MEDIA BRIEFING

COP15 COPENHAGEN DECEMBER 2009

Dear Journalist,

Present and future unavoidable impacts of climate change are set to threaten the lives and livelihoods of millions of people. The poorest, most vulnerable people are being affected directly – first and worst – despite being least responsible for the crisis.

Climate change threatens to undermine the progress made over the last 50 years in the global fight against poverty. Oxfam International, a development and humanitarian organisation that works with local partners in over 100 countries around the world, is campaigning for a strong and fair deal that will avert catastrophic and irreversible levels of climate change and help the world's poorest people cope with changes that are already locked in the system.

Oxfam is calling for a deal in Copenhagen which guarantees action in two key areas:

- Binding emission reduction targets for rich countries - at least 40 percent cut in domestic emissions by 2020 relative to 1990 levels
- At least $50bn every year from 2013 rising to $100bn or more by 2020 - to help poor countries adapt to a changing climate and reduce emissions. This must be new money - additional to overseas aid commitments.

In this briefing pack, you will find further information on the activities and resources Oxfam has to offer at the COP, including:

- Biographies of people Oxfam can offer for interview including experts on the policy and politics of the talks from around the world; men and women from Uganda, Bangladesh, Peru, China and the United States who are already struggling to cope with the impacts of climate change; and young climate activists from around the globe who have been tracking negotiations throughout 2009
- A summary of the multimedia resources Oxfam has to offer – including pictures, footage and case studies
- Oxfam media briefings on the key issues under debate over the next two weeks

We will also be issuing comment and reaction as the talks progress. To ensure you are receiving all our updates and advisories, please send your contact details to media.copenhagen@oxfaminternational.org. And please do not hesitate to contact any of us should you require any additional information.

Sincerely,

Oxfam International Media Team

Anna Mitchell +44 7796 993 288 / +447545719593 / anna.mitchell@oxfaminternational.org
Laura Rusu +1 202 459 3739 / +447540702656 / lrusu@oxfamamerica.org
Angela Corbalan + 32 473 56 22 60 / +447540702661 / angela.corbalan@oxfaminternational.org
Natalie Curtis +44 7824 503108 / +447545719702 / ncurtis@oxfam.org.uk
Isabel Sande Frandsen +45 60 95 96 69 / isf@ibis.dk
Binbin Wang +447540702805 / bbwang@oxfam.org.hk

Oxfam International is a confederation of independent organisations from 14 countries around the world. It works to help others to tackle poverty.

Oxfam is a member of the tcktcktck campaign - a global coalition environments and development organisations, faith and youth groups and unions that is calling for a fair, ambitious and binding climate agreement in Copenhagen in December 2009.

Biographies of Oxfam Spokespersons

Antonio Hill *Senior Policy Adviser on Climate Change, Oxfam Great Britain*
Hill has been a Policy Advisor for Oxfam for nine years and is a leading voice on climate change, environment and sustainable livelihoods. He has worked on environment and agricultural projects in Ethiopia, Senegal, South India and China, including reviewing China's environment & energy portfolio for the UNDP. Hill is an expert on the climate change negotiations, with particular emphasis on finance, adaptation and mitigation. Prior to working for Oxfam, Hill was Vice President and an Associate for Finance at the World Foundation for Environment & Development. Hill speaks English and Spanish.

David Waskow *Oxfam America Climate Change Program Director*
Waskow has overseen Oxfam America's policy and advocacy engagement on climate change since 2007, focusing both on domestic climate change legislation and the international climate negotiations. Before coming to Oxfam, he was the director of international programs at Friends of the Earth US, where he worked on trade policy, corporate accountability, and climate and energy policy.

Jan Kowalzig *Senior Advisor Climate Change, Oxfam Germany*
Kowalzig has been following the UN climate negotiations since 2004, with a special focus on adaptation and finance and the German/EU negotiating positions. Before coming to Oxfam, he previously worked for Friends of the Earth Europe on EU climate and energy policy. He speaks German and English.

Tim Gore *EU Climate Change Policy Advisor, Oxfam International*
Gore is based in Brussels, where he leads Oxfam's work on European climate policy both in Brussels and at the international negotiations on a post-2012 UN climate regime. He specialises in the positions and politics of the EU, climate financing, bunkers, and carbon markets. Before joining Oxfam, Tim was the Policy Officer at Climate Action Network (CAN) Europe. He speaks fluent English and conversational French and Italian.

Katia Maia *Lead on Climate Change, Trade, Agriculture and Food Security, Oxfam International*
Maia is a Brazilian sociologist who has headed Oxfam Campaign and Advocacy Office in Brazil for the last 9 years. For more than 20 years she used to work among social movement and NGOs in Brazil and Latin America region especially in the environmental and development issues. She speaks Spanish, English and Portuguese.

Robert Bailey *Senior Policy Adviser on Climate Change, Oxfam Great Britain*
Bailey has expertise on all areas of the climate negotiations, especially the EU and European government positions. He has long worked on the issue of climate change, with previous work on biofuels and renewable energy. Bailey has authored reports on the human impact of climate change and climate change adaptation. He has witnessed first hand the impacts of climate change across Latin America, Asia and Africa.

Sabina Voogd *Policy Advisor on Sustainable Development and Climate Change, Oxfam Novib*
Voogd is an expert on adaptation and transfer of technologies. Before joining Oxfam, she worked for the Dutch ministry of foreign affairs on access to medicines in developing countries and for Greeenpeace on trade and sustainable development. She speaks Dutch, English and German.

Jon Jacoby *Policy Advisor, Private Sector, Oxfam America*
Jacoby engages the business and investor communities in advocacy on climate change adaptation, as well as foreign aid reform, and other sustainable development issues. Previously, Jacoby served as Associate Director for International Economic Policy at the Center for American Progress.

Bert Maerten *Global Climate Change Campaign Lead and Head of Copenhagen Delegation*
Maerten leads Oxfam International's global climate change campaign. He oversees the global lobby, media and mobilization strategy of the confederation. He managed Oxfam's advocacy and campaign work on agriculture and trade in East Asia, and has coordinated poverty reduction programmes in several countries in the region. He is currently based in Bangkok and is fluent in Dutch and English.

Phil Bloomer *Director, Campaigns and Policy Division, Oxfam Great Britain*
Bloomer runs Oxfam's global campaigning and programme policy work, including campaigning for a fair and safe global deal on climate change; pro-poor solutions to the global economic crisis; humanitarian protection and assistance and the provision of essential health and education for all. Previously Phil was the Head of Oxfam International's Make Trade Fair campaign to achieve trade rules that work for the poor as well as the rich. He speaks English and Spanish.

Kelly Dent *Economic Justice Coordinator, Oxfam Australia*
Dent leads Oxfam Australia's campaign team working on climate change, the food crisis, agriculture and sustainable livelihoods, trade and labour rights. She has followed the climate negotiations with an eye for South-East Asia and the Pacific, as well as the Australian Government's approach to and policies for tackling climate change. She is also an expert on the combined impact of climate change, the economic and food crises, and gender.

Mukta Ziaul Hoque *Policy & Advocacy Manager ,Oxfam GB Bangladesh*
Since the beginning of professional career, Hoque has been focusing on national and international policy issues including macroeconomic policies and practices. He has experience of working with national and international organizations as member of intercontinental and multicultural team. Good understanding on political economy helps him to continue work on Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP), national sovereignty over development plan, special and differential treatment for least-developed countries in multilateral arrangements and political empowerment of weaker states for more than 13 years.

Savio Carvalho, is the Southern Climate Change Campaign Adviser for Oxfam International. He is the former Country Director of Oxfam GB in Uganda and Tajikistan. Savio supports and advises 15 countries in Latin America, Asia and Africa on the Oxfam Climate Change Campaign. He co-ordinates the Global campaign in Southern Countries, through strategy development, Capital level lobby, and represents Oxfam International at key international events and UNFCCC negotiations.

Romain Benicchio *Advocacy and Media Officer, Oxfam International*
Benicchio has been a policy and media advisor in Oxfam's Geneva office since 2002, working on trade and development, access to medicines, agriculture and climate change. He is currently managing Oxfam France's advocacy work on climate. Before coming to Oxfam, Benicchio started as a consultant for UNCTAD and AITIC on trade and development issues, before working with the French Embassy in Iceland as a cultural Attaché.

Stanley So *Campaigns Coordinator, Oxfam Hong Kong*
So coordinates Oxfam Hong Kong's climate campaign. He is an experienced advocate and has helped shape Oxfam Hong Kong's Make Trade Fair Campaign, including campaign around WTO Ministerial Meeting in Hong Kong in 2005. Prior to joining Oxfam Hong Kong, he was a long-time environmental journalist, and still regularly contributes articles on development, globalization, trade, and climate issues.

Biographies of Oxfam Executives

Jeremy Hobbs *Executive Director of Oxfam International*
Hobbs was the executive director of Oxfam's Australian affiliate between until 2001 when he became the Executive Director of Oxfam International. He has wide experience in advocacy, both in lobbying governments and working with the private sector, experience in many aspects of community development, and in NGO management, marketing and fundraising, both domestically and internationally.

Barbara Stocking *CEO of Oxfam Great Britain*
Stocking serves as the Chief Executive of Oxfam Great Britain, which has projects in some 80 countries throughout the world. Since joining Oxfam, she has led the organization's response to humanitarian crises in Afghanistan, Iraq, Sudan, and Oxfam's humanitarian actions during the Indian Ocean Tsunami crisis and the Pakistan earthquake. Prior to her directorship, she worked for the World Health Organization in West Africa, was Director of the King's Fund Centre for Health Service Development, and held senior positions in the UK National Health Service.

Barry Coates *Executive Director of Oxfam New Zealand*
Coates has devoted his career to poverty reduction and sustainable development, with a particular focus on tackling the root causes of poverty, injustice and unsustainability, and a commitment to supporting development in the Pacific. Before coming to Oxfam, Barry was Head of Development Policy with the World Wildlife Fund, Director of the World Development Movement in the UK, and has played a leading role in international campaigns on debt, arms trade, corporate social responsibility and international trade.

Nisha Agarwal *Director of Oxfam India*
Agarwal has been working on poverty, inequality and social development issues for more than two decades. Before coming to Oxfam, Agarwal worked with the World Bank on development issues, and has extensive experience working in countries in the East Asia Region (Cambodia, Vietnam and Indonesia) and in the East Africa Region (Tanzania, Kenya and Uganda).

Biographies of Climate Witnesses

Constance Okollet *Uganda*
Constance is a peasant farmer from Tororo district in Eastern Uganda and a mother of seven. She is also a community activist and chairperson of the Osukura United Women network which includes 40 regional groups in Uganda's Osukura Sub county. In 2007, heavy rains destroyed the homes and food supply of Constance's village displacing all of its residents. Starvation followed. Once the situation stabilised, the community was dealt a second blow: an unprecedented drought that dried up crops and wells, reigniting the cycle of hunger and thirst. She is fluent in English. Available for interviews between Dec 7-Dec 18.

Sharon Hanshaw *USA*
On August 29, 2005, Hurricane Katrina hit Biloxi, Mississippi. Thirteen feet of water crashed through the streets, filling Sharon's house with mud, and destroying her belongings. The floodwater also destroyed the hairdressing business she had run for 21 years. Months later, all the homes on Sharon's block were bulldozed to build a parking lot for the Imperial Palace Casino. Hurricane Katrina has propelled Sharon to a position of leadership in Biloxi. She is the Executive Director of Coastal Women for Change, a group launched in January 2006. The group brings together community members in Biloxi, Mississippi to discuss and participate in long range planning and reconstruction of their community following the destruction wrought by Hurricane Katrina. Sharon will be available for interviews between Dec 7-Dec 18.

Cayetano Huanca *Peru*
Cayetano is a farmer whose village has been dependant on a glacier for hundreds of years. Glacial melt is now affecting his crops and rising temperatures is causing fatal illnesses in his alpaca herd upon which he is dependent. Spanish speaker only. Available for interviews between Dec 12-Dec 18.

Shorbanu Khatun *Bangladesh*
A mother of four, Shorbanu has lost both her husband and her home to the impacts of climate change. After her land, parched by extended dry seasons and flooded with salt water, was no longer cultivable, Shorbanu's husband was forced to veer into the jungle to feed his family. He was killed by a tiger, leaving Shorbanu one of an increasing number of 'tiger widows' along the coast of Bangladesh. In 2000, Shorbanu was dealt a second blow when cyclone Aila destroyed her home, along with 500,000 others. Now she is living in an internally displaced persons camp on an embankment with thousands of Aila survivors. Available for interviews between Dec 2 – 18 Dec.

Xiao Xin *China*
Xiao Xin is 24 and a student at the Nankai University of China. She has visited the Gansu province of China which has been hit hard by drought to see for herself the impact climate change is having in China. Xiao Xin has been an active campaigner on climate change for four years - for example she has helped organised education projects in China for students and regularly blogs on the issue. She won a competition to be go to Copenhagen as an envoy for the Chinese public. She speaks English fluently.

Biographies of ‘Adopt a Negotiator’ Trackers

Adopt A Negotiator is a project designed to open international climate negotiations to people around the world. Young people who will have to live with the decisions that are being made at the UN for the rest of their lives will be tracking the negotiations. Representing 13 countries and speaking 9 different languages the mission of the project is to change the way citizens from around the world engage in the UN climate change process.

Adam McIsaac – Canada:
Adam hails from Prince Edward Island, Canada. He has experience with organic farms in rural Prince Edward Island and Fair Trade Coffee and Cacao collectives in the Dominican Republic.

Andrea Cinquina – Italy
Andrea lives in Pescara, Italy and is the Vice President and co-founder of Greensharing, non profit organization that promotes awareness, actions and changes in behaviour towards sustainability.

Anna Collins – United Kingdom
Anna hails from Warrington, UK and has done conservation work in Australia and a recent trip to Kenya showed her the stark realities of climate change.

Ben Jervey – United States
Ben writes a weekly column for GOOD Magazine called "The New Ideal," and has worked with many environment, education, and clean energy non-profit organizations.

Cara Bevington – Australia
Cara grew up in the Blue Mountains, west of Sydney and works as a campaigner for Oxfam Australia.

Eri Aokie – Japan
Eri is currently pursuing her master’s degree at the University of Tokyo Graduate School of Engineering, focusing on urban environmental engineering and sustainability science.

Florent Baarsch – France
Florent has been a climate activist for more than 20 years. In 2007, he went to Mali saw the really dramatic consequences of climate change in the country.

Fontane Lau – China
Fontane is pursuing her Masters of Corporate Environmental and Sustainability Management at Monash University, Australia. She recently worked as an intern in the WWF Hong Kong.

Jonathan Sundqvist – Sweden
Jonathan lives in Lund, Sweden, and is a student of political science. Realizing that reading about climate change is not enough he started to act in autumn 2008.

Juliana Russar – Brazil
Juliana is from São Paulo, Brazil, and has been following the climate change international negotiations and Brazilian government actions on the issue since 2007.

Leela Raina – India
Leela is currently pursuing her undergraduate degree in Economics from Sri Ram College of Commerce. She hails from Chandigarh, which is the capital of two states with the lush green fields of Punjab and Haryana.

Ole Seidenberg – Germany
Ole is a sociology graduate and blogger from Berlin, Germany. He has worked as an intern at the UN General Assembly in New York in 2006 and 2007, and with Oxfam in Sierra Leone.

Ferran Esteve – Spain Ferran hails from Barcelona where he is a prolific blogger and currently works as the web editor of the Intermón Oxfam website.

Pictures, footage and stories

Compelling stories, high resolution photographs and broadcast quality footage available including of:

People affected by climate change attending the summit with Oxfam: This includes a free pool feed (in mini dv) containing pieces to camera and b-roll of everyday life and climate impacts on Constance Okollet from Uganda, whose village faced death and hunger after prolonged drought, followed by violent rains; and Cayetano Huanca from Peru, whose village is dependent on the disappearing Ausangate glacier for water.

Climate hearings in Ethiopia, Bangladesh, Peru and South Africa, including comment from Emeritus Archbishop Emeritus Desmond Tutu. Over one a half million people in 35 countries have given testimony on how climate change is affecting their lives at Oxfam supported climate hearings. On **December 15th,** Archbishop Emeritus Desmond Tutu, Mary Robinson, Honorary Chair of Oxfam International and former UN Commissioner for Human Rights and climate-impacted people from Uganda, Peru, Bangladesh and America will tell the human story of climate change at an international climate hearing in Copenhagen.

Celebrity ambassadors - Including film footage and photos from supermodel and photographer Helena Christensen, who recently visited her mother's native Peru to highlight the impacts of climate change on communities there.

All stories, pictures and film footage can be downloaded from http://www.divshare.com/folder/638368-9ba or contact the Oxfam Media team for hard copies. Please credit all photos to Oxfam, except Helena Christensen's images which must be credited to Helena Christensen. All footage should be credited to Oxfam or used along side Oxfam mentions in the broadcast.

Killer Facts

- If global temperatures rise more than 2°C over pre-industrial levels, it is estimated that two billion people will be affected by water shortages and most of Southern Africa will have to cope with year-round droughts. Global agriculture will be undermined and hunger and malnutrition is likely to kill up to three million more people every year.
- If global temperatures are allowed to climb above 3°C, billions of people would be affected by severe water stress, crop yields would fall drastically around the world and entire regions, from Australia to Southern Africa, will become non-viable for agriculture. This could mean up to 550 million additional people affected by sever hunger, and up to 330 million people permanently displaced due to sea-level rise.
- Women are often hit much harder during disasters. In the cyclone that hit Bangladesh in 1991, the number of women who died was five times greater than the number of men. They had not been taught how to swim and received no prior warning of the event.
- Climate change will be among the most important drivers of disease this century. Diseases that have long been geographically bound are migrating, bringing them to new populations with no knowledge of or immunities to them. According to the WHO, 300,000 people die a year because of climate change.
- According to the Global Humanitarian Forum, 500 million people live at extreme risk to climate change impacts. Climate change leads to the death of 300,000 every year, displaces over 20 million, and causes over $100 billion dollars in damages a year. And it's only going to get worse.
- The number of people at risk of hunger is projected to increase by 50 million by 2050 as a result of climate change. About three-quarters of that number will be in Africa.
- The risk of malaria transmission will doubled over the coming 20 years for most of southern and central Europe.
- Despite accounting for only 20 per cent of the world's population, developed countries are responsible for over 60 per cent of industrial emissions since 1990.
- The largest 15 countries (including the US) are responsible for about 80 percent of global emissions.
- India is home to 17% of the world's population and 4% of the world's CO2 emissions. The US is home to 5% of the world's population and 22% of the world's CO2 emissions and the EU is home to 7% of the world's population and 15% of the world's CO2 emissions.
- The average Chinese person produces 4tons of carbon dioxide per year; the average American produces 20 tons.
- Poorer countries will suffer between 75 and 80% of the effects of climate change, which was caused by developed countries.
- Some 26 million people have been forced to leave their homes as a direct result of climate change and a million more are added to this figure every year due to climate-related circumstances. Communities on islands of Vanatu, Tuvalu and the Gulf of Bengal have been forced to flee from the rising sea level.
- Since the 1990s, up to 400 million people in China have been affected each year by weather-related disasters and secondary hazards, at a cost of $30 billion.
- Towards 2050, around 150 million people around the world may be forced to leave home as a result of climate change. Some 75 million of these climate refugees will come from the Asia Pacific region, and this number could rise to 150 million by 2100.
- If rich countries use money from existing aid commitments to help poor countries tackle climate change 4.5 million children around the world could die 75 million fewer children would be likely to attend school 8.6 million fewer people could have access to HIV/AIDS treatment (based on diversion of $50bn a year from existing aid commitments to pay for climate finance)
- One third of China's carbon dioxide emission comes from export of goods to rich countries.
- As climate change puts ever greater pressure on limited resources - such as water – conflict is likely to increase: 46 countries with a combined population of 2.7 billion now face the threat of violence due to climate change.

CLIMATE CHANGE MEDIA BRIEF DECEMBER 2009

The Copenhagen UN Climate Talks: What Does Success Look Like?

Climate change kills. It is taking lives today, and will threaten entire communities, countries, and ways of life within a generation, unless world leaders agree a fair, ambitious and binding deal.

The outcome to be agreed at the Copenhagen UN climate talks in December needs to commit governments to avert catastrophic and irreversible levels of climate change. And it needs to help poor people cope with already unavoidable levels of climate change in the coming years and decades. Just as important, the agreement must provide confidence that the needed changes will happen.

Solutions are close at hand. In addition to safeguarding survival for all people and the planet, they have wider benefits – including significant economic returns – less local pollution and related health costs, more jobs, less conflict, more security. The price tag for a sustainable future pales in comparison to the costs of inaction. Influential corporate coalitions are calling for ambitious climate policy at national and global levels. The choice governments face is clear. Now is the time to act.

Top ten ways to score a climate deal in Copenhagen

Ultimately, the test of the Copenhagen agreement will be whether it delivers on the objective set by the UN Climate Convention.

“The ultimate objective of this Convention and any related legal instruments that the Conference of the Parties may adopt is to achieve… stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system. Such a level should… allow ecosystems to adapt naturally to climate change,… ensure that food production is not threatened and… enable economic development to proceed in a sustainable manner.” – Article 2 (Objective) of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.

For Oxfam International, the success or failure of a Copenhagen agreement – it’s ability to deliver on this objective – depends on the extent to which it meets the following ten criteria:

Does it keep global warming as far below 2°C (3.6°F) as possible?

This requires steep cuts to ensure the growth in global emissions peaks before 2015, and concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere fall below 400ppm (parts per million) as soon as possible. A fair distribution of mitigation responsibilities will mean:

1. Emissions reduction targets for developed countries (Annex I) are at least 40% below 1990 levels by 2020, with individual country targets based on their respective responsibility (for historic emissions) and economic capability;

2. Developed countries deliver most of these cuts through domestic action, not offsets;

3. Developing countries contribute to global reductions by limiting their emissions growth with mitigation finance and technology support from developed countries starting in 2010 and rising to at least $100bn per year from 2013.

Does it protect poor people from unavoidable climate impacts?

Women, children, and elderly people are the most vulnerable. All people living in poverty have a right to information, training and money that can help them escape poverty despite growing climate impacts. Rich countries created the climate crisis and have the financial and technological resources to tackle it. This gives them an obligation to finance adaptation measures. The Copenhagen agreement must:

4. Deliver adaptation financing of at least $5bn each year in 2010-2012;

5. Provide at least $50bn in adaptation financing annually from 2013, rising to $100bn or more by 2020, in line with relevant scientific and economic assessments;

6. Ensure all climate-related financing for adaptation and mitigation comes on top of existing commitments by rich countries to deliver 0.7% of their national income as development aid to help achieve the Millennium Development Goals by 2015. Rich countries cannot force poor countries to choose between building flood defences and building hospitals.

7. Finance an international climate insurance pool, and take steps to help people recover from damages and losses resulting from unavoidable climate impacts.

Does it commit governments to the historic shift needed?

The current international climate framework will not avert collective disaster. Just as the economic crisis requires comprehensive reform of the financial system, governments need to stop tinkering at the edges and establish new rules, new institutions, and new relationships to deliver the profound changes urgently needed to avoid climate chaos. The Copenhagen agreement must:

8. Result in a legally binding agreement between all countries that builds on and strengthens existing principles and rules, including the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and its Kyoto Protocol;

9. Include a new global climate finance mechanism, governed with equal representation of all countries, that is effective in delivering predictable flows of new and additional resources for adaptation and mitigation actions in developing countries;

10. Contain the strongest possible compliance and enforcement mechanisms, including international standards for accounting.

All policies, incentives and rules designed to advance mitigation or adaptation objectives under the Copenhagen agreement need to complement each other. Safeguards are needed to help ensure global and national responses do not adversely affect the poorest, most vulnerable people and communities. Women, smallholder farmers and other groups on the front lines of climate impacts are also primary agents of change, and need to be empowered and supported to help deliver climate solutions through targeted and equitable responses.

Contacts

Anna Mitchell + 44 77 96 99 32 88; anna.mitchell@oxfaminternational.org
Angela Corbalan + 32 473 56 22 60; angela.corbalan@oxfaminternational.org
Laura Rusu + 1 202 459 3739; lrusu@oxfamamerica.org
Natalie Curtis + 44 7824 503108; ncurtis@oxfam.org.uk
Binbin Wang +86 13810377810; bbwang@oxfam.org.hk

Hard Cash Could Make Or Break Copenhagen

Financing for tackling climate change in poor countries can make or break the Copenhagen agreement. Unless poor countries see hard cash on the table, there is a real danger they will simply walk away. As EU Environment Commissioner Stravos Dimas said at the beginning of 2009, “No money, no deal”. To seal a fair and safe deal in Copenhagen, Oxfam estimates that rich countries must provide at least $200bn per year of new and additional public money to help poor countries cope with the devastating impacts of climate change and to develop without making the problem worse. This money is not charity – it’s a legal obligation. Climate finance is about the responsibility of rich countries, who have caused the climate crisis, to support poor countries, who are least to blame but suffering first and worst from its effects. This means a clean break with the aid paradigm - cash must be additional to existing aid promises; and not subject to the political whims of rich countries, but spent according to need.

What’s the money for?

“The reason we’re suffering so much is we don’t have resources to cope. We’re simply demanding that rich nations meet existing commitments of financial help.” Bernarditas Muller, chief negotiator for the G77 and China grouping at UN climate talks, October 2009

Climate finance is needed in poor countries for two purposes: to support low carbon development; and to help countries adapt to the disastrous impacts of climate change.

Money for low-carbon development (or mitigation finance) is needed to cover the incremental costs of clean development - of the extra costs of investing, for example, in a new wind farm over a new coal-fired power plant. Without additional mitigation in developing countries – over and above minimum reductions of 40% below 1990 levels by 2020 in rich countries – global emissions will not be cut enough to keep global warming danger levels.

Spending on adaptation to climate change can range according to local needs:

To cope with more severe hurricanes: upgrading early warning systems and community awareness; planting a mangrove ‘bio-shield’ along the coast to diffuse storm waves; changing building regulations for new infrastructure.

To cope with lower, more erratic rainfall: upgrading national meteorological systems and forecasts; researching, testing and growing drought-tolerant crop varieties; installing efficient, low-cost irrigation systems; installing rain-water harvesting systems; spreading water-conserving farming practices.

To cope with increased flooding: upgrading national flood early warning systems and raising community awareness; building new homes and schools on raised foundations; building high platforms for emergency flood shelter; integrating flood risks into governmental planning and budget processes; creating a community-based action plan for responding to floods.

In Bangladesh, following the disastrous 2004 floods, which affected 600,000 people and forced thousands from over 100 villages to be displaced, Oxfam has helped people prepare for the yearly floods. For example, it has helped build flood shelters where people can bring their livestock, possessions, and even their homes. Oxfam has also supported the set up and running of disaster preparedness committees that help people before, during, and after a flood.

How much is needed?

"We have set a minimum figure beyond which we will not go… If needs be we are prepared to walk out of any negotiations that threaten to be another rape of our continent." Ethiopian Prime Minister Meles Zenawi, speaking on behalf of the African Union

Estimates of total climate finance needs vary, but the scale is only increasing as more robust research is conducted. A September 2009 report by the World Bank concluded that on average between $75bn and $100bn is needed every year from 2010-2050 for adaptation alone (assuming global warming can be kept to 2°C). At present, Oxfam estimates that at least US$100bn per year is needed for mitigation and $100bn per year for adaptation in poor countries by 2020.

Rich countries should pay their fair share of the total climate finance needs according to their responsibility for causing the climate crisis (historic and ongoing emissions), and their financial capacity to tackle it (GDP). Oxfam calculates this would mean an annual contribution from each of the EU and the USA in the order of $50bn; Australia of $3.5bn; Japan of $14.6bn; and Canada of $5.3bn.

A big issue in Copenhagen will be "fast start" finance – money provided immediately from 2010-2012, before the Copenhagen regime begins – to address urgent adaptation needs and kick-start clean development. The EU and Commonwealth countries have proposed approximately $10bn per year for this period. While this may be a good first step, rich countries need to increase the ambition of short-term finance given that Oxfam has estimated the costs of meeting the immediate adaptation needs of developing countries to be at least $50bn per year. This money is needed but mustn't distract from the obligation of rich countries to commit in Copenhagen to adequate, long-term, predictable financial support for poor countries.

New and additional, or nothing

"Climate finance must be additional to existing aid commitments of 0.7% national income by developed countries." Prime Minister Hasina Wajed of Bangladesh, European Development Days, October 2009

Climate finance must be new money, not simply old pledges on development aid re-branded to meet new obligations on climate change. This means climate finance must be additional to the existing commitment made by rich countries to spend 0.7% of their national income as aid. This goal was first agreed as a UN resolution back in 1970 but current flows average only 0.3 percent.

In a recent report, 'Beyond Aid,' Oxfam warned that at least 75 million fewer children are likely to attend school and 8.6 million fewer people could have access to HIV/AIDS treatment if aid is diverted to help poor countries tackle climate change. Without new money, recent progress toward the Millennium Development Goals could stall and then go into reverse.

Why the carbon market doesn't count

Climate finance must be public money from governments in rich countries for governments in poor countries. Some rich countries suggest that the "carbon market" will provide all the money for tackling climate finance in poor countries so they don't have to. This is a myth.

There is not one single "carbon market", but rather a few specific market-based instruments for tackling climate change. Most involve financial transactions either between rich country governments, or between companies in rich countries. The only one which involves financial transactions between rich and poor countries is the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM).

The CDM is an arrangement under the Kyoto Protocol which allows industrialised countries to invest in low-carbon projects in developing countries, as an alternative to more expensive emission cuts in their own countries. The investments buy credits which represent the carbon emissions saved compared to what would have happened without this finance. The credits are known as "offsets", because they are supposed to "offset" ongoing increases in rich country emissions. The scheme was expanded in the EU to allow European companies to meet the reduction targets set by the EU Emissions Trading Scheme in the same way.

The total amount of finance from rich countries and European companies to companies selling offset credits in developing countries is quite high – approximately $18bn from 2001 to 2012. But this money cannot be counted towards the climate finance obligations of rich countries because the carbon saved is already counted towards rich country mitigation targets. Climate finance for mitigation is needed to fund additional emissions cuts in poor countries. Counting CDM money as climate finance is called “double-counting”.

Furthermore, there are numerous criticisms of the CDM, which has failed to direct any significant investment to the poorest countries in the world, and caused serious social and environmental concerns in local communities.

Where should this money come from?

$200bn per year to tackle climate change is entirely affordable. It is less than the annual subsidies provided as agricultural produce support by rich countries (more than $250bn a year), and it pales into insignificance compared to the costs of inaction on climate change. The International Energy Agency recently estimated an extra $500bn is needed for each year significant action on cutting emissions is delayed.

But relying on simple pledges by rich countries is not enough. There are no guarantees that rich countries will keep their promises and a lot of evidence that they will break them. So far less than half of pledged amounts have been received, and only 15 per cent have been disbursed. Perhaps the most notorious example of empty pledges is that of the National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs), produced by Least Developed Countries to access funding for their urgent and immediate adaptation needs. They are still waiting for the money to appear.

The picture is just as stark when bilateral channels are included. At the start of 2009, rich countries had pledged $18bn in one-off amounts, but less than $1bn had been delivered. The USA plans to invest 15 times as much as that on flood defences in Louisiana and other low-lying coastal areas following Hurricane Katrina.

Climate finance flows must be reliable and predictable so that poor countries can put in place long term plans for mitigation and adaptation action. The three most promising sources of reliable climate finance under discussion in Copenhagen are:

1. **Addressing emissions from international aviation and shipping (“bunkers”).** A levy or tax on aviation and shipping fuel or the earmarking of revenues raised by auctioning emissions allowances in a new emission trading scheme for aviation and shipping. Up to $30bn per year could be raised in this way

2. **Earmarking revenues from domestic emissions trading schemes (ETS)** such as the region wide European Emissions Trading Scheme. Many rich countries will soon benefit from a new source of finance as emission allowances are auctioned to polluting industries in domestic cap and trade schemes. The EU ETS, for example, is expected to generate up to $75bn (€50bn) per year in this way by 2020.

3. **Selling, auctioning or levying a percentage of international emission allowances**. Assigned Amount Units (AAUs) are currently given away to countries for free under the Kyoto Protocol. The sale, auction or levy of a percentage of AAUs – as proposed by Norway – could raise up to $200bn per year, guaranteeing sufficient sums will flow to poor countries outside of annual national budgetary decisions.

How should the money be governed?

Poor countries are concerned not only about the scale and reliability of the finance they will receive, but also about how it is managed. Oxfam and poor countries are calling for a new fund, under the United Nations climate convention (UNFCCC), which can guarantee money will flow according to need, not the political preferences of rich countries. Such a fund must have fair representation for poor countries, and ensure total transparency in the management of resources.

Rich countries favour the use of existing institutions such as the World Bank, which they control, to manage the funds. A complex web of existing institutions means huge transaction costs for developing countries, which must jump through a different set of hoops for each channel in order to first access funds and then to monitor and report on how they are spent.

State of play in the negotiations on finance

Rich, or so-called Annex I countries, have had legal obligations since the 1992 UN climate convention to provide climate finance to developing countries. But so far, the actual amount paid by rich countries is a pittance – a few hundred million US dollars per year at best. Little progress has been made in negotiations ahead of Copenhagen.

Developing countries have called for rich countries to provide 0.5 - 1% of their GDP (up to $500bn) in new public money per year.

So far, the EU is the only rich country or bloc to put any concrete numbers on the table for the scale of finance needed in Copenhagen, indicating a range of €22 – 50bn ($33 – 75bn) per year by 2020 is needed (far short of the amounts Oxfam and developing countries say is needed).

A few rich countries, in particular EU member states like the UK, Netherlands and Denmark, have championed the need for all finance to be additional to existing aid promises, but this is not yet agreed by the EU as a whole – and has been actively blocked by Germany. The US has supported a new global fund, but like other rich countries, wants this based on existing institutions like the World Bank. It recently emerged that $10bn Japan has offered for fast-start finance in Copenhagen consists entirely of past promises on aid.

Contacts
Anna Mitchell + 44 77 96 99 32 88; anna.mitchell@oxfaminternational.org
Angela Corbalan + 32 473 56 22 60; angela.corbalan@oxfaminternational.org
Laura Rusu + 1 202 459 3739; lrusu@oxfamamerica.org
Natalie Curtis + 44 7824 503108; ncurtis@oxfam.org.uk
Binbin Wang +86 13810377810; bbwang@oxfam.org.hk

Adaptation to Climate Change: Securing Survival of the Poorest

The impacts of climate change on people's lives are already devastating. They range from storms, floods, droughts, sickness, shifting seasons to desertification and rising sea levels. For poor people in developing countries who are already living on the margins, a small increase in climate risk can have catastrophic consequences. And even the most ambitious global efforts to curb emissions under a Copenhagen agreement will only limit, not avoid, global warming and its human cost. Even if it is kept below 2°C, many societies will face serious damages and long-lasting impacts that can send people into a downward spiral of increasing poverty and vulnerability.

What is adaptation?

Developing countries, least responsible for the changing climate, are hit first and hardest. They are particularly vulnerable because of widespread poverty and a lack of resources or social protection systems to help people recover from climate shocks or sustain their livelihoods. Building resilience and reducing people's vulnerability is crucial to protect people against the worsening impacts of climate change.

Making development activities climate resilient could include measures such as working with agricultural communities to select or develop drought-tolerant or flood-tolerant crop varieties, introducing new irrigation and rainwater-harvesting techniques in regions with reduced rainfall, early warning systems to reduce risk and damage from climate related disasters such as floods or tropical cyclones, but also building higher roads and bridges or new regulations for hurricane-resilient buildings. Social protection systems can help people recover from shocks, as can climate-indexed insurance systems that, for example, trigger payouts to smallholder farmers when rainfall drops below certain levels and damages their crops.

Building resilience and reducing people's vulnerability will lower climate related risks and impacts but will not make people immune against high impact disasters. There are limits to adaptation – even a newly constructed seawall may not help against flooding when extremely heavy tropical storms hit land and rising sea-levels will make many small islands completely uninhabitable.

The basics in the Copenhagen agreement

"Rain is so unpredictable these days. My crops are now dry. I used up all my seeds when planting. Now I have nothing. I have mixed different crops as I am not sure which will survive the weather. I have beans, maize, and cassava but still they dry up. The rain has deserted us." Chrisellia Nzabonimpa, farmer and community leader, Nyagatare District, Rwanda

The Bali Action Plan, which is the mandate for the negotiations on a new climate deal by the Copenhagen UN Climate Conference, lists "enhanced action on adaptation" and "improved access to new and additional financial resources" as building blocks of the new agreement. In fact, for many of the world's poorest and most vulnerable countries, these provisions are essential – without them they would have to reject the agreement as unacceptable. Oxfam is calling for the Copenhagen agreement to include an **Adaptation Action Framework** that is built around the following elements. All these measures are found in the current draft texts of the Copenhagen agreement, but many of them are fiercely opposed by rich countries:

- **Regular and binding financial support, in the form of grants, not loans.** Oxfam says it should start with at least $50 billion per year in 2013, and be raised to at least $100 billion per year in 2020. These funds need to be binding and come on top of rich countries' existing commitment to deliver 0.7% of their national income as development aid. This financial support should be disbursed through a new **global climate finance mechanism**, ensuring that all developing countries can access and the most vulnerable countries have priority. Disbursement in-country should take place through, for example, national implementing entities or trust funds.

- **The money should be made available for all adaptation actions and programmes needed, including capacity building, generation and gathering of data and knowledge as well as risks and vulnerability assessments**. Action in countries should focus on the needs of the most vulnerable people and communities; be driven by local needs and priorities; and involve all relevant stakeholders. Identifying and prioritising adaptation needs and actions as well as taking decisions over funding allocation should be a country-driven process, and thus be a clear break from the current model of donor-led international aid finance.
- A **global knowledge and capacity building hub** for sharing, gathering and exchanging data, knowledge and experiences; and improve transparency and participation in adaptation planning and implementation. To this end, regional adaptation centres and networks should be set up or strengthened.
- An international **climate risk insurance facility** that provides technical assistance to help reduce and manage climate related risks and support pro-poor insurance schemes such as micro-insurance.
- **Provisions to address loss and damage from unavoidable impacts** of climate change should kick in when adaptation is not possible or where impacts exceed adaptive capacity. These provisions should aim to recover and rehabilitate livelihoods threatened, damaged or lost through climate impacts. One way or another, countries and communities will need coherent international responses when their lands and livelihoods become untenable.
- A **Work Programme on Near-Term Action on Adaptation.** Since the Copenhagen agreement is not likely to enter into force before 2013, a special international work programme on action 2010-2012 should **fast-track urgent adaptation actions in the most vulnerable countries**, build capacity and help prepare developing countries for the substantially larger investments on adaptation needed in the future ("prime the system").

The battle lines: is adaptation finance truly new and additional?

"Assistance for climate change should not be allowed to divert money from the pledges we have already made to the poorest." Gordon Brown, UK Prime Minister

Poor countries have indicated that when planning and implementing adaptation, including when disbursing international public finance to support adaptation, they want a clear shift away from the current donor led model of international aid finance. They argue that supporting adaptation is not an act of charity but a responsibility by rich countries resulting from their role in causing the climate crisis. Developing countries have also argued that adaptation finance should flow through a central funding mechanism under the authority of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) to increase accountability and measurability of finance provided by developed countries. They also want to move away from what they see as an ineffective system of existing bilateral and multilateral institutions that all have their own conditionalities and rules to access finance, and make developing countries dependent on donor countries own political or economic priorities.

Developing countries have also asked for recognition that there are limits to adaptation. Despite best efforts to adapt and reduce risks, there will be substantial loss and damage from unavoidable impacts of climate change. Small island states, whose very existence is at risk, are leading calls for a mechanism to compensate countries when lands and livelihoods become untenable. Rich countries are fiercely opposing any such moves, and up until the last round of UN negotiations in November several rich countries have tried to kick the entire issue off the agenda.

Rich countries agree that there is an urgent need for enhanced action on adaptation, but they see adaptation as development in a hostile climate. They argue that, rather than providing new and additional resources, the additional costs of adaptation should be covered future aid budgets. They also believe that the current system of bi- and multilateral co-operation mechanisms – such as funds under the World Bank that are controlled by donors – is sufficient to deliver the support they plan to provide.

Contacts

Anna Mitchell + 44 77 96 99 32 88; anna.mitchell@oxfaminternational.org
Angela Corbalan + 32 473 56 22 60; angela.corbalan@oxfaminternational.org

Poor Countries Won't be Fooled by Old Cash

Money to help developing countries adapt to the climate impacts and pursue low carbon futures must be new and additional. On this, all countries agree. It's in the Bali Action Plan, the document that lays out all the things to be covered in a Copenhagen deal and 192 countries have agreed to it. But as Copenhagen draws near, it has become increasingly apparent that there is a huge gulf between rich and poor countries– one worth at least $160 billion a year. The fight over 'additionality' will be one of the most important battles at Copenhagen, with massive implications for poor people around the world. As always, the devil is in the detail – or lack of it.

Additional to what?

"Our development partners should not give with one hand and take away with the other. In addressing climate change we need new and additional resources over and above development aid." Prime Minister Raila Odinga of Kenya, European Development Days, October 2009

When most rich countries talk about climate finance being new and additional, they mean relative to existing aid flows, not additional to existing aid commitments. There is a huge difference – rich countries are committed to spend 0.7 percent of their national income as development aid but current flows average only 0.3 percent. The gap is worth about $160 billion per year in current dollars. This is money already promised to developing countries but yet to be delivered. When the 0.7 per cent target was first agreed as a UN resolution in 1970 – and reiterated continuously over the years -- it of course did not include any costs for climate change.

Why does it matter?

Development aid accounts for a significant part of the economy of poor countries. For example, there are nearly forty countries in which aid receipts exceed 10 percent of their national income. In fact, stealing money from aid budgets would mean taking over $160bn per year away from these and other countries that rely on aid for the provision of essential services such as healthcare and education.

Oxfam estimates that at least 75 million fewer children are likely to attend school and 8.6 million fewer people could have access to HIV/AIDS treatment if aid that would otherwise have been spent to meet the 0.7% commitment on health and education is diverted to tackle climate change. Cannibalising aid promises to pay for climate change will condemn the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to failure. To argue against additionality is to argue against development.

Climate change brings new and additional costs

"To date, commitments to new and additional funding have not been forthcoming. This is a new threat and we must find new money to address it." Ham Lini, Prime Minister of Vanautu, European Development Days, October 2009

An increasingly hostile climate makes development increasingly expensive. It needs new investments in agriculture, infrastructure and buildings, and greater provision of social insurance to name but a few. These additional costs are the costs of adaptation – of helping people reduce their vulnerability to climate change. India is already spending three times as much on adaptation as it does on health.

Poor countries are unlikely to accept a deal in Copenhagen that effectively gives with one hand and takes with the other. This type of deal would leave them with an impossible choice - helping their people adapt to climate change or providing essential services such as health care and education.

The battle lines are drawn

Poor countries want a deal that they can sign. At the last round of negotiations in Barcelona in November, they proposed an amendment to the finance text specifying that funds provided by rich countries should be over and above their commitments to meet the 0.7 percent target. This is now in the text, but in brackets, to be negotiated over at Copenhagen:
[The main source of funding will be new and additional financial resources provided by developed country Parties and other developed Parties included in Annex II, over and above the financing provided through institutions outside the framework of the financial mechanism of the Convention and over and above the goal of 0.7 percent of the GDP of the developed country Parties as ODA. The major source of financing will be the public sector.]

However, only a handful of developed countries have made a clear commitment that climate finance must be additional to aid commitments. In Europe, the UK and the Netherlands have tried to get the EU to a progressive position in time for Copenhagen but have been blocked by other member states such as Germany, France and Italy.

Other rich countries remain silent on the issue, with most seeing additionality as something to be fought over in the end-game at Copenhagen – effectively using old aid promises, ones which should have materialised already, as a bargaining chip. The result of this particular game of poker will have profound implications for the world's poor.

Contacts

Anna Mitchell + 44 77 96 99 32 88; anna.mitchell@oxfaminternational.org
Angela Corbalan + 32 473 56 22 60; angela.corbalan@oxfaminternational.org
Laura Rusu + 1 202 459 3739; lrusu@oxfamamerica.org
Natalie Curtis + 44 7824 503108; ncurtis@oxfam.org.uk
Binbin Wang +86 13810377810; bbwang@oxfam.org.hk

www.oxfam.org

Climate Finance Governance (or who controls the cash)

The figures that rich countries put forward for climate finance are critical – but it's not all that counts. For communities on the ground in developing countries, the way in which financing is governed and delivered will make all the difference. Who gets to decide on the ways in which funds will be spent? Who is the fund accountable to? How transparent will the decision-making and operations of the fund be? These and other governance and institutional issues are central to the finance negotiations in Copenhagen.

What kind of international financial governance should Copenhagen deliver?

"A mechanism for the provision of financial re-sources . . . shall function under the guidance of and be accountable to the Conference of the Parties, which shall decide on its policies, programme priorities, and eligibility criteria related to this Convention. The financial mechanism shall have an equitable and balanced representation of all Parties within a transparent sys-tem of governance." from Article 11.1 and Article 11.2 of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.

A new global climate fund, designed to meet the needs of affected communities in developing countries, should be put in place in Copenhagen to help them adapt to the climate impacts and develop in a low carbon way. According to Oxfam International, the fund should have the following characteristics:

Equitable governance: to ensure that developing countries' voices are heard concerning the fund's policies and operations, it should be governed by an executive board where all countries are fairly represented.

The governance structure of the current Adaptation Fund, which was established in connection with the Kyoto Protocol to fund adaptation in developing countries, is a good example of how this could work. It provides representation for all global regions, in particular for vulnerable nations such as least developed countries and small island states, and the fund's board has a slight developing country majority. The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria is another example of a representative governance model.

Accountability: the climate funding mechanism should also be under the authority of -and accountable to- all the parties that belong to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). This is essential to ensure that the fund acts in a way that is coherent with the outcomes from the UNFCCC negotiations. It will also guarantee that the entire range of countries – particularly the poorest and most vulnerable – have a full and equitable say in how financing is disbursed and delivered.

Specifically, the UNFCCC parties should have the authority to determine who sits on the executive board that will govern the global climate fund. The UNFCCC parties should also have the authority to set the policies, program priorities and eligibility criteria for funding and revise those as needed (all of which is laid out in Article 11 of the UN Framework Convention itself).

Coherence: a new global climate fund should have an institutional mandate to ensure coherence in international climate financing. Coherence is needed because of the recent proliferation of bilateral and multilateral funds. A new climate fund can provide more effective and efficient pooling of international resources, to allow longer term planning in affected countries. A global fund can also provide consistency of rules and operational principles to ensure that different sources of funding do not work at cross-purposes.

Accessibility and participation: resources from the climate fund need to be delivered in a way that is accessible and driven by the engagement of developing country governments and citizens. To achieve this, the fund should have simplified procedures and direct access so that developing country governments and communities do not have to go through overly cumbersome funding processes.

The global climate fund should also ensure the participation of affected communities in the design and implementation of adaptation and mitigation activities, and those communities should be able to hold the fund to account if they are not fully engaged in this process. The fund should also provide support to developing country governments to develop and carry out their own national strategies for adaptation and mitigation.

The fund must also be transparent so that citizens and affected communities can access complete information about its policies, decision-making, and operations.

Contacts
Anna Mitchell + 44 77 96 99 32 88; anna.mitchell@oxfaminternational.org
Angela Corbalan + 32 473 56 22 60; angela.corbalan@oxfaminternational.org
Laura Rusu + 1 202 459 3739; lrusu@oxfamamerica.org
Natalie Curtis + 44 7824 503108; ncurtis@oxfam.org.uk
Binbin Wang +86 13810377810; bbwang@oxfam.org.hk

tck tck tck

Oxfam International

CLIMATE CHANGE MEDIA BRIEF DECEMBER 2009

Emissions Reductions: Rich Countries Double Duty to Act

To avoid catastrophic climate change, the science says we must keep global warming as far below 2°C as possible – the threshold at which 'tipping-points' are likely to be triggered increasing the danger of runaway climate change.

As temperatures rise above 2°C scientists predict that an estimated two billion people will be affected by water shortages and most of Southern Africa will have to cope with year-round droughts. Global agriculture will be undermined and hunger and malnutrition will kill up to three million more people every year.

To have a decent chance of keeping below 2°C, scientists have calculated that rich countries as a group must reduce emissions to at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2020. But this is only half the story. Avoiding climate catastrophe is not just about how much rich countries cut their own emissions, but how they work with developing countries to curb theirs.

The double-duty

On their own, rich countries' cuts of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2020 will not be enough to keep temperatures from rising above danger levels – or to cover their fair share of global mitigation action. Emissions reductions will need to be made across the developing world too. This gives rich countries – which created the climate crisis and have the economic capacity to tackle it - a double duty to act: to cut their own emissions but also to support actions to reduce emissions in developing countries through finance and technology transfer.

Unfortunately, the global solidarity and cooperation required to tackle emissions in the developing world has been wholly absent from the negotiations. Rich countries argue that developing countries must commit to take action on. Developing countries argue that they should not be expected to take on actions until rich countries have made good their promises to cut emissions first and fastest and made available the finance and technology poor countries need to act.

Mitigation in the negotiations

Since Bali, UN negotiations have proceeded in two parallel negotiating tracks:

The KP track (Ad-hoc Working Group on further commitments for Annex 1 Parties under the Kyoto Protocol or AWG-KP) focuses on further emissions reduction commitments for rich countries (Annex 1) under the Kyoto Protocol. The Kyoto Protocol is a legally binding instrument under which parties agree national emissions reduction commitments. The current round of commitments (the first commitment period) expires in 2012, before which parties are required to agree a new round of emissions reductions for a second commitment period. Because it never ratified the Kyoto Protocol, the US does not participate in the AWG-KP.

The LCA track (Ad-hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action or AWG-LCA): emissions reductions or mitigation is considered both in terms of quantified emission limitation and reduction objectives (i.e. emissions targets) for rich countries, and nationally appropriate mitigation actions for developing countries, to be supported by finance, technology transfer and capacity building from rich countries. The LCA track applies to all countries including the US, and also includes negotiations on adaptation and other topics.

Rich countries would like to see the two negotiating tracks brought together. Developing countries wish to maintain the Kyoto Protocol track until there is something stronger with which to replace it. They are concerned that combining the two tracks will result in some or all of the Kyoto Protocol features – environmentally rigorous targets and global compliance mechanisms - being dropped in an attempt to craft a deal which appeals to the US.

Rhetoric versus (in)action

The distrust on the part of developing countries is certainly justified. Rich countries have an atrocious record of delivering on their promises, particularly where money is concerned. Rich countries originally pledged to spend 0.7 percent of their national income as aid as far back as 1970. Despite recycling the promise occasionally, they are currently only at 0.3 percent. Meanwhile a number of Annex 1 countries remain off course to achieve their modest reductions under the Kyoto Protocol, and Canada has even suggested it will not bother. And while rich countries say they are committed to 2°C – for example at this year's meeting of the G8 countries –this is not borne out by their current pledges to cut emissions. Only one country – Norway – has offered to reduce its emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by 2020 in the context of an agreement in Copenhagen. Analysis by the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) suggests that current targets is worth aggregate reductions in the range of 12 to 19 percent below 1990 levels by 2020 – less than half of what is required.

The inequalities of climate change: some facts

- Developed countries are responsible for about three quarters of greenhouse gases already released into the atmosphere.
- The average Australian emits nearly 5 times as much as the average Chinese. The average Canadian emits 13 times as much as the average Indian.
- About 100 poor countries, with a total population of nearly a billion people, but accounting for less than 3 percent of global emissions, are set to suffer first and worst from climate change.
- Developed countries, which became rich by burning fossil fuels over the last century, have far greater economic capability with which to tackle emissions.
- Per capita income in the US is about 10 times that of China and about 19 times that of India.

The need for rich country leadership

Even the most progressive rich countries – such as the European Union - are a long way off doing what is needed on emissions reductions. Europe's target of 30 percent reductions is contingent upon other rich countries committing themselves to 'comparable emissions reductions', otherwise it will only go as far as 20 percent – less than half of what is required. This is not leadership. Leadership requires that the EU moves unilaterally to an unconditional 30 percent cut, and table a conditional offer of 40 percent in the event of a fair, ambitious and binding deal. Analysis has shown that since the recession, the cost of achieving a 30 percent reduction is now considerably cheaper than the original costs of achieving the 20 percent target when it was adopted. And greater ambition from the EU need not result in free-riding elsewhere. Leadership from Europe would reduce the risk of collapse at Copenhagen by building trust with developing countries, and place the EU in a stronger position from which to demand greater ambition from others.

But at the moment, it's developing countries that are rising to the challenge. Rather than wait for mitigation finance commitments from rich countries, they are forging ahead with voluntary pledges to tackle emissions. For example in recent weeks:

- Mexico has committed to halving its emissions by 2050
- Brazil has announced it will pledge a reduction below projected emissions of 38-42 percent by 2020.
- South Korea has announced a target to reduce emissions to 30 percent below projected levels by 2020.
- Indonesia plans to cut its emissions to 26 percent below projected levels by 2020, with this figure increasing to 41 percent with sufficient support from rich countries.

Meanwhile China has announced a voluntary reduction in carbon intensity - emissions relative to economic growth - by 40 to 45 % by 2020 from 2005 levels. This opens the door to negotiations on what more China could do with finance and technology support rich countries have promised.

Contact
Anna Mitchell on + 44 7796 993 288 or anna.mitchell@oxfaminternational.org
Angela Corbalan on + 32 473 56 22 60 or angela.corbalan@oxfaminternational.org

www.oxfam.org

tck tck tck COPENHAGEN 7 DEC 09

Oxfam International

CLIMATE CHANGE MEDIA BRIEF DECEMBER 2009

Women & Climate Change

When natural disasters strike, they hit poor communities first and worst. And since women make up an estimated 70 percent of those living below the poverty line, they are most likely to bear the heaviest burdens. At the same time, women are often left out of the conversation about adapting to climate change and mitigating emissions, even though they are sometimes in the best position to provide solutions. Socially constructed roles and responsibilities usually put women at a disadvantage in preparing for climate change and responding to climate impacts, such as extreme floods, droughts and storms. However, a global climate agreement can work to ensure that the special needs of both women and men are met as the world comes together to avoid catastrophic climate change.

Key reasons why gender equity must be incorporated into a global climate agreement

- Women are the linchpins of societies. Women are the key providers for the family, and raise the children, care for the old and the sick. As a result, they are on the front lines of the devastating effects of climate change, and largely define the community's ability to adapt or recover from a disaster.
- Women produce up to 80 percent of the food in most developing countries. They regularly do the jobs, such as cultivating crops, and collecting water and fuel, which are most affected by climate change.
- Women are disproportionately represented among the poor, making up roughly 70% of those living below the poverty line. They often have less access to resources and essential services before and after disaster strikes, and are more likely to die during natural disasters than men.
- Women often struggle to get their voices heard in the climate debate. Given their central role in the family and community, women have invaluable knowledge about creating and implementing innovative ways to adapt to a changing climate yet their opinions and experience is all too often overlooked.
- Other international agreements specifically address gender. Of the legally binding agreements that resulted from the 1992 Earth Summit, the UNFCCC is the only convention not to incorporate gender issues. The Convention on Biological Diversity has incorporated a gender plan of action that recognizes women's traditional knowledge and access to land assets.

State of Play

- One year ago at COP 14 in Poznan, Poland, there were no references to women and gender equality in the Long-term Cooperative Action (LCA) negotiating text. This changed dramatically throughout the course of 2009, and the text now contains eleven references. It is important that language in the text which specically addresses women's needs in a changing climate and ensuring their voices are heard in remains strong.

- Iceland – along with the other Nordic countries – emerged as the biggest champion on gender issues speaking on the floor at almost every negotiating session this year on women's capacity to act as leaders and innovators in the shift towards a low-carbon energy economy, and they have been joined by strong statements from Ghana, the African Group and Least Developed Countries, the Philippines, Central American countries, and others. The European Union was a strong supporter of language supporting women and gender equality under the Czech Presidency, however, it remains to be seen whether the Swedish Presidency will continue this legacy.

Gender equity in a Copenhagen agreement

"Climate change affects women because they are usually the main food producers of crops like rice, millet, vegetables. Because of no rain, climate change affects them. And girls have to drop out of school because they need to start working for their families." Voré Gana Seck, executive director of Green Senegal and president of the international nongovernmental coalition, Conseil des ONG d'Appui au Développment.

- Language that recognizes women as critical agents of change in the effort to adapt to climate change and reduce global carbon emissions must be secured in a final Copenhagen agreement and in a subsequent legally-binding agreement. It is not enough to recognize women as disproportionately affected by climate change impacts. Additionally, women must be seen and understood as equal participants in both the negotiation process and in the implementation of a global climate change agreement. Parties in Copenhagen must ensure that:
- Gender equality is explicitly integrated in the Copenhagen outcome, taking into account that gender equality is a key component of the social and economic conditions called for by the Bali Action Plan, and a prerequisite for poverty eradication and sustainable development, identified as priorities in the Convention.
- The differentiated impacts of climate change on vulnerable populations, groups and communities are recognized and priority is given the most vulnerable (for example adaptation measures, capacity building and technology development and transfer are tailored to ensure they meet the needs of women).
- The active participation of all men and women is sought and fostered in decision-making, planning, implementation and evaluation measures of the Copenhagen outcome.
- Promotion of policy approaches and positive incentives to foster participation and remove barriers to women's capacity to act and contribute to adaptation, mitigation, and all other activities.

Contacts
Anna Mitchell + 44 77 96 99 32 88; anna.mitchell@oxfaminternational.org
Angela Corbalan + 32 473 56 22 60; angela.corbalan@oxfaminternational.org
Laura Rusu + 1 202 459 3739; lrusu@oxfamamerica.org
Natalie Curtis + 44 7824 503108; ncurtis@oxfam.org.uk
Binbin Wang +86 13810377810; bbwang@oxfam.org.hk

Climate Change & Food Security

More than one billion people will go hungry today. More than 60 per cent of hungry people are women. The number of hungry people around the world has reached dire proportions as the result of the food price crisis in 2008 and the global financial crisis that followed swiftly behind. Hunger and poverty is overwhelmingly concentrated in rural areas – 70 to 80 percent – and is expected to remain so for decades to come.

Climate change is already adding potentially devastating impacts to this already difficult situation, by creating erratic weather, sea level rise and increasing the frequency and intensity of floods, droughts, hurricanes. The result for agriculture, food security, and rural livelihoods is failed harvests, disappearing islands, destroyed homes, water scarcity, and deepening health crises, all of which can reverse the advances made towards poverty alleviation in the last half century.

Resources to build the resilience and adaptive capacity of vulnerable countries and communities to climate impacts on agriculture and food security are essential. Equally, with 15% of global greenhouse gases estimated to come from the agriculture sector, poor farmers around the world can be key allies in the effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Climate change hurts food security

We are seeing profound changes in the seasons. There is less rain, and the rainy seasons are less reliable. In the past we would always expect the long rains and the short rains, and other periods when the seasons changed. The Gabra used to count five seasons, but now we count only two, and even they fail. The seasons seem to get worse and worse each year." Molu Elema, Marsabit district, Kenya

Worldwide, 1.7 billion small-scale farmers and pastoralists are highly vulnerable to climate change impacts. While higher average temperatures may lead to yield increases in northern countries in the short term, southern countries — mostly poor— will experience the greatest negative impacts.

Projected increases in the frequency and severity of extreme weather events and water scarcity will undoubtedly affect food production.

Agricultural production accounts for an astounding 70% of fresh-water use. Five hundred million people already live in water-stressed zones, and the number is projected to increase to four billion by 2050 as unsustainable water-use practices and climate change leave many agricultural areas vulnerable to conflict over scarce water resources.

According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), climate change could reduce yields from rain-fed crops in parts of Africa by 50 per cent as early as 2020, putting between 40 and 170 million more people at risk of hunger worldwide.

In the Andes too, climate-related pressures are worsening. Most of the world's tropical glaciers are found in the mountains of Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador are melting rapidly, leading to changes in the rates and timing of water discharge from mountain rivers. In turn, this will destabilize slopes, creating natural hazards like landslides, worsen water stress during dry seasons, and reduce water availability for food preparation and power generation.

Adapting to climate change and building resiliency reduces hunger and poverty

Many farmers in developing countries live on marginal rural lands characterized by conditions such as low rainfall, sloping terrain, fragile soils, and poor market access. Their poverty is often exacerbated by social exclusion. Such farmers are vulnerable because they depend directly on rainfall and temperature, yet they often have little savings, little government or family support and few alternative options if their crops fail or livestock die.

Given existing hunger and looming climate change, donors and national governments must take immediate action by committing to new money to help build vulnerable farmers resilience to climate shocks and adapt to a changing climate. The International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) has assessed that, just to prevent any increase in already high levels of child malnutrition, at least $7 billion annually in climate adaptation funding will be needed over the next 40 years. This figure only addresses agriculture directly, and doesn't include the other essential needs of poor farmers affected by climate change, including water availability and diseases.

Achieving resilience requires improving the resources, skills, expertise and voice of vulnerable farmers. In many case, farming practices that use ecological approaches and restore natural resources, including agro forestry, are the key strategies needed to build climate resilience.

Poor farmers are key allies in the fight against climate change

As stewards of some of the world's most degraded soils, poor farmers are key allies in the fight against climate change. Agro-ecological approaches such as restoring degraded soils and planting trees can store carbon from the atmosphere as well as increasing the resilience of agriculture to climate shocks.

Building up soil organic matter can be done by fertilizing fields with animal manure or compost, using crop residues as mulch, and employing conservation tillage methods. Increasing soil organic matter content makes soils more fertile, better able to hold water, and more resistant to erosion. The end result is farms that are both more productive and more resistant to climate shocks.

For instance, farmers in Adamitullu village in Ethiopia are working with an Oxfam partner to restore their degraded land, which produces little and leaves them vulnerable to increasingly erratic rains. They now use manure as a fertiliser and plant trees. The land has been restored and newly planted trees and improved soils act to store carbon.

Any efforts to include agriculture mitigation in the UNFCCC should focus on poor farmers and enhance their capacity to respond to climate impacts through win-win practices for adaptation and mitigation, especially in ways that promote food security. Agriculture mitigation efforts – including in Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD+) policies – should ensure that the rights and interests of these farmers are protected, and not promote large-scale industrial approaches to solving the climate mitigation challenge.

Contacts
Anna Mitchell + 44 77 96 99 32 88; anna.mitchell@oxfaminternational.org
Angela Corbalan + 32 473 56 22 60; angela.corbalan@oxfaminternational.org
Laura Rusu + 1 202 459 3739; lrusu@oxfamamerica.org
Natalie Curtis + 44 7824 503108; ncurtis@oxfam.org.uk
Binbin Wang +86 13810377810; bbwang@oxfam.org.hk

CLIMATE CHANGE MEDIA BRIEF DECEMBER 2009

Business & Climate Change: Dissension in the Ranks

The business community plays a central role in the fight against climate change. Companies have both a responsibility and a business imperative to take significant steps to cut their own emissions in line with keeping global warming well below 2°C. They can create and disseminate technologies to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions, such as renewable energy systems, and energy-efficient appliances. They also must secure their own markets and supply chains by helping communities adapt and build resilience to its impacts. But most importantly, the business community must play a leading role in supporting an ambitious government response to tackle global warming. After all, only public policy can tackle the challenge of avoiding catastrophic climate change at the necessary scale. Governments rely on the private sector to turn vision into reality through innovation and investment. The private sector can also expand the political space in which governments dare to take bold decisions, not only through its actions but also through its lobbying on policy positions.

State of play

There have been two business voices in the climate change debate – one calling for ambitious and urgent action and the other for obfuscation and delay. On one side are major business associations, such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, that have used their considerable lobbying clout to fight against climate change policies. The U.S. Chamber recently convened an international conference at which oil company ExxonMobil and other major industry players voiced opposition to climate change action.

But increasingly, influential corporate coalitions have emerged calling for ambitious climate policy action at the national and global levels:

BICEP: Business for Innovative Climate & Energy Policy is a U.S. based coalition of 16 leading consumer-facing companies such as Nike, Levi Strauss, Timberland, Gap, Starbucks, eBay, and Sun Microsystems. BICEP is advocating for far-reaching U.S. climate legislation that makes significant investments in international adaptation and aligns with the scientific consensus on emissions reductions. On the global deal, BICEP states: "[We] believe that the United States must re-engage and provide strong leadership in the international climate negotiation process. It is crucial that a new legally-binding global agreement is agreed upon by the time of the international climate talks in Copenhagen in 2009 – and that the United States is part of this agreement." For more information, please see http://www.ceres.org/bicep

The Corporate Leaders' Group on Climate Change: Created by the Prince of Wales and based at the University of Cambridge, the group organized the Copenhagen Communiqué, a detailed policy statement signed by over 600 major global companies such as Coca-Cola, Nestle, and Procter & Gamble. The Communiqué calls for: "an ambitious, robust, and equitable global deal on climate change that responds credibly to the scale and urgency of the crises facing the world today. The one thing we do not have is time. Delay is not an option." For more information, please see http://copenhagencommunique.com/

USCAP: The U.S. Climate Action Partnership (USCAP) is a U.S.-based coalition of approximately 30 major companies – many from major emitting industries such as GE, Dupont, Duke Energy, and Shell – and six environmental organizations advocating for comprehensive climate change legislation and a strong global deal. For more information, please see http://www.us-cap.org/

Critical juncture

Dissension in the ranks of the business community over climate policy action has been on vivid display in the United States recently. Major companies such as Apple, Nike (a BICEP member), and Exelon (a USCAP member) have withdrawn from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce or its board over its head-in-the-sand opposition to government actions to tackle global warming. What is needed most from the business community at this critical juncture is a unified voice calling for a fair, ambitious, and binding global deal that averts climate catastrophe and accelerates the transition to a low-carbon global economy. If unity cannot be achieved, then progressive companies and coalitions that see the need for and the advantages of moving toward a low-carbon future should not allow backward-looking companies and coalitions to give the impression that business is against a strong deal.

Case Study: National Grid

National Grid is an international electricity and gas company and one of the largest investor-owned energy companies in the world. It has an annual turnover of £15.6 billion. Last year National Grid increased its target for reducing emissions from 60% to 80% of 1990 levels by 2050. It has already cut its emissions by around 30%. In April this year, it became the first high-profile company to tie carbon budgets to executive pay. It also began applying a shadow carbon price to all its investment decisions from plant construction to fleet and building management. It is focusing on energy efficiency projects such as smart grids, smart metering and the connection of renewable generation. The company is keen to see how its pipeline expertise could be deployed in the field of carbon, capture and storage (CCS) - it has said that some of its natural gas pipelines in Scotland could be available for re-use for CCS from 2013.

National Grid is calling for government, industry and consumers to work together to meet emissions targets. “You simply can’t operate as an international business and not take climate change seriously,” says Karen Jordan, manager of National Grid’s UK climate change policy. “You can choose to be in the driving seat or to be a passenger. We’ve chosen to drive for change. As leaders in the energy industry, we’re bringing our expertise to the table to work together with government, regulators and industry to create a clear way forward,” Jordan says.

“We are investing billions of dollars in the UK and the US so we have to make the right choices to deliver on our obligations and achieve our ambition. There will be areas where we get an immediate pay-back – for instance, in energy efficiency projects – while some investment will bring longer term benefits”.

National Grid’s chief executive Steve Holliday says that minimizing the company’s environmental impact while delivering safe, secure and economic energy supply “isn’t an option, it’s a must. The two must be tackled together.”

Case Study: Starbucks

Climate change threatens to disrupt the supply chains that are crucial to global businesses. Starbucks is one company making the business case for adaptation and resilience-building efforts in developing countries. As quoted in the *New York Times*, "Climate change represents a direct business risk to our supply chain. You can't just grow coffee in Iowa”, said Jim Hanna, director of environmental impact at Starbucks, noting that changing weather patterns threaten coffee production in several parts of the world. “Moral arguments aside, it makes absolute economic sense to mitigate your own issues."

To cite one example, the company sources Fair Trade coffee from the Kilimanjaro Native Co-operative Union (KNCU), which is experiencing the effects of climate change first-hand. Rising temperatures and unpredictable rainfall are hitting coffee-bean yields, as irrigation ditches and water taps run dry. Farmers’ incomes are suffering and their health is affected, too; malaria is spreading up the mountain to areas that it never reached before.

Motivated by concern that the quality and quantity of its coffee supply would suffer as a result of climate change, Starbucks joined the Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy (BICEP) coalition. As part of BICEP, Starbucks is lobbying the US government on climate policy, including a call for substantial financing to help developing countries prepare for and adapt to climate impacts to protect local communities and global supply chains alike.

Contacts
Anna Mitchell + 44 77 96 99 32 88; anna.mitchell@oxfaminternational.org
Laura Rusu + 1 202 459 3739; lrusu@oxfamerica.org