve the effectiveness of carbon market? (max 4000 characters)

6. Carbon leakage

How could the delocalisation of emissions from developed countries with binding emission caps to other parts of the world be minimized? (max 4000 characters)

The Greenhouse Development Rights framework discussed in other parts of this submission suggests that all countries should be called on to adopt binding emissions caps. However this implies that setting these caps needs to be in accordance with realistic quantifications of responsibility and capacity and above all to respect the right to development. This will require developed countries accepting emission reductions commitments that are far more confined than anything currently discussed. Such reduction commitments are likely to quickly exceed the total emissions of the developed countries - obligating support to reductions in developing countries. Adopting such an approach would minimise delocalisation of emissions.

7. Sectoral approaches

What type of sectoral approaches could effectively contribute to global emission reductions? (max 4000 characters)

Sectoral approaches may be particularly appropriate for dealing with economic sectors that cannot be adequately dealt with at a national level. However any sectoral approach should respect the right to development - this means that developing countries which might incur significant economic costs from a sectoral approach should be compensated for those costs. For example small island developing states are likely to be disadvantaged by any sectoral approach to shipping.

8. Emissions from international air and maritime transport

How could emissions from international air and maritime transport be effectively addressed? (max 4000 characters)

In as much as a global sectoral approach is considered see response to question 7 above.

9. Emissions from deforestation and forest degradation

What should be sources of financing emission reductions from deforestation and degradation? (max 4000 characters)

AprODEV has great concerns with market-based approaches : 1. Inconsistency with the EU's mitigation objectives The EU ETS scheme has been designed to reduce emissions from large point sources in Europe, and the inclusion of sinks in this scheme would undermine this objective. Recent studies were quoted that conclude that allowing forest credits into the ETS could crash the price of carbon by almost 50% [Anger, Sathaye et al. 2008]. This would likely prevent necessary investments in clean and renewable technologies, which are needed if temperature increases are to stay below 2 degrees. It is estimated that an estimated 6 billion forest offset credits could be made available, which would flood the ETS, which currently only has 1.6 billion units of carbon. Also, in many countries, not least those with tropical forests, the lack of reliable data,

e.g. on the historic rates of deforestation, is likely to lead to emission reductions that are “fake”. Without certainty that real reductions are being made, the ETS would lose its means to assess and predict its contribution towards meeting the EU’s climate goal of staying below a 2 degrees temperature increase. Also there is uncertainty whether real and permanent reductions are made. Carbon emitted over a period of the next 50+ years should not simply be offset by protecting a forest that may burn down next year. 2. Inconsistency with the EU’s human rights objectives Including forests in the carbon markets could lead to a “land grab” by national and private interests in areas where indigenous and local peoples’ rights are not recognised or enforced. Several cases have already been reported of violations of the rights of the forest-dependent poor and indigenous peoples such as evictions and expropriations, unjust targeting of the poor/indigenous as drivers of deforestation, and violation of customary land and territorial rights. Therefore, the EU’s reputation as an advocate of human rights could be violated. 3. Inconsistency with the EU’s objective of achieving the millennium development goals If forests were to be included in a market mechanism, it could undermine achievement of the millennium development goals. The number of CDM projects that are currently implemented in the poorest region of Africa is less than 2% of the global total amount. Leakage of deforestation to other countries or regions could have a huge impact on the livelihoods of forest dependent people. Certification standards developed specifically for carbon forestry projects tend to be voluntary and can’t be enforced. Also, the certification process to enter into the carbon market is expensive and small producers and indigenous people often cannot afford these initial transaction costs. Before the implementation of avoided deforestation schemes there is a need to look at the viability of forest protection relative to other forms of land-use needs such as those related to food security and local livelihoods. If this would not be done, it could very well be that the implementation of Avoided Deforestation schemes could actually exacerbate poverty and would take countries further away from achieving the Millennium Development Goals. The creation of a multilateral forest fund under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) would be very welcome, and could initiate the worldwide protection of forests without the above mentioned problems. A clear danger of a fund based approach, however, is that the fund would not be filled. However, if the fund would be linked to the market (such as filling it with the revenues of auctioning allowances) there would be the security of predictable flows of finance.

How financing of emission reductions from deforestation and degradation should be monitored taking into account non-permanence, leakage and liability issues? (max 4000 characters)

10. Adaptation needs and support for most vulnerable countries

What mechanism should be used to finance cost-efficient adaptation action in the most vulnerable countries, in particular LDCs, SIDS and African countries? (max 4000 characters)

Firstly the most cost-efficient adaptation action is strong mitigation and those countries with the most responsibility for the climate crisis we now face must take a lead for this and for financing adaptation costs. The magnitude of the support for adaptation in developing countries needs to be scaled up by at least three orders of the actual level. The future adaptation framework and especially its funding regime must contain the following pre-requesting elements: expanded cooperation and support for National Adaptation Planning and Implementation; expanded action in the field of climate risk management including an international insurance mechanism; establishment/enhancement of regional adaptation centres/networks and an adaptation technology mechanism. In our view, there is a need to incorporate adaptation into broader development efforts to address linkages between development challenges and climate conditions. The future mechanism should generate long-term resilience with a view on ecosystem feedbacks and complex system behaviour. Adaptation needs to be understood holistically and yet with clear local approach to vulnerability of people. Faced with this complexity, we call for a comprehensive approach to adaptation that entails a range of measures that reduce the physical risk posed by climate change; address and reduce the underlying factors of vulnerability and strengthen adaptive capacity of the transparently identified most vulnerable people in line with existing human rights, world heritage and biodiversity obligations. The funding commitments by Parties in the future adaptation framework need to generate in the order of tens of billions of US dollars annually over and above existing ODA commitments (0.7% of developed countries GNI) largely provided by developed countries. The burden sharing needs to be based on indicators of responsibility for GHGs emissions and (economic) ability to provide resources. It ought to be linked with the level and scale of emission reductions so that a failure to fulfil mitigation targets results in additional adaptation funding burdens. Only financial contributions released either through mechanisms of the post-2012 architecture or following criteria and guidelines agreed on by the COP should be counted as contributions towards Parties’ determined shares. Flexible support to developing country governments in their own efforts to advance successful and effective national adaptation planning and implementation is vital for successful finance of adaptation, for a one-size-fits-all approach would increase the risk of mal adaptation. National priorities ought to get identified in transparent and inclusive processes and implementation supported by sufficient resources. A key mechanism

in this is the UN Adaptation Fund which could become a beacon due to its innovative nature, including: a) a governing board with a significant majority for developing countries, which is unprecedented in the history of development financing, b) the option of direct access to resources from the Fund, and c) a source of resources independent of donor contributions through a 2% share of proceeds from emission reductions issued under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). The Adaptation Fund Board (AFB) is also developing an innovative streamlined project cycle for projects submissions and approval. Thus, the Adaptation Fund is a major step forward to put developing countries in the position that they deserve, being primarily those who face consequences of climate change they have not caused. The funding for adaptation needs an international effort which should be led under the UNFCCC framework. Current initiatives through the World Bank could be in contradiction to the primacy of the UNFCCC. Even more unacceptably the use of loans by the World Bank and the United Kingdom places the burden on the recipient countries and not on those responsible for climate change.

How should the effectiveness of adaptation measures be monitored and assessed? (max 4000 characters)

Effective and targeted adaptation with priority on the most vulnerable populations should be monitored and assessed by using the human rights framework which derives from international law (Human Rights Covenants) and which was further operationalised in the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on the Right to Food as mechanisms with widest international acceptance. A human rights based approach to adaptation is not only relevant for a debate about principles, but it can have procedural implications. The adaptation debate can in this regard learn from the debate on the right to adequate food. In that, countries have agreed to procedural guidelines which include an assessment and identification of the most vulnerable groups as a prerequisite for directing policies at the most vulnerable groups of society. Using a rights based approach is also a strategic negotiation issue, because it is very likely that developed country governments and parliaments will only be able to commit to generating adequate, predictable, sustainable and additional resource flows to those countries particularly vulnerable to climate change if there is a process to ensure that resources will be targeted at those people most vulnerable. Clearly developing countries have a legitimate claim for receiving adaptation support by developed countries given the latter one's responsibility as the main causers of greenhouse gas emissions. But committing to the huge financial transfers needed will depend on public and parliamentary acceptance of this transfer. And this willingness to pay will largely be dependent on a transparent process to direct adaptation policies to the most vulnerable people. The future mechanism ought to demonstrate clearly that there is real political will to focus on the clearly identified most vulnerable people. For the latter, see "Making the Adaptation Fund Work for the Most Vulnerable People", a Germanwatch and Bread for the World Discussion Paper, 14 September 2008. To safeguard effective adaptation measures, key principles for "good" adaptation need to be defined for application of all Parties delivering countable adaptation finance. 1) focus on the most vulnerable, 2) promotion of poverty reduction and long-term resilience, 3) inclusiveness, for adaptation projects and programs should actively and meaningfully involve all relevant stakeholders in gender-balanced planning and decision-making around how adaptation funds are disbursed, used, monitored and evaluated, whereby dialogue and collaboration between various stakeholders should be encouraged, 4) access to information, for adaptation activities should be conducted in a transparent way, well documented and placed in public domain, 5) attention to gender; adaptation planning should prioritize adaptation needs of women and ensure that women are actively consulted and included in related decisions, 6) subsidiarity; adaptation decisions should be made at the smallest, lowest or least centralized competent authority level relevant to the implementation of adaptation and 7) learning by doing, for recognising that the challenges of future climate change are likely to be beyond past experience, effective adaptation requires the development and implementation of flexible programmes through which learning can be captured, mistakes rectified, and future activities adjusted. Lock-in to technologies that might be seen as a panacea, but are appropriate only for one particular future climate scenario must be avoided. Existing guiding frameworks, such as the Hyogo Framework for Action on Disaster Risk Reduction (2005), ought to be taken advantage of. It is particularly necessary to allow civil society and other stakeholders to hold governments accountable and monitor their decisions and activities; this can be secured by very simple procedures such as ensuring public notifications of coming and ongoing adaptation measures.

What should be the catalyst role of the UNFCCC, considering notably the role and contribution of other relevant international organisations addressing the impacts of climate change on their area of competence? (max 4000 characters)

The Copenhagen agreement must result in a coherent framework for long-term collaborative action on adaptation. To make adaptation a strategic cross-cutting priority, it needs a coherent and strategic approach across all work streams and components of the UNFCCC. The UNFCCC must be the lead on this and the framework must be responsible to UNFCCC systems of governance. Organisations like the World Bank may have an implementation role, but only subject to UNFCCC guidance and authority. Currently, the Convention covers adaptation in a fragmented way, for none of the existing arrangements (e.g. the Nairobi Work

Programme on Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability or the Least Developed Countries Expert Group) has the mandate to fulfil the necessary task comprehensively. To enhance the situation, a permanent UNFCCC adaptation body is needed to particularly enhance action for implementation with the following key functions: 1) assess progress and develop recommendations for further action to the COP (in particular under SBI) based on Parties requests and reflections, 2) develop guidelines and give guidance for the preparation of long-term adaptation strategies and 3) assist the adaptation funding regime and develop mechanisms/instruments to verify countries' related commitments. The body should take the form of a multi-stakeholder committee with government, expert, civil society and private sector participation. It should build on experience gathered through e.g. existing arrangements under the UNFCCC. A strong UNFCCC adaptation body would serve to strengthen regional cooperation initiatives as well as enhance linkages and exchange of experience with other funding streams and institutions dealing with adaptation. The Adaptation Fund established under the Kyoto Protocol should be fully operationalised as soon as possible. Given the uniqueness and innovative features of its structures, we think it should continue in the future regime as a central element of the adaptation funding regime. We request the EU to promote establishment of an international insurance mechanism as an integral element of a post-2012 adaptation, see e.g. the submission from Munich Climate Insurance Initiative (MCII, 2008) "Insurance Instruments for Adapting to Climate Risks", http://unfccc.int/essential_background/library/items/3599.php?rec=j&piref=500004788#beg. A comprehensive strategy under the UNFCCC must include both actions to prevent and reduce climate-related risks (prevention pillar) and to help countries to cope with the costs and damages that climate-related disasters impose on them (insurance pillar). One suggestion is to make the availability of a strategy to identify and target the most vulnerable communities and households a key criterion for approval of Parties' applications. The current dominant approach is looking for a formula which accounts the available resources to the eligible countries in equal shares or based on certain indicators in a first step, as can be derived from AFB/B.3/9. Such an approach remains at the country level, while it is important to focus vulnerability assessments additionally to the community and household level. Part of this approach could be that Parties that want to submit proposals need to set up some kind of country coordination mechanisms under the auspices of their respective UNFCCC national focal points. It should have the form of a multi-stakeholder committee, with broad government, expert and civil society participation - including representatives of the most vulnerable communities. The combination of the human rights based obligation and the strategic negotiation value of targeting the most vulnerable communities through adaptation activities provides a good common basis to openly discuss how the Adaptation Fund can best foster such a focus. The place to do that is the 3rd session of the AFB.

11. Technology cooperation

Is there a need for specific support schemes for the development, demonstration or deployment of certain technologies? If so, for which ones and how should these be structured? (max 4000 characters)

Yes. Development, diffusion and transfer of technologies are fundamental, both to reach reduction targets, and to make adaptation possible in developing countries. Furthermore transfer of technology and capacities are crucial to ensure that developing countries have a continued possibility for development and industrialisation, also within a frame of a global climate agreement. It is important to note that transfer of technology is a broad concept including transfer of knowledge, expertise, capacities, working cultures and methods, soft and hard technologies. Any initiative within a climate change framework must be measurable, reportable and verifiable. It should be acknowledged that markets and business are global and transfer of technologies does not necessarily mean transfer to a locally owned company or actor. However, in order to ensure a long term and sustainable effect, initiatives should lead to increased capacities locally, including possibilities for further adjustment and usage in the area. All developing countries have a need for technology but the ability to attract foreign investments and new technologies differ a lot. Big developing countries are eager to initiate their own innovation and development, and they have no problems attracting both interest and investment from foreign and transnational actors. For LDCs and many small developing countries the situation is different and in these countries market based mechanisms will not be enough to attract foreign companies or transfer of technology. It is therefore important to include a fund within a new agreement, which can facilitate initiatives not based on market criteria, but based on the need for new technologies related to adaptation and mitigation. Funds are also needed to support innovation and adjustments of technologies for developing countries. Today most technological solutions are made for use in industrialised countries and there is need for solutions suitable for developing countries where the context may differ dramatically. Where intellectual property rights (IPRs) act as a barrier to technology transfer, an approach is needed that maintains incentives for technological advancement, but recognizes the need for rapid and affordable diffusion of existing and new advanced technologies. This will include, but not be limited to, using existing IP flexibilities and exceptions, as well as preventing anti-competitive practices that limit access. It should be acknowledged that private corporations have a special role to play as most technologies are owned,

and used, within the private sector. It is therefore needed to identify both pull and push factors, which will enable an efficient and sustainable transfer of technology, as described above. Transfer of technology can be pushed through regulations, such as global standards, that can increase the interest for climate friendly technologies, IPR initiatives, such as an IPR library where patents are pooled and made available for payment, possibilities for national investment and trade policies facilitating transfer of knowledge, expertise and technologies. Pull initiatives, or incentives, could include the CDM (however, not in its existing form), financial support for initiatives facilitating transfer of technology, e.g. PPP and different forms of business-to-business cooperation. Access to investment capital (loans) for companies which are willing to invest in certain areas with special focus on transfer of technology can also be a possibility. Even though additional funds are crucial for many relevant initiatives, it needs to be supplemented with an institutional framework. This institution should facilitate corporate contacts and corporations, and support the use of different solutions within a global climate change agreement.

How to strengthen enabling environment for the deployment of the many existing clean technologies? (max 4000 characters)

In developing support to strengthen enabling environments the EU must be careful not to require liberalisation commitments of developing countries that should be dealt with under legitimate negotiations on trade policy. The UNFCCC is not the place for such negotiations, and developing countries should have the freedom to adopt such measures or not, based on their own judgements. Capacity-building is a key enabling mechanism in developing countries, and needs to be addressed as a matter of priority within any future mechanisms to develop, deploy and diffuse technology. This relates to technical as well as regulatory and institutional capacities. Other key elements for enabling environments are a) clear and common global long term vision and framework, which is an essential signal for the private sector b) access to funding and c) enabling policy frameworks. For private sector development it is important to have clear and long term frames for their activities. A long term perspective creates an environment where companies are willing to invest, which is important for facilitation of transfer of technology. As described in answer to the question above funding is crucial, and it is not enough with market based solutions as many of the most vulnerable countries will have difficulties to attract market based funds due to their location, size, domestic level of education and industrialisation, limited domestic market and lack of comparative advantages. Funds must be predictable, additional and adequate, and they should be used both for development and adjustments of technologies relevant for developing countries, and for diffusion of existing experiences, knowledge and technologies, either through purchase of products or patents, or through support to different types of international technology cooperation (e.g. PPP). Policy frameworks do also have an important role to play. However, they need to be adjusted to the local conditions in order to be most efficient in enabling transfer of technology. There is big difference between China that easily attracts investments, and landlocked Malawi, without a big industrial sector. A climate change agreement need to be adjustable and flexible to encompass the different need of different countries, and there must be given space for national development priorities in selecting different policy measures. Intellectual property rights is one policy area which should be assessed, and in areas where existing IPR provisions limit access to climate-friendly technology, improvements need to be made. It should be acknowledged that the need for initiatives may differ between countries and sectors, and action should therefore be differentiated. A framework agreement on IPR and technology licensing could be established to encourage patent sharing, joint ventures and public private partnerships. Countries should agree to the principle of 'protect and share', in order to increase accessibility to key climate friendly technologies that are protected by IPRs, while strengthening incentives for R&D through IPR protection for those countries that are ready to participate in such a scheme. Within the framework the possibility of a "Patent library" should be explored, as a solution for innovators as well as buyers of climate friendly technology. Knowledge and inventions on the different selected technologies relevant for adaptation and mitigation will be pooled into a database, to which users can buy access for a set percentage of their profit - e.g. 10 pct. The profits are then pooled into the library and divided among the innovating parties according to the number of times, their knowledge has been used. Furthermore dissemination and facilitation of existing possibilities for IPR sharing within the TRIPS system should be strengthened.

12. Finance and investment

How should additional public support be organised and which should be the three top priority areas for financial support in developing countries? (max 4000 characters)

The priorities for public support are likely to be (not in order): - Adaptation support for the most vulnerable communities - Incremental costs associated with a shift to a low carbon economy for countries with limited responsibility for causing climate change and limited capacity to decarbonise their economy, including support for innovation and technology transfer. - Preventing deforestation and protecting carbon sinks.

How could private sector be involved in mobilising additional finance? (max 4000 characters)

13. Compliance and enforcement of the new agreement

How should it be ensured that countries will comply with their commitments? (max 4000 characters)

14. Other suggestions

Please enter any other suggestions that were not covered by previous questions (max 4000 characters)

By responding to this consultation you automatically give permission to the Commission to publish your contribution on the Internet. It is important to read the specific privacy statement at the beginning of this questionnaire for information on how your personal data and contribution will be dealt with.	I / We accept this reply to be published with my personal data
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

Meta Informations

Creation date
10-10-2008

Last update date

User name
null

Case Number
180932755581828408

Invitation Ref.

Status
N