



**STAKEHOLDER
FORUM**

Outreach

Tuesday
December 8th
2009

A daily publication of Stakeholder Forum at the 2009 Copenhagen Climate Summit

Inside this issue:

Going for Broke	1
What's Wrong with Including SFM in REDD?	3
Double-Edged Burdens	4
It Has To Be CLIMATE SUSTAINABILITY	5
Gender Countdown	6
A Bird's Eye View of the Challenges of Climate Change and Water	7
Policy Proposals on Climate Change	8
If I could Facebook message my Annex 1 delegates, this is what I would say.	10
Climate Security	11
Food for Thought...	12

Outreach is a multi-stakeholder newsletter which is published daily at the COP15. 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.

Outreach is made possible through the generous support of: Dutch Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management, UN Water, Global Water Partnership, International Water Association, Sustainlabour, Ministry of Foreign Affairs Denmark, and UNIFEM

Going for Broke



By: Harald Winkler

The future of the climate change regime is to be decided now Copenhagen. It is not looking pretty. The US is not ready to put ambitious numbers to the emission cuts it knows it must do. The European Union (EU) has proposed a step-up in finance, but still expects developing countries to pay in even more. And most other industrialised countries are hiding behind these two players.

This is a predictable state of affairs at this stage of the negotiations. No one wants to play their hand too early. What progressive developing countries need to do in this situation is to go for broke. Only by being bold about an 'ambitious but realistic' outcome will there be a chance of a long-term deal that keeps temperature increases below 2° C.

From December 7 to 18, the negotiations under the United Nations Framework Convention on

What progressive developing countries need to do in this situation is to go for broke.

Climate Change (UNFCCC) and its Kyoto Protocol will take place in Copenhagen. Two years back, it was agreed that this would be the meeting to chart the future. A few months back, four possible scenarios were being painted for the outcome of Copenhagen.

The ideal scenario would have seen serious money flow into adaptation, helping all developing countries to deal with the negative impacts of climate change – with emphasis on

Continued on page 2...

the poor. All industrialised countries would have agreed to deep, mandatory, absolute cuts in their emissions, ratcheting up the stringency of targets under Kyoto and bringing the US on board with something comparable. In response, some developing countries would make the move from qualitative to quantitative mitigation commitments. Commitments to acting on limiting the growth of emissions would be a major step forward, while maintaining a clear distinction between Northern commitments and Southern action. The North would accept responsibility for its much greater share of historical emissions, encouraging leadership in the South to take responsibility for the future. The extent of action in the South would depend on support – in the form of finance, technology and capacity. All this would have been tied up in a shared vision. The headline would have been ‘Together, we can save the planet’.

This scenario, sad to say, seems out of reach – barring a political miracle. There are many reasons for this, but what stands out are the two M-factors – the numbers for mitigation and money. The US, under the Barack Obama administration, has re-engaged in multilateral talks, but the change in tone is not (yet) matched with change in substance.

The US, fundamentally, remains inward looking, attaching much more weight to healthcare and midterm elections than multilateral negotiations. President Obama is spending his political capital on healthcare, not on climate. The US approach is marked by exceptionalism, a conviction of the uniqueness of its domestic process. Despite being responsible for 21% of greenhouse-gas emissions and having 4,6% of the world’s population, it wants a special dispensation that would allow it more space to pollute more for longer. By dint of sheer repetition, it has persuaded the rest of the world that it will never sign Kyoto, and that this is acceptable.

This makes life easier for Japan, Canada and Russia – they want to jump from Kyoto and do things the US way – in conformity with domestic, not

international, law. And no one can fairly expect China to move before the US does.

The EU has long cultivated its image as climate leader. But, at the September round of negotiations in Bangkok, it started to show its other face and made it clear that it was ready to abandon Kyoto. Effectively, the EU is also joining the US track, not finding the strength to stand up to the Obama administration. It is holding onto the quaint belief that the ‘best of Kyoto’ can be cut and pasted into a new agreement unchanged (it is not specifying which parts are vrot) and that the US Senate would ratify a weaker treaty (by no means a given).

***If ‘no deal is better
than a bad deal’, then
the deal should not be
closed in Copenhagen***

Quietly, the EU knows we will lose the teeth of Kyoto – the compliance regime. And while it at least mentions a sum of money, it does not specify how much developing countries must cough up. That would take the climate regime back more than a decade, to 1997, and a free-for-all, bottom-up pledge-based negotiation. The only consequences of not complying would be a loss of reputation – and even that is subject to spin. Only strong action by the Africa Group kept the Kyoto track alive in Barcelona.

Without numbers on mitigation and money, the scenario moves to second-best a foundational political agreement in Copenhagen. Even this will require some major political shifts, not only from Ministers but also from a few heads of State. This is the first sense in which South Africa should go for broke, work hard to get as much of what would be a breakthrough for us into the foundational package. It would contain the heart of the bargain, in political terms. Some key numbers, and a bit of legal text, would remain to be filled in.

But the options on the crunch issues are clear enough that we could still have the headlines on December 19: ‘Solid foundations laid to save our planet, but not there yet’.

Scenario three is depressing – it is the Greenwash. Some have suggested that Copenhagen is “doomed to success”. Public scrutiny and the weight of expectations are so huge that the pressure on governments is immense to declare a ‘success’ whatever is agreed on in Copenhagen, no matter how weak. This would be the end of the road, with not even a sense of failure to mobilise renewed action.

The Prime Minister of Denmark mooted a deal that is “politically binding”, rather than what is needed legally binding. Even closer to the convention process, its chairperson and the executive secretary both stated in Barcelona that a treaty was out of reach in Copenhagen.

The fourth scenario is collapse. Strangely, this is not as bad as the previous one, depending on how it is reached. Of course, if climate talks collapse in acrimony, because there is no political will to agree at all, that will not help. South Africa has long been constructively engaged in multilateral climate talks. If we had to walk away because the deal was simply too bad to sign up to, that would be a sad day. But there might be a time where this would be needed. That is the situation where progressive countries would have to go for broke in the second sense and only if the first has failed. If ‘no deal is better than a bad deal’, then the deal should not be closed in Copenhagen, but postponed for three to five months to allow more time for negotiations, and, hopefully, for the US to come back with its mitigation and finance numbers.

Why three to five months? We can’t make it six months, that is the World Cup, and then we would have to argue South African exceptionalism. We could make it 12 months but the climate simply does not have more time. We need to go for broke. Now. ♦♦

What's Wrong with Including SFM in REDD?

By: Peter Wood and Rick Jacobsen,
Global Witness

The current negotiating text on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) being discussed at Copenhagen includes several references to "sustainable forest management" or SFM. Although this term sounds pleasant enough, in practice it has come to be associated with industrial scale logging, a key driver of deforestation and forest degradation. SFM includes the expansion of logging operations into intact natural forests, which results in massive carbon emissions and reduces the resilience of the forest. In spite of this, SFM is being proposed as an activity that could be promoted and funded by REDD.

There is no legally binding definition of SFM, and no agreement as to what minimum standards must be met or what types of activities should qualify. The only consensus statement that governments have achieved on the meaning of SFM is vague and merely aspirational: SFM is a "dynamic and evolving concept" that is "aimed" at maintaining inter alia the "environmental value" of forests. The only guidelines, or "criteria and indicators," that have been developed for SFM are voluntary and place an emphasis on sustaining timber production. In practice, maintaining carbon stocks and ecosystem resilience are secondary considerations. Dozens of certification systems led by the forest industry have been established to "green-wash" products coming from high-impact operations. The bottom line is that it is impossible to prove that a company is not doing SFM, as this "dynamic" term can mean whatever you want it to mean.

Intact natural forests, particularly in the



Without the right rules in place, REDD could end up subsidizing forestry in natural forests.

REDD+ funds directed at SFM could end up subsidizing the building of logging roads further into intact forest areas

tropics, tend to have the greatest capacity to store carbon. Industrial-scale logging (that which is carried out on a large scale, using extensive road networks and machinery to remove large volumes of trees) inevitably reduces the carbon stocks in these forests, increases the likelihood of subsequent conversion to other land uses, and decreases biodiversity, forest resilience, and the permanence of forest carbon stocks. As a report by the Convention on Biodiversity recently concluded, "if SFM practices are applied to previously intact primary forests, this could lead to increased carbon emissions and biodiversity loss..." (CBD Technical Series No. 41, October 2009). REDD+ funds directed at SFM could end up subsidizing the building of logging roads further into intact forest areas, or fuel costs for transporting logs from

more remote areas: it's all part of forest management. Industrial-scale logging, under the guise of SFM or otherwise, is incompatible with the objectives of REDD.

One of the most effective ways to achieve the aims of REDD is to prevent the expansion of industrial-scale logging into intact natural forests. Yet as it stands, there is no mention of forest protection in the entire agreement. Financial support must be provided for removing areas of natural forest from industrial-scale timber production and developing alternatives that promote the restoration of degraded forests. Timber sustainably produced from secondary forests will remain unviable so long as logs continue to flow from industrial-scale logging in intact natural forests. Addressing the underlying drivers of deforestation and forest degradation such as industrial-scale logging must be the principle objective of REDD. Allowing industrial-scale logging into a REDD+ agreement through the use of a poorly-defined term like "SFM" is contradictory to this objective and this loophole must be removed.



Double-Edged Burdens

Climate change and rising hunger are already two of the largest challenges that the poorest part of the world's population face. More than one billion people are malnourished and hungry by the end of each day and the food crisis of 2007-2008 put the well-being of millions of people at risk. Never before had so many workers not been able to purchase basic food staples and within 12 months, the number of hungry rose by 150 million, causing food supplies to reach their lowest level in history and bringing uncertainty and turmoil to many regions of the world.

By: Helle Damgaard Nielsen, Policy Research Officer, ITUC

Although food prices have diminished slightly, they are still historically high and volatile and price adjustments at local markets have not followed the global in the same way. When more people go hungry today, where world food markets are not lacking food, what are the prospects of eradicating hunger and feeding a population that stands to grow from six to nine billion people? The food crisis has not gone away! and as long as the factors that caused it have not been tackled, it remains all too likely to return in the near future.

Ensuring that enough food is available in the future will require that overall food production grows by 70% but this will become difficult as the consequences of climate change and alterations in weather patterns stand to severely affect agriculture. Irrigation will become harder due of water scarcity and drought in some areas, and other regions will be hit by more and more extreme weather events, such as flooding or cyclones.

The adverse impact of climate change on agriculture will probably cause a loss in productivity and an overall decline in food production and it feeds into the vicious circle of poverty by adding more barriers to development.

Decent work is part of the solution

To the trade union movement, addressing climate change is critical to the economic, social and environmental interest of all peoples of the world. The populations in the developing world, who are already vulnerable and food insecure, are likely to be the most seriously and negatively affected by climate change.

Trade unions believe it is worth exploring how accompanying adaptation measures in developing countries can yield positive effects on employment, such as new agricultural methods, sustainable production, land management, economic diversification, organic farming, rotation of cultures, efficient public water use and pesticides substitution are all valuable pathways for reducing this sector's climate footprint and ensure a sustainable adaptation to climate-driven events and greater food security.

However, 75% of world's poor live in rural areas – and those who feed the world have the least resources to feed themselves and their families. A large percentage of waged agricultural workers live in poverty despite working more than 12-14 hours a day and the rights of migrant workers in the fields and plantations are often overlooked.

Advancing the fight against hunger, today and tomorrow, means advancing decent work and living wages in agriculture.

Changing the recipe for hunger

There is an opportunity embedded in every crisis and the link between food security and climate change must be prioritised.

In Africa and in many other regions, the agricultural sector has been significantly overlooked for more than twenty years, and greater investments are now needed in order to mitigate and adapt to climate changes. But those investments, in rural infrastructure, small-scale production, technical assistance, capacity building, access to inputs and improved food storage facilities, must take place under the right terms to achieve economic, social and environmental sustainability including decent work and respect for international labour standards.

Social protection schemes, including active labour market policies (social security including social insurance and income maintenance, and job placement services, among others) and access to public services at affordable prices (health, basic energy, water and sanitation needs) are key for ensuring justice in the transition towards a sustainable, low-carbon society and should lay the foundation for sustainable recovery, and prevent negative climate change impacts in the future.

To read more, please consult the ITUC report "A Recipe for Hunger, How the World is Failing on Food":
http://www.ituc-csi.org/IMG/pdf/food_crisis_EN.pdf



Workshop on food crisis & climate change

In August 2009, Sustainlabour and ITUC-Africa held a workshop on food crisis and climate change in Lomé, Togo with the participation of 30 trade unionists from 19 African countries that met as part of the joint UNEP-Sustainlabour project on "Strengthening trade union participation to international environmental processes".

Over the two day workshop participants analysed the causes of the deteriorating state of global food availability. This included discussions about financial factors; unequal distribution of land; unsustainable use of natural resources such as water, and threats to biodiversity, along with a special analysis of the impacts of climate change on agriculture.

It Has To Be CLIMATE SUSTAINABILITY

By: Uchita de Zoysa, Convener, Climate Sustainability PLATFORM

Another talk shop to discuss climate change started yesterday with the commencement of the UNFCCC COP15 in Copenhagen; and this time with less hope of an agreement to save the earth or rather to save human existence on earth. The leaders of the world and their representatives have been bargaining now for more than fifteen years on climate agreements, and now have come to Copenhagen to seal a deal! Have they consulted us, the people, before trying to seal the deal? NO, says members of the Climate Sustainability PLATFORM. They demand that no deal is sealed without consulting people.

Gopal Jain of the Centre for Environment Education in India echoed a collective sentiment that the climate negotiations at the UNFCCC are not convincing enough to enable human wellbeing on earth as basic sustainability issues such as poverty eradication is not adequately addressed.

According to Jeffrey Barber from the Integrative Strategies Forum in USA "negotiations within the United Nations system are too often based on linear or not integrative thinking. Approaches to many of the world's problems are compartmentalised and end up competing with each other, rather than working together holistically."

Therefore, by design the UN system is unable to provide solutions for a complex world of diverse societies and their lifestyles, needs and behaviours. These negotiations at the UN are historically disintegrated because they believe in focusing on each issue separately. Therefore, climate change is another great challenge to be discussed separately and decoupled from trade, poverty, peace, environment, economy or any other issue. Climate change is a single issue for them and is dealt within those chambers only. Therefore, the inter-linkages between economic growth, development, poverty, environment, sustainability and peace do not have adequate space in one package solution.



Will the promised arrival of the heads of states of USA, China and India to COP15 change this lack of confidence amongst the PLATFORM members, as they will be the key to an emission reduction agreement? Another Indian, Prof. Atmanand, Dean at the Management Development Institute, India, stated that "while technology can support mitigation of the harmful effects of climate change, with large potentials for sustainable energy production, the need for peoples vision and healthy relationships within humanity is far more important to make this dream a reality."

A more optimistic sustainable entrepreneur from Taiwan, Mr. Daniel Ku has been running around the world to find innovations and solutions for a greener world. He says "like a tree I can only spring from only the roots. The solutions are under your feet and on earth". He means that the answers to the world problems are within our own communities and their environments. But, we are warned by the scientists and the bureau-

crats that our destiny is merely within the limits of a liveable world.

Discovering a way to survive in a liveable world cannot and should not be the aspiration and determination of human-kind. 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. If we are not planning a better world for our children, then we are planning their unhappiness. Therefore, our responsibility should not be to compromise the lives of our children by consenting to a liveable world, but we should be demanding a better world for them. The PLATFORM therefore demands that, it has to be climate sustainability!

(send comments to uchita@sltnet.lk)



Gender Countdown

Summary of Diminishing Gender Text in Long-Term Cooperative Action Non-Papers

The following text (*in italics*) compiled from existing proposals in the non-papers (excluding Annexes) reflects all current gender-specific references in the Long-Term Cooperative Action under the Convention (LCA). It is worth noting that while the AWG-LCA text “INF1” included 30+ direct references to gender equality and women, and “INF2” included 23, the current non-papers from Bangkok and Barcelona include 8 and 3 references, respectively.

Shared Vision: Despite interventions by Iceland and Sweden on behalf of the EU in Barcelona, Shared Vision non-paper no. 43 did not include gender text. Non-paper no.33 from Bangkok, however, highlights equitable participation in Preamble Alternative 1, Paragraph 8 — although it is still in brackets : “... and seeking the active participation of all stakeholders [, be they governmental, including subnational and local government, private business or civil society, including the youth and *addressing the need for gender equity*].”

Adaptation: Combined, non-papers 41 and 31 include three direct references to gender. Barcelona non-paper 41 includes one reference, Paragraph 3, which reads, “The implementation of the adaptation [framework] [programme] [shall] [should]: (e) Involve all relevant stakeholders at all levels through a participatory and *gender-sensitive approach* to ensure ownership and inclusiveness. The earlier Bangkok non-paper no. 31, Paragraph 10 on Implementation of Adaptation Action includes two gender-specific references. The first reads, “To enhance adaptation action at national level, all Parties, in line with a country-driven approach and taking into account local and national adaptation plans, as well as *gender and ecosystem considerations*, [shall] [should] [may] implement specific programmes, projects, activities, strategies and measures”. And the second, in Paragraph 27, Option 3 of



Photo: K. Chupakin

Institutional arrangements at national level reads, “National coordinating [bodies] [entities] [centres and networks] should be established, or enhanced where they already exist, to address all aspects of the means of implementation for adaptation, *including gender-balanced participation*, and to strengthen the institutional capacity of national focal points and all stakeholders.”

Capacity Building: Non-papers on capacity-building include one direct gender reference among them. Barcelona non-paper 46, Paragraph 3 (e), Option 1 in Implementation of Capacity-Building Action and Related Institutional Arrangements reads, “ Strengthening climate change communication, education, training and [public awareness] at all levels, including at the local and community levels, *taking into account gender issues*”.

In sum, within the non-papers currently under consideration, three references relate to gender balanced or gender-sensitive participation. Of these, the reference in Shared Vision remains in

brackets. Adaptation includes one reference in support of gender considerations in local and national adaptation plans. And the last refers to taking gender issues into account regarding capacity-building at all levels. These are significant references worth retaining in the LCA text under consideration.

While the need for a concise LCA outcome is paramount, the full scope and interrelationship of climate change policy to gender equality is not yet fully reflected in the text. This is unfortunate as gender equality is an essential component of truly sustainable development and poverty eradication—both key principles of the UNFCCC and Bali Action Plan. Fortunately, however, Parties have regularly raised gender equality issues throughout negotiations since Poznan, Poland, and in the spirit of ‘Hopenhagen’ gender advocates continue to hope that it will be fully articulated in the Copenhagen outcome in order to help ensure full and effective implementation in all areas of the Convention.



A Bird's Eye View of the Challenges of Climate Change and Water

**By: Mike Muller, Special Adviser,
Global Water Partnership**

Many of us participants arrived in Copenhagen by air. And some of us are feeling guilty about making the climate problem worse even as we try to solve it. But let's put that guilty conscience to good use, and not just by planting the statutory "conscience tree".

Take a bird's eye view of what you flew over, on the way here, understand what it means for climate change and the water resources that are the indicator of CC's impact. Then let's ask what COP15 is going to do to address the challenges. And, as important, what action are you going to take?

On my way to Copenhagen from Johannesburg, the pilot had to divert around some heavy thunderstorms – we do expect weather systems to be more energetic as a consequence of global warming with higher winds and more intense rainfall.

The diversion took us closer than usual to Botswana's Okavango delta, fed by Southern Africa's third largest river. Enjoy it while you can. The future of that massive wetland into which the river disappears is uncertain. If predictions about declining rainfall, increased aridity and reduced flows come true, the flooded area could shrink by more than 50%. How will we balance the needs of the people in that arid region with that of the unique ecosystem?

That is not the challenge faced on the Congo river over which we flew a few hours later. If anything, a warmer earth and more active hydrological cycle will see even more water flowing in that great river, the 2nd largest, by volume, in the world, driven by all that additional solar energy. How can Africa tap that renewable energy, enough to power the whole continent, sustainably?



It's the same question as we fly over Mount Cameroon where average rainfall is 10,000 mm a year – no wonder it is called the water tower of West Africa. The rivers that flow off the mountain could generate 50 000 MW of electricity. But why is the power not harnessed? Might power generation help to conserve the mountain forests if the benefits were shared with all concerned?

Yet in a matter of a few hundred kilometres, we are over what remains of Lake Chad, a rapidly shrinking water body. What a contrast! History tells us that the lake has changed size before but if current trends continue, it will dry up altogether. What is really happening though? Despite the fine words about climate challenges, there is less monitoring of the rivers that flow into the lake than even a few decades ago, so it's hard to tell. We take great pictures of the shrinking lake from space, but without local data to guide their interpretation we cannot understand what they mean. How can we remedy the information drought in the midst of the data deluge?

Over Libya, we are reminded of the substantial reserves of water that lie underground. It is even more difficult to understand where that water comes from and how it is recharged. But at least while they may clash over football, Algeria and Egypt are working with Libya and other neighbours, to understand better how this hidden, shared, resource can best be managed.

With a little background, there is so much that we can learn from such a

bird's eye view, even before we fly over an Italy scarred by fires, across the Alps where the dwindling of "snow reservoirs" threaten countries downstream with both floods and low flows in dry seasons.

There is no shortage of problems to address, whether they arise directly as from climate change or just because of climate's natural variability. Many of them are written in water.

So what will YOU do as a penance for the damage you have done by coming here?

Choose one intervention to help respond to the challenges you have seen:

- Take action to strengthen the understanding and management of water resources in one of the vulnerable countries
- Act to help the people on the ground to take decisions that make sense in the face of growing challenges.
- Support action to use the immense potential for renewable and sustainable development that the water resources offer

And if you still insist on planting that tree, remember that trees can be part of the problem as well as the solution. In South Africa, plantation forestry and wild invasions of alien trees use scarce water, and have dried up streams and depleted groundwater. So if you do plant a tree to atone for your CO₂ emissions, make sure it is the right tree in the right place.

Whatever else you do though, make sure that your trip here sows the right seeds, in the right place. Think about it, as you fly home.



Policy Proposals on Climate Change

Mother Earth is no longer in a period of climate change, but in climate crisis.Indigenous Peoples have a vital role in defending and healing Mother Earth. We uphold that the inherent rights of Indigenous Peoples ... must be fully respected in all decision-making processes and activities related to climate change.

Anchorage Declaration 2009 (Indigenous Peoples Global Summit on Climate Change)

By: International Indigenous Peoples Forum on Climate Change

1. Climate change, in the light of the current global financial, economic, environmental and food crises, represents an unprecedented challenge and opportunity for humanity to transform global economic, political, social, cultural relations to live in balance with Mother Earth. Reaching climate equilibrium and justice is inseparable from acknowledging the historical responsibilities of developed countries while promoting social equity between and within nations, maintaining ecological integrity, addressing the climate and ecological debt, and pursuing an effective transition away from fossil fuel dependency towards a green economy. It requires honouring international commitments to poverty eradication, sustainable development, biodiversity, and human rights. The full and effective participation of indigenous peoples, local communities and vulnerable groups is key to achieve a just and equitable outcome of the climate negotiations.

2. Climate science, indigenous and traditional knowledge, international solidarity, equity and human rights, widespread social mobilisation and strong political leadership, are all building blocks towards desirable outcomes in Copenhagen and beyond.

3. Climate change governance must transcend state-governments' negotiations, to recognize the rights of Indigenous Peoples which includes the full and effective participation in all negotiations by Indigenous Peoples' traditional governments, institutions and organizations. It must also embrace diverse contributions and inter-cultural collaboration, recognizing distinct and

valuable contributions from children and youth, women, indigenous peoples and local communities. All voices need to be included in climate governance and decision-making: we are all learners and teachers together in addressing human-induced climate change.

Indigenous Peoples are Rights-holders

4. We hold inalienable collective rights over our lands, territories and resources. Policies and actions that are being negotiated now directly affect our traditional lands, territories, oceans, waters, ice, flora, fauna and forests thereby also affecting the survival and livelihoods of over 370 million Indigenous Peoples from all regions of the globe. However, our concerns and views have not been seriously addressed in the climate negotiation processes, least of all those from indigenous women and youth. We reiterate the States' and whole UN system's obligations to uphold regional and international human rights commitments and standards, especially the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). The provisions of the UNDRIP articulate rights which must be respected and safeguarded in all climate decision-making and actions. We are therefore holders of collective rights, including sovereign and inherent rights to land and treaty rights, covenants and agreements. Protecting these rights also strengthen the capacity and resilience of indigenous peoples and local communities to respond to climate change.

5. Respect for the human rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, valuing our traditional knowledge and innovations, and supporting our local mitigation and adaptation strategies are critical and invaluable require-

ments towards adequate holistic solutions to climate change. As such, our local strategies and priorities must be reflected in National Adaptation and Mitigation Action (NAMAs) and National Adaptation Plans and strategies of Action (NAMAs and NAPAs), in the development and implementation of which we must participate fully and effectively. The distinct roles and responsibilities of indigenous women and youth, will need to be considered; underlining the importance of their inclusion in decision-making and planning processes.

6. Our rights to self-determination and free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) are the minimum standards to safeguard our rights and interests through the different stages of the project lifecycle, including policy framing, planning and design, implementation, restoration, rehabilitation, benefit-sharing and conflict resolution.

7. Our governing bodies have the right to enact such laws and regulations as appropriate and adopt mitigation and adaptation plans within their jurisdictional authority as they deem necessary to protect and advance the social, economic, political and cultural welfare of their communities in matters pertaining to climate change. Each indigenous people's governing body has the prerogative to determine and apply the best available science, including native sciences and conventional sciences, according to their cultural requirements consistent with the right to determine and develop priorities and strategies for the development or use of their lands or territories and other resources.

Indigenous Peoples' Contributions to Ecosystem-based Mitigation and Adaptation

8. We have intrinsic contributions towards addressing the climate crisis, and renewing the relationships between humans and nature. For generations, we have managed ecosystems nurturing its integrity and complexity in sustainable and culturally diverse ways. Our customary resource management systems have proven to be ecologically sustainable, low carbon economies. These include mobile pastoralism in drylands and rangelands, rotational swidden agriculture and ecological agriculture in tropical forest regions, the conservation, management and restoration of other natural ecosystems such as mangroves, savannahs, wetlands, the Arctic environment and small island ecosystems. Traditional knowledge, innovations and adaptation practices embody local adaptive management to the changing environment, and complement scientific research, observations and monitoring.

9. The climate crisis threatens our very survival, particularly forest-dependent, ice-dependent peoples, peoples in voluntary isolation, and the indigenous peoples of small island states and local communities. Addressing such vulnerabilities requires recognition, respect and strengthening of the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples, and strengthening the resilience of ecosystems and Indigenous Peoples and local communities' capacities to adapt to climate change. Ecosystem-based adaptation based on holistic indigenous peoples' systems and rights can deliver significant social, cultural, spiritual and economic values to Indigenous Peoples and local communities as well as to the biodiversity of indigenous lands and territories. This should be considered with the full participation of indigenous peoples in the planning, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of these measures. The empowerment of Indigenous peoples and local communities is critical to successful adaptation strategies to climate change.

10. Our cosmovision, ways of life and traditional practices have been in existence since time immemorial. Sumak Kawsay, Penker Pujustin and other indigenous visions and values propose a way of life that is respectful, responsible, balanced and harmonious with nature and offers equity and solidarity as the guiding principles of global wellbeing. Indigenous worldviews embody an organized, sustainable and dynamic economic system, as well as political, socio-cultural and environmental rights. This vindicates a social dimension of democracy that goes beyond formal democracy, where economy becomes a subordinate activity to the development of peoples in the name of humanity, solidarity and respect for Mother Earth.

Securing Indigenous Peoples' Territories

11. The global economic transition to sustainable, low carbon development will require revitalization of diverse local economies, including support for Indigenous peoples' self-determined development. Economic planning combined with adaptive management to climate change will need to apply an ecosystem-based approach, and must fully respect the rights and interests of indigenous peoples and local communities. Securing our rights to our ancestral lands, forests, waters and resources, provides the basis for sustainable local social, cultural, spiritual and economic development, and some insurance against our vulnerability to the impacts of climate change. This is also beneficial towards improving ecosystem governance, ecosystem resilience and the delivery of ecosystem services.

12. Many forests are within the traditional lands and territories of Indigenous peoples and Indigenous peoples around the world live in and depend upon forests for their survival and to enjoy their fundamental rights to forests and land tenure. They are of cultural, social, economic and spiritual significance for us and provide benefits for humankind. Accordingly, the rights of Indigenous peoples, including our land and resource rights, must be

recognized and respected at all levels (local, national and international) before we can consider REDD initiatives and projects. The recognition of our rights must be in accordance with international human rights law and standards including the UNDRIP and ILO Convention 169, among other human rights instruments. If there is no full recognition and full protection for Indigenous peoples' rights, including the rights to resources, lands and territories, and there is no recognition and respect of our rights of free, prior and informed consent of the affected indigenous peoples, we will oppose REDD and REDD+ and carbon offsetting projects, including CDM projects. All decision-making processes on REDD and REDD+, Clean Development Mechanism, Land Use and Land Use Change and Forests (LULUCF), Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) as well as other ecosystem-based mitigation and adaptation measures and projects must be conditional to the free prior informed consent of Indigenous peoples.

13. Our laws, regulations, and plans shall be recognized as authoritative and determinative as to the risks, values and benefits associated with measures to adapt to, or mitigate for, climate change effects within the territorial jurisdiction of tribal governing bodies.

The IIPFCC affirms our global unity and solidarity to realize the enjoyment of our collective rights and the recognition of our vision, indigenous knowledge and our contributions in solving the climate change crisis. ❖

If I could Facebook message my Annex 1 delegates, this is what I would say.

By: International Youth Climate Movement

The best text I got on my mobile this morning was from another youth at a hostel down the street saying, "I feel awful after last night. About as bad as an Annex 1 country after announcing their 2020 targets."

Text messages are what they are. Turns out, cheating on developing countries is about as consequential as cheating on your girlfriend with that hot REDD/LULUCF activist from the reception party. (Not good).

After watching our national governments for some time, one of the most interesting – and important – issues floating the halls right now is an amended, extended, or all-together-new Kyoto Protocol – code for 'let's make sure it's law for rich, industrialized (i.e. capable-if-willing) countries to do as much as, or more, than Norway has committed to on climate change by 2020'.

In 1997 -- the year (yes I do still listen to it) Wannabe went #1 -- most of industrialized countries signed the Kyoto Protocol (oh... except the US). Over the coming years, the majority of countries around the world also signed on (oh... except the US... ohhhh and Canada, but we won't mention names). By 2005 enough countries committed to make it law (the same year that movie where released that have could be used to describe the process Sin City, Doom, Fight Plan, and Are We There Yet?)

The deal was that Annex-1 (oh... except the US) would reduce their emissions 5.2% below what they were in 1990, by the time the year 2012 rolled around. It became a commitment known throughout the world. Regardless, our emissions went up. A lot..

Meanwhile, the year 2012 is quickly approaching. So what did we do? We do

Box 1.1: What the International Youth Climate Movement expects to see at COP15

- A legally binding agreement with 2020 targets must be the end goal of Copenhagen negotiations
- The survival of all countries and all peoples must be guaranteed. This means that temperature increase due to global warming must be kept below 1.5°C and we must reduce atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases to at least 350ppm CO₂-e as quickly as possible.
- Global emissions must be reduced by at least 85% by 2050 (compared with 1990 levels)
- Developed nations must actively lead by committing to emissions reductions of at least 45% by 2020, and 95% by 2050 (compared with 1990 levels)
- Global emissions must peak and decline by 2015 at the absolute latest
- The positions of those most at risk from climate change, including AOSIS, LDCs, and the Africa Group, must be supported by other negotiators

the opposite of what is in box 1.1. (Note: to reverse this rumour, please follow instructions)

Dear Annex 1, it's time to shape up. (I thought the same thing when I looked in the mirror this morning -- it's okay). It's time to sign up for something legal, something with the numbers "40%" or "2020" somewhere in there, and maybe even a statement in plenary by the entire Umbrella group along the lines of. "Holy Hopenhagen, you're right. We really DO need to peak emissions before the time the youth delegation's average age reaches 25."

Some Annex 1 countries have already achieved their promised Kyoto Protocol targets. (Note: ALL 1000+ youth here have a personal shrine next to our beds to celebrate your achievements. Seriously. We love you.)

Other countries have not yet, but certainly plan to reach their targets in the

coming years. (We *will* love you.)

Our goal is for us to have something to celebrate on Saturday at the NGO party. Our goal is for us to be able to return home to our Facebook friends and Skype contacts on December 21st and say "Hey... they did it. I saw this mermaid statue, I fell asleep in the main plenary hall once on Yvo's shoulder... Oh, and all the rich countries actually DID something. It was un-believable."

So, Annex 1 countries, how do we win your leadership? Are your bosses and our elected politicians at home asking too much? Are you bound by our political systems? We can guess the answers. We understand what you are up against. (They told us in our political science class).

Though, at the same time, our ministers arrive next week and we want you to have built up our countries' positions to the absolute highest level possible



within your capacity. We know you are working hard. We know you are not sleeping. (We saw you at the reception with REDD/LULUCF activist). We know it's possible. And, truthfully, we're

grateful.

...You know what would make us more than grateful? You know what would make us want to hug you (platonically)

at the end of plenary? Just guess. We left a clue

We are trusting you -- our colleagues, our public servants, our governments -- to do all that you are capable of in the coming days.

We would do it for you.

Love, an Annex-1 youth, 6 UN climate conferences old.

Climate Security

By: Dr. Andrew Baldwin,
Durham University

Climate security is the new buzz in climate change politics. But what exactly does climate security mean? That climate change is now widely viewed by governments as an issue of both national and international security raises important questions about what it means to be a political agent in climate change politics today. Debate on these questions is desperately needed at this critical juncture in the climate change agenda.

The emergence of climate security discourse coincides sharply with the arrival of the Obama White House. Climate security discourse has a much longer history. However, it is with the Obama White House that climate security has been normalized in climate change debate. This is perhaps not surprising given the Administration's ongoing efforts to unify American political culture through the climate change agenda; climate security represents a common vocabulary palatable to both US liberals and Bush-era conservatives. For liberal progressives, climate security is simply another way of claiming climate change as an issue of human security. For conservatives, the term allows climate

change to be conceptualized as a military problem.

In both cases, climate security discourse shifts the climate debate away from a conventional focus on economic competitiveness to one in which the promissory gains of a low carbon economy are rationalized in terms of security. In other words, measures taken to mitigate climate change are not simply about building a low carbon economy adequate to the twenty-first century. Such measures are also driven by wider geopolitical considerations, such as oil dependence, mass migration and development.

Climate change is now widely viewed by governments as an issue of both national and international security

That the White House now appears willing to assume a leadership role in international climate change is a welcome shift in US foreign policy.

However, this shift brings with it a host of new conceptual and policy challenges that revolve around climate security. Who defines climate security? How will it be realized? Who or what will benefit

from climate security? And, more ominously, who won't? What kinds of practices will be deemed sources of climate insecurity and with what sanctions?

Answers to these questions are to be found in specific areas of policy.

Two such areas of policy come to mind: reduced emissions from deforestation and degradation; and environmental migration. Although it is impossible to predict the fate of REDD in the post-2012 climate regime, it is not esoteric to ask how the objectives of climate security (whatever climate security means) might condition the distribution or recognition of indigenous peoples rights to forest carbon. So, too, on the question of environmental migration, we might ask how climate security effects the rights of the environmental migrant or climate refugee. A growing body of climate security rhetoric identifies environmental migrant as a threat to national and international security. If this is so, then to what extent will environmental migrants enjoy state protections? Or will the movements of environmental migrants, both domestic and transboundary, be heavily restricted in the interest of state and international security? At present, there are no answers to these questions. But in the era of climate security, such questions demand our fullest attention.



Food for Thought...

Felix Dodds, Stakeholder Forum

Rationing and Direct Action

Rationing: So we have something like 35,000 people registered for the UNFCCC meeting here in Copenhagen. This includes 5,000 media and 14,000 representatives from stakeholder groups. The remaining 16,000 are from governments, intergovernmental organisations and I guess security and serviced staff.

I understand that the venue only has a capacity of 15,000, is it really that surprising that there has now been the introduction of rationing. This could over the next few days, present some serious difficulties for everyone. For instance many organisations haven't set up a system to be able to self monitor the situation.

We had a similar situation in Johannesburg for the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002, the Sandton Centre was careful to monitor those coming in and out and to slow down entry if there was peak, but there was no attempt to assign individual limits to organisations. Of course it is

slightly colder here in Copenhagen than Johannesburg so keeping people a little longer in the queue there wasn't an unpleasant experience, just an annoying one. There were also a larger number of very nice restaurants within a few minutes' walk which you could always inhabit and wait for the crowds to subside.

Here in Copenhagen there is only the Bella metro station, and I would venture not the most pleasant place to wait. Perhaps there could still be some creative thinking of an overflow tent where people could wait and maybe have the chance of a coffee or two and network.

Tomorrow and the coming days may see some difficult times for some organisations, as they are told of their quota and try ensure that they are able to get in the key people they need such as speakers for events, chairs of discussions and lobbyists. Could this have been foreseen? Could there have been a discussion on how to deal with

this if it happened? At least if there is no agreement in Copenhagen we move to Mexico for COP16 and warmer weather.

Direct Action: I believe that non violent direct action does have its place. We have seen great leaders Ghandi, Martin Luther King and Cesar Chavez to mention a few, who have effectively used such action to great effect. So how about such things at the UNFCCC? I think any people planning such action should think about doing it outside the venue. Any action taken inside the centre could not only have an impact on all of us here but also on the whole range of other UN forum. A large amount of work has been done by civil society through the years to enable the space which we have within such forums. There are many ways to creatively work inside with delegations that want to address global warming and these should be explored in innovative ways. ❖

EDITORIAL TEAM

Executive Editor: Felix Dodds, Stakeholder Forum

Senior Editor: Richard Sherman, Stakeholder Forum

Daily Editor: Stephen Mooney, Stakeholder Forum

Design and Layout: Erol Hofmans

Contributing writers:

- Harald Winkler
- Peter Wood and Rick Jacobsen, Global Witness
- Helle Damgaard Nielsen, Policy Research Officer, ITUC
- Uchita de Zoysa, Convener, Climate Sustainability PLATFORM

- Mike Muller, Special Adviser, Global Water Partnership
- International Youth Climate Movement
- Dr. Andrew Baldwin, Durham University

