



**SEE THE BIGGER PICTURE
ACT ON CLIMATE CHANGE**

AUSTRALIAN ACTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE: A GUIDE FOR GARNAUT AND THE GOVERNMENT

MAKE POVERTY HISTORY

Make Poverty History Members

Action Against Poverty	HOPE (Householders for the Protection of the Environment)
Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA) Australia	International Centre for Eyecare Education
Aidwatch	International Needs Australia
Anglican Board of Mission	International Women's Development Agency
Anglicord	Jubilee Australia
Archbishop of Sydney's Overseas Relief and Aid Fund	Marist Mission Centre
Assisi Aid Projects	Melbourne Catholic Commission for Justice, Development & Peace
Australian Business Volunteers	National Council of Churches in Australia Christian World Service
Austcare: World Humanitarian Aid	Oaktree Foundation
Australian Council for International Development (ACFID)	Open Door Mission
Australian Doctors International	Opportunity International Australia
Australian Education Union	Oxfam Australia
Australian Lutheran World Service	PALMS Australia
Australian National Committee on Refugee Women	Plan International Australia
Australian Relief and Mercy Services	Quaker Service Australia
Australian Reproductive Health Alliance	RESULTS Australia
Australian Services Union (ASU)	Save the Children Australia
Australian Volunteers International	Sense Foundation
Baptist World Aid Australia	Sexual Health & Family Planning Australia
Burnet Institute	TEAR Australia
CARE Australia	The 40K Home Foundation
Caritas Australia	UNICEF Australia
Catholic Mission	Union Aid Abroad-APHEDA
ChildFund Australia	Uniting Care Wesley Adelaide
Christian Blind Mission International	Uniting Church Overseas Aid
Comic Relief	United Nations Association of Australia
Credit Union Foundation Australia	Justice and International Mission Unit, Uniting Church in Victoria and Tasmania
Engineers Without Borders Australia	United United Nations Youth Association (UNYA)
Fair Trade Association Australia and New Zealand	Water Aid Australia
Family Challenge	World Education Australia
Foundation for Development Cooperation	World Vision Australia
Fred Hollows Foundation, The	YMCA Victoria
Friends of the Earth Australia	ZeroPoint7
Greenpeace Australia Pacific	

MPH is grateful for the significant contributions made by the Climate Action Network Australia (CANa).

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Australian Leadership in the International Negotiations	4
3. Delivery of equitable emission reductions in line with less than a 2°C temperature rise	6
Why 2°C?	
Emission reductions targets	
Reducing emissions from deforestation	
4. Just adaptation	10
Costs borne by those least responsible	
Current funding woeful	
Principles for international policy on adaptation financing	
Raising and disbursing funds	
5. Technology transfers to developing countries to address climate change	14
Developing countries' need for technology transfer	
Mechanisms for technology transfer	
Australia's actions so far	
6. 'Climate Change Refugees'	16
Australia's role in addressing 'climate change refugees'	
Assistance with intra-country evacuations	
An Australian immigration program for 'climate change refugees'	
International protection for 'climate change refugees'	
7. Response to the Garnaut Review's Draft Report on climate change	19
8. Summary of recommendations	24
9. Bibliography	28
10. Glossary	29

1. Introduction

“We live in constant fear of the adverse impacts of climate change. For a coral atoll nation, the sea level rising and more severe weather events loom as a growing threat to our entire population. The threat is real and serious, and is of no difference to a slow and insidious form of terrorism against us.”

Saufatu Sopoanga, Prime Minister of Tuvalu

Tuvalu, a small island nation in the Pacific, has in recent years lost about one metre of land around the circumference of its largest atoll due to changes in storm conditions and rising sea levels. Tuvalu is one of the world’s lowest lying countries, with its highest point standing a mere four and a half metres above sea level. Half of Tuvalu’s population of 11,000 people live just three metres above sea level.

“We live in constant fear of the adverse impacts of climate change. For a coral atoll nation, the sea level rising and more severe weather events loom as a growing threat to our entire population. The threat is real and serious, and is of no difference to a slow and insidious form of terrorism against us.”

Saufatu Sopoanga, Prime Minister of Tuvalu

Salt-water intrusion reduces the land’s productive capabilities and has already affected communal crop gardens on six of Tuvalu’s eight islands. Some families have taken to growing taro (root staple) in metal buckets to avoid the saline soils. In addition, the increased coral bleaching from rising ocean temperatures is depleting local fish stocks.

Tuvalu is the first country where residents have been forced to evacuate because of rising sea levels – with nearly 3000 Tuvaluans already evacuated.

“Taking us as environmental refugees is not what Tuvalu is after in the long run. We want the islands of Tuvalu and our nation to remain permanently and not be submerged as a result of greed and uncontrolled consumption of industrialised countries. We want our children to grow up the way we grew up in our own islands and in our own culture.”

Tuvaluan Governor-General Sir Tomasi Papuas

Climate change is real and happening right now. Within our region, people living on low lying islands and river deltas are already experiencing negative impacts of rising seas and salt water inundation which contribute to crop losses, destruction of fresh water sources, and flooding. For these people climate change is already a stark reality and a terrifying future.



Pacific and Torres Strait Islands including Tuvalu, Kiribati, the Murray Islands and the Carterets are succumbing to rising sea levels. Saltwater intrusion affects fresh water quality, leads to crop losses, and ultimately is forcing islanders to relocate from islands they have occupied for generations. Photos: Toby Parkinson/Oxfam

In the Western world we are slowly coming to demand more action on climate change. In 2006 the world watched Al Gore's film, 'An Inconvenient Truth'. In 2007 the Nobel Peace Prize was jointly shared by Al Gore and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). In the same year climate change played a significant role in the Australian Federal Election.

Most recently, in July 2008, Professor Garnaut released his Draft Report on climate change, outlining Australia's response. Calling climate change a 'diabolical policy problem...harder than any other issue of high importance that has come before our polity in living memory', he urges Australia and the world to take urgent action before it is too late.¹

However, despite these events and the broad recognition that climate change is a defining challenge of our generation, we are still lacking sufficient public debate on climate change from development and poverty perspectives. Within Australia, the focus still remains on largely domestic issues, without due consideration of issues affecting poor women and men in developing nations. Make Poverty History hopes that this publication and its national campaign can change the debate to better inform the public, business and decision makers to **see the bigger picture – and act on climate change.**

Climate change is already beginning to undermine poverty reduction and sustainable development objectives under the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and is set to get worse.² It cuts across all development issues and seriously threatens the lives and livelihoods of poor people around the world.³ It affects all sectors of development, from food and water security, to health and sanitation, to displacement and migration, and conflict and disasters.⁴ Developing countries are more vulnerable to climate change because they are more dependent on their natural resources than developed countries, and have a lower capacity to cope with environmental hazards and shocks.⁵

The debates on climate change, and Australia's response, must include issues of social justice, equity and responsibility, in addition to science and economics. For poor people in developing countries who currently lack a voice these issues are a matter of life and death. Their voices must be heard in order for international policy to reflect their real needs, and not just the economic arguments. The reality is that climate change is one of the biggest moral and ethical issues facing our planet today. How we rise to the challenge of asking *and* answering the ethical questions, will play a significant part in determining the future of the world's poor.



Funafuti, Tuvalu: The narrowest part of Fogafale islet is only 20 metres wide. During the king tides the water washes over from the ocean to the lagoon. © Jocelyn Carlin/Panos

1 Garnaut (2008).

2 Oxfam Australia (2007).

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.

5 UNDP (2007).

2. Australian Leadership in the International Negotiations

Australia has traditionally played an active role in international negotiations, “punching above our weight”. We have strong negotiators, and cover most aspects of the negotiations. Therefore, a positive position from Australia could be magnified in importance.

The United Nations international climate negotiations are at a crucial stage. Governments have less than 18 months to agree a comprehensive deal that will prevent dangerous climate change. This agreement will be one of the most complicated ever agreed to at an international level. It must include ambitious mitigation targets for developed countries that are responsible for the vast majority of the climate change we’ve experienced up to date. It will also need to involve a fundamental restructuring of the majority of economies, as well as a fair adaptation program, including substantial funding from developed countries for adaptation in affected countries. To be successful, it will also need to include significant technology transfer and finance mechanisms at least of an order of magnitude greater than any current programs. What the treaty will eventually look like is currently unknown to any of the players – we are in new and precarious territory.

However, Australia is in a good position to play a positive role in the international climate negotiations.

As a developed country significantly at risk from climate change, an effective international agreement will have substantial benefits for Australia. Australia could ally itself with developing countries who will suffer similar problems such as water shortages and droughts, to create new alliances within the international negotiations. These alliances could put joint submissions, proposals to the negotiations, and lobby jointly around points of agreement, effectively building bridges between the developed and developing world. One example would be in supporting the Association of Small Island States position for keeping warming below 2°C.

In a welcome move, the Australian Government announced a \$1 million contribution to the fund to allow developing countries to participate more actively in the international negotiations⁶. As there will be at least six full negotiation meetings, and various other workshops, as part of the process leading up to the crucial negotiations for a new treaty to deal with climate change in Copenhagen in 2009, there is clearly the need for substantially more funding to allow least developed countries and small island developing states to attend all of the meetings and to prepare fully for each meeting. Australia should contribute substantially more to this fund, and should provide additional funds to allow civil society from these nations to participate in the negotiations.

Australia has traditionally played an active role in international negotiations, ‘punching above our weight’. We have strong negotiators, and cover most aspects of the negotiations. Therefore, a positive position from Australia could be magnified in importance.

However, Australia has traditionally allied itself with those countries least willing to take meaningful action on climate change in the international negotiations: US, Canada and Japan. Australia should use its influence with these countries to change their positions, and become more proactive in working towards a fair and equitable post 2012 agreement.

Since the election of the Rudd Government, Australia has made a number of submissions to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). One way for Australia to move the negotiations forward is to put a European-style set of targets for emission reduction on the table: one target for unilateral action that Australia will take regardless of what others do, and a second target if other developed countries take on targets to do their fair share of emission reduction. Australia must make it clear that it is the responsibility of rich developed countries to lead and take binding greenhouse gas reduction targets first and fastest, and that other countries should take other forms of action provided that these are funded by rich developed countries.

Australia should give full consideration to the range of proposals for multilateral funds to finance technology transfer, mitigation and adaptation tabled at the recent UNFCCC negotiations in Bonn.

Taking a leadership role amongst developed countries would have a significant, positive impact on the negotiations, and assist the world to achieve a global deal that will deliver a securer future for generations to come.



Australia is at significant risk from climate change. But increasing drought will hit not only our farmers: unpredictable rain patterns and increased drought severity are impacting on many countries surrounding Australia – from Africa to Asia to the Pacific. Photo: Mike Pflanz/Oxfam

Recommendations for Australian Leadership in International Negotiations

Specifically, Australia should:

- Demonstrate leadership in international negotiations by allying its positions more closely with those developing countries who are set to suffer first and worst;
- Commit to do its fair share of mitigation and encourage other developed countries to commit to mitigation targets so that the combined efforts of developed countries will reduce their collective emissions by at least the upper end of the 25-40% range by 2020 based on 1990 emission levels;
- Use its influence with recalcitrant countries such as the US, Canada and Japan to change their positions and become more proactive in working towards a fair and equitable post 2012 agreement;
- Commit to fund a fair share of adaptation, technology transfer and mitigation efforts in developing countries. Australia should support proposals to generate the volume of funds required in these areas – which will be in the tens of billions of dollars per year globally, and
- Be clear that it does not expect developing or emerging economies like China, Mexico, Brazil or South Africa, to take absolute emission reduction targets. Rather, Australia should seek that these countries take action to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions where it is funded by rich developed countries.

6 <http://www.environment.gov.au/minister/wong/2008/pubs/mr20080603.pdf>

3. Delivery of equitable emission reductions in line with less than a 2°C temperature rise

Why does the threshold of 2°C above pre-industrial levels matter? It matters because, while by no means a 'safe' level of warming, 2°C is widely recognised as being the lowest feasible target.

Why 2°C?

According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), global temperatures have already risen by around 0.76°C, with a further 0.6°C locked in due to past emissions.⁷ Future 'business as usual' emissions would therefore make it very likely we would pass the 2°C warming threshold unless emissions are drastically reduced.

Why does the threshold of 2°C above pre-industrial levels matter? It matters because, while by no means a 'safe' level of warming, 2°C is widely recognised as being the lowest feasible target. The overwhelming momentum of the international economic system is sending emissions well beyond this temperature. Current emissions are tracking at the highest levels expected by the most energy intensive scenarios envisioned by the IPCC.⁸ The International Energy Agency has concluded that the momentum of the international system is such that if the current 'business as usual' path of emissions expected by 2030 was to continue until around 2100, we would reach warming of between 4.9-6.1°C.⁹ As the IPCC has shown, 5°C of warming would result in many more millions of people being short of water, widespread famines, major species extinctions, and extreme sea-level rises. Such dramatic changes would be highly likely to trigger large movements of people and armed conflicts. Even 2°C has such serious consequences that we should not consider exceeding it.¹⁰

There is great risk in imagining that we can simply weigh up the costs and benefits and target a particular temperature above 2°C, such as 3.5°C, as being more 'practical'. Such an approach is naïve, since the Earth's climate system is not a simple linear system in which we could rely on coasting to a 'soft landing' at a temperature of our choosing. Instead it is a highly complex nonlinear system with interacting dynamic feedback paths and critical thresholds. Once these thresholds are crossed, the system can flip rapidly into a different state.¹¹ One of the most significant dangers of crossing the 2°C threshold is that we will unleash a cascade of self-reinforcing processes that guarantee that we reach much higher temperatures and much higher sea-level rises no matter what we try to do. In other words, 2.5°C of warming may lead inexorably to 3°C, 4°C, 5°C, and even 6°C as rainforests dry out and burn, Arctic ice disappears allowing the Arctic ocean to absorb far more heat, and the tundras of northern Russia and Canada thaw out, releasing millions of tonnes of greenhouse gases.

The humanitarian and security implications of the impacts of climate change such as protracted droughts, sea-level rise and water shortages constitute perhaps the largest 'hidden cost' of allowing climate change to run its course. The IPCC has indicated that if we continue on our current path, around one billion people in Asia are likely to be suffering water shortages by the 2050s as the river systems previously fed by Himalayan glaciers decline and rainfall decreases in some areas.¹² There are enormous humanitarian and security

implications of widespread water shortages across Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Northern India and Western China and the costs are likely to be enormous. Economic analyses of the ‘costs’ of mitigation which neglect the costs of failing to mitigate climate change may be worse than useless, since they give the grossly misleading impression that substantial and urgent mitigation measures are ‘expensive’ compared with delaying action or doing nothing.

Strong action now to mitigate climate change is not the ‘net cost’ it is so often made out to be in analyses which use baseline projections that assume climate change is not happening. Responding inadequately to the threat of climate change virtually guarantees that our economy will take a far larger hit in the future from the systemic consequences of climate change than the ‘costs’ of serious mitigation measures today.

Recognising the serious consequences of crossing the threshold of 2°C warming, in January 2007 the European Commission drew a line in the sand, recommending that the EU adopt policies to avoid this threshold.¹³

Emission reductions targets

The IPCC has indicated that to achieve the goal of keeping warming to between 2 to 2.4°C, the reductions in greenhouse gas emissions required from the rich countries are 25-40% below 1990 levels by 2020 and 80-95% below 1990 levels by 2050.¹⁴

We can summarise our situation in three points:

1. We are currently on a totally unsustainable path that will have horrific repercussions for both poor and rich countries if it is allowed to continue. In other words, we are facing a global emergency, the likes of which we have never before seen.
2. We need to restrict warming as much as possible, and 2°C is generally acknowledged as a threshold we should not cross.
3. Massive reductions in emissions are required to achieve this goal – including substantial absolute reductions from rich countries, and significant reductions below what their ‘business as usual’ path would have been for poor countries.

How should Australia respond to this predicament? Should we start mainly from the question ‘What can the economy cope with?’, or from the question, ‘What is needed to avoid disaster and how can we make it happen?’

Before we answer, it is worth pausing to contrast the timidity with which mitigation measures are proposed today to deal with a planetary emergency, compared with the rapid general mobilisation a previous generation undertook during the Second World War.¹⁵ To meet this challenge, we should not be thinking merely in terms of tinkering around the edges of economic policy – but rather calling for another General

Mobilisation. The economics of wartime are different from the business-as-usual economics of peacetime – better market signals are of course needed, but alone they are not enough. A General Mobilisation requires governments to take the threat seriously, to show leadership in communicating to the public and to industry what needs to be done, and to make tough decisions about how to achieve it.

What would our children and grandchildren think of our generation if we responded to this emergency by trying to ensure that we were not inconvenienced and did not have to make many sacrifices – and as a result left them a legacy of dust and ashes? Our generation faces a stark choice: to recognise and face the scale of the threat facing us and to mobilise accordingly – or to keep our heads in the sand, hoping for the best.

7 IPCC (2007a), p. 5, (2007b), p. 19.

8 Raupach et al. (2007).

9 IEA (2007), pp. 206-207.

10 IPCC (2007b), Figure SPM.2, p. 16.

11 Lenton et al. (2008).

12 IPCC, (2007b) p. 13.

13 European Commission (2007).

14 Gupta et al. (2007), Box 13.7, p. 776.

15 Walker (1944).



We need to restrict warming as much as possible, and 2°C is generally recognised as the threshold we should not cross.

Could we achieve at least 40% reductions in our emissions by 2020 under a General Mobilisation? Do we have any excuse that we could explain to our grandchildren why we should not try?

In February 2008, McKinsey & Company released *An Australian Cost Curve for Greenhouse Gas Reduction*, showing that Australia could achieve 30% reductions in its greenhouse gas emissions below 1990 levels by 2020, and 60% below 1990 levels by 2030 – without any significant lifestyle sacrifices, technological breakthroughs or massive investments in public transport.¹⁶

What would be possible if we took the climate change emergency and the dire threat it poses to the world's poor seriously and demanded a General Mobilisation? What if we did make some sacrifices? What if we did undertake massive investments in public transport? What if we invested hugely in solar, geothermal and wind generation, positioning Australian industries to ride the wave of global refitting in the 2020s and 2030s? Could we achieve at least 40% reductions in our emissions by 2020 under a General Mobilisation? Do we have any excuse that we could explain to our grandchildren why we should not try?

Reducing emissions from deforestation

Deforestation currently accounts for approximately 20% of global greenhouse gas emissions.¹⁷ This is largely being driven by external demands for timber, beef production and crops including biofuels.

Developing countries are the stewards of the world's tropical forests. About 1.4 billion people are dependent on forests to sustain their livelihoods.¹⁸ A majority of these are impoverished and marginalised communities. Past experience has shown that any successful effort to prevent deforestation and land clearing needs the support and involvement of local communities.

An essential step in curbing the market that drives destruction of our forests is for countries such as Australia to ban the importation of timber and wood products from illegal sources. The Government has promised a suite of measures to curb illegal logging but is yet to implement them.

Accreditation schemes can also be effective in combating illegal logging. For timber certification schemes to be effective they must be transparent and open to independent scrutiny. At present, the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) is the only body with a certification scheme which provides a credible chain-of-custody to track the flow of certified timber from the forest to the shelf – something which is essential to avoid the laundering of illegal timber into the supply chain. While FSC certification does not always guarantee that timber has been sustainably logged, it provides a minimum standard for timber that can be imported into Australia.

Schemes to reduce deforestation need to acknowledge the vital role that Indigenous and tribal forest communities play as custodians of the world's rainforests. The right to free, prior and informed consent is a fundamental principle in the UN Declaration of Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Failure to ensure this right risks violation of human rights and customary land rights.

Recommendations for Australia's contribution to delivering on equitable emission reductions in line with less than a 2°C temperature rise

Specifically, Australia should:

- Adopt a national framework for urgently reducing Australia's greenhouse gas emissions by at least 95% below 1990 levels by 2050, and by at least 40% by 2020, by socially equitable means;
- Ensure that domestic greenhouse gas emissions peak no later than 2010;
- Play a lead role in reducing emissions from deforestation:
 - End broad-scale land clearing in Australia
 - Increase funding for reducing deforestation in the Asia Pacific region to \$400m over 5 years, prioritising support for community-based forest management
 - Address the drivers of deforestation, including implementation of Labor's election promise to stop all illegally logged timber being sold in Australia
 - Support the Forest Stewardship Council certification as a minimum international standard
 - Ensure free, prior and informed consent with Indigenous communities as a mandatory requirement of any scheme to address deforestation, and
 - Promote and support action on global emissions to peak and fall by 2015 at the latest and be reduced by 50-80% at the very least (below 1990 levels), by 2050. Australia should support the IPCC undertaking work to identify greenhouse gas emission reductions needed to keep global temperature rise below 2°C.

¹⁶ McKinsey & Company (2007).

¹⁷ Raymond et al. (2007).

¹⁸ Consultative Group in International Agricultural Research (2006).

4. Just adaptation

“No community with a sense of justice, compassion or respect for basic human rights should accept the current pattern of adaptation¹⁹.”

- Desmond Tutu,
Archbishop Emeritus of Cape Town²⁰

Adaptation is the term used for the actions that are necessary for countries and communities to take to deal with the impacts of climate change.

Equitable and fair climate change adaptation policy is crucial for poor women and men and those most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. It is also a vital building block for any post 2012 international climate treaty, to be treated on a par with mitigation efforts. However, international negotiations continue to be marred by entrenched inequities in power relations, an ongoing lack of consideration for affected communities by rich developed nations, and a disregard for the principles of equity and justice.

Costs borne by those least responsible

‘The largest producers of greenhouse gases must bear responsibility for the damage being caused ... in particular to the vulnerable countries whose sustainability and very existence are increasingly threatened by their actions.’

- Prime Minister Stephenson King of Saint Lucia, 2007²¹

In 2007, damages from severe flooding alone in Northern Fiji cost FJ\$10m (\$7.1m)²². In Tuvalu king tides destroyed many homes and contaminated food supplies²³. In the 2004-5 cyclone season the Cook Islands incurred millions of dollars of damage from five cyclones in one single month, heavily affecting its economy and infrastructure²⁴.

Around the world the costs of adapting to climate change in developing countries are likely to be in the tens of billions of dollars per year, and the cost of this is disproportionately borne by countries not causing the problem²⁵. Australia’s fair share of this amount is US\$1.5bn (\$1.7bn) per year. The costs to vulnerable developing economies are not only unaffordable; they are also a setback to achieving sustainable development and the Millennium Development Goals.

Rich countries have been harming others in the developing world for many decades with unabated greenhouse gas pollution. We know that the impacts are already putting lives and livelihoods of poor women and men in developing countries at risk – across Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Pacific. Worse still, even if global emissions are cut rapidly starting today, the impacts of climate change will worsen until at least 2030, due to the levels of greenhouse gases (GHG) already in the atmosphere, forcing people to adapt. For those already being affected, the need for finance to support adaptation is urgent.

Current funding woeful

To date, international funding efforts have been woeful. In 2007, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) issued its direst warnings to date of the impacts of climate change on vulnerable developing countries. In the same year, the rich and high-polluting countries increased their contribution to the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) for urgent adaptation needs by a mere US\$43m (\$48m) bringing the total amount pledged to a mere US\$163m (\$181m).²⁶

Since September 2007, the rich and high-polluting countries have increased their contributions to the Least Developed Countries Fund by only US\$9.54m (\$10.6m) bringing the total pledged to US\$172.84m (\$192m)²⁷. Only US\$91.84m (\$102m) has actually been delivered to the LDCF.²⁸ Oxfam's estimate for urgent adaptation needs which should come from this fund is at least US\$2 billion (\$2.2bn) leaving a yawning gap between what's needed and what has been delivered.²⁹

Under the Kyoto Protocol (KP), the key opportunity for adaptation financing is the Adaptation Fund (AF). It has the capacity to offer the best sources of reliable funding for developing country adaptation. However, in its current state, it will never be able to provide the level of funding required because revenue raised is limited to one mechanism – a 2% levy applied to the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). The total funding this is expected to raise by 2012 is only US\$100-500m (\$110-550m). The global costs for adaptation in developing countries are estimated to be in the tens of billions of dollars per annum.³⁰ Given the paucity in financing available, and the need for developing countries to access billions more, there is much debate about how additional funding should be raised and disbursed.

Principles for international policy on adaptation financing

Article 4.4 of the UNFCCC commits rich countries to, 'assist the developing country Parties that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change in meeting the costs of adaptation to those adverse effects'.³¹ In this statement it places the responsibility for action on adaptation squarely on the shoulders of rich developed nations. When putting forward or considering any new proposals for adaptation financing, the Australian Government should see this article as central. Make Poverty History adds to this the need for all policy to be fair, adequate and reliable, as well as sustainable for the world's poor:

1. All multilateral financing for climate adaptation to be managed under the UNFCCC.

This is because funds under the UNFCCC have the best structure and governance to:

- prioritise the most vulnerable countries and communities;
- ensure developing country ownership;
- ensure effective and accountable delivery;
- ensure funds will be managed according to principles agreed by all countries, as part of building developing country ownership and international trust.



Even if global emissions are cut rapidly starting today, the impacts of climate change will worsen until at least 2030. For those already being affected, the need for finance to support adaptation is urgent. Photo: Shafiqul Alam/Oxfam

19 Adaptation is the term used for the actions that are necessary for countries and communities to take to deal with the impacts of climate change.

20 UNDP (2007).

21 Prime Minister Stephenson King (2007).

22 Naicker (2007).

23 Ibid.

24 Ibid.

25 Various estimates for the global costs of adaptation in developing countries include; Oxfam- at least US\$50bn per annum, UNDP- US\$86 billion annually by 2015.

26 These figures are sourced from the Global Environment Facility, as of September 2007.

27 These figures are sourced from the Global Environment Facility, as of May 2008.

28 Ibid. Australia's contribution to the LDCF is US\$6.6m.

29 This figure is based on a scaling up of all existing NAPAs (of which there are 31 as of June 2008) to all 49 LDCs.

30 Harmeling & Bals (2008); Oxfam (2007a).

31 UNFCCC (1992).



Tarawa, Kiribati: Families use coral rocks to break the swell during king tides and protect their homes. With the impacts of climate change increasing, this is only a temporary measure.
© Jocelyn Carlin/Panos

2. All financing for adaptation to be underpinned by the ‘polluter pays’ principle. This states that all contributions should be based on a country’s historical responsibility for greenhouse gas pollution, and the capacity of that country to pay for adaptation;³²

3. Financing to be raised through new binding funding mechanisms to guarantee adequate funds for adaptation. Current funding for adaptation misses the mark spectacularly. Of the US\$1.5bn (\$1.7bn) that is required on an annual basis from Australia, only a fraction has been committed, and the majority of this has been through Official Development Assistance (ODA);

4. Financing to be unconditional. Financing to be given as grants not loans, and to be additional to overseas development aid to ensure that we meet existing Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) without diverting already committed funding;³³

5. Financing to reach the most vulnerable. The greatest need for financial and technical support is in the poorest and most vulnerable communities. It is crucial that any funding allocated reduces climate change vulnerability.

Australia, like other rich nations has a responsibility to act. We can demonstrate leadership and fulfil our obligations to poor women and men in vulnerable communities so they can plan and adapt to the unavoidable impacts effectively and in a timely manner.

Raising and disbursing funds

The Australian Government should raise funds for adaptation using the ‘polluter pays’ principle, provided it’s in line with its responsibility for emissions and financial capability. The proposed national Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) is a significant mechanism whereby the Government can raise funds at the level needed, as revenues from auctioning can be significant. Make Poverty History believes that, as far as possible, all permits should be auctioned to create a real incentive for companies to invest in emission reductions at the installation level. Revenue from the sale of the permits should be used to:

1. Reduce Australia’s own greenhouse gas emissions;
2. Assist low-income people in Australia with the resulting increased costs, and
3. Fund Australia’s fair share of assisting developing countries to address climate change.

Equal priority should be given to achieving these three objectives. This includes assisting developing countries with reducing their emissions and adapting to the unavoidable impacts of climate change. ETS revenues should be used to contribute to the UN Adaptation Fund because it is best placed to fulfil the principles set out above.

Revenues earmarked for developing countries from Australia's ETS should not be used for investments in Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) projects, as these projects happen primarily with a view to achieving reduction targets of developed countries. The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) is one of the carbon reduction strategies developed under the Kyoto Protocol. It enables developed countries to pay for emission reductions in developing countries rather than domestically, in order to meet their emission reduction commitments, which makes it cheaper for developed nations to do so. CDM projects include methane extraction from landfills, gas capture, hydro-electric dams, afforestation and reforestation, and energy projects.

In disbursing funds and addressing global adaptation needs, the Australian Government should use the following areas as a guide. This includes:

- engaging with business to a) raise awareness on the intersection of business and community risk due to climate change; b) develop products and services which build resilience in poor countries and c) support adaptation financing policies;

- providing expertise to developing country governments in developing high-quality national adaptation programs of action (NAPAs);
- recognising that adaptation strategies are location specific, and will be aided by working closely with affected communities – seeking their input and knowledge of effective adaptation strategies;
- reducing barriers to relevant information and technology;
- targeting investment in local capacity to manage the economic, public health and other consequences of climate change;
- expanding existing disaster preparedness measures, including both partner country systems and Australian response capability, and
- developing new livelihoods programs targeting resilience in the agricultural sector and alternative livelihoods for small producers whose farming becomes untenable.

Recommendations for Just Adaptation

Australia has a responsibility to assist developing countries to adapt to climate change. It can do this by:

- Publicly committing within international negotiations to the following principles:
 - All multilateral financing for climate adaptation to be managed under the UNFCCC;
 - All financing for adaptation to be underpinned by the 'polluter pays' principle;
 - Financing to be raised through new binding funding mechanisms to guarantee adequate funds for adaptation;
 - Financing to be unconditional, and
 - Financing to reach the most vulnerable.
- Publicly committing to work towards paying its fair share of adaptation financing, including equitable distribution which is at least \$300m in 2008/9, scaling up to \$1.7bn per annum by 2015;
- Using revenue from the ETS to finance mitigation within Australia, as well as adaptation and mitigation in developing countries;
- Addressing global adaptation needs comprehensively, including:
 - reduced barriers to relevant information and technology;
 - targeted investment in local capacity to manage the economic, public health and other consequences of climate change;
 - expansion of existing disaster preparedness measures, including both partner country systems and Australian response capability, and
 - new livelihoods programs targeting resilience in the agricultural sector and alternative livelihoods for small producers whose farming becomes untenable.

32 Oxfam International (2007);
Bauer et al (2007); Tearfund (2007).
33 Oxfam International (2007);
Make Poverty History (2008).

5. Technology Transfer to Developing Countries to address Climate Change

“The extent to which developing country Parties will effectively implement their commitments under the Convention will depend on the effective implementation by developed country Parties of their commitments related to financial resources and transfer of technology and will take fully into account that economic and social development and poverty eradication are the first and overriding priorities of the developing country Parties.”



The need for technology transfer was emphasised in 1992 in Agenda 21 and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. The International Energy Agency (IEA) has estimated that US \$16,000 billion in new investments in global energy supply infrastructure alone is required between 2001 and 2030. Photo: Amin/Oxfam

The IPCC defines the term technology transfer as a broad set of processes covering the flows of know-how, experience and equipment for mitigating and adapting to climate change amongst different stakeholders such as governments, private sector entities, financial institutions, NGOs and research/ education institutions.

The need for technology transfer was emphasised in 1992 in Agenda 21 and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change Articles 4.3, 4.5 and 4.7. Article 4.5 states that developed country Parties and other developed parties included in Annex II shall:

“...take all practicable steps to promote, facilitate and finance, as appropriate, the transfer of, or access to, environmentally sound technologies and know-how to other parties, particularly developing country Parties, to enable them to implement the provisions of the Convention.”

Article 4.7 states:

“The extent to which developing country Parties will effectively implement their commitments under the Convention will depend on the effective implementation by developed country Parties of their commitments under the Convention related to financial resources and transfer of technology and will take fully into account that economic and social development and poverty eradication are the first and overriding priorities of the developing country Parties.”

Transfer of environmentally sound technology is crucial for keeping global warming below 2°C, reducing developing countries' vulnerability to climate change and assisting them to adapt.

Developing Countries' need for Technology Transfer

The International Energy Agency (IEA) has estimated that US \$16,000 billion (\$18,000bn) in new investments in the global energy supply infrastructure alone would be required between 2001 and 2030. Almost 60% of these investments would occur in developing countries and economies in transition which continue to face considerable challenges in attracting private sector funding.

Developing countries need to “leapfrog” a technological generation or two if greenhouse gas concentrations are to be stabilised. They must avoid, as far as possible, the trap of reliance on fossil fuels and move directly to environmentally sound technology. Those developing countries with limited research capacity of their own are more likely to rely on technology transfer.

Technologies for adaptation must be specific to local contexts and appropriate for communities. Many of the technologies need to go beyond traditional ‘hard’ technologies such as infrastructure development and include ‘soft’ technologies such as knowledge, know-how and organisational capacity.

There is also a need to assist governments in being able to monitor their own industries and know who is undertaking what activity with what levels of greenhouse gas emissions. If a government does not know what its industries are doing, then it is very hard for it to assist or pressure those industries to adopt cleaner technologies.

One of the key issues forming a barrier to technology transfer is a lack of financial capacity by some developing countries to be able to buy technologies they need, combined with the desire of those who have the technology to make a profit from it.

Mechanisms for Technology Transfer

Carbon markets and prices have been shown to help drive the adoption of lower carbon technology and can assist in the transfer of technology if designed and implemented appropriately. It must be recognised that markets on their own will not be sufficient to facilitate all the technology transfer that is needed.

Many developed country governments, including Australia, prefer to leave funding for technology transfer up to the market. In contrast, many developing countries would prefer the governments of developed countries to play a more active role in facilitating technology transfer.

Often developed countries, including Australia, see any funding they provide for technology transfer to developing countries as an expense that should come out of existing overseas aid budgets. This has the potential to reduce the amount spent on measures to address poverty reduction and fails to address Australia's obligations under the UNFCCC. Developed nations have a clear responsibility to ensure that technological assistance for climate change mitigation and adaptation is based on *transparent additional* financing, so that it can be integrated with, rather than detracting from, other programs for development and poverty alleviation.

The complexity in dealing with technology transfer also comes from the interplay involving both governments and private companies. Developed countries have tended to argue that the technology is in the hands of private companies and they are not in a position to force private companies to share the technology and certainly not to share it for free.

Further, the recipients of technology transfer may need to be companies

in developing countries, which are private entities in themselves rather than state run enterprises.

Australia's Actions so far

The Australian Government has viewed technology transfer largely as something to leave to the private market – if developing countries need certain technologies to deal with climate change they need to be able to pay for them. The Australian Government has seen a role for itself in public-private sector partnerships to develop new technologies and to assist in the funding of demonstration projects.

There have been some small-scale technology transfer projects through the aid budget, such as installation of solar panels in the Pacific, and the Australian Government has assisted China in developing renewable energy laws.

Australia has supported the use of multilateral funding to help developing countries to be able to put together project proposals for their technology needs to deal with climate change.

The Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate (AP6 or APP) is a technology transfer program. It involves Australia, Canada, China, India, Japan, the Republic of Korea and the US with the stated aim of addressing the challenges of climate change, energy security and air pollution in a way that encourages economic development and reduces poverty. APP is focused on the development and deployment of cleaner, more efficient technologies and involves technology sharing. Australia committed to funding of \$100 million over five years, with \$60 million committed so far to 44 projects. Some of these projects are directed to continuing the use of fossil fuels, but at lower emissions intensities (i.e. emissions per unit of energy produced). There is clearly a great need for Australia to do more to advance technology transfer.

Recommendations for Technology Transfer to Developing Countries to address Climate Change

The Australian Government should play a leading role in the sharing of technology to reduce emissions, assist developing countries to adapt to the unavoidable impacts of climate change, and allow for development to support rapid poverty reduction while minimising emissions. Specifically, Australia should:

- Support international mechanisms to ensure that developing countries gain access to technologies that they need, both to avoid emissions and to cope with the impacts of climate change;
- Ensure adequate technical and financial assistance to developing countries to access clean technologies for the efficient use and generation of energy from renewable sources;
- Develop industry-wide programs to implement clean technologies and phase out high emission and energy inefficient technologies. This could include assisting developing countries with the formulation of appropriate legislation and regulation that sets standards on emission reductions and compels those foreign companies undertaking business in the developing country to meet certain standards, and
- Take concrete and ambitious measures to increase technology cooperation between developed and developing countries in the fields of research, development and deployment of low-carbon technologies.

6. ‘Climate Change Refugees’

As the one of the largest per capita greenhouse gas polluters in the world, Australia must develop and implement policies that accept our responsibility for ‘climate change refugees’.

Pacific Island nations are increasingly vulnerable to extreme weather events, collapsing ecosystems and the contamination of their fresh water and crops with salt water.³⁴ The entire nation of Tuvalu faces the prospect of total inundation by rising sea levels, as do islands in Vanuatu, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia and islands of Papua New Guinea.

Since 2000, two villages in the Pacific Island nation of Kiribati have been evacuated,³⁵ while the people of the Carteret Islands are now preparing to permanently relocate to Bougainville. These climate change refugees are the first of what will be large movements of people within our region due to the effects of climate change. While it is difficult to ascertain to what degree climate change has caused sea-level rise experienced to date, it is undoubtedly a significant contributing factor. Furthermore, the fact that impacts are being felt now highlights the vulnerability of people living in low-lying areas to rising sea levels caused by climate change.

As one of the largest per capita greenhouse gas polluters in the world, Australia must develop and implement policies that accept our responsibility for ‘climate change refugees’.

Australia’s role in addressing ‘Climate Change Refugees’

Australia should develop and implement all of the policies relating to climate change in the Pacific as outlined in Labor’s 2007 National Platform.³⁶ In relation to ‘climate change refugees’, these policies were:

- Assistance with intra-country evacuations when citizens have to be moved from low-lying areas to higher ground;
- Establishing an international coalition to accept ‘climate change refugees’ when a country becomes uninhabitable because of rising sea levels, damage to coastal infrastructure or reduced food security and water supplies;
- Assistance to preserve the cultural heritage of those who are evacuated, and
- Training to assist citizens of countries that have to be fully evacuated.

In addition, Australia should:

- Establish an immigration program with a quota for ‘climate change refugees’ which is additional to our current humanitarian quota, and
- Undertake a high-profile educational program to educate the Australian public about ‘climate change refugees’, why they need to move and what our responsibilities to them are.

Assistance with intra-country evacuations

For Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS), relocation of displaced communities will place an enormous burden on governments if they are not provided with financial assistance. The cost of relocating and resettling approximately 3,000 people from the Carteret islands in Papua New Guinea to Bougainville will be approximately \$5.6 million over seven years. Tulele Peisa NGO, a non-government organisation based in Bougainville, is facilitating the relocations.

A large range of considerations will need to be taken into account when communities are relocated including: environmental suitability; land tenure and legal issues; social and economic suitability; proximity to water, good agricultural land and transport, and whether the community will remain together at the new site(s).³⁷ Particular consideration will need to be given to culturally distinct groups of people who are displaced from their homes. It is also important that relocated communities be involved in decision-making processes and that there is appropriate consultation with recipient communities. Ongoing resourcing will need to be provided in many instances beyond the initial relocation phase.

As with other forms of adaptation and mitigation in developing countries, funding for relocation must be provided according to historical responsibility for emissions and capacity of countries to pay. Australia's historical emissions are far higher than those of most nations in our region. The Australian Government should therefore provide funding for relocation and disaster relief related to climate change and take responsibility for funding culturally sensitive relocation for other people affected by rising seas in our region.

An Australian immigration program for 'Climate Change Refugees'

Australia must start now to develop immigration policies which will be prepared for the eventuality of people displaced from their nations due to climate change, before it is an emergency situation. This will need to be done in consultation with the governments of Pacific Island nations like Tuvalu and Kiribati to ensure that Australia can meet the needs of their populations. It is also essential that a quota for 'climate change refugees' is additional to existing quotas in Australia's current humanitarian program.

International Protection for 'Climate Change Refugees'

Labor's Our Drowning Neighbours policy discussion paper³⁶ states that: 'Australia should help to develop a coalition of Pacific Rim countries willing to accept climate change refugees', and that 'Australia should be working at the UN to ensure appropriate recognition of climate change refugees in existing conventions, or through the establishment of a new convention on climate change refugees'.



As one of the largest per capita greenhouse gas polluters in the world, Australia must develop and implement policies which accept our responsibility for climate displaced persons. Photo: Abbie Traylor-Smith/Oxfam

³⁴ Friends of the Earth Australia (2007).

³⁵ Reuters (2007).

³⁶ Australian Labor Party (2007).

³⁷ Campbell, Goldsmith and Koshy (2005).

³⁸ Sercombe and Albanese (2006).

In the short term, Australia should work with other nations in the Pacific region to establish a coalition of nations to accept 'climate change refugees' from nations which become uninhabitable due to the impacts of climate change. On current projections, Tuvalu is likely to be the first country that is fully evacuated due to climate change, but ultimately Kiribati, the Marshall Islands and others may also have to confront this scenario.

In the long-term, protection for 'climate change refugees' needs to be included in international law. One option would be to expand the definition of refugee currently enshrined in the 1951 *United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees*. However, there are potential problems with this approach: such a development could result in a dilution of the current definition of refugee, and possibly reduce the level of protection afforded to political refugees, strain the already limited resources of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and leave many 'climate change refugees' who are internally displaced, unprotected.

An alternative, proposed by Biermann and Boas in 2007, is a new legal instrument and funding mechanism under the UNFCCC specifically for the protection, compensation and resettlement of 'climate change refugees'.³⁹ This proposal does not take into account other (non-climate) 'environmental refugees' and would include 'climate change refugees' who are displaced both internally and externally.

Recommendations to address 'Climate Change Refugees'

The Australian Government should assist in the development of regional and national responses to assist 'climate change refugees'.

Specifically, Australia should:

- Adhere to the following policies as part of the development and implementation of the Pacific Climate Change Strategy:
 - Training to assist citizens of countries that have to be fully evacuated.
 - Establishment of an international coalition to accept 'climate change refugees' when a country becomes uninhabitable because of rising sea levels, damage to coastal infrastructure or reduced food security and water supplies.
 - Assistance to preserve the cultural heritage of those who are evacuated.
 - Establishment of a Pacific Climate Change Alliance to add greater momentum to global efforts to deal with climate change;
- Establish an immigration program with a quota for 'climate change refugees' which is additional to our current humanitarian quota;
- Undertake a high-profile educational program to educate the Australian public about 'climate change refugees' to ensure that the public has an understanding of why they need to move and of Australia's responsibility to respond due to our historical emissions, and
- Advocate for a new legal instrument and funding mechanism under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change specifically for the protection, compensation and resettlement of 'climate change refugees'.

39 Biermann and Boas (2007).

40 Garnaut (2008).

41 Ibid.

42 Ibid.

43 Ibid.

44 For the Least Developed Countries, the expectation would only be to put in place a carbon penalty on large emissions-intensive export industries.

45 Garnaut (2008).

46 Ibid.

47 Ibid.

7. Response to the Garnaut Review's Draft Report on climate change

So, how does the Garnaut Draft Report, released on 4 July, measure up to the Make Poverty History recommendations?

Australian leadership in the international negotiations

The Draft Report is perhaps the most comprehensive Australian review outlining how a future international climate agreement might work. It contains some important points and innovative ideas but ignores many important factors, not least the need for equity to be enshrined in a future climate agreement, both for reasons of fairness and to ensure developing countries have a prominent role in decision-making.

Garnaut acknowledges three important points:

- Australia has a larger interest in a strong mitigation outcome than other developed countries, due to our vulnerability to climate change. It is therefore in our interest to lead from the front for the best agreement;⁴⁰
- Developed countries must show leadership and good faith by accepting binding reductions immediately and unconditionally,⁴¹ and
- We need to build on the current Kyoto Protocol structure, making it stronger.⁴²

Garnaut identifies the US and Canada as countries not currently meeting their moral or legal obligations, by failing to act in good faith on climate change. The report calls on the US to show that it is serious about climate change and, amongst other things, adopt a 'credible long-term target'.⁴³

Garnaut acknowledges that developed and developing countries have different circumstances, and should take different action. He acknowledges that Least Developed Countries should have very minor mitigation obligations,⁴⁴ although MPH would argue they should have none.

MPH looks forward to Garnaut's recommendations for emission reduction targets for rich developed countries. We urge Professor Garnaut to put forward a target of at least at the top end of 25-40% by 2020 (compared to 1990 levels) for all rich developed countries, and that Australia should set an example by unilaterally agreeing to a target of 40% by 2020 (on 1990 levels), challenging other wealthy developed countries to follow suit.

Unfortunately, Garnaut calls for China to be singled out as a special case 'because of its size, geopolitical importance and emergence as the world's largest emitter'.⁴⁵ It is not appropriate to single out one country, and this will have a negative effect on the international negotiations. Countries should be categorised on objective grounds, using equity as a guide.

Garnaut calls on most developing countries to take on 'one-sided targets' up until 2020, and binding targets after that.⁴⁶ The report does not make emission reductions by developing countries contingent upon funding, technology transfer and capacity building from developed countries.⁴⁷ This places too much burden on developing countries, which should be focusing on bringing their population out of poverty; they can ill afford to pay for climate change mitigation. It also lets rich developed nations, largely responsible for climate change, off the hook.



Professor Garnaut in releasing the Draft Report calls climate change a 'diabolical policy problem'. Photo: Lara McKinley/OxfamAUS

Garnaut acknowledges the need for an international technology fund, with a mandatory funding mechanism, primarily funded by developed countries.⁴⁸ However, he states that some, if not all, could be spent domestically rather than providing assistance to developing countries to follow a low carbon pathway.⁴⁹ Given technology transfer is an essential part of the post-2012 climate agreement, a mandatory mechanism is required to ensure this occurs.

Garnaut suggests an *International Adaptation Assistance Commitment*, but does not specify that contributions should be mandatory from wealthy developed countries.⁵⁰ Without mandatory contributions, there is little chance of the volume of funding required for adaptation being raised. Garnaut also makes access to these adaptation funds conditional upon taking mitigation action, which would be a backwards step. Access to the funds should be non-conditional, and determined by developing countries.

Overall, whilst the Garnaut Draft Report has some innovative ideas, and acknowledges that developed countries must take the lead, it places too much emphasis on developing countries taking action, and does not require sufficient support from developed countries for that action to be realised.

Delivery of equitable emission reductions in line with less than a 2°C temperature rise

The Draft Report does not make firm recommendations for targets, leaving those recommendations for the final report to be released at the end of September. But numerous statements in the draft report make it clear that very strong emission reduction targets will be necessary to retain the chance of avoiding dangerous climate change, and that these should be implemented without delay.

Garnaut states: 'The most inappropriate response would be to delude ourselves, taking small actions that create an appearance of action, but which do not solve the problem'.⁵¹ The report makes clear that delaying action in the short term will eliminate attractive lower-cost options in the longer term and that to delay is to deliberately choose to avoid effective steps to reduce the risks of climate change to acceptable levels.⁵²

The report goes on to say that Australia's prosperity 'gives us the resources to join other developed countries in sharing the global leadership responsibility for mitigation and adaptation'.⁵³

As the Report states, the current negotiations over mitigation targets are our 'last chance to get this difficult policy problem right'.⁵⁴ The stakes could not be higher. MPH hopes that the final report will frame its approach to mitigation targets by

asking 'How best can we achieve what needs to be done to prevent dangerous climate change?', not simply 'What can we afford that's not too inconvenient?'

The Report concedes that, 'Growth in emissions is expected to have a severe and costly impact on agriculture, infrastructure, biodiversity and ecosystems in Australia'.⁵⁵ But the growing threat of these 'low probability but high damage outcomes', including potentially interlocking crises due to rising food prices, increasing water scarcity, and population displacement due to droughts, floods and sea-level rises, may well lead to political destabilisation and armed conflicts in vulnerable regions.⁵⁶ The humanitarian and economic costs of such conflicts may be enormous, and these costs are not captured by the projections of economic models.

Strong mitigation targets are essential to preserve any hope we have of preventing dangerous climate change and economic costs on a scale that may significantly exceed model estimates. MPH looks forward to the Garnaut Review, and the Government, declaring that Australia will take a target of at least 40% by 2020 (on 1990 levels) in order to do its fair share of the global emissions reduction effort.

In the area of reducing emissions from deforestation, Garnaut acknowledges the importance of reducing emissions from deforestation as a low-cost global mitigation action.

The report acknowledges that measuring forestry-related emissions is difficult and complex, and incentives within the current international regime are limited. In light of this, Australia has an opportunity to kick-start action on reducing emissions through further developing bilateral relationships with Papua New Guinea and Indonesia in tackling deforestation. This is an important initiative as long as it doesn't detract from Australia taking the necessary steps in adjusting to a low-carbon economy.

The Report also acknowledges the role that illegal logging and poor governance plays in driving deforestation and the need for a comprehensive approach in tackling this. This is another opportunity for Australia to take the lead – in the Government following up on its election promise to stop the importation of illegal logged timber into Australia.

Just Adaptation

Chapter 13 of the Draft Report contains specific information on how Australia and the world can assist developing countries adapt to climate change. However, only two and a half pages of the 548 page report are dedicated to this important issue, with more detail promised when the Final Report is released at the end of September. MPH urges Professor Garnaut to provide much greater information and detail on adaptation in developing countries, which for poor women and men living in extreme poverty is a matter of life and death.

Despite the brevity of information on adaptation for developing countries the Draft Report does outline some key principles for adaptation. Firstly, it puts forward a proposal for an *International Adaptation Assistance Commitment (IAAC)* to provide new adaptation assistance to developing countries that is additional to existing aid programs.⁵⁷ This is positive because it explicitly identifies the need for new and additional financing for adaptation, on top of existing aid commitments. What is less positive, however, is that this funding is to be tied to developing countries' mitigation efforts. This is disappointing given that MPH believes that all financing for adaptation to developing countries should be unconditional, especially since the damage caused to date has been largely caused by rich developed nations. The *IAAC*, as currently proposed, does not call for binding commitments for adaptation financing, which is what is needed to ensure that developing countries can plan and prepare for the unavoidable impacts of climate change.⁵⁸

The report gives clear support for existing UNFCCC architecture to manage and distribute these funds seeing 'no need for a new adaptation architecture'.⁵⁹ This is important because it gives a strong message to recalcitrant countries such as the US, Canada and Japan, which are trying to undermine the UNFCCC by supporting processes outside of the UN that are unnecessary and waste valuable time.⁶⁰

Garnaut supports the importance of local knowledge as the starting point for adaptation efforts, giving priority to collaborative research on climate change impacts and adaptation strategies.⁶¹ MPH is in support of this call but would like to see this expanded in the Final Report to include more detail on planning and implementation processes to ensure sufficient and balanced representation from developing countries and their affected communities in decision-making.

Garnaut states in the report that Australia's international adaptation response should be concentrated in our region, focusing on climate change impacts, strategic planning and vulnerability assessment, as well as financing for the implementation of priority adaptation measures. MPH supports this focus but urges Professor Garnaut to also include other impacted regions including Asia and Africa, which are already in desperate need of assistance and where large populations of affected people are, and will be, affected.

In terms of the costs of adaptation in developing countries, the report uses the World Bank figure of US\$10-40bn per annum as a guide for the total costs. This figure is too low given that others such as Oxfam and the UNDP have quoted figures in excess of a least \$50bn per annum. The report also fails to put forward a suitable figure for Australia's contribution to this overall cost, which MPH has calculated to be in the order of \$1.7bn per annum by 2015. Even more concerning is the lack of

48 Garnaut (2008)

49 Ibid.

50 Ibid.

51 Ibid.

52 Ibid.

53 Ibid.

54 Ibid.

55 Ibid.

56 Ibid.

57 Ibid.

58 Ibid.

discussion the role of the Emissions Trading Scheme could take in providing some of this financing. Given the level of financing required and the paucity currently available, the ETS could provide a significant slice of the funds required to finance adaptation in developing countries. The ETS should go beyond funding to reduce Australia's own greenhouse gas emissions, and assist low-income people in Australia with the resulting increased costs; it should also fund Australia's fair share of assisting developing countries to address climate change.

Technology transfers to developing countries to address climate change

Garnaut's Draft Report correctly states that the unquantified assurances for technology transfer to developing countries under the UNFCCC and Kyoto Protocol have not been translated into action. He states: 'Some technology transfer has occurred under the Kyoto Protocol's Clean Development Mechanism, but nothing on the scale required to underpin broad-based mitigation [emission reductions] in developing countries'.⁶² The report goes on to state that under the UNFCCC, on average less than US\$1 billion (\$1.1bn) a year was allocated to climate change projects between 1991 and 2004.

Garnaut notes that there have been more recent statements and commitments to fund technology transfer of low-emission technologies to developing countries. It is noted that many of these are in need of additional funding. The report adds that Australian governments have started investing in research and development on carbon capture

and storage from the burning of fossil fuels, and to a lesser extent in research on renewables.

The report states that spending on research and development of low-emission technologies to stabilise greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at 550 parts per million (well above the concentrations that limit average temperature increase to 2°C) is between US\$30 – 100 billion a year (\$33 – 110 billion). This does not include the finance needed to transfer such technology to developing countries.

In a very welcome proposal, the Garnaut Draft Report recommends that technology transfer to assist developing countries in addressing climate change be funded as part of an *International Low Emissions Technology Commitment* (ILETC). This would require high-income countries to allocate a small proportion of GDP per capita above a threshold to the ILETC. The report sees the fund being globally in the order of US\$100 billion (\$110bn) and a country like Australia would be expected to pay in around 0.26% of GDP to the fund (which would have been \$2.8 billion in 2007). The proposal is equitable as it sees countries needing to contribute based on their wealth. However, the proposal allows for funds to be spent both domestically and in developing countries and at this stage lacks detail as to how it would ensure that adequate funding is allocated to enable technology transfer to developing countries.

59 Garnaut (2008).

60 Ibid.

61 Ibid.

62 Ibid.

63 Ibid.

64 Ibid.

65 Ibid.

66 Ibid.

‘Climate change refugees’

In the report’s sections on ‘sea level rise’ and ‘climate refugees’ Garnaut acknowledges that global warming will cause substantial displacement of people, particularly in the Asia-Pacific.⁶³

While the report fails to give sufficient weight to the possibility of very large sea level rises beyond one metre this century, it does conclude that even ‘small rises in mean sea level, when associated with storm surges and major coastal populations, can be devastating’.⁶⁴

The report’s focus on the Pacific is welcome, with recognition that the low-lying atoll countries of Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Tokelau and Tuvalu are ‘highly vulnerable to sea-level rise’ and that ‘ultimately human habitation may not be possible on these islands even with moderate climate change’.⁶⁵

Most significantly, Garnaut reinforces the expectation that Australia and New Zealand have the prime responsibility to assist the ‘climate refugees’ of the Pacific with the ‘international community and the islanders’ expecting them to be ‘the main countries of resettlement’.⁶⁶

Importantly, Garnaut examines the impact of climate change on Papua New Guinea and other Pacific islands as well as Asia. Disappointingly however, the report does not provide a comprehensive review of the scale of the problem. The report also fails to articulate what further action Australia could take beyond the acknowledgement of our responsibility to the people of the Pacific.

Scorecard: How did Garnaut do?

The Issues	Garnaut’s score	Explanation
Australian leadership	***	Whilst the Draft Report has some innovative ideas, and acknowledges that developed countries must take the lead, it places too much emphasis on developing country action, and does not require sufficient support from developed countries for that action to be realised.
Equitable emission reductions	***	The Draft Report does not make firm recommendations for targets, leaving those recommendations for the final report to be released at the end of September. But numerous statements in the draft report make it clear that Garnaut takes seriously the need for very strong emission reduction targets in order to retain the chance of avoiding dangerous climate change.
Just adaptation	**	The Draft Report covers adaptation in developing countries only briefly; clearly more work needs to be done. However, proposals for additional finance and support for existing UNFCCC processes for adaptation are welcome.
Technology transfer	****	Garnaut has acknowledged the urgent need for technology transfer to developing countries and has recommended that wealthy countries need to fund this transfer based on their wealth. However, Garnaut leaves open the possibility that wealthy countries might spend the allocated funds domestically only.
‘Climate change refugees’	***	The Draft Report acknowledges the importance of ‘climate change refugees’ and the need for Australian resettlement from the Pacific. However it lacks a comprehensive review of the enormous scale of displacement and more detailed proposals for action to assist ‘climate change refugees’.

* Missing in action ** Needs more work *** Middle of the road **** Getting there ***** Make Poverty History!

8. Summary of Recommendations

Recommendations for Australian Leadership in International Negotiations

Specifically, Australia should:

- Demonstrate leadership in international negotiations by allying its positions more closely with those developing countries who are set to suffer first and worst;
- Commit to do its fair share of mitigation and encourage other developed countries to commit to mitigation targets so that the combined efforts of developed countries will reduce their collective emissions by at least the upper end of the 25-40% range by 2020 based on 1990 emission levels;
- Use its influence with recalcitrant countries such as the US, Canada and Japan to change their positions and become more pro-active in working towards a fair and equitable post 2012 agreement;
- Commit to fund a fair share of adaptation, technology transfer and mitigation efforts in developing countries. Australia should support proposals to generate the volume of funds required in these areas – which will be in the tens of billions of dollars per year globally, and
- Be clear that it does not expect developing or emerging economies like China, Mexico, Brazil or South Africa, to take absolute emission reduction targets. Rather, Australia should seek that these countries take action to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions where it is funded by rich developed countries.



Australia should show leadership in international negotiations. It can do this through allying its positions more closely with its Pacific and Asian developing-country neighbours, who are currently suffering first and hardest from climate change. Photo: Caroline Irby/Oxfam

Recommendations for Australia's contribution to delivering on equitable emission reductions in line with less than a 2°C temperature rise

Specifically, Australia should:

- Adopt a national framework for urgently reducing Australia's greenhouse gas emissions by at least 95% below 1990 levels by 2050, and by at least 40% by 2020, by socially equitable means;
- Ensure that domestic greenhouse gas emissions peak no later than 2010;
- Play a lead role in reducing emissions from deforestation:
 - End broad-scale land clearing in Australia
 - Increased funding for reducing deforestation in the Asia Pacific region to \$400m over 5 years, prioritising support for community based forest management
 - Addressing the drivers of deforestation, including implementation of Labor's election promise to stop all illegally logged timber being sold in Australia
 - Support for the Forest Stewardship Council certification as a minimum international standard.
 - Ensure free, prior and informed consent with Indigenous communities as a mandatory requirement of any scheme to address deforestation, and
- Promote and support action on global emissions to peak and fall by 2015 at the latest and be reduced by 50-80% at the very least (below 1990 levels), by 2050. Australia should support the IPCC undertaking work to identify greenhouse gas emission reductions needed to keep global temperature rise below 2°C.



Australia should deliver equitable emission reductions in line with keeping global temperature rises at or below 2°C. Photo: Shafiq Alam/Oxfam



Australia has a responsibility to assist developing countries to adapt to climate change.
Photo: Geoff Sayer/Oxfam

Recommendations for Just Adaptation

Australia has a responsibility to assist developing countries to adapt to climate change. It can do this by:

- Publicly committing within international negotiations to the following principles:
 - All multilateral financing for climate adaptation to be managed under the UNFCCC;
 - All financing for adaptation to be underpinned by the 'polluter pays' principle;
 - Financing to be raised through new binding funding mechanisms to guarantee adequate funds for adaptation;
 - Financing to be unconditional, and
 - Financing to reach the most vulnerable.
- Publicly committing to work towards paying its fair share of adaptation financing, including equitable distribution which is at least \$300m in 2008/9, scaling up to \$1.7bn per annum by 2015;
- Using revenue from the ETS to finance mitigation within Australia, as well as adaptation and mitigation in developing countries;
- Addressing global adaptation needs comprehensively, including:
 - reduced barriers to relevant information and technology;
 - targeted investment in local capacity to manage the economic, public health and other consequences of climate change;
 - expansion of existing disaster preparedness measures, including both partner country systems and Australian response capability, and
 - new livelihoods programs targeting resilience in the agricultural sector and alternative livelihoods for small producers whose farming becomes untenable.

Recommendations for Technology Transfer to Developing Countries to address Climate Change

The Australian Government should play a leading role in the sharing of technology to reduce emissions, assist developing countries to adapt to the unavoidable impacts of climate change, and allow for development to support rapid poverty reduction while minimising emissions.

Specifically, Australia should:

- Support international mechanisms to ensure that developing countries gain access to technologies that they need, both to avoid emissions and to cope with the impacts of climate change;

- Ensure adequate technical and financial assistance to developing countries to access clean technologies for the efficient use and generation of energy from renewable sources;
- Develop industry-wide programs to implement clean technologies and phase out high emission and energy inefficient technologies. This could include assisting developing countries with the formulation of appropriate legislation and regulation that sets standards on emission reductions and compels those foreign companies undertaking business in the developing country to meet certain standards, and
- Take concrete and ambitious measures to increase technology cooperation between developed and developing countries in the fields of research, development and deployment of low-carbon technologies.

Recommendations to address 'Climate Change Refugees'

The Australian Government should assist in the development of regional and national responses to assist 'climate change refugees'.

Specifically, Australia should:

- Adhere to the following policies as part of the development and implementation of the Pacific Climate Change Strategy:
 - Training to assist citizens of countries that have to be fully evacuated
 - Establishment of an international coalition to accept 'climate change refugees' when a country becomes uninhabitable because of rising sea levels, damage to coastal infrastructure or reduced food security and water supplies.
 - Assistance to preserve the cultural heritage of those who are evacuated.
 - Establishment of a Pacific Climate Change Alliance to add greater momentum to global efforts to deal with climate change;
- Establish an immigration program with a quota for 'climate change refugees' which is additional to our current humanitarian quota;
- Undertake a high-profile educational program to educate the Australian public about 'climate change refugees' to ensure that the public has an understanding of why they need to move and of Australia's responsibility to respond due to our historical emissions, and
- Advocate for a new legal instrument and funding mechanism under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change specifically for the protection, compensation and resettlement of 'climate A change refugees'.



The Australian Government should assist in the development of regional and national responses to assist 'climate change refugees'.
Photo: Abbie Trayler-Smith/Oxfam

9. Bibliography

Australian Labor Party. 2007 National Platform and Constitution, Chapter 14, Paragraphs 108 and 109.

Biermann, F., and I. Boas 2007 'Preparing for a Warmer World: Towards a Global Governance System to Protect Climate Refugees' Global Governance Working Paper no 3, Amsterdam et al.: The Global Governance Project.

Campbell, J.R., M. Goldsmith, and K., Koshy. (2005) Community Relocation as an Option for Adaptation to the Effects of Climate Change and Climate Variability in Pacific Island Countries, Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research.

Consultative Group in International Agricultural Research (2006) "Is forest management improving in the tropics?" accessed at http://www.cgiar.org/pdf/Toure-%20Forest%20Management_FINAL.pdf.

European Commission, (2007) *Limiting Global Climate Change to 2° Celsius: The way ahead for 2020 and beyond*, Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Brussels, Commission of the European Communities, 10 January, 13 pp. http://ec.europa.eu/environment/climat/future_action.htm.

Friends of the Earth Australia, (2007) A Citizens Guide to Climate Refugees <http://www.foe.org.au/resources/publications/climate-justice/CitizensGuide.pdf>.

Garnaut, R. (2008) *Draft Report for the Garnaut Climate Change Review*, Commonwealth of Australia.

Gupta, S., et al. (2007) "Policies, Instruments and Co-operative Arrangements", In *Climate Change 2007: Mitigation. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* ed. Metz, B., et al.; Cambridge University Press, Cambridge & New York, pp. 745-807.

IEA, (2007) *World Energy Outlook 2007: China and India Insights*, International Energy Agency, Paris, 663 pp.

IPCC, (2007a) "Summary for Policymakers", In *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* ed. Solomon, S. et al.; Cambridge University Press, Cambridge & New York, pp. 1-17. <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg1/ar4-wg1-spm.pdf>.

IPCC, (2007b) "Summary for Policymakers", In *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* ed. Parry, M.L., et al. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge & New York, pp. 7-22. <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg2/ar4-wg2-spm.pdf>.

IPCC, (2007c) "Summary for Policymakers", In *Climate Change 2007: Mitigation. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* ed. Metz, B., et al.; Cambridge University Press, Cambridge & New York, pp. 1-23. <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg3/ar4-wg3-spm.pdf>.

Lenton, T.M., Held, H., Kriegler, E., Hall, J.W., Lucht, W., Rahmstorf, S. and Schellnhuber, H.J., (2008) "Tipping Elements in the Earth's Climate System", *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, Vol. 105, No. 6, 12 February, pp. 1786-1793.

McKinsey & Company, (2008) "An Australian Cost Curve for Greenhouse Gas Reduction", McKinsey Australia Climate Change Initiative, February, 25 pp. http://www.mckinsey.com/client/service/ccsi/pdf/Australian_Cost_Curve_for_GHG_Reduction.pdf

Naicker, J.R. 'What to Pay for – Climate Change or Development' in *Just Change: Critical Thinking on Global Issues*. Issue 10, October 2007, p. 2.

Oxfam International (2007) 'Adapting to climate change' Oxfam Briefing Paper 104, Oxfam International.

Prime Minister Stephenson King (2007) speaking at the UNFCCC, Vienna, September 2007. Available at: <http://www.un.org/apps/news/printnews.asp?nid=24065H>

Raupach, M.R., Marland, G., Ciais, P., Le Quéré, C., Canadell, J.G., Klepper, G. and Field, C.B., (2007) "Global and Regional Drivers of Accelerating CO2 Emissions", *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, Vol. 104, No. 24, 12 June, pp. 10288-10293.

Raymond E. Gullison, Peter C. Frumhoff, Josep G. Canadell, Christopher B. Field, Daniel C. Nepstad, Katharine Hayhoe, Roni Avissar, Lisa M. Curran, Pierre Friedlingstein, Chris D. Jones, and Carlos Nobre. Tropical Forests and Climate Policy. Published online May 10 2007; 10.1126/science.1136163 (Science Express Policy Forum). Available at: <http://www.csiro.au/news/GlobalCarbonProject-Deforestation.html>

Renaud, F., J.J. Bogardi et al. Control, Adapt or Flee: How to Face Environmental Migration? In *Intersections No.5/2007*, United Nations University: Bonn.

Reuters, 'Island nations plan for rising seas, mass migration', Nov 14, 2007 [<http://uk.reuters.com/article/environmentNews/idUKSP27770920071114>]

Sercombe B. and Albanese, A. (2006) *Our Drowning Neighbours: Labor's Policy Discussion Paper on Climate Change in the Pacific*. <http://www.anthonyalbanese.com.au/file.php?file=/news/940/index.html>

Teske, S. and Vincent, J., (2008) "Energy [R]evolution: A Sustainable Australia Energy Outlook", Sydney & Brussels, Greenpeace Australia Pacific & European Renewable Energy Council, June, 47 pp. <http://www.greenpeace.org/australia/news-and-events/news/Climate-change/blueprint-energy-rev>

UNDP Human Development Report 2007. UNDP: New York.

Walker, E.R., (1944) "War-Time Economic Controls", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 58, No. 4, August, pp. 503-520.

10. Acronyms

AF	Adaptation Fund
APP	Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate
CDM	Clean development Mechanism
ETS	Emissions Trading Scheme
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
GHG	Greenhouse Gases
IEA	International Energy Agency
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
KP	Kyoto Protocol
LDCF	Least Developed Countries Fund
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MPH	Make Poverty History
NAPA	National Adaptation Program of Action
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
UNFCCC	United Nations Convention on Climate Change

© Copyright 2008

Make Poverty History is a coalition of over 60 aid agencies, community groups and religious organisations committed to more and better aid, debt relief, fairer trade, good governance, tackling climate change and honouring commitments made to the Millennium Development Goals, a global plan to halve poverty by 2015.

MAKE POVERTY HISTORY

See makepovertyhistory.com.au