



Safe Passage to Cancún

Getting a UN Climate Deal Back on Track

The International Forum on Globalization

SAFE PASSAGE TO CANCÚN: GETTING A UN CLIMATE DEAL BACK ON TRACK

**Excerpts From the IFG Special Event:
Evaluating Copenhagen – What It Means for Ecology, Economy, and Equity
Tuesday, February 16th 2010
Washington, DC**

**In collaboration with the Institute for Policy Studies, Action Aid-US, Friends of the Earth,
Oil Change International and Movement Generation**



The International Forum on Globalization (IFG) is a research and educational institution comprised of leading scholars, economists, researchers, and activists from around the globe.

© April 7th, 2010 International Forum on Globalization (IFG)

1009 General Kennedy Avenue, # 2

San Francisco, CA 94129 USA

Phone: +1-415-561-7650

Email: ifg@ifg.org Website: www.ifg.org



Authors: Alexis Halbert and Victor Menotti

Editing: Katie Damasco and Vivien Freund

Transcriptions: Gabriella Campos, Gillian Douglas, Alexis Halbert, Guilherme Serodio

Design: Alexis Halbert

Cover Photo: Satellite image of Hurricane Dean hitting Cancún in 2007, which left destruction in its path that the forest communities in the Zona Maya still suffer from today.

<http://scienceblogs.com/intersection/hurricane-dean-Mooney-1105.jpg>

Photo Page 5: <http://www.flickr.com/photos/amicagov/4166846946/sizes/1/>

Photos Page 16 and Back Cover: Courtesy of Victor Menotti

Special thanks to The Christensen Fund, the Ford Foundation, and the Connect US Fund

SAFE PASSAGE TO CANCÚN
GETTING A UN CLIMATE DEAL BACK ON TRACK

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|---------|
| Executive Summary | Page 2 |
| Remarks by Moderator, Ray Suarez, PBS Senior Correspondent | Page 3 |
| Global Civil Society Perspectives on the UNFCCC | Page 4 |
| Assessing the Copenhagen Accord | Page 6 |
| Climate Debt and the Polluter-Pays Principle | Page 8 |
| Climate Technology: Cooperation and Competition | Page 9 |
| What About China? | Page 10 |
| Why the UNFCCC? | Page 11 |
| Safe Passage to Cancún | Page 13 |
| Biography of Speakers | Page 15 |



Aerial view of Punta Cancún, Mexico, site of the 2010 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Conference of the Parties (COP) 16. Mexico's government and hotel investors have spent millions of dollars to move tons of sand from the Caribbean Sea to shore up Cancún's eroding coastlines. Warming waters and ocean acidification are beginning to bleach the coral reefs adored by throngs of tourists who support the region's industrial economy. <http://www.studentcity.com/newsletter/Emailpics/cancun.jpg>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes the main messages from the International Forum on Globalization's (IFG) public event in Washington DC on February 16th, 2010 to provide analysis and perspectives on the outcomes of the December 2009 UN Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen.

Given the post-Copenhagen confusion, there was an urgent need to set the record straight on the actual results of the summit, to reinforce the reasons why a UN climate process is so critical, and to point to some possible ways forward to success at Cancún in November 2010.

The Copenhagen Accord's emission cuts amount to maybe only half of what science says is needed to avoid climate catastrophe. Cancún must achieve more than a governance architecture of "climate anarchy," where each country does only what it desires, free from any comprehensive framework of agreed rights and responsibilities. Agreements allowing such high temperature increases are irresponsible, non-governance of our global commons.

"Is a UN climate deal even possible?" some people in the climate policy community now ask. While certainly possible, it is probability less likely as long as a handful of Senators are able to determine the position of the United States, and by consequence, the world. Success after Copenhagen will be based on bridging North-South differences, with progress in Cancún depending dangerously on changes in the U.S. to incorporate developing country concerns.

Forging of the Copenhagen Accord was far from a "rescue of a collapsing UN process" but rather a move undermining two years of negotiations. Many multilateralists view it as defying the UN's established principles of climate equity in ways that shift new obligations onto developing countries while the U.S. has yet to deliver on its own legal commitments assumed almost two decades ago. In Copenhagen, China was blamed for lack of "transparency" and poor countries were credited with "blackmailing" industrialized nations. A precondition to getting a truly effective global deal will first require effective constituencies in the U.S. for poor countries and communities.

The urgent need to conclude a global climate agreement cannot be underestimated, nor can the complexity of the issues involved in climate negotiations. But balanced products require a balanced process. As Martin Khor of the South Centre noted, "These are very complex issues that are no longer about climate science, but about translating climate science into commitments; environmental and especially economic commitments because (carbon) emissions are linked to economic performance. So we are in the midst of the most complex negotiations ever...for not only the future of humanity and the earth; we are also negotiating the distribution of the future Gross National Product (GNP) of the world."

We need new, bold and cooperative measures to drive complex global solutions. Fortunately, the opportunities to re-imagine and re-create our collective trajectory are truly rich. Such perspectives are especially urgent for informing the United States climate policy community, general public and politicians alike, if we are to bridge the North-South gap in our search for global climate solutions.

Main messages emerging from our efforts include:

- Agreements are unacceptable if based on an institutional architecture of *climate anarchy*, where each country does only what it desires; this is non-governance of our global commons. Nations must set a science-based global carbon budget then fairly share the remaining atmospheric space.
- Climate finance governed by climate authorities is a litmus test for North-South trust building.
- Technology cooperation needs intensified engagement to drive smart innovation farther and faster.
- Indigenous peoples' issues are gaining ground but still need to consolidate protections for their rights.
- Leaving behind the US—until it gets its act together—could help the rest of the world move ahead.

REMARKS BY MODERATOR RAY SUAREZ, PBS SENIOR CORRESPONDENT

I was in Copenhagen to cover the climate conference in December for *The News Hour*. Many of the leaders I talked to in Copenhagen knew they wouldn't live to see the future they were arguing over, which is not to say that they were cynical or irresponsible as much as they knew that whatever they agreed to could be, would be, tweaked, adjusted, tampered with, to meet the needs of future societies and future leaders of their own countries.

At the heart of every conversation I had in the Danish capital was the knowledge that those most responsible for today's challenges would also be the best able to insulate themselves from the consequences, while some of the most vulnerable people on the planet, not only had almost nothing to do with the state of play today, but would be contributing little to the concentration of green house gases in the atmosphere for decades to come.

But, and it's a really big but as it turns out, the giant emitters of tomorrow were really trying hard to play both sides of the street. Depending on the context of the discussion, China, India, and Brazil were either large dynamic surging economies with a lot to say about their own needs and aspirations, or in a different conversation later that same day, were just like Nepal, Surinam or Burkina Faso.

A lot was at stake in Copenhagen and depending on your perspective it was either a massive missed opportunity, or paved the way for a serious, durable, longitudinal agreement that can't stop global climate change in its tracks...but could begin the process of reordering our access to energy in a way that may blunt the worst impacts 40, 50, and 75 years from now.

When I started working as a reporter in Washington in the 1990's, the place was a fire with think tank-commissioned writing about how the modern world would be a "post-governmental world." The just completed Cold War and the recent 8 years of Ronald Reagan led to talk about a world where governments were able to do little to increase the happiness and well being of the people who elected them. And the future really belonged to economic actors: the consumers, corporations, markets and forces unleashed by money.

But take whatever counter argument you like off the shelf - Hurricane Katrina, Copenhagen, or since I just got back from two weeks reporting in Haiti, Port-au-Prince; governments still matter, it turns out, a lot. And since emissions come from specific places and then get released into everyone's atmosphere, a solution is going to require some high quality governance.

GLOBAL CIVIL SOCIETY PERSPECTIVES ON THE UNFCCC

Copenhagen in the context of converging global crises

“The International Forum on Globalization (IFG) went to Copenhagen...because we saw a set of converging global crises that weren’t just about climate—they were related to resource restraints in water and energy supplies and arable soil and a slow motion collapse of the natural systems that sustain life on Earth,” said Victor Menotti, Executive Director of the IFG in his opening statement.

“And we saw this within the context that Ray referred to, where, after the Cold War in the early 1990’s, the idea was to ‘get government out of the way.’ Since then, global corporations have largely been governing the global economy, but energy markets haven’t been regulated, carbon hasn’t been priced in, and it’s only gotten more and more externalized. We saw the climate and energy crises as related to the global financial crisis, the food crisis, and so many other areas where corporate power has really captured global institutions, created them, and written the rules.”

“Copenhagen wasn’t going to solve everything. We knew big issues—like how to govern private investment in energy, which is probably one of the key issues that is going to decide whether or not we peak global emissions by 2015—were not on the table. We knew population issues were not going to be on the table, we knew a lot of things that would really decide what those emission curves would look like were not going to be on the table. But still, the UNFCCC (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change) is the game in town.”

“It was one very important process, that is, a decision-making process that was going to set ecological limits on the global economy for the first time. And we saw that it had to be done fairly; it had to be done in a way that was going to be equitable. We saw that the equity issues there weren’t just idealistic, they were the *realpolitik* of the deal’s dynamics, where it had to be a fair deal,” Menotti continued.

“Our role as civil society was to drag the world’s governments to the table and knock their heads together to get them to cooperate and save the planet. That is their job. And we were doing our job by getting them to do their job,” Menotti concluded.

Who defines our future...

Gopal Danyaneni of Movement Generation, who was the head of a delegation to Copenhagen of U.S. grassroots leaders from urban, racial, economic and environmental justice groups, added “What we are missing in the global climate architecture is that those of us who have been tirelessly crafting these principles over decades have to now create the implementation language that creates our vision on the inside (in the UN) so we have something to fight for; and then negotiation happens! We’ve got to start by saying what we really want. Negotiation is when you don’t get what you want.”

“One of the key things that needs to happen is that the voices of those folks who are the youth, for example, the moral voice of the future, need to not only have access on the inside but actually need to be instrumental in defining the future,” continued Dayaneni. “Just as indigenous peoples and land-based peoples shouldn’t just be there, they should actually be integral parts of the negotiation; so, for civil society to actively be able to participate...‘No decisions about us without us’”.

Indigenous peoples’ involvement in UNFCCC

Victoria Tauli-Corpuz of the Tebtebba Foundation (Indigenous Peoples’ International Centre for Policy Research and Education) in the Philippines shared her experience as “a part of the indigenous peoples forum on climate change, which brought together more than 13 indigenous peoples from Asia, Africa, Latin America, the Pacific, and North America. Our main objective is to bring these people who are doing work at the grassroots level to see what’s happening globally, to influence the process, and to link their concerns of local level to global level, and to bring whatever is happening globally into their communities.”

“The main lessons we learned in Copenhagen are that we must occupy spaces of civil society on the outside, participate in meetings and activities happening inside, and that we become the negotiators; that is the only way we can more effectively bring the issues we want into the documents,” stated Tauli-Corpuz. “I think we managed to do all of those things, and of course now many of the indigenous people we brought to Copenhagen are a part of the national climate change formations in their own countries, because of the fact that they managed to meet people from governments in Copenhagen. They showed they have expertise and they are now a part of decision making bodies at a national level.”

Corporate capture of Copenhagen

“The corporate presence there was appalling,” noted Maude Barlow of the Council of Canadian Citizens. “When you got off the plane Coca Cola greeted you - Coca Cola greeters who appeared to represent the summit. Ban Ki-moon, who the year before put up a huge campaign to make the issue sexy, got a big marketing company to come up with the term ‘Hopenhagen’...I called it ‘Copenhagen’ because wherever you went you saw images, videos, and advertisements of nice children in green places with clear running water being sponsored by Coca Cola.”

“And they sponsored a number of very important events. These companies had VIP privileges that nobody else had,” said Barlow. “We need to name this. We saw the same thing back in the summit for Sustainable Development in 2002 in Johannesburg. It was the same presence that we see at the World Water Forum every three years; the last was in Istanbul, Turkey. These summits are brought to you by corporations; we need to be very clear.”

Barlow recognized the need for businesses to be part of the solution, but not to control the outcome of the talks. “The VIPs were more important than others; big countries were ganging up on smaller countries and were overriding democracy. I thought there would be a slightly different process because it was about a shared hope, since this was called ‘Hopenhagen.’ However we saw the same power structures were there (as in the WTO) and that’s what we need to challenge...there is a place for corporations to help us and help themselves by stopping pollution and coming up with technologies, but they should not be designing and running policy and should not have this influence at the UN.”



ASSESSING THE COPENHAGEN ACCORD

While the countdown to Copenhagen raised expectations in both governments and civil society, the degradation of the UNFCCC's established principles of equity became more apparent with each successive meeting leading up to the Fifteenth Conference of Parties (COP 15) in Copenhagen. The Bali Action Plan was intended to provide the opportunity for the United States to make national emissions reductions comparable to those made by other Parties to the Kyoto Protocol. But this was re-interpreted as a means toward a new agreement comprised of national pledges by developed nations, which if became legally binding, would supersede the Kyoto Protocol and represent a downgrading of commitments and action by developed nations.

Important advances were made within the individual tracts under the UNFCCC - the Kyoto Protocol Working Group (AWG-KP) and the Advanced Working Group on Long Term Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA) – but it was clear to many that while Copenhagen was an important step in the two-year negotiating process, it would not yield a final climate outcome.

“Maybe 60 to 70 percent of the work has now been done...at Copenhagen, itself, the real work that took place was in the Working Groups,” said Martin Khor, Director of the South Centre. In the LCA, “The five issues (mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology, and shared vision, by which they mean a long term global goal to cut emissions) had been delineated, and in these five issues the structure of the issues and the sub-issues had been clarified...in some areas there had been consensus and in other areas there had not been consensus. On the second to last day in Copenhagen, this Working Group that had been working for the past two years, finalized a report that had chapters in these five issues with areas of agreement and with areas where agreements had not been reached, but options had been put forward...this (is the) document to be carried forward for continued work this year. If we had another 6 months we could possibly have finished this,” said Khor.

What was really rotten in Denmark

Much to the surprise of the negotiators themselves, a draft of a “final text” was leaked during the second week of the meetings, with content that was clearly representative of developed country leadership and not the negotiated text of the multilateral UNFCCC Working Groups. Despite the outcry to the COP Presidency and the continued demands that the process remain both democratic and transparent, the multilateral process was replaced with a plurilateral agreement at very end.

Lars Løke Rasmussen, the Danish Prime Minister who served as President of COP 15, selected a group of 29 leaders to broker a back-room deal: the Copenhagen Accord. “When the document produced by 30 heads of state was presented to everybody, all hell broke loose. Now we have this Copenhagen Accord and we do not know how it came about, how it was crafted, and how it will come back to the multilateral process,” said Khor.

“Copenhagen did not fail because of the UN, it failed because the UN was sabotaged,” continued Khor. “In fact, in the last session with the UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon sitting in front, many of the countries were very critical of the ‘process outside of the UN process’ that then collided with the UN...they said, ‘The UN Secretary General is on stage (and) he is now witnessing how the UN charter, the UN principles of non-discrimination and equality of states and so on, of sovereignty, are being totally violated right in front of his very eyes.’”

“Democracy, unfortunately, takes time,” continued Khor. “Because it takes time...and the UNFCCC process has worked through many years, not as a result of the 192 countries negotiating all the time amongst themselves; in the beginning, yes, every country puts forward its view, but when it comes to the crunch and options are put forth by various groups, a smaller group is convened by the Chair. That smaller group is appointed democratically by the 192 countries and is divided into different regional or interest groups. Then the smaller group of 30 countries gets to meet and make decisions...and this is the way it has been going on for 15 years. The COP has been making decisions and there has never been a crises of this kind where it has ended up with shouting and so on.”

“But this (Copenhagen outcome) happened through vanity I think,” said Khor. “The Danish Prime Minister wanted to go down in history as the man who convened all the Prime Ministers and Presidents, especially President Obama...where he could chair the session and come out with a Copenhagen declaration...”

“You involve the Head of State and Presidents when an agreement is already ready, or when only a few issues are left to be decided...” continued Khor, “and this gives it a prestige...and a better chance of being implemented...so this is the problem – it is not the United Nations but the man who chaired the meeting who then violated the normal practice and rules of the United Nations. I would like to put that on record.”

Shifting burdens on to developing countries

The Copenhagen Accord also created what many had feared: a downgrading of both national and aggregate emissions reductions commitments by developed nations who were supposed to be taking the lead in mitigation. “In the Kyoto Protocol it was agreed that there would be an aggregate figure based on science,” said Khor. “For example, we agreed that there would be an overall cut of 25-40%...now we are after the 31st of January deadline (of the Accord) and the offers have come and according to the World Resources Institute (WRI), the total aggregate number only adds up to 13-19%.”

“Now the Accord does not say that, after all the offers have come in, we will sit around the table and see if they were adequate, and that, if they are not, we will ‘up’ the offers,” Khor continued. “It basically is a pledge. Each one voluntarily pledges what it wants to do. So we actually have a downgrading of the commitments of the developed countries, while the developing countries have upped their commitments.”

“And Canada changed its offer before Copenhagen, and now says that whatever the United States offers, it will do the same. And that offer is an *increase* in emissions by 19 percent, not a reduction of 19 percent by 2020...those who had previously committed a high target will come down to the U.S. level and all offers will be voluntary. And now a voluntary effort adds up to 13-19%. And with offsets and loopholes some studies show that it could all add up to a 0% reduction,” said Khor.

“It was envisioned that the Parties to Kyoto would renew their commitments for post-2012, then U.S. would make a compatible commitment inside the Convention...while not legally binding, would to some extent be politically, morally or half-legally binding. And with these two pieces in place, the developing countries, which do not bear historical responsibility for the crisis, could then come forward and take the additional obligations that they had agreed to in Bali. Those three pieces, if they had been in place and if we had moved forward and completed the negotiations, would have been a major step forward,” Khor concluded.

The necessary elements to move forward were not realized in Copenhagen and the decisions contained within the Accord represented an actual increase in developing countries commitments without an increased commitment by the United States. The notable absence of an aggregate figure for developed country emissions reductions creates an internal conflict within the Accord itself: While signatories committed to limiting a global temperature rise to 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit), the January 31st developed country targets create a trajectory much closer to four degrees. Unless these issues are reconciled in the post-Copenhagen period, “the contradiction itself is not going to be resolved and that makes the Accord look hypocritical or insincere,” said Khor.

CLIMATE DEBT AND THE POLLUTER-PAYS PRINCIPAL

In Copenhagen, there was a call for climate leadership from the wealthiest nations, who are most responsible for carbon emissions in the atmosphere as a result of fossil fuel intensive economic development. Echoing the call for leadership was the call for compensation for all the nations and peoples who did not create the crisis, but who are most directly affected by the impacts of a changing climate. While many developed nations do not currently accept historical responsibility for the climate emergency, there is an urgent need for climate finance to flow to developing countries for adaptation to a rapidly changing climate, as well as for the mitigation of future carbon pollution.

“A lot of interests converged in Copenhagen,” noted moderator Suarez, “and these interests said the people most responsible for the problem have to pay us to make adjustments over time. The small island states said, ‘Well, we have to make physical changes to the places we live in order to withstand rising sea-levels.’ And then of course, Africa and the least developed countries said ‘We need money for mitigation, for technology transfer, and it has to be recognized that we didn’t cause the problem.’”

“Well that is a lot of people in line, standing in front of Western Europe, Canada, the United States and a few other places saying ‘Well, you owe us because you caused the problem,’ exclaimed Suarez. “Everyone agrees that they caused the problem, but is there enough money in the world for all these interests to get the money they want to make the adjustments?”

If the climate was a bank...

Victoria Tauli-Corpuz responded by reaffirming the importance of finance in the climate negotiations and by placing climate finance into perspective. “Yes, it is the issue that is going to decide whether there is going to be any agreement or not,” said Tauli-Corpuz. “But I think this whole issue is sometimes misrepresented because when the U.S. had its crisis it paid 700 billion, 800 billion, one trillion dollars to its banks.”

“Money, I don’t think that is really the problem for the U.S.,” continued Tauli-Corpuz. “I mean if you can even afford to pay your banks that big amount of money. Even this 10 billion (the proposed fast start finance for developing nations), which is really nothing compared to that kind of money – this money should not be a problem for the rich countries. They have accumulated wealth by consuming all these fossil fuels and extracting them at the expense of the lives and human rights of the most vulnerable peoples, like indigenous peoples, and that is really what the whole issue of historical debt and climate debt is all about.”

“For me, that is the most crucial thing for the climate change convention, the ‘polluter pays principle’ – those who pollute, should pay,” said Tauli-Corpuz. “They are the ones who have polluted the atmospheric space, and therefore they should pay. I think that is just logical, the most moral way to approach this problem. If you expect the ones who are the most vulnerable, who are the weakest, to contribute even a small amount of money – that is really so unjust as far as I am concerned.”

Mobilizing the money

Gopal Dayaneni also responded to Suarez’s question, stating that he did not expect anyone walked away from Copenhagen believing that the heads of state of developed nations would ready to “pay up.” He added that “what is politically feasible is fluid, and is influenced not only by rapidly shifting conditions in the material world, and political and economic conditions shifting in the world, but also by the level of organization, the level of activity of social movements, and by how much people in the U.S. rise up and demand that the US do better. All of these contribute to the shifting political landscape, and one way or another we are going to have to deal with the transition.”

In response to an audience question about the redirection of current military spending as part of the solution to climate finance, Martin Khor responded, “the military industrial complex, of course, can be the solution if we dismantle a large part of that and transfer the funds to climate change. We are asking

for a mere fraction of the money that is spent in all the wars. We are talking 10 billion, 100 billion dollars. Even a mere fraction of what you have paid for the bailout of one of the companies, such as AIG, or Citibank, would be enough. Or perhaps a 20% tax on the bonuses of those on Wall Street will give us the \$10 billion (for fast start climate finance). The United States is not committed to the whole \$10 billion; it is committed to a share of the 10 billion, which is perhaps 2 or 3 billion," said Khor.

While emissions reductions are needed in both developed and developing nations, the future global carbon budget will not be met unless developed countries decrease emissions over 80% below 1990 levels by 2050, and unless the developing countries can leapfrog over the dirty fossil fuel development to achieve their national development goals. Developing countries have estimated that they will need at least \$200 billion per year by 2020 to meet adaptation and mitigation challenges, and these funds must be additional to current overseas development aid (ODA).

"What's key is how the financial mechanism would be governed, what the scale of resources would be, where the sources of financing would be coming from – who is actually going to pay – and who is going to benefit," added Victor Menotti. "Climate funds must be governed by climate authorities."

"They are probably going to pitch in, but only on the condition that they will get more from it," stated Tauli-Corpuz. "They will give money to Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) if they can buy cheaper carbon offsets that can be used to meet their targets. So clearly they are going to chip in some money if it is something they can use to fulfill their obligations, but that is really one part of the problem...but let's give them the benefit of the doubt; they are really concerned and are not climate skeptics. I think with the pressure all of us are going to exert on them, maybe they will contribute in the end."

Tauli-Corpuz went on to share her perspective as an indigenous person and as Chair of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. "We did not contribute to this problem – in fact we help to solve this problem. We are the ones who are contributing the most to mitigation and we have saved our forests despite the way states have wanted to pave and plunder our forests. We have fought against oil, gas, coal and mineral extraction and we have kept this carbon under the ground. And still, we fight for our rights to continue our traditional forest management practices. It is a very difficult struggle...what we do makes a lot of sense, but it is not what the real world is about, unfortunately. This is an issue of who has the most power. It is still the issue of the dominant economic development paradigm. As Evo Morales says, the cause of climate change is capitalism, and really it is the cause – the unsustainable production and consumption processes of this kind of system. It is what has caused this problem."

CLIMATE TECHNOLOGY: COOPERATION AND COMPETITION

A UNFCCC technology mechanism must channel money for mitigation to enable developing countries to leapfrog over dirty development and into a clean energy future. "We've paid very close attention to the technology discussion," continued Menotti, "because we see it as the question of what is going to be the energy infrastructure that replaces today's fossil fuels infrastructure? Whatever it is, it is going to have all sorts of impacts, and it is not only going to be a question of who owns those means of energy production but also what are the means of production? Will they be nuclear? Will they be small-scale solar? That is going to redefine our economies; it is going to redefine our communities and redefine our ecosystems."

"The real energy crisis is in the developing countries, as most do not have sufficient energy," stated Khor. "The question is how do we supply that energy in ways that are not damaging to the climate? Whether it's solar, or wind, or other renewable energies such as small hydro dams and so on, we need to see whether we can have enough economies of scale to reduce the cost so that technologies are affordable for poor countries, and poor people. That's the kind of intellectual energy we have to put into it, and the why research would be better if funded by an international technology fund."

"Why through a fund?" Khor continued. "Because a fund funds the research and development (R&D), and then the products that come out need not be subject to patents. Technology and information can then be made accessible for a lower cost to developing countries. This will also allow developing countries to make their own machines and equipment. They also can participate in the R&D. This is the kind of technology mechanism that we are looking for in the UNFCCC."

WHAT ABOUT CHINA?

The economic interests of nations, in addition to those of corporations, disproportionately affected the outcome of the negotiations, highlighting the threat felt by hegemonic powers from the growth of developing country economies. Leading into Copenhagen, it was clear that the emission reduction commitments by the Chinese, who are considered part of the developing country (G77 + China) block, and the extent to which these actions are measurable, reportable and verifiability (MRV), would dominate the discussion in the United States.

“There is a China problem and a China discussion that has to be had. Because while it is the number one emitter now, it still has a per-capita GNP much smaller than that of developed countries and wants to continue growing,” commented moderator Ray Suarez. “So we have the paradox where China is racing ahead of the rest of the world to become the greenest country on the planet, and racing ahead of the rest of the world to become the blackest country on the planet (as it rolls out new coal fired generation plants month after month and continues to emit very intensely)...can we get an agreement that does not have measurable, reportable, and verifiable emissions reductions from China?” asked Suarez.

In response, Martin Khor explained the inherent contradictions between the end-game stories that surfaced post-Copenhagen where China was both the cause for a failed process due to its reluctance to commit to a 2050 emissions reduction target, and at the same time hailed as a main broker in the final Copenhagen Accord with U.S. President Obama. “China is a major issue, especially in the US,” said Khor, “but I think more than half the reason is not because of climate change, it is because of the economic crisis the United States is in. There is the perception that somehow that the Chinese have somehow escaped the crisis and are still doing well, and is this because they have stolen jobs from the United States; they have a huge trade surplus; they are building up trillions of dollars, and so on. So I think there is a lot of resentment that has built up on the economic side that has now spilled over to the climate side.”

“Can we take action in the United States on climate if the Chinese do not take similar action (and thereby climate is used to curb American growth while the Chinese continue to sprint ahead and take more jobs)?” asked Khor. “These are the underlying, maybe unsaid, or over said assumptions, many of which are not correct...but these assumptions are the underlying reason why China is so unpopular in many sectors in the U.S. and why the climate bill in your Congress is somehow also linked to what actions the Chinese are prepared to take.”

While China recently overtook the United States as the number one polluter in absolute terms, it is low in terms of per-capita emissions. According to the World Resources Institute, China is 85th in the world in per-capita carbon emissions, polluting 4 tons per person in 2005 vs. 20 tons per person in the United States. “China’s number one crime is its population. It has 1.3 or 1.5 billion people,” stated Khor. “It should be 60 countries and by historical accident it ended up as one country...we have this basic problem, do we look at per-capita or absolute emissions?”

“So what we need to do is to treat the developing countries as developing countries,” said Khor. “Historically, China was not responsible, especially in per-capita terms for most of the emissions. In the future, it may be the most important polluter in absolute terms, but even then, not in per-capita terms. So it is true we need to monitor, we need to verify, we need to report, and this has already been agreed to by China and by all of the developing countries in Bali. Now we are trying to operationalize it,” said Khor.

While Khor stated that he was “glad that the United States took what the Chinese offered in the Copenhagen Accord as acceptable,” he was more disappointed that China accepted “what the developed countries offered, which was a big climb down from the Kyoto Protocol into an anarchy of each one does what it wants.” Khor continued, “And we can see what has happened, especially in the case of Canada now, whose figures are atrociously low. And now I don’t know if we accept it or don’t accept it. This Accord is now going to be played out, hopefully, back in the United Nations process. The task will be for each person who agreed to the Accord to put their understanding of the Accord into the text of the multilateral process.”

WHY THE UNFCCC?

While acknowledging that the United Nations process needs to be more accountable to civil society, and less influenced by corporate interests, all of the speakers agreed on the importance of keeping the climate negotiations under the umbrella of the UNFCCC process. Other international efforts can contribute solutions but the UN is the foremost multilateral forum to ensure overall policy coherence.

Gopal Dayaneni said, "I believe the UN process is an appropriate and legitimate vehicle to build a global climate architecture insofar as we need a transition from the model we have now to one in which communities have much greater control over the decisions that affect their daily lives, where resilience and development issues are defined by the communities, and where people have control over their resources. So the kind of global climate architecture that we need is one that creates the greatest amount of autonomy and the most transparent and democratic mechanisms for community control and community resiliency."

Victoria Tauli-Corpuz agreed. "No matter how imperfect the UN is - it is still the body that brings all of the countries together. It still rests on the principles of non-discrimination and equality, and from my perspective as an indigenous person, many of our rights are violated by the nation states and it was the only intergovernmental body where we were able to go to get a hearing on the violations in our countries and to get a declaration that sets the standards by which our rights and dignity are going to be respected," stated Tauli-Corpuz.

Integration of Human Rights Instruments

One of the greatest advances within the Copenhagen negotiations was made within the sphere of human rights, specifically for indigenous communities, in the discussions of REDD and REDD + in the AWG-LCA. "I was one of those up until five in the morning to make sure that many of the agreements are really reflecting what is being said by the indigenous peoples..." said Tauli-Corpuz. "In my experience I have seen how difficult it is because countries which have more power and more money they really are the ones who want to have a bigger say, but I also have seen how important it is that it should be within a multilateral process because no matter how big or small you are you do have equal say and equal voice inside the negotiation rooms."

"For indigenous people it was a major gain, from my point of view and from many in the indigenous peoples' caucus, that we managed to bring in the whole issue of human rights into the climate change document (through the reference to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples – UNDRIP). We need respect and consideration for the traditional knowledge of indigenous people in adaptation and mitigation actions," said Tauli-Corpuz.

"We are very much disappointed in the attempt to destroy the multilateralism that the UN stands for," Tauli-Corpuz continued, "and we believe that we have to bring it (the climate process) back to the multilateral arena because that is the only place where non-state actors, like indigenous peoples, farmers, and women can have a chance of bringing in their issues and getting them enshrined in the global agreements and processes."

Other International Fora

Post-Copenhagen, the international media echoed criticisms against the UN, blaming the institution for a failure in negotiations. Many developed nations themselves have echoed the new call for a retracted decision-making body on climate, insisting that the G8, G20, Major Emitters Forum (MEF), or even the undemocratically chosen group of 29 leaders who were in the back-room in Copenhagen should be the ones to broker a deal.

Maude Barlow, from the Council of Canadian commented on this move, "the long hard slogging process (the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP)...got taken over by the arrogance of a separate process that operated secretly, and that needs to stop. I invite you all to come in June to Canada because the G8 and then the

G20 are meeting in Toronto. This is the subject that they are going to be speaking about and yet again it is a small group of countries making decisions for the entire world, which is wrong. This model is wrong.”

Because proposed solutions to climate change will transform global economic and development pathways, other international fora must take climate agreements into account within their own negotiating processes in order to avoid undermining coordinated action. “I would say that our governments need to be more consistent,” said Barlow, “because while they are there, some of them with the best of intentions to come to a serious agreement on climate, they are off negotiating more trade agreements that are moving us all in the entirely opposite direction. My country is what I call the ‘perfect storm’. There is a whole rack of new trade agreements, including one with Europe that is being negotiated at the sub-national level of government called the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement that will be ‘coming to a country near you’.”

“After they experiment with Canada, the EU wants to do this with your country,” continued Barlow. “That means that they have the right to challenge any local law around environment, from bottled water bans to fair trade rules, to bi-local rules, to all sorts of environmental regulations that you may undertake to fulfill your agreements that maybe your government will sign next year in México and Cancún, if we can only hope. So I think that inconsistency is the third concern...(it is) almost as if ‘environment people’ get sent to these (climate) conferences but ‘trade and economic people’ are designing the instruments that have the enforcement mechanisms that continue to put us on a road to continued destruction of our environment and the overuse of our resources,” concluded Barlow.

The U.S. and the U.N.

Martin Khor asserted that, “The UN should be given the chance. And why is the United States so critical of the UNFCCC process when this administration is what we call in popular language a ‘Johnny-come-lately’? The US was so against this whole UNFCCC process until President Obama came to power and then Todd Stern came into the hall in March of last year and said ‘The real United States has arrived! The real United States believes that climate is a crisis! The real US wants to take leadership!’

“That was in March (2009), but by March this year (2010), one year later, it is saying the UN is useless, it cannot make decisions so fast, and so on, and then it denigrates the UN process of which he is a Johnny-come-lately,” said Khor. “The other countries did not reply ‘what about your Congress? How fast does it make decisions? How long have we waited?’ Nobody was so impolite. We could have said ‘well, the problem is with your Senate because you have 100 Senators – if there were only two Senators you could make a decision faster.’ No, nobody says such a thing because we respect the Senate, whether you like a Senator or not, you respect the Senate. We respect democracy, so the UN should also be respected. Two years is not very long for a very complex negotiation like this,” stated Khor.

Even though the U.S. has yet to deliver on its UNFCCC commitments made in Rio in 1992 by the first Bush Presidency, and reconfirmed in Bali in 2007 by the second Bush Presidency, a number of imperatives make it increasingly clear how an ambitious agreement in the UNFCCC is in the U.S.’s own national interest:

- Jobs, jobs, jobs for U.S. producers of goods and services that are climate resilient;
- Foresight that a carbon-constrained planet needs collective governance of our shared atmospheric space on a scale that requires a multilateral mechanism for planning, coordination and coherence;
- Legitimacy and standing in world opinion that the U.S. is a responsible member of the global community that delivers on diplomatic promises about *the* moral issue of our time;
- Security benefits from avoiding massive displacements causing climate refugees to destabilize governments and entire regions;
- Economic security benefits from shifting from imported fossil fuels to clean domestic energy sources;
- Cost efficient monitoring, reporting, and verifying of carbon emissions – a challenge that no country should attempt unilaterally.

SAFE PASSAGE TO CANCÚN

With the next UNFCCC meeting set to take place in Cancún, Mexico at the end of 2010, the world is wondering where to pick up after the conclusion of the Copenhagen negotiations. "What is the way forward to Mexico and the COP 16?" asked Suarez.

"I would say that our movements have a great deal to do," stated Barlow, "particularly in the Global North, to pressure our governments, particularly those governments who didn't even support the declaration on indigenous rights. We need to challenge our mainstream environmental movements in our own countries, which I think have played too much of a game of negotiation. Not in a positive way, but basically buying the message that we can have unlimited growth, continued corporate control, unlimited assault on all our resources, water, energy and so on. And still have it all and still somehow deal with climate change."

"I think that some of them are culpable in getting money from a lot of places; they are part of the problem and not part of the solution," said Barlow. "I think our movements have a job to do here in the Global North. And we need to work in solidarity and in support of the movements in Global South - it is very important for them to take the leadership and for us to show them support."

What the U.S. must do differently

"The first step is to recognize that developing countries are already participating," replied Menotti. "Since Bali, they have come out with their own ambitious actions and they are saying 'This is what we are doing on our own - if you (developed countries) would implement the Convention by providing us with the finance and the technology, then we would be able to do a lot more, but here is what we are doing on our own.' In the meantime the U.S. has yet to enact the obligations it had from two decades ago. It wasn't the Clinton-Gore administration that wrote the principles of this Convention; it was the first Bush Presidency in Rio-1992, then reconfirmed by the second Bush Presidency in Bali-2007. Article 4.7 of the Convention says that developed countries, those most responsible, will provide finance and technology to developing countries to make the transition. We have yet to deliver on our emission cuts, or on the provision of support for the developing countries," concluded Menotti.

"Then, three things have to happen, at least in the U.S. context," stated Menotti. "One is that we need to shine a very bright light on the fossil fuel interests involved. I think that when it comes to these sorts of international negotiations, what has often worked in the past, especially in the trade context, is showing decision makers, showing the press, showing the public, who is benefiting and who is losing. I think it got too tied up in Copenhagen as a developed country, developing country tradeoff. The real tradeoff was between the world's corporate elite and the world's most marginalized populations."

"Secondly, we have to align our domestic decisions on climate policy, with what is going to enable an international deal," said Menotti. "That means more ambitious cuts, and that means more ambitious levels of finance and technology to enable a global deal in Cancún. The U.S. Senate has yet to enact legislation delivering on these commitments, even though policy could bestow huge security and economic benefits to the U.S. We have to marry America's Green Jobs Agenda with a Global Green Deal."

"Thirdly, we need to focus in Cancún more on rural constituencies which are almost half of the world's population. There is an opportunity to tell a different story about the different impacts of climate change; who the victims are, who the losers are. And where the solutions are as well, because traditional communities are the ones protecting forests, water, biodiversity, and keeping the ecosystems intact," Menotti concluded.

Gopal Dayaneni concurred, "We need grassroots education, grassroots organizing, and grassroots mobilizing at the local level and at the community level pressing up through the chain of decision making. And when I say grassroots I mean people organizing in their communities as communities. So people developing a base and getting together and figuring out how to take action on the issues as they impact their daily lives. I think there is a great need to build the capacity of communities to understand both the scale and pace of the crisis that we are in and the necessity to craft solutions that meet their

immediate needs. It's not that equity and justice are things that we have an opportunity to deal with while we deal with climate. They are the measure of the efficacy of any climate solution."

"So, what we need is a global climate architecture that actually devolves power back to the place of your local basin relations and bio-regions where you get to actually build, where you have control over the decisions, where you can actually have a reflective relationship to the consequences of your actions, and where the consequences don't have catastrophic impacts," said Dayaneni. "And actually, this is where we are coming from, civil societies organizations on the outside. Via Campesina was calling for massive land reform in countries and communities all over the world; calling for soil and agriculture to be used for growing food and not for growing fuel. And right now we grow food by mining calories from the soil. We don't grow food. We mine the soil for calories by putting in lots of oil."

"So the kinds of solutions that are being amplified on the outside are the kinds of solutions that need to be mirrored on the inside. The idea that the oil needs to stay in the soil, that the coal needs to stay in the hole; these are not just rhetorical ideas," stated Dayaneni.

An urgent and unglamorous way forward

"I think the way forward is to go back to those unglamorous Working Groups...they are the hard working meetings of the hard working negotiators," continued Khor. "The Chinese, Indians, Brazilians, and South African ministers met a few weeks ago and they have made a declaration that they want to return to the multilateral process. They want to have five meetings before Mexico. They want those committees to be the basis for negotiations, and not the Copenhagen Accord - even though they support the Copenhagen Accord. This view is shared by other developing countries, such as the small island states that have said that they want the negotiations to resume in the UN as soon as possible. They don't want them to be in the G20 or in the World Bank or wherever else."

"If we proceed along these lines we can still have a chance of success in Mexico," said Khor, "Especially if we do three things. First, retain the mitigation architecture of Bali, complete the negotiations for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol and bind them with the aggregate figure. The United States not a member of the Kyoto Protocol and will make it its own commitments in the UN convention. And the developing countries will make mitigation efforts. The second action that would need to take place would be a proper assessment of the financing needed, where it should come from and where it should go. The third action is technology transfer. Developing countries want to have access to the best and latest technology at the most affordable cost. We need to have financing. The present targets of developed countries are that the world are set for a 4 degree rise in temperature; we cannot afford that..."

"This is where the Accord meets the Working Group report," added Khor. "This is where the group of 29 finally meets the group of 192 in the negotiating hall. And this is where the test is going to be. So fine, the Accord may be a good thing that helped to catalyze the final solution, or it may be something that complicates the process towards a final solution. We do not know - let us see."

BIOGRAPHIES OF SPEAKERS**MAUDE BARLOW, The Council of Canadians, Canada**

Maude Barlow is the National Chairperson of the Council of Canadians, Canada's largest public advocacy organization, and the founder of the Blue Planet Project, which works internationally to secure the right to water. In 2009, she was named as the Senior Advisor on Water for the President of the United Nations' General Assembly. She serves on the boards of the International Forum on Globalization (IFG) and Food and Water Watch, and is a Councilor with the Hamburg-based World Future Council. Maude is the recipient of seven honorary doctorates, the 2005/2006 Lannan Cultural Freedom Fellowship Award, the 2005 Right Livelihood Award (known as the "Alternative Nobel") for her global water justice work, and is the Citation of Lifetime Achievement winner of the 2008 Canadian Environment Awards. Maude is also the best selling author or co-author of 16 books, including *Blue Gold*, *The Fight to Stop Corporate Theft of the World's Water* and the recently released *Blue Covenant: The Global Water Crisis and The Coming Battle for the Right to Water*.

GOPAL DAYANENI, Movement Generation, United States

Gopal Dayaneni serves on the Planning Committee for Movement Generation Justice and Ecology Project, which works to engage grassroots racial and economic justice organizations in strategic action on issues of ecological crisis and transition. Gopal also serves on the board of the International Accountability Project, is an active trainer and organizer with the Ruckus Society and a member of the Progressive Communicators Network. Gopal has been a campaigner with Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition and Project Underground, among other organizations. He has been involved in fighting for social, economic, environmental and racial justice through organizing & campaigning, teaching, writing, speaking and direct action since the late 1980's.

MARTIN KHOR, South Centre, Malaysia

Martin Khor is currently the Director of the developing country governments' only think tank, the South Centre, based in Geneva. He is ex-Director of the Third World Network, a leading developing-country civil society organization involved in research and publications in trade, environment and development issues. Martin has authored many books and papers on trade, sustainable development, intellectual property rights, and development. He is also the editor of the *South-North Development Monitor* (SUNS), and a member of the United Nations Committee on Development Policy. From 1996 to 2002, Martin served on the board of the South Centre. He has also served on the board of the Helsinki Group on Globalization and Democracy, the International Task Force on Climate Change (2003-2005), the Expert Group on Democracy and Development, Commonwealth Secretariat (2002-2003) and the United Nations Secretary-General's Task Force on Environment and Human Settlements in the UN System (1998), the Working Group of Experts on the Right to Development, and the UN Commission on Human Rights (Vice-Chairman - 1996, Member - 1997). He received an education in economics at Cambridge University (U.K.) and at the University of Science Malaysia.

VICTOR MENOTTI, International Forum on Globalization, United States

Victor Menotti is Executive Director of the International Forum on Globalization. Much of his focus is with traditional farming, fishing, forest, and indigenous communities and global civil society networks on trade and finance. After attending the Rio Earth Summit, he traveled to South America laying the groundwork for an international citizens' network on economic integration issues. In 1993, he was the editorial researcher for the Earth Island Press Book, *The Case Against Free Trade*, and coordinated the Clearcut Book Project for the Foundation for Deep Ecology. He is the author of the IFG report, *Free Trade, Free Logging: How the World Trade Organization Undermines Global Forest Conservation*, contributed a chapter on "WTO and Native Sovereignty" in *Paradigm Wars: Indigenous Peoples' Resistance to Economic Globalization*, and author of *WTO and Sustainable Fisheries* for the Institute for Fisheries Resources. Menotti earned his degree in International Relations from UCLA and speaks several languages.

VICTORIA TAULI-CORPUZ, Tebtebba Foundation (Indigenous Peoples' International Centre for Policy Research and Education), The Philippines

Victoria Tauli-Corpuz is an indigenous woman from the Cordillera region in the Philippines. She was one of the leading indigenous advocates for UN adoption of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and is the currently elected chairperson of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. She is founder and director of the Tebtebba Foundation (Indigenous Peoples' International Centre for Policy Research and Education), which is based in the Philippines. She helped organize and convene the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, China, in 1995. Victoria is also chairperson of the UN Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Populations, convener of the Asian Indigenous Women's Network, and a board member of IFG.



Mayan women in Tihosuco, Quintana Roo, Mexico, 2003. 2007's Hurricane Dean has hurt the rural economy and food security of the Zona Maya that surrounds Cancún



Mayan boy looking toward Cancún from Isla Contoy – the low-lying island is considered the most important nesting place of sea birds in all of the Mexican Caribbean, and is threatened by rising sea levels from climate change.

International Forum on Globalization
1009 General Kennedy Avenue, # 2
San Francisco, CA 94129 USA
Phone: +1-415-561-7650
Website: www.ifg.org