



IHDP Open Meeting 2009

7th International
Science Conference on the
Human Dimensions of
Global Environmental Change

26-30 April 2009
World Conference Center Bonn
UN Campus
Bonn, Germany

The Social
Challenges of
Global Change

IHDP Secretariat | Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10 | D-53113 Bonn | P +49 (0)228 815 0600 | F +49 (0)228 815 0620
www.openmeeting2009.org | openmeeting@ihdp.unu.edu

Time: Monday 27 April, 14:00 - 15:30. Session: D290

Global Climate Governance Post 2012: Architecture, Agency and Adaptation

Location: World Conference Center Bonn, Room F

Convenors: Frank Biermann, Philipp Pattberg, Fariborz Zelli

With the end of the commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol drawing nearer, policy, academic, business and NGO communities are leading an extended debate about how global climate governance should take shape after 2012. Building on our analysis of these debates, and on our insights in the chances and barriers for future climate governance, we present and discuss a range of post-2012 strategies in this panel. We have developed these strategies in the course of the three-year European Union-funded integrated research program ADAM- "Adaptation and Mitigation Strategies: Supporting European Climate Policy". Our strategies address three research themes which we consider to be crucial and timely questions of global climate governance: 1) the social and environmental effectiveness of different types of international climate architectures (fragmented or universal); 2) the role and relevance of new types of agency beyond the state, including the role of business and NGOs in governance arrangements; and 3) the adaptation of regions and international institutions to global climate change, in light of major challenges such as climate refugees and food insecurity. The three domains chosen for research reflect the research domains identified in the Science and Implementation Plan of the Earth System Governance Project under the auspices of the IHDP. We have approached these three research themes by three main sets of methodologies: qualitative policy assessment, formal modelling, and participatory forms of assessment. The multi-disciplinary composition of our panel and the diversity of our presentations mirror this innovative approach. By analysing each theme from different methodological viewpoints, we have conducted a comprehensive appraisal that examines different criteria for policy feasibility and effectiveness.

Global Trading versus Linking. Options for International Emissions Trading Post-2012

Presenter: Christian Flachsland, Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK), Germany

Authors: Christian Flachsland (1), Robert Marschinski (1), Ottmar Edenhofer (1)

Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK), Potsdam, Germany (1)

The paper focuses on institutional and material interlinkages between the UN climate regime and the World Trade Organization (WTO). While parties of the climate regime discuss trade-related measures for a post-2012 agreement (e.g. optimised flexibility mechanisms, incentive mechanisms or climate-friendly technologies), WTO parties lead debates on climate-related measures (e.g. on the trade in environmental goods and services, or on unilateral and multilateral trade measures in a post-2012 world). Attempts to manage this fragmentation of debates and the legal overlaps between both regimes have largely failed. Based on the findings of a major ADAM-UNEP workshop, the paper looks at prospects for cross-cutting approaches, arguing that a careful linkage of debates across arenas can produce additional tradeoffs and thereby break some of the deadlocks in which these discussions have partly ended up. Potential docking points exist for instance between Kyoto debates on technology transfer and intellectual property rights and WTO discussions on plant genetic resources and agricultural subsidies. On the other hand, the paper attends to the caveats of such linkages, e.g. regarding the clout of the UN climate regime over some issues and the level of ambition of such “joint” post-2012 strategies.

Post-2012 Options beyond Climate Change. Prospects for Linking Debates between the Global Climate and Trade Regimes

Presenter: Fariborz Zelli, University of East Anglia, United Kingdom

Authors: Fariborz Zelli (1), Harro van Asselt (1)

Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research, Norwich, United Kingdom (1), Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam - IVM, Amsterdam, Netherlands (2)

The paper focuses on institutional and material interlinkages between the UN climate regime and the World Trade Organization (WTO). While parties of the climate regime discuss trade-related measures for a post-2012 agreement (e.g. optimised flexibility mechanisms, incentive mechanisms or climate-friendly technologies), WTO parties lead debates on climate-related measures (e.g. on the trade in environmental goods and services, or on unilateral and multilateral trade measures in a post-2012 world). Attempts to manage this fragmentation of debates and the legal overlaps between both regimes have largely failed. Based on the findings of a major ADAM-UNEP workshop, the paper looks at prospects for cross-cutting approaches, arguing that a careful linkage of debates across arenas can produce additional tradeoffs and thereby break some of the deadlocks in which these discussions have partly ended up. Potential docking points exist for instance between Kyoto debates on technology transfer and intellectual property rights and WTO discussions on plant genetic resources and agricultural subsidies. On the other hand, the paper attends to the caveats of such linkages, e.g. regarding the clout of the UN climate regime over some issues and the level of ambition of such “joint” post-2012 strategies.



How Climate Change has become a Business Risk

Presenter: Philipp Pattberg, Institute for Environmental Studies, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Netherlands

Authors: Philipp Pattberg (1)

Institute for Environmental Studies, Amsterdam, Netherlands (1)

Recently, there has been increase in the number of transnational climate governance arrangements that do not involve state actors and consequently do not require their consent for the establishment of rules and norms at the global level. One striking feature of all the arrangements is the active participation of transnational corporations (TNCs), both in decision-making and implementation. This paper will investigate the agency of non-profit organizations in manufacturing the issue of climate change into a risk for business organizations. I address three related questions: First, what organizational form and strategy does the construction of climate change as a business risk (and opportunity) take? Second, how successful are civil society actors in driving corporate behaviour in a more sustainable direction using the concept of risk? And finally, what are the implications of this strategic reconfiguration of civil society engagement from confrontation to cooperation for our general understanding of climate governance? Empirically, this paper analyses the Investors Network on Climate Risks and the Carbon Disclosure Project.

The Effect Of Different Mitigation Strategies On International Financing Of Adaptation

Presenter: Andries Hof, Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, Netherlands

Authors: Andries Hof (1), Kelly de Bruin (2), Rob Dellink (3), Michel den Elzen (1), Detlef van Vuuren (1)

Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, Bilthoven, Netherlands (1), Environmental Economics and Natural Resources Group, Wageningen University, Wageningen, Netherlands (2), Institute for Environmental Studies, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, Netherlands (3)

Recent proposals at the UNFCCC meeting in Bali in December 2007 suggest that a 2% levy on the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) could finance adaptation costs in developing regions. Other proposals include extending the scope of the levy to emissions trading. This study applies an Integrated Assessment Model to analyse to what extent adaptation costs in non-Annex I countries could be financed by a 2% levy on both the CDM and emission trading from non-Annex I countries in the long run. We show that this strongly depends on the climate mitigation target and the burden sharing regime. A more stringent climate global mitigation target will increase the demand for the CDM and the level of emission trading and lower the need for adaptation in the longer run. Both factors increase the share of adaptation costs funded by these mechanisms. Burden sharing regimes in which Annex I countries have relatively strong emissions reduction targets compared to non-Annex I countries also increase the funds available for adaptation. However, in the shorter run and for less stringent emission reductions, the level of adaptation that can be financed remains well below 10%. Additional funding mechanisms therefore seem necessary to finance adaptation costs in developing countries.



Towards a Global Governance System to Protect Climate Refugees

Presenter: Frank Biermann, IVM, Netherlands

Authors: Frank Biermann (1), Ingrid Boas (2)

IVM, Amsterdam, Netherlands (1)

Climate change threatens to cause the largest refugee crisis in human history. More than 200 million people, largely in Africa and Asia, might be forced to leave their homes to seek refuge in other places or countries over the course of the century. Yet the current institutions, organizations and funding mechanisms are not sufficiently equipped to deal with this looming crisis. The situation calls for new governance. This paper outlines a blueprint for a global governance architecture on the protection and voluntary resettlement of climate refugees. It provides a definition of climate refugees as well as an extensive review of current estimates of their likely numbers and probable regions of origin. With a view to existing institutions, the paper argues against the extension of the definition of refugees under the 1951 Geneva Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees. Key elements of this proposal are, instead, a new legal instrument specifically tailored for the needs of climate refugees—a Protocol on Recognition, Protection, and Resettlement of Climate Refugees to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change—as well as a separate funding mechanism, the Climate Refugee Protection and Resettlement Fund.