



CAN Position Paper

Minimization of Adverse Effects of Response Measures

Mitigation policies and measures are being, and must dramatically be increased in order to minimize the adverse impacts of climate change, which impact the poorest and most vulnerable disproportionately: the greater the mitigation action taken the more likely that adaptation measures will be manageable, or even achievable. Thus fulfillment of the Convention's fundamental goal to "prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference in the climate system" will minimize the adverse social, environmental and economic effects.

Annex 1 countries should strive to minimize adverse impacts of response measures, through taking the fastest pathway to achieve a low-carbon economy. Knowing that environmental and social positive impacts are harder to assess than negative economic impacts, makes the debate around response measures biased by nature.

Reduced use of fossil fuels

The wholesale reduction in the use of fossil fuels, and in the emissions of the associated GHG reductions, are essential and *intended* consequences of the battle against climate change, as their emissions hurt the planet and people. On the contrary, CAN sees that current subsidies on fossil fuels are creating negative 'spill over effects' by increasing climate change impacts and energy dependency, which is an issue raised by some country delegates. CAN thinks a discussion of compensation for lost oil revenues is absolutely not acceptable to negotiate.

However, CAN believes a more positive and productive discussion could be on ways to support the sustainable diversification of the economies of fossil fuel producing countries, through the sharing of experiences of economies that have already undergone significant transformations, and through the negotiations on the development and deployment of sustainable technologies, under the relevant agenda items in the UNFCCC processes. This would provide the best policy against any negative spill over effects.

Other vulnerable sectors

There are other unintended consequences of climate protection policies to be addressed in the UNFCCC process, which need to be clearly defined; areas cited in the literature include food miles and other international trade, and impacts on tourism. Such measures often impact international trade in goods and services. These concerns

can be addressed through the design of the modalities for international aviation and shipping. Whilst this impact could be negative or positive economically, we must not forget that reducing GHGs will have a beneficial impact on social and environmental goods, as well as on the long-term economic sustainability. It is clear that there is a huge lack of information on this subject, and there is a need to exchange experience and provide evidence of actual consequences.

CAN sees real value in exchanging experience and providing robust evidence of actual consequences. In CAN's opinion, the path to reaching safe levels of GHG concentrations should ensure such adverse impacts are minimized. Essentially the best method to avoid adverse impacts is for countries affected to diversify their economies towards a greener, more environmentally sustainable pathway. This can be achieved through Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions, enabled and supported by finance, technology and capacity building.

Focusing on those who have the least capacity to cope

Some countries from the developed and developing worlds could be vulnerable to adverse impacts of mitigation policies. However, CAN strongly believes that those with the least capacity to cope with the unintended impacts should be supported by assisting these countries to make the transition to a low carbon society, achieving sustainable economic, social and environmental development through technology transfer and economic diversification.

Forum for negotiations

CAN firmly advocates that negotiations on response measures are separate to adaptation negotiations, and should not be discussed in that context. Adaptation funding should in no way be used to address response measures. Both the AWG-LCA and the AWG-KP are debating many similar issues in relation to spill-over effects and response measures. CAN wishes to ensure that duplication across the negotiating tracks is minimized to ensure coherence and progress on this issue.