



Climate Change Leadership – Power, Politics and Culture 2014

Workshop Block 3: Confronting Political Paralysis – 26th March

Purpose

- To take different conflicts of interest into account drafting and coming to a joint agreement
- Explain the connections between climate changes, conflicts, cooperations and geopolitical power relations
- Apply skills within leadership, cooperation, organization and communication specifically connected to different contemporary and future scenarios within the climate field.

Welcome to the 18th Session of the Working Group¹ on the Green Climate Fund's Allocation Protocol, focusing on Clause 4.6 of the Preliminary Action Charter.

Scenario: It is the year 2014, and the Green Climate Fund (GCF), first proposed in Copenhagen, has been established. The majority of the details have now been successfully negotiated and agreed upon, with only a few clauses left to finalize. Initial pledges into the fund have also been made, totaling USD 80 billion, which is ready for allocation when the remaining negotiations are finalized. There is, quite naturally, great pressure on negotiators to finalize the process so that allocations can be made.

One of the more contentious issues of debate remains in regard to Clause 4.6, §17.2a. This states the following:

Clause 4.6, §17.2a²

With regards to the target allocation for the GCF, the directors are required to maintain an apportionment of funding whereby a minimum of [X] % of the net annual distribution from the fund is to be spent on climate adaptation, with the remainder to be used for mitigation purposes.

It is the percentage ('X') where parties have to date, not managed to come to agreement.

Negotiating Parties: Five different groups are participating in the negotiations. These include: AOSIS (Alliance of Small Island States), G77, USA, EU, and China.

Furthermore, the Climate Action Network (CAN) has been admitted as observers to the process, and will, as usual, be awarding the 'prize' for the Fossil of the Day, as well as blogging about the negotiations.

Finally, the negotiations are moderated by the two trusted and highly respected³ Secretariats of the UNFCCC.

¹ Disclaimer: This working group may be fictional ☺

² This clause may also be fictional

³ Not to mention well-dressed



Instructions: You will be assigned roles in one of the above mentioned groups (through lottery). Your first task is to meet with your negotiating partners and discuss what strategy you will be pursuing, and what percentage you are hoping for, and/or willing to accept. Of the selected clause, the only remaining contention surrounds the actual percentage of funds going to adaptation (with the remainder going to mitigation). The Secretariats will then summon you (at a specified time) into the negotiation chamber, where you will briefly outline your proposals. You may also have the chance to respond to other groups' proposals, by raising your hand. At the conclusion of the negotiation, the CAN will outline what outcome they hope for with the adaptation funding. They will also comment on the procedure, and allocate the Fossil of the Day award.

Remember that this is a role-play exercise, where you are expected to present a proposal that is in line with what you expect the group would be advocating in reality. You might not be sure about what that 'reality' is. We therefore encourage you to search for this information if you are unsure of what your group's strategy would be.

Good Luck!
Rickard and Sanna

MAKE UP TASK FOR MISSED SEMINAR:

We are sorry that you missed out on the negotiations described above. Your version of this will be a written analysis of this exercise, as follows:

- a) Try to map out each groups standpoints on where a global 'Green Climate Fund's' focus should lie in terms of the division between mitigation and adaptation. Who benefits most from each, and why?
- b) If each group has different demands, how can they come to common ground in negotiation?
- c) Should it only be developing nations who have access to these funds?
- d) Is there a need to agree on a fixed target for division of funds between these two aspects of climate change, or should money be allocated on a case by case basis?

Please write about 2 pages for this exercise. You should spend at least three hours, preferably a little more on this exercise, so you can research, or reference other sources if you find them. You don't have to have equal focus on each of the parts above – you can focus where you see fit – however you should try to write something on each part.

Thanks,

Rickard and Sanna