

OUTREACH

a multi-stakeholder magazine on environment and sustainable development.



THE MESSY PUZZLE OF CLIMATE FINANCE

BY MARTIN STADELMANN, J. TIMMONS ROBERT & AXEL MICHAELOWA

Contents

01

The messy puzzle of climate finance

03

The Challenge is not Adapting to a Liveable World!

04

Linking the Rio Conventions – the launch of the Ecosystems Pavilion at COP 16

05

Global UN Commitments, Resolutions and other Intergovernmental Outcomes Linking Gender Equality, Climate Change and Sustainable Development

06

Chinese-U.S. Youth Launch Climate Solutions Exchange in Cancun

07

Profile: Sébastien Duyck

08

Multilateralism Works

10

The Andean social management of natural resources

01



03



04



05



06



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

Martin Stadelmann
Center for International and Comparative Studies

J. Timmons Robert
Director of the Center for Environmental Studies at Brown University, US

Axel Michaelowa
Oxford Institute for Energy Studies

The China-U.S. Youth Climate Exchange

Women Watch

Uchita de Zoysa
Convenor – Climate Sustainability PLATFORM

Felix Dodds
Executive Director, Stakeholder Forum for a Sustainable Future

Sebrina Chesterman
Climate Scientist at OneWorld Sustainable Investments

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 messy puzzle of climate finance

Why rules for MRV are essential and a case for “Official Climate Finance”

By
Martin Stadelmann,
J. Timmons Robert
and Axel Michaelowa



PHOTO: Stock.Xchng

The bottomline for finance negotiations at Cancun will focus on the establishment of a New Fund, following the announcement in the Copenhagen Accord of the Copenhagen Green Climate Fund. While this new fund may become a cornerstone of a post-2012 agreement, it is only a part of the larger puzzle of climate finance.

Key questions: sources, governance, MRV, channels and use

Before Cancun, five key questions on the Copenhagen promises of US\$30 Billion (between 2010 and 2012) and US\$100 Billion (yearly by 2020) remained. Firstly, which sources does climate finance stem from; how much public, how much private? How many loans, and how concessional? Secondly, who is governing those funds, the UN or a decentralized governance structure? Third, what is counted as “climate finance”, and how and by whom are the flows monitored, reported and verified (MRV)? Fourth, through which channels is the money flowing; through a centralized UN fund, as the one to be established in Cancun, or through various multilateral and bilateral channels? And fifth, for which purposes and in which countries is climate finance to be used?

The answers of the High-level Advisory Group

The recent report of the UN High-level Advisory Group on Climate Change Financing made clear the US\$100 Billion is attainable by 2020. However it is important to note the scale of challenge in terms of raising the funding through public sources, with private funds and the carbon market needed to bolster the fund. The report astutely flags the influence the Multilateral Development Banks will have, especially in relation to channelling the funds.

The emerging, messy picture: why MRV is key

The emerging architecture of climate finance will be focused around multiple sources, decentralized governance and multiple channels. Within this messy picture, monitoring, reporting and verifying (“MRV”) will be crucial to assess levels, sources, channels, usage and effectiveness of climate finance, but also to avoid overlaps of programs, identify funding gaps and assure a minimum level of accountability to the Framework Convention.

The recent EU report on fast start finance

for Cancun underscored the fundamental need for international MRV. The EU perspective on multilateral channels was made clear, however it failed to outline the individual contributions of member states or the use of bilateral flows. In addition the consistency of reporting between the EU and other industrialised countries is not assured.

Level of “new and additional” flows

While all mentioned MRV parts are important, the focus here will be the first and most debated issue – what is the level of climate funds? Or, more specifically, if we take the wording from the Framework Convention and the Copenhagen Accord: What is the level of “new and additional” climate funds?

Developing countries insist on “new and additional” flows as they fear that promised climate funds are just “recycled” pledges or funds diverted from development assistance. For assessing this level of “new and additional” flows, we need to address the question: what is the baseline, above which funds may be seen as “new and additional”?



Baselines for “new and additional” flows

In evaluating options for ‘new and addition’ climate finance we have explored eight options for baselines, starting with the developed countries wish to have no baseline definition and the one of developing countries, to only count flows above 0.7% level of Gross National Income (GNI). The extremity of these positions is not feasible within the political mandate where decisions are made; hence the analysis had to dismiss further options.

The two pragmatic options are plausible, firstly “new sources only”, as new sources, especially those related to carbon pricing which are less prone to compete with development assistance than ordinary budget contributions. The second is “above pre-defined projection of development assistance”, which would avoid the diversion of both existing and future development flows. To make this second option politically acceptable for the North, the projection would need some flexibility for adapting the level to economic booms and recessions.

Do we need a new currency?

Depending on the baseline definition, none or even all funds are to be called “new and additional. Ultimately, hardly any “baseline” will ever be accepted by developing countries. If any baseline, they may agree that funding is “new and additional” above current climate finance. However, this baseline has only merits if we can clearly define “climate finance” and

assure that we have no major diversion of existing and planned development assistance. They only way to assure this is to introduce a new currency: Official Climate Finance.

The case for “Official Climate Finance”

“Official Climate Finance” (OCF) would consist of flows that are clearly separate to “Official Development Assistance” (ODA), a measure governed by the OECD. Additionally, the international community may define some rules for OCF, such as: relation of flows to climate change mitigation or adaptation, level of concessionality required, and inclusion of private and carbon market flows.

With OCF, the assessment of “new and additional” would be much easier and effective, as developing countries could just announce to raise OCF by X above the level of year Y (while not lowering or even increasing ODA), which can easily be monitored. While diversion of ODA to OCF can not totally be ruled out, at least it could be guaranteed that climate funds are not double counted as both climate finance and development assistance.

Three critical issues with OCF exist: acceptability by the North, integration of climate and development and governance. First, the concept of OCF is not appealing to industrialized countries. However, when including loans and private finance – sub-categories of OCF which could be defined and raise interest in the North, where the power to define which flows are to be called OCF or ODA.

Martin Stadelmann

is a researcher at the Center for International and Comparative Studies, ETH and University of Zurich, and project manager at the Myclimate foundation.

J. Timmons Roberts

is Director of the Center for Environmental Studies at Brown University, US; and author of ‘Greening Aid’ (Oxford University Press) and ‘A Climate of Injustice’ (MIT Press).

Axel Michaelowa

is Head of the International Climate Policy group at the Center for International and Comparative Studies, ETH and University of Zurich, and Senior Founding Partner at Perspectives.

Second, the division of ODA and OCF may could dispute the argument that climate change and development programmes and plans should be integrated, to seize co-benefits and avoid trade-offs. However, accounting OCF and ODA separately does not mean that both funds can not be integrated in the same programs. Indeed, they should be integrated, while the goals of the two “currencies” – climate change and development – are clearly separated, which may also allow for a more efficient assessment of the goal achievement.

Third, regarding governance, it may be easiest to assign the OECD the task to register OCF, as it can easily avoid overlaps with ODA. However, this may undermine the role of the UN and the inclusion of developing countries in governance of OCF. Therefore, either the UNFCCC should assign accounting OCF to the OECD (while giving clear guidance) or a well elaborated administrative link between ODA accounting at the OECD and OCF accounting at the UNFCCC has to be established.

In conclusion the emerging messy picture of climate finance calls for a well elaborated MRV framework, including both definitions of what climate finance encompasses as well as a clear baseline above which funds are to be considered “new and additional”. As this is an almost insurmountable challenge, we propose a new currency: “Official Climate Finance”, which is clearly separated from ODA. It has the benefits of avoiding double counting of funds, being transparent on the goals of funding, and enabling a straightforward assessment of “new and additional”.

The Challenge is not Adapting to a Liveable World!



By Uchita de Zoysa
Convenor – Climate Sustainability PLATFORM

The focus of our challenge on earth should not be diluted or diverted towards merely adapting to a liveable world. Even in a world with increased temperature, the future human generations should be able to find wellbeing and happiness. The adaptation challenge is not to compromise on a liveable world but to take necessary action to create prosperity in a changing climate on earth.

The danger of the compromised approach suggests that we humans will suffer in a 2°C plus temperature rise. Humans have shown their resilience throughout history and should be able to make a warmer world into a happy planet. But that is only if we all can agree to give away with the current system that promotes consumerist lifestyles that may take us beyond a 4°C rise in heat that is not even suited for human habitation.

The problem lay within our inherited world of false ideals that we keep on passing to our future generations. We have been told that capacity building in life is for higher income and acquisitions, and that development would mean commitment to achieve such materialistic targets. Only a few nations on earth have experienced development in the market economy based development approach.

For the past many decades we have been told that some countries are developed and that some are developing. I have waited over four decades to understand 'development' as it has never reached my country - Sri Lanka. Then I meet so many people from the branded developing countries, while travelling across the world and at conferences, and they too do not seem to have a clear idea and do appear to struggle as much as I do.

I also associate a lot of people from the categorized developed countries, and they do not seem to have found contentment or happiness in the development given to them. While they have already had their higher incomes and acquisitions, it is puzzling to see why they are not content and happy in life. Now that the French and British governments have understood that the GDP based economic growth approach does not reflect the nation's prosperity in the wellbeing of their citizens, perhaps the UN and USA can start appreciating those smaller Southern nations who have been rebelling to retain their sufficiency pathways to prosperity approach.

In these times of change, greening the existing industrial production system will not help green the economy and achieve climate sustainability. It will not take us towards a carbon neutral society and drive us away from the wasteful lifestyles. A new green world order has to be more authentic than making mountains of the green labelling and green procurement businesses.

Such a new world order will have to make sufficiency based considerations more pertinent. Sufficiency can firstly reduce greed and want for over-consumption through a state of adequacy and contentment. It can also innovate on indigenous knowledge systems to produce without waste, more efficiently, become more self-reliant, and less dependent on external resources.

The national economic crisis in 1997 is what led the King of Thailand to officially pronounce a 'philosophy of the sufficiency economy' as the way forward in that country. Subsequently the Ninth National Economic and Social Development Plan from 2002 to 2006 in the country, adopted suffi-

ciency economy as their economic policy and explained that its goals are to achieve sustainable development and proper wellbeing for Thai people. It is a balanced development which took into account the economy, society, politics, and environment, aiming to make people in the society happy, self-reliant, and abreast with the world, while still preserving the Thai national identity.

Just like in Thailand, many smaller nations believe in sufficiency as the way to national prosperity and wellbeing of their people and are involuntarily dragged into suffering through a global economic and governance system that thinks otherwise.

Those who have dragged us towards a state of climate change that threatens human existence on earth are now trying to discover a way for us to survive in a liveable world. This cannot and should not be the aspiration and determination of humankind. That is a compromise that we, as a generation, are trying to make on the lives of all future generations.

While enjoying the offerings on earth today, we are planning a world of lesser enjoyment for the future humans. If we are only negotiating for a liveable world for our children and their children, then we are demonstrating intrinsically our selfish nature as a generation and it is simply fighting to get the best share for ourselves. Climate change has also provided the humans a historical opportunity to act as one species, and the act needs to be mindful this time.

Send your comments to:
uchita@sltnet.lk and for more information visit: <http://www.climatesustainabilityplatform.blogspot.com> and <http://climatesustainability.blogspot.com/>

Linking the Rio Conventions

The launch of the Ecosystems Pavilion at COP 16

By Sabrina Chesterman

Climate Scientist at

OneWorld Sustainable Investments



Riding the wave of success from the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Conference of the Parties (COP) 10 held in Nagoya, Japan, the Rio Conventions Ecosystem Pavilion was launched within the UNFCCC fora at COP 16 in Cancun. The aim of the platform is to enable a collaborative outreach focus, aided by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and Lifeweb.

The Pavilion has been mandated by the three Rio Conventions (UNCCD, UNFCCC and CBD) as a platform to raise awareness, share findings and ensure co-operation. The inter-linkages between the three conventions focus on the intrinsic relationships between land degradation and desertification, climate change and biodiversity protection.

Multiple challenges and opportunities for collaboration between land managers and areas of biodiversity exist and must be capitalised on, especially in line with the predicted impacts of climate change. As the Pavilion rightly highlights, the responses to this plethora of global environmental challenges will define the 21st century.

Nagoya was a success as sovereign compromises were made and the process was driven by a strong desire within the parties to achieve success combined with excellent political leadership and facilitation by Japan. The outcomes have re-energised the global environmental governance arena and proved multilateralism can be effective. In this manner, and in line with the ambitious targets agreed upon under the 'Aichi' target (both short term 'the mission' and long term 'the vision'), the gains need to be seen as a dual success for all the Rio Conventions, rather than an explicit gain for the CBD and biodiversity arena.

The 'Aichi Target' for 2050 calls for unfaltering action to half the loss of biodiversity, this in itself needs to provide huge momentum going into 2011 when Forestry takes the limelight from Biodiversity and the UNFCCC will

need to guide the plight and fundamental importance of forests linking to the three Rio conventions, exactly what the Ecosystems Pavilion is hoping to flag.

This focus on synergistic activities like ecosystem based adaptation needs to be readily embraced by the UNFCCC, as they provide rare 'win win' yet plausible scenarios for both ensuring vital ecosystem service flows in addition to aiding the abatement of climate change. The launch of the International Panel on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) provides further momentum in biodiversity protection, and dual activities across the conventions as IPBES, like the IPCC galvanises dynamic and world class scientific assessment, however focused on the issues of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

As well as a scientific progression Nagoya was historic in its formal adoption of the Satoyama Initiative. The decision regarding the Sustainable use of Biodiversity acknowledges the Satoyama initiative as a tool to better support anthropogenically impacted natural environments to more effectively ensure co-benefits for both biodiversity and livelihood well being. This political embrace of such an initiative illustrates the fundamental importance of national scale land management, and the commitment of the relevant parties to support initiatives linked to sustainable socio-ecological production landscapes.

This positive move is further validated by the Global Biodiversity Outlook 3's (2010) conclusions, which evaluate climate change is of equal importance to abating biodiversity loss, in terms of global environmental challenges. The Global Biodiversity Outlook concluded that the issues of biodiversity loss and climate change should be addressed concurrently and in tandem, focusing on;

1. Reducing the loss of ecosystems able to sequester significant amounts of carbon for example peat bogs, salt marches and tropical rainforests
2. Reducing external stressors on

ecosystems which make them vulnerable. In addition to the GBO, The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) reports provide an economic foundation to endorse the policy incentive for biodiversity protection. Four key issues TEEB flags of particular importance which the Ecosystems Pavilion should seek to find synergies between the three conventions' governance focus, include;

1. The Coral reef emergency – a loss valued at between US\$ 30 – 170 billion per year
 2. Tropical forest carbon mitigation needs to be capitalised on to provide an operational model for the development of financial mechanisms which would reward other services
 3. National accounting for forest carbon needs to be an urgent focus to implement reliable systems of measuring and accounting for carbon storage and sequestration
 4. Ecosystem investment for climate adaptation, linking in the theme of ecosystem based adaptation, community initiatives and the need to urgently upscale the investment in ecosystems
- There are a multitude of overlaps between the three conventions but particular areas to focus on which capitalize on the mandate of the three conventions includes the interaction between the oceans and climate change, protected area management and poverty alleviation and human linkages to dry and sub-humid areas.

The three conventions facilitated by the Ecosystems Pavilion need to rapidly develop robust co-operation and co-ordination channels to ensure a flow of technical and policy processes and achieve economies of scale and multiple benefits of a greater magnitude as a consequence of co-operation. At the local scale there is no distinction between the three conventions and their mandates as is made at the regional and national level, and it's this local unified view of the Conventions that needs to be cemented at the conclusion of COP 16.

Global UN Commitments, Resolutions and other Intergovernmental Outcomes Linking Gender Equality, Climate Change and Sustainable Development



By Women Watch

In 1992, more than 100 Heads of States met in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil for the first International Earth Summit convened to address urgent problems of environmental protection and sustainable development. The assembled leaders signed the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity, endorsed the Rio Declaration and the Forest Principles, and adopted Agenda 21, a 300 page plan for achieving sustainable development in the 21st century. **More information:** <http://www.un.org/esa/earthsummit/>

The countries which signed the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) committed to finding ways to reduce global warming and to cope with its effect on the environment and populations. With 192 State Parties, the Convention enjoys universal membership. The Convention is complemented by the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, to which 184 State Parties have entered into force (via either ratification, acceptance, approval or accession) since January 2009. Under this treaty, 37 industrialized countries and the European Community have committed to reducing their 1990 level of emissions by an average of 5 percent by 2012. A major distinction between the Protocol and the Convention is that, while the Convention encouraged industrialized countries to stabilize green-house gas (GHG) emissions, the Protocol commits them to do so. **More information:** http://unfccc.int/essential_background/items/2877.php

The United Nations Climate Change Conference in Bali in December 2007 called for further commitment to address climate change; and led to the Bali Action Plan to support the negotiation process towards the achievement of a comprehensive global agreement by the end of 2009. The Bali Action Plan reaffirmed that effectively addressing climate change requires mitigation and adaptation strategies as well as technology transfer and financing.

Although the UNFCCC does not address gender equality, there are numerous global

commitments and agreements that make the linkage between gender equality and climate change. The International Conference on Population and Development (1994), the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action (1995), the World Summit on Sustainable Development (2002), and the 2005 World Summit all acknowledged the pivotal role women play in sustainable development.

The Convention to Combat Desertification which, as of March 2008 had 193 State Parties, recognizes the role played by women in regions of desertification and drought, particularly in rural areas of developing countries. It calls for its Member States to promote women's participation in decision-making policies and programmes that address desertification and drought. **More information:** <http://www.unccd.int/convention/ratif/doiif.php>

In addition, the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) states that "Parties shall take all appropriate measures to eliminate discrimination against women in the political and public life", and to ensure that women are on equal terms with men in both Governmental and Non-governmental organizations and in regards to the development and implementation of policy. In addition, CEDAW emphasizes the unique challenges for rural women and the need to ensure the application of these measures in rural areas. For example, CEDAW calls for "access to agricultural credit and loans, marketing facilities, appropriate technology and equal treatment in land and agrarian reform as well as in land resettlement schemes [Article 14.2 (g)] and to adequate living conditions, including adequate sanitation and water supply [Article 14.2 (h)]. In 2009, the CEDAW Committee issued a statement on Gender and Climate Change, expressing concern about the absence of a gender perspective in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and other global and national policies and initiatives on climate change; and calling on States Parties to include gender equality as an

overarching guiding principle in the UNFCCC agreement expected at the 15th Conference of Parties in Copenhagen. http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/ce-daw/docs/Gender_and_climate_change.pdf

In 2002, the Commission on the Status of Women considered the issue of climate change at its 46th session. The agreed conclusions on "Environmental management and the mitigation of natural disasters" adopted by the Commission called for action to mainstream a gender perspective into ongoing research on the impacts and causes of climate change, and to encourage the application of results of this research in policies and programmes. The Commission on the Status of Women considered climate change as an emerging issue in its 52nd session in 2008. Participants drew attention to the fact that climate change is not a gender-neutral phenomenon, stressing that it has a direct impact on women's lives due to their domestic work and makes their everyday sustenance even more difficult. The Commission called for efforts on financing for gender equality and the empowerment of women, specifically referring to the impact of climate change on women and girls. Furthermore, it called for governments to: integrate a gender perspective into the design, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and reporting of national environmental policies; to strengthen mechanisms; and to provide adequate resources to ensure women's full and equal participation in decision-making at all levels on environmental issues, particularly on strategies related to the impact of climate change on the lives of women and girls

This article was originally published on http://www.un.org/womenwatch/feature/climate_change Please refer to Women Watch for more information.

Chinese-U.S. Youth Launch Climate Solutions Exchange in Cancun

By the China-U.S. Youth Climate Exchange



Youth listened to strategies for broader China-U.S. climate collaboration today at the Climate Change Village in Cancun.

The “China-U.S. Youth Climate Exchange” held its first workshop today at the Climate Change Village; the first brick of a foundation that they’re laying for stronger Sino-American cooperation on climate and energy solutions.

Recognizing the critical role China and the United States share in solving the climate crisis, the group’s primary goal is to educate young people about the intricacies of Sino-American climate diplomacy and ultimately to show a way forward based on mutual understanding and respect for the two cultures

“We’re showing how the U.S. and China can work together,” said Michael Davidson, an organizer of the China-U.S. Youth Climate Exchange and member of the SustainUS delegation. “Our values are as disparate as our leaders, but the youth

can work together and find solutions in commonalities despite these differences.” The organizers hail from seven youth organizations and one nonprofit organization focused on U.S.-China relations: China Youth Climate Action Network, Peking University CDM Club, Tsinghua Green Student Association, China Dialogue, Sierra Student Coalition, SustainUS, Cascade Climate Network and Golden Bridges.

“In the midst of the greatest challenge facing our generation, we believe it is our responsibility as future leaders to establish this dialogue now,” said Jared Schy, an organizer of the exchange and member of the Cascade Climate Network, a U.S.-based youth advocacy organization. The first workshop, “Hello, Nihao, and the Road Forward,” was held yesterday, at the Climate Change Village. Holly Chang of Golden Bridges led with the pressing

need to create solutions for a shared sustainable future.

Chinese and American participants welcomed the opportunity to discuss the “good fortune” that brought them together today and their shared passion for countering global climate change. The event was also a learning experience: Schy surprised the Chinese youth when he described the complexities of the American lobbying system.

The workshop concluded with an “open space,” setting the agenda for the next two weeks of the UN climate talks. Participating youth hailing from several organizations of both countries paired off and committed to regroup several times during the negotiations.



Organizers will coordinate other workshops reuniting the youth, as well as a shared action, a bilingual blog and a “diplomacy dinner.”

The shared action will be highly visual and underscore the need for more investment in clean energy systems in China and the United States.

The joint blog, “China-U.S. Youth Climate Dialogue,” at chinausyouthclimate.weebly.com, will feature posts on team members’ accounts of the negotiations and experiences working together. Posts will be translated into English and Chinese.

“We are demonstrating an innovative model of cooperation on climate change to our governments,” said Yiting Wang of China Youth Climate Action Network. “In doing so, we hope to induce more coo-

“We are demonstrating an innovative model of cooperation on climate change to our governments.”

peration between our governments and more aggressive action in creating and taking leadership on climate and energy solutions.”

Together with several of her fellow Chinese organizers, Wang was involved in the Sino-American workshop put on by the Chinese Youth Delegation during last year’s UN climate talks in Copenhagen. Al Gore praised the workshop, “Our Shared Future: Hello, Nihao,” as a model for the two countries’ leaders.



The collaboration begins in Cancun, but it’s just the beginning, organizers say. Through these joint activities, U.S. and Chinese youth hope that the exchange will strengthen trust between the two countries and establish long-term relationships founded on friendship and mutual cultural understanding.

Other collaboration events:

The second workshop, “Reflecting and Future Collaboration” will be held at 7 p.m. at the Climate Change Village Thursday, Dec. 8, where industry experts, government officials and NGO advocates are invited to sit with participants. For more information, contact Jared Schy at schy.jared@gmail.com.

Profile



Sébastien Duyck

Nationality: French
Country of residence: Finland
Organisation: Youth Constituency at the UNFCCC
Current Position:
 Focal Point to the UNFCCC Secretariat
How long have you been in this position? 1 year

What prompted your early interest in environment?

My interest in environmental matters has resulted from the education that I received and the weekend spent outdoors with my parents, as I was younger.

Describe your first attempt to ‘save the planet’:

Since the age of 12, I used to gather the kids from my neighbourhood each spring to collect all the rubbish, which could be found in the forests and green areas in which we would spend the whole summer playing.

Favourite quote:

It’s not too late at all. You just don’t yet know what you are capable of. M. Gandhi

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

Being a facilitator of the youth constituency is a volunteering function. What has contributed the most to my path towards this function are more the dedicated and passionate young activists that I met in the past years than any practical experience or job.

What do you believe should be achieved at COP16?

If this COP restores trust in the process in ensuring that concrete steps are taken to move forward towards a more ambitious regime, showing that no single country can prevent the international communi-

ty from taking the needed decision, then this COP will have put us back on the right track.

What do you consider the most significant hurdle to achieving an international agreement to succeed the Kyoto Protocol?

I believe that what is lacking the most at the moment is the presence of a group of countries demonstrating that there are more opportunities than drawbacks in committing to a pathway that does not endanger the survival of other countries and future generations. Too few countries are currently showing such leadership. Our role as civil society is to encourage our decision makers to acknowledge this.

What timeline is reasonable for an international agreement to be achieved? And what should this look like?

The more we wait, the larger the gap between political realism and scientific necessity becomes. We need to achieve a fair, ambitious and binding treaty in South Africa next year, as a first step towards a paradigm shift.

Multilateralism Works

By Felix Dodds
Executive Director of Stakeholder
Forum for a Sustainable Future

A lot has happened since we all left Copenhagen. January and February seemed to be full of conversations around coffee bars and meeting rooms at the UN; “Was this the end of the UN as a major multilateral forum?”

The previous year had seen the G20 with increased prominence and seemingly successful activities on the global economy. It seemed to offer an alternative to that messy and unwieldy approach to coming to an agreement with everyone. Why don't the ‘important players’ just get together and sort it out and then the rest of us can fall in line.

The emergence of the BASIC group as a significant player offered to bring to the table the key G77 countries. South Africa now a member of OECD, the old order seemed to be changing and maybe the way we do things needed too.

By May, some enthusiasm had returned around Rio+20 as people got to start to think what a processes around the green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication might look like. In fact, if you could change some of the key economic drivers then there would be a great contribution to any future targets but more importantly moving the economy in a green direction would have a lot of the impacts that we had all hoped for in Rio in 1992.

Much of the delivery of climate change will be through changing the economic drivers in the different sectors. In the last thirty years, we have seen the planets economic systems driven by irresponsible capitalism – plundering the natural resources and polluting as if there is no time of reckoning. Like the financial crisis we have privatized the gains and socialized the losses and

our children will have to pick up the costs. WWF believe that if we all consume like the developed countries, we will need three planets by 2030, twenty years from now. The Green economy discussion, for all its imperfect definitions, offers the chance to address the drivers to help see a move towards a more sustainable planet.

A new Rio+20 Green Economy Agenda 21 document should build on the relevant sectoral chapters of Agenda 21 and the JPOI but also look at how they contribute to contribute to:

- Poverty eradication
- Employment generation
- The decoupling growth from pollution
- How to address sustainable production and consumption

As the challenges are getting bigger we need a real stock taking of present institutions and if they are not up to the job of addressing today's challenges create strong and robust international institutions that can cope with the challenges ahead in an equitable and fair way.

The work by Johan Rockstrom on Planetary Boundaries in 2009 is an important contribution to helping us understand how close or how far exceeding those boundaries we are. The biggest being the extinction rate of biodiversity. The October Convention on Biological Diversity would be critical as it would be dealing with a possible new protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing.

Maybe the lack of media coverage or the lack of Heads of State going gave the meeting the space to focus on the real things that needed to be done. Of course it was a late Saturday morning finish but it demonstrated that 179 countries can

agreed to some very difficult decisions together, and that it doesn't need a small club to dictate the way forward.

In addition to the protocol, they also adopted a strategic plan for conservation and a deal to secure financing for that plan by 2012 and 20 ambitious headline targets “We've overcome the curse of Copenhagen,” said The Nature Conservancy's Andrew Deutz. Although the financing will not kick in until 2012, the host country made a substantial pledge of \$2 billion.

A lot of credit goes to the leadership of the Government of Japan, the Executive Secretary of the CBD Ahmed Djoghlaif, but also to those government, stakeholders who didn't give up on multilateralism and showed it can work and if to add to that only less than a week ago the Convention on Migratory Species gave us another success with Tigers. Governments of 13 countries where the world's tigers still live, meeting in Russia endorsed a proposal to save the big cats. They agreed on plans intended to double the number of tigers by 2022.

Achim Steiner, the Executive Director of UNEP, underscored the challenge facing us when he said; ‘The systematic destruction of the Earth's natural and nature based resources has reached a point where the economic viability of economies is being challenged - and where the bill we hand to our children may prove impossible to pay.’

Can delegates rebuild trust and move beyond national self interest? Maybe Cancun can take the first steps and Durban and Rio bring us closer to a roadmap which we can all together work on.

PROGRAM AGENDA

TIME	SESSION	SPEAKERS
8:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.	Registration (ROOM: Grand Coral 3 on 4th Floor)	
9:00 a.m. - 9:20 a.m.	Opening Remarks	Jose Luis Luege Tamargo , Director General, National Water Commission of Mexico (CONAGUA) Gloria Grandolini , Country Director for Mexico and Colombia, The World Bank
9:20 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.	Order of the Day	Rene Carayol , Facilitator
9:30 a.m. - 9:50 a.m.	Keynote Speech: From the Boiler Room to the Board Room	Andrew Steer , Special Envoy for Climate Change, The World Bank
9:50 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.	Introduction of Sir David Attenborough's Documentary "How many People can live on Planet Earth"	Brian Richter , Co-Leader, Global Freshwater, The Nature Conservancy and Key Opinion Leader in Documentary
10:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.	Screening of Sir David Attenborough's Documentary "How many People can live on Planet Earth" This documentary by David Attenborough reflects on the profound effects of rapid population growth, both on humans and the environment. The film focuses on the consequences for water and food security vs. climate change. Produced by Educational Publishers LLP, BBC Active / Pearson Education Group	
10:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.	Coffee Break	
11:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.	The Multiple Lenses of Adaptation • Why is Adaptation Important for Africa? • Can Water and Ecosystems be managed for Sustainable Development with challenge of Climate Change? • How can Modern and Satellite Technology Contribute to Water and Food Security?	Bal Mass Taal , Executive Secretary, African Ministerial Council on Water (AMCOW) and Former Minister for Water Resources of Gambia Brian Richter , Co-Leader, Global Freshwater, The Nature Conservancy Molly Brown , Senior Researcher, NASA
12:30 p.m. - 1:45 p.m.	Lunch	
1:45 p.m. - 2:45 p.m.	Town Hall: A Media Event	PANEL: Andrew Steer , Special Envoy for Climate Change, The World Bank Charlotte Streck , Director, Climate Focus North America
2:45 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.	A Summary of Discussions	Rene Carayol , Facilitator
3:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.	Coffee Break	
3:30 p.m. - 3:45 p.m.	Screening of Film: "Adaptation Measures to Fight Climate Change" A film featuring case studies in managing climate risks and the introduction of concrete solutions from technical assistance and new organizational structures in Africa and Latin America. Produced by the World Bank Institute	
3:45 p.m. - 5:20 p.m.	Less Conversation and More Action: A Panel Debate	Carlos Manuel Rodriguez , Vice President of International Policy, Conservation International Jose Luis Luege Tamargo , Director General, CONAGUA Julia Bucknall , Sector Manager, Water Unit, Sustainable Development Network, The World Bank Marfin Stuchtey , Director, McKinsey and Company and Leader of Sustainability and Resource Productivity Practice
5:20 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.	Closing Remarks	Julia Bucknall , Sector Manager, Water Unit, Sustainable Development Network, The World Bank
5:30 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.	Reception (Place: Hotel Pool Area)	

The Andean social management of natural resources

By Cindy Krose with Daniel Halem, Progressio

Every year the villagers of Tupicocha gather for an annual Water Harvesting Feast – a celebration to inaugurate the water harvesting practice known by the locals as ‘Amunas’. Water harvesting techniques were once widespread in the Andean highlands, together with other pre-Hispanic techniques to store, capture, conduct and distribute water. Nowadays most of these practices go unnoticed or have even disappeared.

The ceremony takes place at 4500m up in the Andes. The president of the community designates four participants who will embody the protectors of the water: the local deities Tayta Pingollo (Water, represented by a skull) and Mama Capiana (Mother Earth). Once named, the four ‘Huare’ transform themselves into the protectors of the waters. Then, following the course of the canal, they return to us to the sound of the tinya (small drum) and wakrapuco (bull horn trumpet). They each hold one corner of the ritual cloth on which they carry the offerings and the skull of Tayta Pingollo.

After the celebration the community members pick up their shovels and head towards the ‘Acequias Amuneras’, special canals made of rocks and soil, to clean and restore them. They use these canals to redirect water from the river during the rainy season to specific places in the

mountain where the structure of the rocks and the soil allow a natural absorption of the water to recharge the aquifers. The canals give the local population water year-round.

The water recharge also helps to reduce erosion of the slopes and contributes to the conservation of the existing vegetation. Even though they date from pre-Hispanic times, thanks to the collective efforts of the community members who spend hours shovelling stones and soil, the canals can still be used today.

Andean communities have always been faced with tremendous climatic extremes. On top of this Peru is one of the most vulnerable countries when it comes to climate change, especially the rural population who are experiencing more droughts, floods, hailstorms and other unpredictable weather events than ever.

However, over the years, the people’s understanding of the water cycle and the mountains – as reflected in the water harvesting practice of the Tupicochans – has proven effective in reducing the vulnerability of Andean communities to climatic extremes on the long term. National and international initiatives seeking to promote adaptation to climate change should take these ancestral practices into account, but often don’t.



Understanding the Andean social management of natural resources helps us realise that the process of adaptation to climate change and prevention of water scarcity will not just depend on the construction of sophisticated infrastructures and transfer of specialised knowledge. It also entails a long term relationship with the natural environment in a social and cultural context that gives meaning to the protection of these natural resources.

Progressio works with partner organisations to learn more about ancestral natural resource management systems and promote these sustainable and effective ways of adapting to climate change – ways that could be replicated and adapted to other localities of Peru and the world.

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



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