



**Climate Change, Energy and Ecosystems:
Creating links to better manage climate change impacts
Building capacity to influence climate change policy**

International seminar 6-8th May 2008

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

The impacts of climate change are already seriously impacting on the environment and therefore societies that depend on natural resources, in particular the poorest and most vulnerable communities. In the face of such challenges, a collective conscience is growing for the need to integrate adaptation in development projects, in the management of

REPORT

To consult full presentations, please check: <http://www.ccee-bamako.org/>

Introduction

The introduction was aimed reminding the objectives and the agenda of the workshop, presenting the networks and participants, and asking the participants about their expectations.

IUCN gave a presentation about climate change, the international negotiations, and the Bali roadmap and its implications for developing countries.

HELIO introduced the energy session by presenting the basic notions about adaptation, energy resilience, the effects of climate change on energy systems, the contribution of renewable energies to energy resilience and the methods for assessing vulnerability to climate change.

The international negotiations on climate change

The Climate Action Network presented the work that was done in 2007, with the publication presenting the positions of francophone NGOs about energy, forests, and adaptation, which was then presented during a side event with the African negotiators at the COP in Bali in December 2007.

The network is now wider as IUCN and HELIO are involved and a new publication will be prepared in 2008, including energy, mitigation, and finance.

Climate change mitigation and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (CAN)

The impacts of climate change are already being felt with a global temperature increase of +0.74°C, causing global warming, species extinctions, sea level rise and negative health impacts. Global warming needs to be limited to +2°C compared to pre-industrial levels, which means that emissions will have to peak by 2050. This implies that industrialized countries need to reduce their emissions by 25 to 40% by 2020, and 80 to 95% by 2050, and developing countries will need to stabilize their emissions.

In Bali, three tracks have been discussed:

- the Working Group for setting emission reduction targets, the track of industrialized countries that ratified Kyoto;
- the US track, with or without set emission targets;
- the developing countries track with appropriate national actions enabled by technology transfer, finance and capacity-building, with emission reduction targets only if developed countries would provide them with the necessary support.

The post-2012 agreement needs to take into account development and North-South equity issues.

NGOs were very critical towards to the US approach as it does not necessarily include clear commitments. The voice of developing countries is legitimate, given the equity issue. Commitments also need to be differentiated depending on the very different level of development in the large group of developing and emerging countries.

The overall objective in Copenhagen is to come to an agreement that would reconcile the three tracks discussed.

The concept of « Greenhouse Right Development » can be used to measure the necessary effort required by each country depending on its ability to act on climate change. According to this tool, developed countries should contribute to 78% of the costs implied by climate change, given their income and population, whereas the Least Developed Countries would contribute to 0% of the costs.

The situation is now changing very quickly, China being the biggest emitter in the world in 2007. Some emerging countries are now in the category of Annex I countries. The countries grouped in the G77 have very different levels of development.

The criteria used to differentiate among countries are :

- historical responsibility (amount of greenhouse gas emitted in the past)
- capacity (income)
- potential for reduction (available technologies, etc...)

Using these criteria, 4 categories can be defined among developing countries : newly industrialized countries (e.g. : Korea), fast-growing countries (e.g : China), other developing countries (India, Nigeria), and Least Developed Countries (Mali). These classifications could evolve with the time. There could be set emission reduction targets for the first two categories, and for the last two categories, some qualitative rather than quantitative targets implemented with the support of developed countries.

This means that there will be negotiations inside the block of the G77 countries.

Recommendations proposed :

1. Objectives of greenhouse gas emission

How can be addressed the issues of governance and land tenure rights?

REDD needs to be linked to a broader framework of forest governance reform, including capacity-building for local communities, decentralization and community-based management of forests. Pilote projects need to be developed to see what works and what doesn't work,

-
- *Reinforce and improve the role of the Expert Group on Technology transfer*
 -

Should there be an Adaptation Protocol, separate to the comprehensive post-Kyoto agreement? or will it disperse energy and slow down the negotiations ?

There should be more synergies and interactions between the different Rio Conventions and in particular to address the issue of desertification (e.g: Niger, climate change and desertification are two issues closely linked).

Adaptation should be top priority during the negotiations and should not remain a marginal issue.

An Adaptation Protocol could be a long-term goal but on the short term it should be part of a comprehensive post-2012 agreement to avoid slowing down the negotiating process.

Recommendations proposed :

1. Need to mobilize public opinion to involve social movements and the populations that are the most affected by climate change impacts

2. Need to respect the existing clauses on adaptation

3. National Adaptation Plans (NAPAs)

- *Need to increase the level of funding and to accelerate to process for the transfer of funds to move faster to the implementation phase.*
- *Local communities need to be more consulted and better associated to the the design and implementation of NAPAs to better answer their needs*
- *Most vulnerable communities need to able to implement the measures themselves.*
- *Need to learn and exchange about lessons learned to use successful examples and facilitate the implementation of PANA in the countries that don't have a PANA yet.*

4. Adaptation and development:

- *Need to integrate adaptation and climate change considerations into existing development projects and progra2to mobi01(menobi01.1(prodse success9hangimen)-.0ntheer*

NB: this part is only about Finance for Adaptation; other financial aspects related to Technology transfer, Mitigation or Forests are addressed in the other parts

1. Need for more coherence between the different Funds

