



2 April 2008

The Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA)
Hearing in the Development Committee European Parliament

Intervention by Mrs. Karim Harris, Climate Action Network Europe

Karim Harris is the Policy Officer responsible for Development Cooperation at Climate Action Network Europe the European Secretariat, of a global coalition of environmental groups working together to stop dangerous climate change.

Based in Brussels she has been working with CAN-Europe since September 2005 as a communications advisor and has been responsible for making the links between climate change and development policy for the network since January 2007.

Karim has been actively involved in many European climate policy processes and has followed the UN negotiations on climate change since 2004.

Karim is a lawyer by training in the UK and Belgium focusing on European policy, development cooperation and international relations.

Climate Action Network Europe (CAN-E) is recognised as Europe's leading network working on climate and energy issues. With over [100 members](#) in 25 European countries, CAN-E unites to work to prevent dangerous climate change and promote sustainable energy and environment policy in Europe.

The Climate Action Network (CAN) is a worldwide network of over 365 Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) working to promote government, private sector and individual action to limit human-induced climate change to ecologically sustainable levels. CAN is based on trust, openness and democracy.

Intervention:

We welcome thinking and the efforts from DG DEV to harness strategic partnerships between the EU and the most vulnerable countries - primarily with regard to this partnership being linked to or feeding into the negotiations for a fair and equitable post 2012 UNFCCC agreement. On 20th July 2007, we were part of a roundtable of NGOs who were introduced to the GCCA prior to its launch. We were able then to give our opinion on the initial draft. Not many of our recommendations or concerns were then reflected in the final communication. However I am happy to see most of them in MEP Wijkman's report.

An initiative such as this could potentially deliver certain much needed political momentum to the international political debate surrounding climate change. By this I specifically mean the need, long overdue, to highlight or scale up the political role or 'voice' of LDCs and other poor countries in the Post 2012/Future framework negotiations. There has been an imbalance which many NGOs have sought to redress between - the degree of participation of poor countries, the most vulnerable and least responsible countries - and the negotiations in the international arena. And in the instances where initiatives exist for poor country engagement - it has focussed on mitigation and less attention has been paid to adaptation.

This type of imbalance which has led to mistrust between poor countries and industrialized ones quite rightly needs to be addressed sooner rather than later. The experience in Bali at the climate talks in December 2007 emphasises this. We saw in Bali real movement when the EU supported poor country positions and kept the alliances together. This initiative could be a real 'carrot' on the international level in helping to bring about a global deal. But it must be based on a fair and equitable arrangement for poor countries.

Given the above, this initiative can play a role in building up new terms for alliances between the EU and poor countries. It is important therefore that the GCCA is able to meet the grand obligations it proposes. The last thing we need is another loud sounding initiative which never gets off the ground. Based on the GCCA communication thus far we have some questions which remain open:

1. **What are the plans for the advancement of the GCCA? How is this to be operationalised?** We are not convinced that adequate resources - human and financial - have been allocated to realising this initiative. This could be disastrous to getting the GCCA up and running. If this is a key policy proposal of DG DEV then they must scale up the amount of people who work on this file and the activities stemming from it.
2. **Consultation with target countries should be formalised and entrenched in the GCCA.** With a needs-based assessment as one of the initial outcomes. The emphasis should not only be on speed in getting this initiative off the ground, but also ensuring that it pushing the right buttons in terms of what target countries need and require in achieving their adaptation and mitigation goals and having the knowledge and capacity to do so. The working timetable of the GCCA should follow closely or be linked to the UNFCCC negotiations to 2009.
3. **What has been the buy-in from member states so far? What has been the reaction?** Do they support the initiative to the extent that they have pledged additional financing or try to match the seed money? Without strong member state backing and taking up of this initiative it cannot be fully realized.
4. **What has been the feedback from target countries?** Within our work we have found that there are gaps in our knowledge of what poor countries need to fight climate change. Do they need another initiative such as this Alliance proposes or are there other ways the EU can lend support?
5. **What are the ideas to scale up the finances needed for this Alliance?** Certainly the order of magnitude for financing needs to be increased, 50 million euros is not credible to actors working on climate and development needs of poor countries. Some of the figures that have been put forward thus far on what amounts are needed are:
OXFAM 2007 AT LEAST 50 BILLION USD
UNDP 2007 86 BILLION BY 2015
UNFCCC 2007 28 - 67 BILLION USD BY 2030
WORLD BANK 2006 9 - 40 BILLION USD

Some recommendations:

POLICY COHERENCE

There must be policy coherence across the board, of EC policies. Efforts should be made to ensure that this is not a new initiative which never gets fully going. While other substantive programmes such as the action plan are left to languish. Do not repeat ground that has been or is being covered elsewhere. We encouraged and continue to encourage the improvement or facilitation of initiatives which already exist on EU and member state levels. For example improvement of the 2004 Adaptation Action Plan, meant to allow for the climate proofing of EU policies. This was never really mainstreamed and could be linked into this initiative more. LDCs have called for help with NAPAs - there should be a stronger link to those here.

GEEREF also should be referenced here.

FINANCE:

Firstly the order of magnitude must be addressed. Several reports of adaptation funds needed has placed it in the 10s of billions mark. 50 - 300 million is just a drop in the barrel. In addition there re-branding or re-allocating funds away from other sustainability initiatives, must be avoided. There must be new and additional funding/money sought - one place this could come from of course, is Auctioning revenues under the EU ETS, another reason for MEPs to seek for 100% auctioning under the review of the ETS. The financing must also seek to be long term.

CAPACITY BUILDING:

A real need which is still missing is to build capacity of LDCs to engage in the process. We would encourage workshops between the EU and target countries prior to each meeting under the UNFCCC to aid their negotiating capacity. There is a real need for knowledge and skill transfer on the international level. Many LDCs suffer from low representation numbers and capacity to follow all the meetings.

A final note on the role of the DEV Committee. The MEPs within the DEV committee certainly possess the skill and expertise to aid this initiative. There are alliances between the EP and ACP and other parliaments which could stimulate the climate policy discussions if employed. We would encourage greater involvement of the DEV committee members in the climate change discussions in Europe and internationally.