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**I. Overview**

This report focuses on the role of civil society constituencies as actors in influencing the current UNFCCC process, and the opportunities for IUCN to play a catalytic role in bringing actors, rights holders and decision makers together in a new configuration. The three civil society constituencies discussed here include: the indigenous peoples’ regional and global constituency; the faith-based regional and global constituencies; and the NGOs dealing with adaptation topics.

The UNFCCC negotiations are the only viable global and multilateral platform for achieving a binding agreement on the reduction of Greenhouse Gas emissions and an equitable approach to financing, technology and international cooperation in response to the impacts of climate change. The negotiations are progressing too slowly to protect us from gravely serious and potentially catastrophic climateimpacts in the medium and long term scenarios.

One of the main problems with the negotiations is the design of the platform. A State-centric negotiating forum based on a 20th century model of balancing different national needs is contributing to a ‘zero sum game’ approach by negotiators – what one gains, another perceives as a loss. The negotiations themselves need to be recast in terms of a global good and a positive sum game, or even a new configuration which is a type of emergency approach, recognizing the overall vulnerability of the human species in the scientific modeling of consequences.

This report considers IUCN’s strategic position with regards to influencing the climate negotiations, strengthening civil society movements which could positive impact on the negotiations and direct actions at local, national and regional levels. The overview is that IUCN has not fully considered its potential catalytic role in changing the dynamics of negotiations and also providing a complimentary and different system of cooperation between State parties, scientists and civil society movements. Currently, IUCN can be seen as an expert *spectator*, able to make certain technical contributions but it has not actualised its potential as a ‘*game changer’* with regards to the combined crisis of surging human population, accelerating biodiversity loss from land use changes and human impacts, and anthropogenic climate change impacts.

**2. Summary of TILCEPA contributions at COP18**

The Chairperson of the Theme on Indigenous Communities, Local Communities, Equity and Protected Areas (TILCEPA), Dr Nigel Crawhall, attended the UNFCCC COP18 in Doha as part of the IUCN delegation.

TILCEPA is an inter-Commission body, hence the mandate of the work at the UNFCCC COPs was linked to the mandates of the two parent commissions and associated constituency at the COP. There was a prior agreement with WCPA and GPAP to give attention to Protected Areas themes and Ecosystems-based Adaptation which link to landscape / seascape conservation and management. Under TILCEPA, the focus was on interacting with the indigenous peoples’ caucus, notably the African indigenous peoples’ caucus.

TILCEPA co-sponsored an event with the Global DrylandsProgramme (GDP) on traditional knowledge, adaptation and Islamic values. As part of the CEESP mandate arising from Motion / Resolution 009 of the IUCN World Conservation Congress, attention was also given to meeting with and facilitating advocacy strategies with Faith-based organisations and leadership. Finally, in cooperation with IUCN and the NGOs at COP18, TILCEPA monitored where possible the NGO discussions and lobbying on Loss & Damage.

The main activities for TILCEPA included:

* Successful mobilization and facilitation of the faith-based organisations and leadership at the COP, in cooperation with the Senior Social Policy Advisor and the Director of the Global Ecosystems Manager Programme (3 coordination meetings organized; 3 side events supported);
* Coordination of a joint side event by Global DrylandsProgramme, IPACC, We Have Faith side event on Islamic values, traditional knowledge of pastoralists and climate adaptation (1 side event and participation in some of the Hikma lunchtime events, including a focused working group on pastoralism and adaptation);
* Facilitation of participation of the International Network of Engaged Buddhists (first time at UNFCCC COP);
* Support to the Doha International Council for Inter-religious Dialogue (DICID) panel on faith, values and the environment side event;
* Blog contribution for IUCN page on Thursday 29 November;
* Designed and facilitated Adaptation Hub lunchtime dialogue on indigenous peoples and climate adaptation, on Tuesday 27 November;
* Designed and facilitated Adaptation Hub lunchtime dialogue of Faith-based organisations on the theme of adaptation
* Participation in morning IUCN delegation briefings and review sessions;
* Meetings with the delegates of the Republic of Niger on a 2013 workshop on pastoralism, traditional knowledge and adaptation policy development;
* Launch of the IPACC film on pastoralism, climate change and conflict management through participatory modeling (in Chad);
* Meetings with indigenous leaders and activists on preparations for the World Parks Congress;
* Participation in the global indigenous caucus, provided half day French-language interpreting, worked with indigenous leaders and NGOs on regional safeguard norms and procedures;
* Interfaced discussion between Climate Action Network, TILCEPA Marine and IUCN Marine Programme on ocean acidification in relation to the text on Loss & Damage.
* Development Days – round table on Loss & Damage

**Outcomes can be defined as:**

* Faith leaders and indigenous peoples had greater contact with IUCN and could identify a potential for a stronger relationship between the faith-based constituencies and the IUCN;
* Stronger alliances between Islamic leaders and specialists with the global faith-based environmental advocacy groups which could contribute to future advocacy;
* INEB activitists exposed to COP process and able to use this in planning for the newly created Asian inter-religious network on climate and biodiversity;
* IUCN delegation gave more thought to building alliances with civil society constituencies – how science is a resource for civil society, and the role of civil society in messaging and influence beyond the IUCN’s current capacity;
* Greater awareness of a regional mechanism approach to human rights safeguards for indigenous peoples with regards to REDD+ or other adaptation measures;
* Greater visibility of drylands climate impact issues, pastoralism as part of food security systems in Africa;
* An agreement in principle with the Republic of Niger to host an adaptation, drylands and pastoralism workshop in 2013;
* Increased media profile for inter-religious cooperation and advocacy at the COP, promotion of an ethical framework for discussing anthropogenic climate change;

There was little focus directly on Protected Areas during the UNFCCC. A series of bilateral meetings were held with indigenous leaders and NGOs interested in the 6th World Parks Congress. Most of the discussion focussed on preparations for the May 2013 meeting of the international indigenous peoples and local communities network of land and sea managers, due to take place in Darwin, Northern Territories. It is likely that WCPA could have greater impact by promoting the role of Protected Areas in adaptation and mitigation during UNFCCC events, notably at the inter-sessional meetings. If WCPA and IUCN want specific text (beyond the current references to Ecosystems), this should be conceptualised ahead of the annual negotiations.

During the DICID panel on inter-religious dialogue and the environment, Islamic scholars emphasised that the Qur’an obliges Moslems to do certain forms of landscape conservation. This is explicit in terms of Medina and Mecca, where no hunting is permitted and biodiversity must be protected. This principle should likely be considered as part of the overall Islamic response to threats to the climate and environment.

**2.1. Adaptation**

The focus for adaptation was the agreed cooperation with IUCN Global Drylands Programme and IPACC, on the promotion of participation by nomadic and semi-nomadic pastoralists (often self-defined as indigenous peoples) in national adaptation platforms, programmes of action and action plans.

IPACC, in cooperation with TILCEPA, Global Drylands Programme and the We Have Faith in climate action network hosted a formal side event on Islamic values, traditional knowledge of pastoralists and climate adaptation. The event involved the launch of the film by Jade Productions “Brousse de tout les dangers; carte de tous les espoirs” and release of an English-language report on the use of participatory 3D modelling in southern Chad as a means of creating a platform to discuss conflict over water resources in climate sensitive sub-humid areas.

The event was opened by Mr Essa al Sharqi of the Al Tajdeed Cultural & Social Society of Bahrain, who spoke on Qur’anic principles of protecting the environment, governing natural resource equitably, and challenging those who despoil the balance of the environment.

This was followed by presentations by Ms. Hindou Oumarou Ibrahim of the Association des Femmes Peules Autochtones du Tchad, Mr Souleymane Outtara of Jade Film Productions, Mr Hassan Guyo Shano of WASO Trustlands in northern Kenya on the Borana ‘gadaa’ traditional drylands management institution, and Mme Sada Albachir of Association Tunfa of Niger. Mme Tunfa challenged delegates to give more consideration to the conservation of subsurface water resources in the Sahara which support life and economies of the desert region.

<http://www.ipacc.org.za/eng/news_details.asp?NID=314>

The IPACC / Global Drylands Programme event resonated well with a series of other side events organised during the Hikma lunch time dialogues on Arab responses to climate change and the traditional Hima system of rangeland conservation. The World Institute for Sustainable Pastoralism (WISP) organised a sympathetic side event on pastoralism and drylands conservation, adaptation and carbon storage.

The Doha International Council for Inter-religious Dialogue (DICID) organised a prominent side event on inter-religious dialogue on ethical responses to the threats and impacts of climate change. Here again, Islamic engineers, scientists and scholars gave detailed presentation on how Moslems can draw on the Qur’an for guidance on appropriate guidelines to conservation and adaptation. This includes the overall teaching that humans are stewards of creation, that Allah the All Merciful has created the world in balance and abundance, and it is only through spoiling of nature and disrespecting this duty that we drive the world out of balance and into situations of scarcity and suffering. This message was echoed by Hindu and Christian leaders and led to a robust discussion on the importance of ethicising the UNFCCC discussions.

The main points raised during these sessions included:

* Traditional pastoralism is adaptive by nature as it allows for changing the density of human and livestock pressure on natural resources subject to availability and fluctuations in the climatic norms;
* Adaptation is done locally and needs to involve indigenous peoples and local communities who have developed a way of living which is related to the capacity of the local ecosystem and is informed by local climate fluctuations of the Holocene;
* In many countries, traditional pastoralists are marginalised from formal political representation, and sedentary farmers may have more political power and representation. This can lead to skewed issues of power and access to land and water resources, which may contribute to maladaptive and conflict enducing situations.
* Human conflict, and human-wildlife conflict are expected by-products of climate instability, and hence adaptation policy making needs to have predictive systems to reduce conflict and institutional platforms to negotiate disputes over land and natural resources;
* Traditional knowledge, which arises in a particular landscape, is important for understanding how people in a territory understand the ecosystem on which they rely, the density and fluctuations in the abundance of resources, and provide a cultural point of reference for decision making which may be substantially different from what scientists or policy makers expect or would recommend;
* Traditional pastoralism is governed by traditional institutions, sometimes a single ethnic institution such as the ‘age grade’ system, or sometimes by a series of interlocking institutions such as how oasis dwellers and nomadic herders govern reciprocal relationships. In all cases, adaptation needs to include traditional authorities and traditional institutions. This may be challenging in some political contexts but needs to be emphasised, facilitated and promoted by those engaged in adaptation policy elaboration;
* Current UNFCCC initiated policy frameworks, such as the National Adaptation Programmes of Action and National Adaptation Plans may need to be reviewed to ensure that different types of land use are taken into account, and that indigenous peoples / traditional herders / traditional institutions have access to the policy making platforms.

**2.1.1 Adaptation Hub Dialogues**

IPACC and the We Have Faith network produced a series of small pamphlets for the COP which were shared in the Adaptation Hub. These linked issues of indigenous landscape management and adaptation with the role of faith institutions in promoting equity, fairness and appropriate responses to adaptation, mitigation and financing.

Two lunch time Adaptation Hub dialogues were organised with constituencies on the theme of adaptation. Members of the indigenous peoples’ caucus participated in a round table dialogue on adaptation on Tuesday 27 November. The report is attached here as an appendix. Participants noted that the IUCN is in an important position at national levels to promote national dialogue and social cohesion on inclusive, multiple knowledge system approaches to local and national adaptation. Participants felt that IUCN and other UN agencies (not specially the UNFCCC which has little national presence) could help contribute to guiding national Ministries, NGOs and indigenous peoples on how to cooperate to promote implementation of global agreements and good practices in adaptation and resilience.

Religious leaders and delegates from faith-based agencies (including Christian aid organisations) participated in a second dialogue. The topic proposed was on adaptation, but delegates spoke on a wide range of issues, including disaster risk reduction, early warning systems, linking climate disaster relief with policy advocacy, improving synergies between disaster risk reduction and adaptation, and overall mobilising churches, mosques and temples to be vectors of information sharing, policy dialogue (linking rural community experiences back to national policy making). Summary is attached here as an appendix.

**2.1.1 Loss & Damage**

The Climate Action Network (CAN) engaged substantially in the text elaboration and negotiations on Loss & Damage. This theme was also picked up by Koko Warner during the Development Days weekend workshop (see <http://www.eurocapacity.org/downloads/LossandDamage.pdf> ).

Loss and Damage is an emerging area of work at the UNFCCC and it was an important text that was adopted by Parties during COP18. The final text was strongly criticised by NGOs, but still helped bring to the fore the seriousness of climate impacts on vulnerable communities, countries and ecosystems and associated economies. The precise meaning of Loss & Damage remains somewhat fluid but seems to be moving in the direction of who is responsible when mitigation fails and adaptation fails or does not get implemented – resulting in a catastrophic and unrecoverable type of climate-related damage or losses.

The text of the Parties emphasised that Loss & Damage needs to refer to slow-onset impacts. This may have emerged from the Cancun and Durban discussions on degrading agricultural output due to climate changes, which tend to be slower impacts. However, some such impacts are acute with rapid onset.

TILCEPA facilitated an exchange between marine scientists from the IUCN network and the CAN Loss & Damage team about whether or not the impacts of ocean acidification should be considered as an example of slow onset and unrecoverable damage to food security and livelihoods. This discussion was complex (speed of onset, whether ocean acidification is to be counted as a climate impact or is a co-occurring result of high CO2 emissions that slow the recovery of damaged coral reefs, and whether there is scope to discuss adaptation to acidification or it is an unrecoverable impact). This topic was also broached by the IUCN delegation in Durban COP17. There was discussion of this by the IUCN delegation at COP18 without consensus on whether IUCN was adequately representing these issues in the negotiations and providing policy guidance to Parties and civil society.

There was post-facto discussion in NGO lists about whether the Parties had accepted that Loss & Damage financing should come from the overall “package” of USD 100 billion for climate impacts, or whether it was supplementary. The decision reads:

Requests developed country Parties to provide developing country Parties with finance, technology and capacity-building, in accordance with decision 1/CP.16 and other relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties;

Decision 1/CP.16 locks in the Copenhagen financing promises of USD 30 billion for the period 2010–2012 (paragraph 95) and USD 100 billion per year by 2020 (paragraph 98). Further to this, the Doha decision on the agreed outcome of the AWG-LCA reaffirms

...that developed country Parties commit, in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation, to a goal of mobilizing jointly USD 100 billion per year by 2020 to address the needs of developing country Parties...(preamble to finance section)

It appears that these two provisions could assure Parties that financing for loss and damage falls within the USD 100 billion commitment and does not require additional contributions.

**2.2. Mitigation**

IUCN had a delegation expert on mitigation in the COP18 team. This was an asset to the delegation.

TILCEPA has been supportive of efforts by indigenous peoples and support organisations that indigenous peoples and local communities need to be recognised as custodians of biodiversity and territories where mitigation projects are being financed. There should be no diminution of rights due to mitigation projects being implemented, and all efforts should be made to improve human rights, tenure and safeguards while elaborating mitigation projects, most notably REDD+. Some systems of traditional land use can contribute to both ecosystem resilience and carbon sequestration, these include traditional fire management regimes, nomadic herding, oasis water management.

In one of the *Hikma* sessions, participants from Saudi Arabia reported that plant biotic carbon density has reduced in the Arabian peninsula due to the demise of traditional pastoralism. It was a reminder that certain forms of dryland exploitation stimulate biotic carbon sequestration and biodiversity.

IPACC’s team continued to promote the principle that the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights should support national institutions to create regional standards on safeguards and a back-up mechanism for recourse of rights protection. This is not the only avenue available for recourse but would help promote norms and standards within the African system. The IPACC recommendations also include the idea of getting African states to use carbon finance to protect and fund biotic carbon which is in Protected Areas, notably those threatened by extractive industries.

**2.3 Ethics**

Ethical foundations for responding to the climate crisis are a place where many civil society groups potentially come together. This is most explicit from the perspective of faith-based civil society, but it is also inherent in the work of indigenous peoples, human rights NGOs, development agencies and even conservation NGOs – in the sense that human conduct has created imbalances which threaten vulnerable people and other species – hence there is a moral, ethical and normative pressure to take responsibility for these actions and consequence and address them.

The IUCN delegation discussed the issue of the ethical framework for negotiations. This discussion needs further consideration within the Union and its constituent parts. For those who have an explicit understanding that any system of multilateral and global governance by humans is by definition dealing with ethical considerations, this aspect is intrinsic and needs to be operationalised in the negotiations. At the same time, there are experts and institutions which focus on technical aspects of the negotiations and do not necessarily recognise how ethics creates a frame around human decision making. This makes it difficult for the IUCN to have a clear position on the ethics of the UNFCCC, its different policy components, or the relationship between the IUCN and social movements and agencies promoting ethical accountability. IUCN comes from a science heritage. Western science has a long ethical tradition, and scientific endeavours are shaped within ethical codes of conduct and responsibility. There gap in the Western tradition between religion and science sometimes leaves an ambiguity about whether scientists can or should be discussing ethical issues with policy makers – as if politics and policy making may somehow be exempt from ethical frameworks.

As the human rights and environmental crisis deepens, it is likely that more media and public attention will shift to the moral imperatives and implications of inaction. IUCN would likely benefit from convening an intra-Union platform on the ethics of climate change, and help integrate this into its strategies, actions and messaging.

**3. Constituency facilitation**

**3.1 Indigenous peoples**

The indigenous peoples’ caucus at the UNFCCC is a relatively well organised constituency and lobby group. The hub of this constituency is the International Indigenous Peoples Forum on Climate Change (IIFPCC). This year Tebtebba Foundation of the Philippines helped coordinate the IIFPCC during the COP, with Spanish and English language interpreting and co-Chairs. There are other indigenous delegates at the COP but the IIFPCC is the main think-tank and planning hub for lobbying and advocacy. A number of the IIFPCC constituents belong to the Adaptation Hub and are active in side events. Several of the leading regional or sub-regional networks are also members of the IUCN, including la Coodinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica (COICA) and IPACC.

The IIFPCC divides its work thematically according to the structure and themes of the UNFCCC. Most attention goes to issues of mitigation, adaptation and finance, with little capacity to engage in themes of technology transfer. As the IIFPCC is a global constituency its members have access to a number of national delegations and regional forums, some members belong to national delegations, and usually the IIFPCC has access to senior political and technical people during the COP, including the COP President and Executive Secretary.

Indigenous people are usually experts in rights related advocacy and have a sense of confidence about their right to be involved in decision making. Sometimes there is need for more technical coaching to strengthen their ability to influence decision making in the UNFCCC or related platforms.

There is an opportunity within IUCN’s strategy at the UNFCCC to find concurrence between indigenous peoples’ policy positions, rights-based frameworks, and providing more access to science or technical information which the indigenous caucus could make good use of in its advocacy. Currently there is only a tenuous link between the IUCN and the indigenous peoples delegates and caucus.

**3.2 Faith leaders**

Christian leaders associated with the World Council of Churches (WCC) have been advocating for greater action and responsibility to avert climate change causes and impacts for more than thirty years. In the past five years there has been greater global engagement by the faith-based civil society, institutions and leadership in climate issues. This is partly driven by the impacts of climate change which are creating pressures on faith-based relief agencies and institutions. During climate crises people tend to use the churches / mosques / temples as refuges and religious leaders are required to provide practical and moral support. These local impacts have been influencing national and regional bodies who recognise the escalation of the crisis and the impasse in the multilateral political system.

Since COP14 in Poznan, there has been an effort to coordinate and mobilise faith networks in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Europe to work more closely together. This has started with side events and is growing into a lose alliance of coordination structures. In Durban for COP17, an African inter-religious alliance known *as We Have Faith – Act Now for Climate Justice* organised a rally at the King’s Park Stadium with Archbishop Emeritus Desmond Tutu and religious leaders from across the region. African, Asian and Pacific political leaders are particular open to influence from the faith leaders and institutions, creating an opportunity for a new type of advocacy and focus in shifting state behaviour and multilateral dynamics.

Rationally, no one would want such a crisis to be visited on humanity, and the means to change our energy usage are already available to us. The IPCC’s efforts to bring change have already demonstrated that overall rationality and the ‘instinct’ for survival is clearly not having an adequate impact on the decision-makers in the UNFCCC.

The faith sector has argued that science alone is not what changes human behavior. As the drivers of climate change have to do with human intentions, actions and values, the framework for understanding the challenges and need for responsibility and change is by definition ethical. It is the ethical component that has been marginsalised in the UNFCCC process. The faith-sector, in combination with indigenous peoples, NGOs and scientists may be able to get the ethical framework back on the table for consideration, and shift where the attention, energy and resources of the negotiations are currently directed.

In September 2012, the IUCN World Conservation Congress passed motion 009, calling on the Union and DG to work more closely with faith-based organisations and networks dealing with the environment and climate issues. TILCEPA, as part of its CEESP mandate, assisted in coordinating the participation of delegates from the We Have Faith campaign and the International Network of Engaged Buddhists (INEB) at COP18. INEB also hosted a major Asian regional conference on climate change and biodiversity loss for diverse religious leaders in September 2012 on the island of Sri Lanka.

During COP18, TILCEPA in cooperation with other delegates from the IUCN Secretariat and Regional Offices helped support the faith-based organisations to come together to share approaches, ideas and start to evolve into a more coordinated caucus group. Three coordination meetings were held, one lunchtime Adaptation Hub event, and several side events. Minutes of these meetings were circulated by email, building up a further information network. Edmund Barrow, Director of the Global Ecosystems Management Programme (based in Nairobi) provided valuable support and the TILCEPA Chair and Barrow have offered to help develop a ‘zero’ draft with religious leaders in preparation for COP19 which will be held in the predominantly Roman Catholic country of Poland.

Religious leaders were not of one view about whether they should be contributing general ecumenical and moral messages to the negotiators, or should be engaging in the technical details of the UNFCCC negotiations. The African and Asian networks have put more emphasis in bringing the ethical and grass roots perspectives directly into the technical negotiations by building up the capacity of clerics to participate effectively.

All of the religious groups note that it helps them to have proper briefing on the science of climate change. They have access to broad networks of relief agencies, international development agencies, and grassroots congregations, so they are rich in information, testimonies, data and imagery of the crisis, impacts and responses.

The overall strategy will be to build a strong, visible and clearly messaged platform for religious leaders in Warsaw, hosted by the Polish inter-religious organisations, with contributions from the global South, and attention to keep momentum from the Islamic world that was established in Doha.

<http://www.cop18.qa/en-us/News/SingleStory.aspx?ID=284>

<http://portals.iucn.org/blog/2012/12/04/spreading-climate-change-awareness-through-religion/>

**3.3 Adaptation NGOs / Loss & Damage**

In his blog on COP18, Kit Vaughn, CARE International Director of Climate Change and Environment had this to say:

...what we witnessed [at COP18] was an almost unprecedented and united stand by the world's poorest and most vulnerable countries, together with their developing country allies, to demand the establishment of an 'international mechanism' to address the significant and increasing loss and damage resulting from climate change impacts.

Loss & Damage (L&D) is emerging as an important theme and in Doha was starting to be defined more clearly as that area of work when mitigation has failed and adaptation has failed / has not been implemented, leading to an unrecoverable situation. What precisely was being measured in L&D was hotly contested. The state parties were concentrating on the idea of economic losses, losses of livelihoods, whereas the NGO sector was also trying to map our the loss of ecosystems, economic sectors (such as fisheries, agriculture), and also the loss of cultural system (loss of whole populations, loss of culturally important practices and physical or non-physical sites, mass migrations, etc).

L&D is also providing a point of focus for NGOs who have been advocating for greater attention to vulnerability of the poor, the consequences of inaction on mitigation, the need for public mobilization for linking adaptation and ‘development’ (however that may be defined). Even though the CAN adaptation subgroup on L&D were not satisfied with the final text, it did indicate that the immense gravity of climate change impacts is now coming onto the table at the UNFCCC and is creating a new platform for discussing responsibility, compensation mechanisms, and ideally also having an impact on how mitigation and adaptation are prioritized (i.e. the more one studies loss & damage, the more one recognizes that early action and preventative action are much less costly and catastrophic).

IUCN does not have a formal relationship with CAN and some staff on the IUCN delegation emphasised that a diplomatic distance should be kept between CAN and IUCN due to IUCN’s status as an inter-governmental body. Commissioners and members are not as constrained by such diplomatic considerations as staff members, and it would be useful to create channels of contact between the highly focussed CAN working group on L&D and IUCN’s climate team.

IUCN could strengthen its relationship and information sharing with CAN’s L&D network to give particular attention to the ecosystems aspect of L&D, and valuable technical input, such as on the complex interactions between ocean acidification and the impacts on reefs of changes in water temperature.

See:

<http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/kit-vaughan/doha-climate-talks-not-lost-but-damaged_b_2266379.html?utm_hp_ref=green&ir=Green>

<http://www.irinnews.org/Report/96867/CLIMATE-CHANGE-When-the-damage-is-done>

**II. Analysis of UNFCCC COP18& IUCN’s potential role**

The UNFCCC process poses one of the greatest challenges to human civilization ever. There is a temptation after each COP to look at what progress has been made and to emphasise this as an achievement, rather than looking at the larger picture wherein we find that the UNFCCC process is not tackling the core drivers of climate change. The underlying causes are driving us into a long-term climatic instability which is becoming exponentially more serious and harder to address as each year passes. Trying to put a ‘good face’ on our failure to address the cause of the crisis is not helping to change the behaviour of the Parties. We are looking at an inability to proactively bring about change.

*If you always do what you’ve done, you will always get what you’ve always got.* -Ed Foreman

The failure of the UNFCCC platform to create a rapid, robust and binding decision on reducing GHG emissions and preparing to cope with climate shocks that are already unfolding places life on the planet in a precarious and vulnerable position. If one steps away from the negotiations, the answer to the crisis is obvious – rapidly phase out fossile fuels and replace them with renewables- yet as one gets closer to the action, there is a kaleidoscope of issues which cause a general paralysis across the system.

If we accept the premise that the UNFCCC is unable to deliver the type of adequate global agreement on GHG emission cuts, and is struggling to find other diplomatic accords to support and fund adaptation, technology transfer and loss and damage, it raises a pertinent question about IUCN’s role.

IUCN has been highly influential in the work of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity, and has made valuable contributions to the UN Convention to Combat Desertification. Climate change is a thematic area of work which cuts right across the interests of the IUCN, all of its members, Commissions and programmes. Currently, IUCN has been putting together a multidisciplinary team to participate in each COP. The Adaptation Hub has been an important innovation which is creating a space, synergies and networks within the UNFCCC system which IUCN quietly supports.

Despite its immense complexity and scope, IUCN has valuable capacity to bring diverse stakeholders and rights holders together to focus on problem solving and synergies between different perspectives and scales of understanding. The COP18 delegation received important moral support with the presence of the Director General for several days of the COP. This type of leadership engagement is helpful, and IUCN could be playing a much more influential role than it is doing currently.

Below are some recommendations for consideration:

* IUCN needs a multidisciplinary policy and planning platform with regards to climate change and engaging with the UNFCCC. This platform should include different Global Programmes and Divisions of the Secretariat, Regional Offices, technical experts, relevant member organisations and Commissioners;
* The IUCN’s multidisciplinary platform should have virtual coordination meetings and a structured approach to engaging with inter-sessional meetings, COPs, technical working groups and non-UNFCCC but related agency work (e.g. working with UNITAR, UNDP, UNCBD, etc);
* National IUCN structures could play a greater role in engaging with State Parties to share key messages, provide feedback and help promote cooperation and action;
* The Commissions have a vast network of expertise. It would be valuable to mobilise the Commissions’ capacities to contribute to IUCN strategy and knowledge flow on various aspects of climate change advocacy and actions. CEESP, CEL and CEM have particularly important roles in this regard;
* The 2010 Whakatane conference hosted by CEESP on *Sharing Power* in Conservation could serve as a model of hosting a global conference of civil society on climate adaptation and mitigation;
* IUCN has an important opportunity to make its massive knowledge systems and networks more available to the civil society movements which need to be influencing climate advocacy and actions. IUCN needs a strategy about its engagement with constituencies, with notable attention to indigenous peoples, local communities (e.g. fishing communities), faith-based civil society, women’s organisations and networks, youth, farmers and business.
* IUCN has a valuable role in providing space and platforms for civil society to increase its level of organisation and sophistication in relation to thematic areas of work, such as ecosystem resilience, adaptation, loss & damage, different forms of biotic carbon conservation (grasslands, marine biota, salt marshes and forests...);
* IUCN’s work on mainstreaming gender in climate negotiations and supporting women negotiators and influence makers is an exceptionally good model which could be shared with other wings of civil society and various formulations of this model could be developed. This would not only spread the work load, change the negotiation dynamics, it would also speak directly to donors who are looking for more effective impact which is both political (in the sense of shaping policy) and rights-based
* IUCN can provide complementary policy spaces which may be less trapped in the economic impasses of the UNFCCC and help create shifts in thinking and commitment which would have a valuable impact on the UN negotiations;
* IUCN could increase its provision of targeted knowledge products and science to influence makers;
* IUCN’s messaging and the place of ethics and the intrinsic value of nature / biodiversity in multilateral environmental agreements...
* If WCPA and GPAP would like more attention to the role of Protected Areas (and connectivity landscape planning) in climate change policy at the global level, this would benefit from a focussed policy discussion group, and then a strategy for lobbying states and regional blocks to promote this approach.

**Appendix 1**

**Lunchtime Adaptation Hub dialogue:**

**Indigenous peoples, traditional knowledge and implementing Adaptation agreements**

**Tuesday 27 November 2012**



The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) has been facilitating coordination between civil society groups and indigenous peoples’ organisation on adaptation policy, innovations and coodrdination. Part of this includes an Adaptation Hub at the UNFCCC COPs, and since Durban also a lunchtime dialogue series on different themes and constituencies. This dialogue was coordinated by the Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee (IPACC) and the IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP).

Delegates from the International indigenous peoples’ forum on climate change working group on Adaptation attended the event. Delegates came from Niger, Namibia, Chad, Burkina-Faso, Vietnam, Kenya, Brazil, Nepal, Nicaragua, and Philippines.

Main points:

1. UNFCCC has designed its main tools for Adaptation policy: National Adaptation Programmes of Action for Least Developed Countries, National Adaptation Plans, and the Cancun Adaptation Framework;
2. At COP17, the Nairobi Work Programme adopted traditional knowledge as a priority area for adaptation policy and resource development, in complimentarity with science and other knowledge systems;
3. Delegates emphasised that the problem is not with the high level policy framework; the two major challenges are:
   1. Traditional knowledge of ecosystems, climate and biodiversity are held at local levels, on the ground, and often in oral systems. There is a major gap between the holders of the knowledge and the development of national policies, practices, information flow and support;
   2. National governments, particularly in the South, have not systematically involved indigenous peoples in national consultations and policy making. Sometimes in Africa and Asia this is linked to a reluctance by governments to recognise indigenous peoples as a specific group of rights holders;
4. Though states should comply with their international duties, delegates also noted that indigenous peoples’ organisations and networks need to be proactive. Proactive engagement includes:
   1. Knowing when national meetings are taking place and insisting on full and effective participation;
   2. Making sure local indigenous communities, particularly in rural areas are aware of their rights and the policy making processes;
   3. Indigenous peoples can develop their own methods for mobilising TK and making connections to the types of resilience, conservation and adaptation that are appropriate to communities – this can also help guide national approaches;
   4. Initiation of participation in policy making is valuable, but indigenous peoples also need to monitor implementation and follow up, including working with scientists, government or NGOs to document changes to their local ecosystems, livelihood changes, and good practices which could be valuable to share;
5. Delegates noted that valuable innovations in methodology for planning adaptation and advocacy include participatory mapping, community seasonal calendars and other participatory, community controlled events to look at changes in the climate, baselines for biodiversity and ecosystems, and systems of local governance that can help improve equitable and sustainable resource management and planning;
6. Delegates emphasised that adaptation is not only about the state of the environment and biodiversity, climate stress causes social conflicts which can erupt into violence. Part of adaptation is the supportive recognition of indigenous institutions which can help prevent or reduce conflict through local wisdom and negotiations, including clear and equitable control of scarce natural resources, such as water access;
7. It was noted that the UNFCCC is not a helpful forum for holding States Parties to compliance with high level policy. It was recommended that the IIPFCC and indigenous peoples’ organisations interested in adaptation to should raise issues of compliance and implementation with the national governments, and with the UN agencies. There are good examples of UN agencies supporting such adaptive efforts at local levels. Actions recommended include:
   1. Present a report from IIPFCC to the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues and the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. As the UNPFII to present a case to the Inter-Agency Support Group (both global and regional) to study the policy frameworks on adaptation and facilitate support at sub-regional, national and sub-national levels;
   2. UNPFII 2013 will study the question of pastoralism and indigenous peoples rights in the Arctic and Africa – the issue of indigenous peoples’ rights to mobile tenure, natural resource governance recognition in the framework of sustainable use and adaptation should be highlighted, and this principle may need to be shared to other indigenous territories;
8. African delegates noted that adaptation is being associated with drylands territories and mitigation with forests. In practice both are a false distinction. IIPFCC should push for integration of rights and policies for all ecosystems and all peoples, with an integrated and rights-based approach to both mitigation and adaptation. Forest-based indigenous peoples should highlight through the UN forums their role in adaptation and application of traditional knowledge;
9. Greater sharing of adaptation experiences, policy making, innovations and recognition of traditional knowledge should be shared through indigenous networks – the IIPFCC could play a valuable role in this regard;
10. Indigenous delegates made a particular appeal to IUCN to be more involved in promoting knowledge sharing platforms on the relationship between indigenous / traditional knowledge and Ecosystems-based Adaptation. IUCN national and regional offices can also help with monitoring implementation;

APPENDIX 2

**Faith-based organisations and networks participating in the 18th Conference of Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change**

**Lunchtime Adaptation Hub Dialogue**

**Doha, Qatar**

**28 November 2012**



The event was an open dialogue amongst faith leaders, faith-based organisations and networks. The platform was offered by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) which supports an alliance of civil society organisations interested in adaptation topics, themes and shared actions.

This lunch event was organized by the We Have Faith – Climate Action Now network (Southern Africa), the South African Faith Communities Environment Institute, and the Inter-religious Climate and Environmental network / International Network of Engaged Buddhists. Participants came from a range of faith organisations, networks and traditions.

**Main messages:**

* The faith networks are important players in bringing about change, mobilising constituents, speaking truth to power – we may understate our potential to bring solutions to the climate crisis;
* Our success will be in our ability to work across religions – to find different ways to cooperate – to find a shared language that puts ethics and morality back at the heart of the policy discussions – climate change is a human-made crisis, and we have to take responsibility for this;
* More attention needs to be given to the medium and long term strategies, vision and plans for our work with regards climate change – we are too caught up with current emergencies and are letting the politicians and diplomats control the negotiations agenda;
* Our faiths are built on the foundation of truth, of love for life, of our ability to sacrifice, to withstand challenges and set aside disempowerment and despair- replacing these with hope, faith and courage to do what is right;
* Despite the vast scale of the believers on Earth, the world religions, religious orders, and faith-based organisations have been slow to come to the climate policy table, slow to educate our members, slow to get high-level and high profile messaging;
* We need religious leaders to be well trained in climate science and policy to adequately challenge national and multilateral policy making;
* We have a role to play at every level – our compassion for the most vulnerable needs to turn into practical support, education and mobilisation. Our witnessing of suffering and vulnerability must be brought to national policy attention. Our united inter-religious capacity needs to redefine the multilateral policy discussions;
* A lot has been done, and is being done – we need to be more strategic and have the courage to rise to this global challenge;
* Meeting during the COP is useful and we should meet again before the COP ends; COPs are not the ideal time for lobbying and advocacy – that should be done earlier with governments and at inter-sessionals.

The meeting had a free flow of ideas and explored different priorities. The key questions that were used to open the discussion included:

* How do faith based organisations move from a reactive mode to a proactive approach to building climate resilience - both social and ecological?
* What can the faith sector do about public education on the vulnerability, impacts and risks of social conflict due to climate stress?
* What is the faith sector doing about strengthening the capacity of communities and faith institutions to advocate for effective national adaptation policies that take into account the needs of the poor, those dependent on natural resources, indigenous peoples and others at risk?

Opening comments: Traditionally, the faith sector has provided emergency relief services during climate and weather related crises. Food relief, shelter and medicine are provided by religious organisations all over the world. Increasingly, the religious emergency services are finding themselves overwhelmed by the increase in frequency and severity of climate based emergencies. What are the opportunities to shift from a reactive approach to a proactive one? This COP is focusing on creating multilateral frameworks on climate adaptation. This is because we have failed at our first task of reducing Greenhouse gas emissions, and we are bringing onto ourselves this terrible burden of instability. What are your organisations doing about adaptation policy making? Are you working with your congregations and those who experience these impacts to speak up and help shape the national policy making as it unfolds?

Greek Orthodox: We are often caught up in the immediacy of the problems of climate change. There is however an opportunity for the faith-based organisations to engage more fully in policy work. Greater attention can be given to adaptation, as well as returning ethics to the discussion of climate change.

German Lutheran: A lot of work has been underway for some years. Bread for the World and its sister Christian agencies have been working through partner organizations including SAFCEI, SACC and IPACC. The view is that climate education and advocacy needs to be done in solidarity with the global South, as well as at home in Germany with Church leaders and organisations. The German Lutheran Church works on policy in Germany:a statement has been organized with the Bishops’ conference; a campaign is run on Low Carbon Development; attention is given to public education and policy work has been done on financing climate advocacy and support, including on loss and damage. Interfaith dialogue has a long history and remains central to the Protestant approach to climate advocacy and action. This culture was visible in the pre-COP17 work with the national conference in South Africa; the SADC conference in Lusaka and the main Nairobi meeting of 130 faith leaders from across Africa at the UNEP. The culmination was the mass faith rally before COP17 in Durban.

Baha’i: Within the Global Environment Fun (GEF) work has been done on vertical integration of the adaption picture; How can we contribute to the next step? We need to focus beyond the short time shocks; where are we going as people of faith in shaping the agenda and strategies ahead of us?One of the strengths of the religious leaders is that there is a longer term approach to decision making and sustainability – there is a vision of an ever advancing civilization. Here in Doha we have to ask ourselves why we donot have impetus to commit to the changes and sacrifices which we all know are necessary and urgent. Everyone knows, and it does not happen … Embrace sacrifice, greater good as the ambition.

Buddhist: All of our religions have as a foundation that we need to go through challenges to find our faith. Suffering and sacrifice are in fact good for discerning truth and wisdom from comfort and complacency. Buddhism posits suffering as the first noble truth – by embracing suffering we discover its cause and our own salvation and path to enlightenment. Islam asks of believers to sacrifice the ego in humble submission to Allah – the Sustainer. Christians understand their faith in terms of the harsh sacrifice made by Jesus to offer salvation to all humanity. Climate change requires sacrifices and compassion for others – concepts that are noble within our faith traditions.

Catholic: Creation is common to all faiths; it is a foundation for understanding our place on Earth, our duty to God, our role as temporary custodians to the greater plan.To reach people we need a language that is accessible to all. Note there will be a side event with the Doha Interfaith Center on Monday 2 December (details below);

Buddhist: The next COP may be in Poland – which again raises the question of working more closely with the Holy See and Roman Catholic host churches.

Catholic: We need bold leadership from the heads of the main religions. We need to Pope, the Cardinals, the Archbishops and Chief Imams to speak out, to call the political leaders to account – to give a name to the situation and call on followers to mobilise.

African Protestant: Senior COP leader met today with youth. Youth have an important role to make the interfaith voice heard; What do we in the church believe about policy making on adaptation? How do we cascade what we are experiencing in terms of the effects of climate change into policy processes? We are the witnesses of the experience of the poor, and we must work to transmit this accurately. It is the role of faith-based civil society to communicate with the most vulnerable. What do we mean when we speak of equity, and how does this emerge in on adaptation? What does this mean for Malawi? It is hard to impact on the COP – we need to be influencing the process earlier. World Council of Churches is having its major policy congress in Busan, Korea next year. WCC is on board with us and we should be working to develop our strategies.

Norwegian Lutherans: We are searching for a common language; We need to say something differently than all of the others – we have a moral language, strong words, we have the history and tradition to bear witness and carry weight in our message. We carry hope, and can articulate the religious views on creation and ecology. We should not underestimate our reach and potential impact. There has been some work on this over the years, e.g. the interfaith statement in Durban at COP17; We need to work with our local and national networks. Perhaps it is a hidden secret that the Protestant networks work closely with Hindus, Buddhists, Moslem – our priority is praxis rather than just words.

German Lutherans: One of our activities is about witnessing. We bring church leaders and parliamentarians to climate crisis hot spots to see what is happening, to bear witness to those most vulnerable – testimonies from the South Pacific and Bangladesh. We organize people to come to Germany to speak at special sessions with parliament. We bring together actors from the south and the north. We have consistently been open to share with other faiths. We have to learn from HIV / AIDS crisis – the Church was slow to accept reality, to open itself up and mobilize. We see this also in climate change – a reluctance to engage, and yet also a clear experience and evidence at the level of congregations.

Brahma Kumari / Hindu tradition: It is our duty to keep ethics in the centre of the discussion; we need to collaborate with each other; build this alliance. We have recognised that there are different ways for the faith organisations to come together. We can have a committee which is a binding thing; and then there are forums which are freer, optional, voice of many, fluid and share. We should encourage a diversity of ways in which faiths work together – supporting the networks and sharing across them.

Catholic: Holy See – leadership from the top; need strong statements from the top of the system; Great work is being done on the ground; Not enough back up;

Buddhist: IUCN passed a resolution to invite membership by Faith-based organisations and networks dealing with conservation, the environment and climate advocacy. There is an opportunity to bring science and faith closer, to find different ways to get the message out to different constituencies. The scientists have expressed their frustration about having brought facts and models to the politicians, and then to be ignored. The faith-based movements need to take the same science, combine it with ethical and religious motivation and inspiration, and bring a message of change and action.

Catholic: We need to link between the local particularities and the UNFCCC process; e.g. when the Pacific caucus meets to discuss the 1.5 degree increase – does this get discussed in Pacific Churches?The faith delegates are agents of connection. It is not enough to recount our views of creation or ethical expectations – we need to study the instrument, know the language, know when to intervene. We need to know when we should be influencing policy makers, when we should be informing our congregations, and when we have the opportunity to trigger one experience to impact on the other. We must move away from vagueness – it is a luxury we do not have time for. We need a well-prepared cadre of faith leaders who are effective in the different levels of the change process.

Baha’i: We can bring this change. It is within us to rise to this challenge. Our faith is a source of inspiration to us, as it is to many on Earth. There are ways to reach negotiators and decision makers to think more clearly, to have the courage of their convictions – to do what is generous, noble and right. By working together and having a shared vision we can bring change.

The meeting ended with a silent reflection.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Events:**

Doha International Center for Interfaith Dialogue (DICID) invites faith leaders from different global traditions to a side event on Monday 3 December, 2012 at 10h30 until 12h00, at the QNCC Hall 5, Rm 9;

A Seminar on Environmental Protection: A Religion's Perspective

Chaired by DrIbrahim Saleh Al Naimi, Chairman of the Board of Directors of DICID.

For further information you may contact Nadia on[nadia@dicid.org](mailto:nadia@dicid.org" \t "_blank),

web site :[http://www.dicid.org](http://www.dicid.org/" \t "_blank)

Assembly of the World Council of Churches, 30 October to 3 November 2013 in Busan, Korea:

<http://www.oikoumene.org/en/who-are-we/organization-structure/governing-bodies/assembly.html>