

Summary of Panel discussion at the International Climate Dialogue Meeting 15th of May 2009

Panel Discussion A: Expectations for a Climate Agreement at COP15

Presentations by

- **Connie Hedegaard**, Minister for Climate and Energy,
- **Saleemul Huq**, Chairman of Bangladesh Centre for Advanced Studies (BCAS),
- **Yu Jie**, Head of Policy and Research, The Climate Group China Office
- **Alden Meyer**, Director of strategy and policy, Union of Concerned Scientists, USA

Connie Hedegaard opened the panel discussion by giving a presentation on “**Denmark’s Ambitions for a Climate Agreement at COP15**”.

There are three crunch issues which must be solved if the negotiations are to move forward:

- A1 countries must take on ambitious targets that are in line with IPCC recommendations
- Mitigation targets of some advanced developing countries are also required in order to get a deal in Copenhagen.
- Additional finance is needed in order to secure a deal. Leadership by the A1 countries is lacking.

Pressure from NGOs is needed in order to move the negotiations forward. Denmark’s role as host country will be to create an atmosphere of trust and confidence in the multilateral negotiations. At bilateral meetings the role will be to push the negotiations in the right direction, where the need for ambitious targets will be stressed. The minister expressed interest in the NGO paper outlining how a final architecture could be set up.

Saleemul Huq pointed out the lack of representation of the poor people who are most vulnerable to Climate Change in the international multilateral meetings outside the negotiations, such as the MEF and the G8. They have no voice and this is a problem since poor people constitute the majority of people adversely affected by Climate Change. Huq called for the Danish Climate Minister to raise the voice of the poor in these meetings.

Yu Jie outlined the role of China in the Climate Change negotiations. China has started to engage with Climate Change issues. There is a strong focus on renewable energy and china aims to accelerate the domestic markets for pvc, evs and focus on energy efficiency. However, China is also asking for fairness in the negotiations and more focus on technological cooperation and capacity building.

Alden Meyer stated that in order to combat Climate Change a technical revolution is required. The question is how far the Copenhagen deal can take the world in that direction. A focus on specific technologies could be leverage to break the dead lock in the negotiations as it concretize the solutions to Climate Change. However, it is the government’s responsibility to educate the public of the benefits of a deal. It cannot be assumed that sunrise industries, and the people suffering from Climate Change with limited political power, will be able to mobilize people.

The open discussion: centered around the lack of leadership of the EU, the deadlock of the negotiations due to the developed countries not submitting progressive proposals on finance

and technology cooperation and the role of China. The minister expressed interest in the NGO paper outlining how a financial architecture could be set up.

Panel discussion B: Mitigation and Justice

Presentations by:

- **Angelica Navarro**, Ambassador and Lead Negotiator, Bolivia,
- **Srinivas Krishnaswamy**, Climate and Energy Campaigner, Greenpeace India
- **Peter Emberson**, Climate Change Campaigns Officer, Pacific Conference of Churches, Fiji.

Angelica Navarro explained the historical climate debt of the developed countries and argued that the debt should be reflected in the A1 mitigation targets in order to ensure an equitable and fair climate deal.

Srinivas Krishnaswamy reflected on India's shift on Climate Change, moving from scepticism to creating action plans for Climate Change, whilst drawing attention to the divide in India's population. 10 % population create 90 % of emissions. India is asking developed countries to adhere to their responsibilities by providing funding to mitigation and adaptation.

Peter Emberson outlined the plight of Small Islands States in the Pacific Ocean due to Climate Change and how sustainable lifestyles are threatened, whilst pointing out the lack of local as well as global leadership to deal with Climate Change.

Open discussion: Worry was expressed by several participants that Climate Change is not taken seriously enough by political leaders although it already has devastating effects on Small Island States. In contrast the financial crisis has gained a lot of attention and big sums have been pledged to deal with it. The climate crisis is just as important, if not more, but there is no action. To generate a sense of urgency and underline the seriousness of it, it was suggested it should be coined the Climate "Crisis" by political leaders and NGOs.

Panel discussion C: The Least Developed Countries and a Climate Agreement at COP 15.

Presentations by:

- **Ketil Karlsen**, Senior Advisor, Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
- **Rachel Berger**, Climate Change Policy Advisor, Practical Action, UK,
- **William Chadza**, Programme Director, Centre for Environmental Policy and Advocacy, Malawi.

Ketil Karlsen gave a presentation on the aspects of the Climate Agreement that are of special importance to LDCs and SIDS, with focus on CDM and Finance. Denmark's support of the CIF was outlined, as well as Denmark's role in ensuring funding for Adaptation based on the guiding principles developed from the Strategic Policy Dialogue Process.

Rachel Berger emphasised the need for immediate adequate additional funding for adaptation that is not donor driven. The money should be seen as compensation/restitution to the LDCs for the damage caused, by the developed countries not acting soon enough in cutting emissions to prevent dangerous Climate Change. The need for new, democratic organisational structures to govern the funding was also highlighted. Also a need for immediate action from the developed

countries was called upon as hardly any of the funding pledged for the LDCs have actually been delivered. This has created deep mistrust in the LDC as to whether developed countries will keep their promises and whether a fair deal in Copenhagen will be reached.

William Chadza highlighted the need for additional funding and the role of institutions. Most LDCs are very sceptical about the World Bank as it has been difficult to access the funds and because of its governance structure. Furthermore, the World Bank might undermine the UNFCCC. The Adaptation Fund was highlighted as an example of a more democratic organisation.

Open discussion: several questions went on what institutions should be created to govern and channel Finance to adaptation and mitigation in the developing countries and what role, if any the World Bank should play in this. It was questioned how Denmark as host country and self proclaimed neutral negotiator could support the CIF, when many LDCs have experienced the World Bank as being undemocratic, donor driven and even supporting climate unfriendly projects. The response was that Denmark has lobbied for a sunset clause within the CIF, that there is a need for a stronger institutional framework within in the UNFCCC, but also a coherent framework, where only the "best" institutions can become part of a new financial architecture. Worry that the funds pledged for Climate Change would not be in addition to ODA was also expressed in the open discussion.

Panel discussion D: Financing a Climate Agreement

Presentations by:

- **Per Callesen**, Deputy Permanent Secretary, Danish Ministry of Finance,
- **Antonio Hill**, Senior Climate Change Policy Advisor, Oxfam International,
- **Tasneem Essop**, International Climate Policy Advocate, WWF South Africa.

Per Callesen highlighted that economic mechanism alone cannot solve the climate crisis. It is also necessary to ensure public funding and help developing countries to adopt mitigation target, fx through the "no loose"- approach. There are several problematic issues with the current CDM system that needs to be refined, for example through a move towards sectoral, programmatic CDM.

Antonio Hill focused on the lack of EU leadership in the Climate negotiations. The EU has delayed proposing a figure on Finance issues and thus stalled negotiations. The amount of money required is relatively small compared to the money pledged to solve the financial crisis, although money for Climate Change will move the world towards sustainability whereas money pledge to solve the financial crisis is given to preserve the existing flawed system.

Tasneem Essop highlighted the progressive proposals and submissions put forward by many developing countries to move the negotiations forward, whereas the A1 countries have not shown leadership, thereby stalling the process. In order to move the negotiations forward A1 countries must propose mitigation targets and secure the funding needed for financing the deal. Denmark should take the lead on this.

Open discussion: Impatience with the EU was expressed during the open discussion and several questions were raised as to when the EU will step up as a leader and deliver a figure on finance. It was also stressed that additional Climate Change funding is also needed from the EU and other A1 countries. Furthermore, it was questioned whether CDM should play a role in the next implementation period.

