

Dhaka, 17 December, 2011

Statement for 17th Dec. Post CoP 17 / Durban Press Conference from BAPA, BIPNet, CCDF, CSRL, EquityBD and NCCB

Durban Reality and What Next

1. Our accountability

We, the six civil society climate networks, namely Bangladesh Poribesh Andolan (BAPA), Bangladesh Indigenous People Network for Climate Change and Bio Diversity (BIPNet), Climate Change Development Forum (CCDF), Campaign for Sustainable Rural Livelihoods (CSRL), Equity and Justice Working Group Bangladesh (EquityBD) and Network for Climate Change in Bangladesh (NCCB) in Dhaka conducted several public events during pre Durban period in view to reflect Bangladeshi people's general concern in the country. During CoP 17 in Durban we ran a stall, conducted two seminars on climate migrants' rights and also conducted two press conferences, reflecting on on-going CoP process". So, in this situation, we feel it as our accountability to arrange this press conference to make our observation and concerns public.

2. Durban Platform : Grim Reality or Debacle

It was the mass demand, especially from developing countries that there should be second period of Kyoto Protocol (KP) as legally binding in view of scientific predictions, especially commitment of drastic cut in mitigation from Annex 1 / developed countries. This is 45 % Green House Gas (GHG) emission cut by 2020 in 1990 level, so that there will be global temperature level of 1.5 celcius. According to research presented by German scientists, the world is on the track of a 3.5 C (6.3 F) rise, spelling worsening droughts, floods, storms and raising sea level for tens of millions of people.

But mainly due to obstinacies of USA that has not ratified the KP since beginning, with the passive support of Chair from South Africa "Durban Platform" was launched from CoP 17.

Some critics cite this as Durban Debacle, as there is dilution or death of Bali Action Plan. Bali action plan was mandated to formulate mitigation, adaptation, financing, technology transfer and capacity building. And also there are elimination of the term historical responsibility, equity and common but differentiated responsibility (CBDR) in the document.

Blame must go for South Africa (SA) chair too, she has adopted this after elapse of 36 hours' when at least 30 country delegations left and without listening or considering dissent voices especially from Venezuela. Some Critics said SA did it deliberately to support US intentions. It should be noted that there are several objections on US delegation lead and unilateral imposition of terminologies, even which was brought notice of the chair, but she overlooked those. Some critics also blamed India and China for their obstinacies, but it is also true that it is the Indian delegation that gave passionate call for inclusion of CBDR and it is the China and Egypt delegation pleaded a concrete road map on Green Climate Fund (GCF) with predictability, additionally and sustainability, as they have mentioned, now it is a fund without fund.

CoP 17 has failed to reach an second commitment period with "legally binding" of emission cut, now the "dialogue" will continue up to 2015 and as written instead of the term "legally binding", as written there will be an "outcome with legal force" should be agreed and which will be implemented from 2020.

Please note that China, USA and India are in the top three among global top ten emitters, e.g. China emit 6.9 billions ton, USA 5.2 billion tons and India emits 1.5 billions tons. China and India have become huge emitters of carbon over the last half dozen years but do not have KP constraints as they are developing countries. The

key to Durban deal lay in overcoming the opposition of the big three by crafting vague text. The US opted out, and now Canada, Japan and Russia have said that they will not take part.

Some said that, there might be only progress on the Green Climate Fund (GCF), which is supposed to funnel annually \$ 100 billions starting in 2020 to help developing nations. There were no commitments on where the money would come from, what was agreed to set up a “work plan” to mobilize significant climate funds from both private and public source. There are debates on inclusion of private source, as private source always looks for profit, private source explicitly include carbon markets too as government from the rich countries frequently cited the financial crisis has tied their purse strings Civil society and some developing countries noted that governments have made trillions of \$ available for the bank and financial sector and the world military budget is 10 times more than what is needed for the GFC.

Creating private markets for the buying and selling carbon offsets remains highly controversial and very complex in terms of measurement, ownership of carbon in soil or forests and more. Then there are ethics of rich countries offsetting their own emissions by buying up forests or land in poor countries.

So, delaying and pull out in fact reflects a matter of debacle too, and in fact the inaction up to 2020 while scientist forecasts 3 to 4 Celsius raise in fact will kill millions of people due to extreme events, more fry up of Africa and more submerge of islands. The alliances already stated in a press conference in Durban on 5th December that, in fact it will enhance the already existing mass climate genocide. There is a cost of delaying, it doesn't make sense economically. According to Faith Biriol, the chief economist of the International Energy Agency, “delaying action is a false economy, for every \$ 1 of investment in cleaner technology that is avoided in the power sector before 2020; an additional \$ 4.30 would need to be spent to compensate for the increased emissions.”

3. G77 + China group how much dependable and other loopholes

There is muscle flexing of developed countries and of USA too. One political scientist said that it is very easy to purchase a vote of developing country in UN floor rather than buying a vote of a poor people in their own developing countries. Because developing countries especially least developed countries some how very much dependent on developed countries, especially for aid and financial assistance in relation with international financial institutions (e.g., World Bank and International Monetary Fund). During 8th December in Durban the alliances have had a press conference, where the alliance has mentioned that China and India under the disguise of G 77 and China negotiation group basically served their own interest not the interest of other members. Climate vulnerable countries (CVC) have to be aware of their own interest which is very much separate from the interest of China and India, they must re group themselves, and emerge as separate negotiation group. Now Bangladesh is the chairperson of this Climate Vulnerable Forum (CVF), it is the unique opportunity to take lead in this regard. The alliance has also same appeals this while CVF was held in Dhaka during the middle of November 2011.

Some other tactical loopholes were also observed in the CoP process, with developing countries and CVCs. Since the beginning of COP 17 they all are giving over emphasis on climate finance, countries were placing demand one after one on climate finance allocation, management and procedures. It has been proved to all of us, and it should be also clear to all the negotiators that issue of mitigation should come first.

4. Role of government delegation and other stakeholders in CoP 17 Durban

We consider our role was to support Bangladeshi people's agenda in mobilizing global civil society with a positive engagement with Bangladesh government delegation. Apart from this we feel a responsibility to give comments on

the role of other government and nongovernmental stakeholders in public.

We appreciate the capacity of presentation, access and inclusiveness of Minister Dr. Hasan and spoke person Dr Quazi Kholikuzzaman in leading the government team; we also like to say that we have hardly any difference in agenda setting. But, we have a concern on team, especially in respect of its size and output. We feel in future it should be more objectives, criteria and output oriented.

In respect of NGOs and INGOs, we feel we should have more self initiative for wider coordination even if we are in different platform and we should give more emphasis in building opinion or support building for Bangladeshi cause among global civil society members especially in developed countries.

Role of media is important especially building awareness and opinion in back home, we appreciate that more and more participation of Bangladeshi media in CoP process is facilitating this. But, we need more attention of media especially in news on alternatives especially what happening in outside the official process, beauty of democracy is in fact that how we are building a pluralistic society in providing diverse of information and opinions. There are very little information of our media reporting regarding CoP 17 civil society conferences in University of Kawanzulu Natal (UKZN) during the whole period, 3rd December global day of action march which was attacked by YANC (Youth African National Congress) members wearing UNFCCC volunteer dress, beating civil society members in President Jakob Zumas meeting in town hall on 6th December, 10th December civil society demonstration inside the CoP premise, different press conferences of civil society groups in CoP official media briefing centers.

5. What next : preparing ourselves for the worse is the priority

Durban teaches us that we hardly are able to rely on external source whether for finance and for expected level of mitigation that world is cooling down immediately. We have to be active in

multilateral dialogue process offcourse, but we have to take deep concern and expedite the process in back home more seriously. Apart from our urge on gradual emphasize on facilitating and leading CVF as separate negotiation group, the government should give importance on following course of actions;

(a) Prepare plan B to proceed with Climate Strategic Action Plan (e.g., BCCSAP) in integration with the Six Five Year Plan (6FYP). The Minister has already pledge a review of BCCSAP, where integration of 6FYP should be a priority.

(b) It seems that issue of demanding new United Nation (UN) protocol for climate induced migrants is getting more and more support from global community, the issue already mentioned in Cancun agreement. But to make it on the basis of solid reasons, government should have a comprehensive assessment / appraisal in this regard.

(c) Not least but the last, we were repeatedly expressing our concern on transparency and inclusiveness of climate finance management; we have also same concern on development finance too. Especially for a credible management and optimal utilization we must initiate a process of multiparty and inclusiveness, in past what we have had proposed a management of “democratic ownership” instead of sole government ownership.

6. What we did in Durban

During the period of 28th Nov to 10th Dec we did the following activities, description, press release, position papers and media clippings related to all those events are available for download in www.equitybd.org. In respect of seminars the alliances expanded its alliances six other international networks, namely, Jubilee South based in Argentina, Asia Pacific Movement for Debt and Development (APMDD) based in Philippines, LDC Watch based in Brussels, South Asia Alliance for Poverty Eradication (SAAPE) based in Nepal, 350.Org based in USA, and Trust on Community

and Education (TOCE) based in Durban, South Africa.

(i) We ran an exhibit booth / stall title “**voice from climate change ground zero**” with 26 photos from Bangladesh featuring climate change impacts on water and migration. A lot of delegates including our minister visited the stall.

(ii) On 3rd December, we have a seminar title “Need of a new UN protocol, climate induced migrants: Human rights perspective” held in CoP official premise, among several foreign speakers Janet Redman from Institute of Policy Study USA and Elena Gizabeera from CRBM, Italy has participated. The seminar has been given one full page coverage in Canada based organization IISD in its news letter ENB..

(iii) On 5th December the alliance conducted a press conference in UNFCCC media center, provided opinion on on-going negotiation process, title of the position paper “**Delaying Outcome: Hastened Mass Killing**”. The press conference was moderated by Ziaul Haque Mukta; position paper was read out by Rezaul Karim Chowdhury, other speakers were Dr. Ahsan Uddin and Dr. Abdul Matin.

(iv) On 7th December, the alliance again held the seminar “**Climate Induced Migrants : Human Rights Perspective**” at UKZN, Kumi Naido Executive Director from Green Peace International, Malcolm Demons from Africa Economic Justice Network, Senior Professor of UKZN Patrick Bond and Bryan Ashley, who are also the coordinator of CoP 17 civil society, Willy D Costa of APMDD, Tanvir Shakil Joy Member of Parliament from Bangladesh, Dr. Ahsan Uddin from CSRL, Raja Debasish Roy Ex Advisor to the Care taker government and BIPNet have spoken on the occasion.

(v) On 8th December, the alliance again has had a press conference in the UNFCCC media center, title of the position paper was “**Rather Break the G77 and China.**” The session was also moderated by Ziaul Haque Mukta, position paper was read out by Dr. Ahsan Uddin, Other speakers were Raja Debasish Roy, Rezaul Karim Chowdhury and Mizanur Rahman Bijoy.

Networks



BIPNet

CCDF



Bangladesh Poribesh Andolan (BAPA), Bangladesh Indigenous People Network for Climate Change and Bio Diversity (BIPNet), Climate Change Development Forum (CCDF), Campaign for Sustainable Rural Livelihoods (CSRL), Equity and Justice Working Group Bangladesh (EquityBD), Network for Climate Change in Bangladesh (NCCB)

Contact

Rezaul Karim Chowdhury, e-mail: reza@coastbd.org, Mobile + 8801711529792
Mostafa Kamal Akanda, e-mail: kamal@coastbd.org, Mobile +8801711455591

All related information is available in www.equitybd.org