



CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK

25 YEARS
OF FIGHTING
FOR THE CLIMATE



SMALL WINDOW, BRIGHT LIGHT:
A HISTORY OF CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK

Climate Action Network-International
P.O.Box: 14-5472, Beirut, Lebanon
Tel. No. +961.3.506313
administration@climatenetwork.org
www.climatenetwork.org

© Climate Action Network-International 2014.
All Rights Reserved.

In memory of

Morrow Gaines Campbell III

Dedicated CAN member and Board of Directors Co-Chair

1940–2014

COP 4 in Buenos Aires in 1998: The tiger, Manfred Treber, circulated around Jürgen Trittin, German Environment Minister at that time, who was interviewed by Volker Angres, ZDF—second German TV channel. This scene was also shown in the evening TV-news. Esso was accused by NGOs to be a strong force in preventing measures to fight climate change—even in manipulating science.





Wael at his first UNFCCC meeting as the CAN Director in 2012



INTRODUCTION

When I sat down this morning to write the introduction to the story of CAN, I received some very sad news. Our dear friend, colleague and co-chair of the CAN-International Board of Directors, Morrow Gaines Campbell III passed away this morning. Gaines embodied the essence of CAN. He was so committed to the vision of CAN and believed deeply that together as a Network we will win this fight to stop climate change. The Network was more than just an organization to him. It was his second family that he dedicated a lot of his free time to support it in addition to his usual daily responsibilities. Gaines took on major network challenges, especially facilitating a good working environment to help divided groups work together and be productive again. Many times he facilitated internal conversations and developed relationships to help our diverse Network work through difficult issues and stand united.

Since its establishment in 1989, CAN is built on the dedication and leadership of individuals like Gaines. These individuals committed to the value in "together we are united, separate we fall," which is the philosophy, that Gaines and others put before their own personal views, to overcome differences, and allow CAN to be one of the most effective and professional networks working on climate change.

Most recently, CAN members came together in 2012 to develop a CAN 2013–2015 strategic plan that has reshaped the CAN Secretariat and elaborated the Network's focus. In addition to the traditional role of coordinating civil society around the UNFCCC process, CAN has started coordinating national campaigns to start the shift to low carbon development, to phase out fossil fuels, and to move towards a 100% renewable energy future. Additionally, CAN took on the role of strengthening the climate movement

and building global, national and local momentum for action on climate change.

This shift in CAN's objectives and roles will be a new chapter in CAN's history. CAN members are coming together in new ways to build the climate movement to be the most powerful people-driven force on the planet. This is how we will win the fight for the climate. Before embarking on this new journey, it is good to not forget the past, to remember those pioneers that shaped the climate movement and to learn from the victories and failures of those who came before us. That is why we have decided to produce this history booklet.

This history of CAN is a snapshot from several perspectives of who CAN is, how we came together, and what we have achieved. We still have so much to do and because climate change is a long-term, as well as immediate problem, we need to do everything we can now, but also not burn out early as the work will continue on as long as we are burning fossil fuels.

My friend Gaines helped shape CAN's new directions. He believed that when we work together and demand climate action with strength and peace, we will be heard. I look forward to reading the next chapters of CAN's history when I'm 73, like Gaines was, and seeing how these new directions helped make the world a safer and more sustainable place for my son, your daughter and all our grandchildren.



Wael Hmadian, Director,
Climate Action Network-International







The story of the Climate Action Network-International is, because of its purpose and founding, bound to the story of the international climate change negotiations. And, because of its nature as a network of organizations, its history is also the history of those groups, the people within them, and their struggle to address climate change.

Thus, the story of CAN begins even before CAN began, with the increasing international attention paid to climate change in the 1980s and the growing interest of non-governmental organizations (NGOs), particularly environmental groups, in stopping it.



1988–1994: BEGINNING OF THE BEGINNING

Between the 1988 World Conference on the Changing Atmosphere and the creation of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and the 1990 decision by the United Nations General Assembly to develop a negotiating committee to draft a climate change convention, organizations from primarily Europe and the United States agreed in 1989 to establish amongst themselves a loose but official network for the coordination of their activities around the climate change negotiations and domestic climate action. Many had already worked together on other environmental issues and had been cooperating at initial international climate change meetings held in the 1980s.



It was a heady time. I remember being in conversations with Mary Ann Ginsberg with the German Marshall Fund. She was the one who was encouraging American and European environmental groups to talk to one another about climate change. That's why the founding conference was held in Germany, at Loccum, at a church retreat center. I recall about 30 or 40 people being there. I'd been involved a few years earlier in the creation of another network of environmental groups, called the Pesticide Action Network (PAN). The idea for the name Climate Action Network came from that. PAN was an interesting model for us.

—**Jacob Scherr**

We were trying to figure out what the hell was going on. The whole history of the environmental movement had been a dress rehearsal for the climate issue. I was there for the early conversations up to Rio, though not for all of the details. For me, CAN's main function was to subsume the egos and the logos to such an extent that we could really function as a meritocracy. In one country or at one time or another, one group was bigger than another. The goal was to spend enough time and energy, taking the institution seriously, working on its development, respecting its processes, so that when shit hit the fan and you couldn't wait for long meetings, there was a level of trust. The recognized experts could go for it and the rest of the Network had their backs.

—**Steve Sawyer**



At the time, the “International” part of what is known today as Climate Action Network–International was not so much its own entity, but rather a representation of the shared effort among the regional and national climate networks that had just been formed or were still developing. Initially, this consisted of one regional group—Climate Network Europe—and two country groups—US Climate Action Network and Climate Action Network UK. An unincorporated Climate Action Network Canada came shortly thereafter. The histories of these and other national and regional “nodes” that today comprise CAN are equally important in telling the story of civil society’s fight for environmental justice and against climate change, but they are left for others to share.

That said, some structure was established, including the selection of Annie Roncerel, then of the Stockholm Environment Institute, as the first CAN Coordinator and Climate Network Europe Coordinator, and the first efforts to formally convene NGO representatives of CAN to develop shared policy positions around the international negotiations. Fortunately, its members were already practiced in developing shared visions. Some of its future members had, for example, released a paper at the 1988 World Conference called “Escaping the Heat Trap: An NGO Statement of Policies to Prevent Climate Change.” Some of the policy positions from that paper helped form the basis of the emissions reduction goals that emerged from that conference. This early effort foreshadowed later successes by CAN to help develop and promote policies that eventually became outcomes at some of the climate negotiations.

From its founding, CAN members recognized that the Network should be representative of the broad range of nations and peoples who would be affected by climate change, and of the growing



My memory of CAN in the early years is of an organization very different from what we have now. People came together only occasionally, during the UN negotiations. We started with a small number of organizations, a few national nodes. They tried to work together, but there were so many different numbers of groups in each level. So CAN Europe sort of filled the international node role, and we were able to raise money, particularly for Southern countries to participate. The science also wasn’t there – we spent so much time explaining to the media what global warming was, how it wasn’t the ozone hole, and more or less the public came to understand this. This was a key merit of CAN then, being the link between the science and the wider public.

—Delia Villagrasa



number of organizations from around the world who were working or beginning to work on climate change issues. While much of the early support, both financially and in volunteer power, came from North American and Western European groups, NGOs from the Philippines, India, and Brazil were active from the beginning, and participation from developing country groups steadily grew.

After the 1989 Loccum meeting, a steering committee took up the task of broadening the Network to include representatives from most parts of the world. With initial funding from US foundations, NGO representatives from developing countries were invited and supported to attend various international climate meetings in 1990 and 1991 to assess their interest in forming a united global network. Initial responses were largely positive, such that already by 1990, CAN was able to represent itself to the media as speaking on behalf of over a dozen organizations from Africa, Europe, and North America.

1991 saw the formation of CAN South Asia (CANSAs), a launch spearheaded by Atiq Rahman of Bangladesh. By November of that year, CANSAs had already convened its first regional meeting, including also representatives from Sri Lanka and India.

Around the same time, what initially began as plans to start CAN Malaysia grew into CAN Southeast Asia with the inclusion of the Philippines and Indonesia.

With the UN's International Negotiating Committee going to Nairobi in 1991, the stage was also set for members to assist in the creation of an African CAN that year. Initially, a network of Kenyan NGOs with government support, by 1993 this network had become its own NGO. After a variety of changes and restructurings, it now exists as CAN

Eastern Africa, CAN West and Central Africa and the Southern Africa Region CAN (SARCAN), and includes several national nodes, such as CAN South Africa.

CAN participation at international negotiations continued, including the International Negotiation Committee meetings at the UN, the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, and the various early meetings of the bodies of the Framework Convention on Climate Change itself.



It was 1991 and I was doing climate stuff around the Rio meeting—Rio+Nothing. I sort of came across CAN there. I was with a tiny NGO called VERTIC, so the first few meetings I turned up with Jerry Leggett, who was then Science Director of Greenpeace; so they all thought I was with Greenpeace and I just hung around with the Greenpeace guys. If you're a little group, it's very helpful to be part of a large agglomeration of NGOs. At the time, if you were an NGO there you were in CAN. It was mainly a bunch of friends. Some had been around for a while, especially Yasuko Matsumoto, since the 2nd climate conference, and Bill Hare. It didn't evolve much until not long before the Convention came into force.

—John Lanchbery



*ECO editorial board in 2009 at the
Hotel Ambassador in Bonn*

ECO

Another early CAN effort was to take up the publication of the ECO newsletter at international climate meetings. Versions of ECO had been produced by civil society organizations at various international environmental meetings and negotiations since the Stockholm Environment Conference in 1972. ECO was meant to give voice to NGO's concerns in a way that was engaging and easy for negotiators and the media to read. CAN began producing ECO in 1990 at the 2nd World Climate Conference.



ECO was originally run like a British tabloid and it absolutely had to be funny. The middle was factual and the front and back was commentary. We eventually did a deal with Earth Negotiations Bulletin to just do the commentary and they did the facts. ECO stayed up there pretty well.

—John Lanchbery

In 1990 for Geneva I was brought in to do the layout. Chris Rose was the Editor. At that time, computers were the innovation. This new thing called desktop publishing. Before that, I think it was produced on typewriters, and cut and paste literally meant that—scissors and glue. But everyone would write stuff by hand, the typist would key it in by hand. We were up all night, and we would produce 8 pages a day, with just two very slow computers, and scan in illustrations. The first time, I don't think I even went to the meeting. With computers, though, it looked very professional, and as a result, its credibility started to go

up—it looked much better than government publications in some cases.

My introduction to writing for ECO was in summer 1991, the first INC. I went down to the Palais des Nations to have an eye and see how all of these governmental delegations would be working, went into it quite wide-eyed. I got frustrated listening to people. And I started writing down a glossary of terms that were being used, somewhat tongue-in-cheek. And we found that it helped to get it read. Over the years, on more than one occasion, we produced a special issue of ECO during the day, a single side with one article relating to a decision that was to be made, with copies being handed to delegates as they went into the room—with, as I recall, the result being a change of mind.

—Alister Sieghart





The ECOs have always been highlights. It was a lot funnier then, with a lot more cartoons, and negotiators really read them—not just to get the ‘real’ story, but also to be entertained. They were the tools for figuring out CAN positions, before CAN had working groups. Getting agreement on ECOs was how we got agreement at all. At times, there were very hot debates, and so ECO was almost always completed at like 4 or later in the morning, because we were still figuring out our opinions. Now it is more an expression of already formed opinions.

—Delia Villagrasa

ECO is mostly a sleep deprived blur for me. Lots of writing

late at night, but we would put text in the ECOs that would occasionally show up in the negotiating text. It was an innovative tool in its day.

—Steve Sawyer

I liked hovering around the ECO editor room back in the 1990s when it was being prepared. Most contributors and writers had to be in the same room to type articles, and a couple or more were looking into the same screen, pointing, and it was a really good learning place for what’s going on in the actual negotiations because those people contributing are the experienced key people. Very good place to start some personal connections with these people. I tried to be around them even if I wasn’t writing an article that night. Now it’s a bit different since people are writing and sending from email, so there is no one place except the Eco Editorial Board.

—Yuri Onodera





John Ashe used to come and hang out in the ECO room late at night, because he was just a nice guy. He found it a relief to just bounce ideas off of the NGOs.

—Alister Sieghart

When I started in 1997 I had no idea what things like carbon sinks and flex mechs were about. The negotiations were much simpler back then. I didn't have the basic knowledge and there was a guy we Japanese NGOs worshipped leading up to Kyoto, Alister. The reason I so enjoyed talking to him was that he was British; his accent was friendly sounding and he had this whole wealth of knowledge of the negotiations, by going through every ECO from, I think, the 1980s, knew every key person in CAN. Chatting with him in the afternoon when everyone else was chasing the negotiations was nice because he made time. It was a great learning experience for me

—Yuri Onodera



The 1992 Summit in Brazil helped spur the creation of the last of the original regional networks, CAN Latin America. Initial organizations came from Chile, Brazil, and Mexico. A Secretariat was established in Chile in 1992.

By 1993, in between the 1992 opening for signature of the Framework Convention and its coming into force in 1994, CAN enjoyed formal and informal membership from several dozen organizations organized into seven regional networks and had put out for itself a set of general but lofty goals:

- *to coordinate information exchange on international, regional and national climate policies and issues, both between CAN groups and other interested institutions;*
- *to formulate policy options and position papers on climate-related issues; and to undertake further collaborative action to promote effective non-governmental organization involvement in efforts to avert the threat of global warming.*

The giant boat built by NGOs for COP 6



1995–2001: THE BEGINNING OF COP AND ALL THINGS KYOTO

The first Conference of the Parties (COP) opened in Berlin in 1995, by which point CAN membership swelled to nearly 150 groups. In a prelude to what would later become the CAN Strategy Session held before each negotiation session, members met immediately before the COP to develop "Goals for Berlin."



COP 1 in Berlin is a highlight. One of the great tactics was undertaken primarily by Greenpeace—there was this big article in Der Spiegel of Don Pearlman, a lawyer working for the US coal industry, being the high priest of the carbon club. And they got a bunch of youth dressed up in monk's robes to follow him around everywhere he went in the conference center, which affected his conversations with the Saudis, Kuwaitis, and other delegations that he was coordinating with. And you had to get agreement on the Berlin Mandate, and CAN folks helped to coalesce the Green Group of progressive developed and developing countries, which laid the groundwork for getting the mandate. A lot of it was the result of shuttle diplomacy by CAN.

—Alden Meyer

We didn't have Fossil of the Day back then, but together with USCAN we did an assessment of the national climate plans for each EU, Central and Eastern European country and the US. A national NGO filled in a matrix asking the same 10 questions in each country about what countries were really doing. It was like a shadow report on each country's plan, probably the best reference on their activity, providing an invaluable overview, the first of its kind. Extremely successful in creating peer pressure on countries, and the UNFCCC Secretariat loved it because they didn't have the capacity to follow what was happening on the ground in each country. Their review teams used those reports as references.

—Delia Villagrassa

A nice thing I remember was in the meeting when the discussion on renewables was only starting, there was a special session during one of the negotiations in Bonn, and all the NGOs were asked to give their opinions alongside the country delegations. CAN-International had one seat and therefore one message, while the renewable industry asked for multiple seats. The renewable industry spokespeople all had different opinions. Now they are

more organized and have more of a common position. The importance of having one clear message was shown in the reaction of the governments, who followed the opinion of CAN and ignored the differentiated renewable groups.

—Karla Schoeters

By Geneva, governments had to decide whether the new agreement would be legally binding. And that negotiation was also very intense and we had to convince the Clinton Administration negotiators, Tim Wirth and Eileen Clausen. I remember when we had helped to broker that agreement, at the NGO party that was in some villa right next to the UN compound; they were playing Message in a Bottle by The Police, and I started singing 'Protocol in Kyoto' and everyone started jumping up and down and singing it. It was one of the more spirited NGO parties, the more celebratory.

—Alden Meyer

After Geneva, the 6th Meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Berlin Mandate would take place in Bonn. For Germanwatch, which was situated in Bonn, this was a challenge. We knew that there was always a CAN party on Saturday and that a local NGO should be active in preparing it. As we had good contacts with a high school nearby with suitable accommodations, we arranged that the CAN party would take place there.

That Saturday, we brought the food and beer to the high school. But then we got a terrible message: This is a school, no beer allowed. What to do? It's not a CAN party without beer. We quickly changed the location to the just renovated Germanwatch office. We counted more than a hundred guests in our small office with not more than four rooms. After the party, our office need a few more cosmetic renovations...

—Manfred Treber



Preparing for Kyoto was very massive. It was the first time we had a UN environmental conference in Japan, an historic moment for the Japanese civil society movement, to have so many international NGOs, coordinated by CAN. We had two weeks of nationwide press coverage of NGO activities, since the media centre and NGO offices were in the same hall. It changed a lot of peoples' perceptions of NGO work.

— **Yuri Onodera**

Oh the drama of Kyoto... I think CAN really helped do the messaging work that set expectations and made it clear that the voluntary approach was not working by itself. It was a key media air war. And of course some of the CAN members that had key networks in the major capitals pushed their governments on various crunch points.

— **Alden Meyer**

We managed to get the EU to adopt a quite tough negotiating target going into Kyoto. CAN lobbied for 20% reduction by 2005, and the EU went in with 15% by 2010. So just positioning wise we were very successful in moving the EU to a better place. We almost had a split in Kyoto because we had a huge fight about which gases would be counted. We almost fell apart over it, which seems ridiculous now.

— **Delia Villagrasa**

The really bizarre thing was when the negotiations went into overtime, the Japanese had booked the conference centre at Kyoto for a fashion show that was to start on Saturday. While we were there, crews were getting it ready, right around us, and we were all sleep deprived and in a catatonic state, watching it happen. So the building was being deconstructed at the same time that Kyoto was being constructed. And then it was on to Buenos Aires and Milan to work on the rules.

— **Alden Meyer**



When we got to Kyoto, lots of people started turning up to CAN. It began to get more formalized, partly because of money. It was getting awkward for countries who funded ECO to just hand over all of the cash to someone at an international meeting. So we started forming a more corporate structure. It was more informal before that, really. It was a pity, in a way, because we had to develop all of these constitutional rules.

—John Lanchbery

In fact, several important national networks formed around the lead-up and reaction to Kyoto. The negotiations helped the development of Japanese NGOs to form a network, supported by CAN members from other countries, called the Kiko Forum. Begun in December 1996, it matured into one of the largest national CAN networks, the Kiko Network, in April 1998, and became its own non-profit organization in November 1999. CAN-Rac Canada incorporated in April 2004. RAC-France was also founded in 1996. CAN Australia formalized in 1998.

As electronic communication grew throughout the 1990s, the process of policy coordination improved. Initially, shared policies and messaging were developed immediately before or during negotiations or occasionally at regional network meetings. Some members quickly embraced new tools like email and message lists, allowing policy coordination and exchanges of views to happen throughout the year. These became the predecessors to “CAN-talk,” the current general email list for CAN members, and working group lists that exist today. ECO also began to be distributed via newsgroups and the World Wide Web, as a supplement to the issues that were printed at the negotiations and sent via fax to major media outlets. Similarly, CAN launched the first version of its website in 1998, with USCAN as the first node to operate its own separate site the same year.

Please note: this site is under construction -- not all links are complete

The Climate Action Network *A Force for Change*

Global warming (the "greenhouse effect") is probably the greatest threat to the future of the planet.

It is mainly caused by gases emitted by industrialised countries, burning fossil fuels (coal, oil and gas) for electricity, heating and transport. Because of gases that have been emitted in the past -- and are still pouring into the atmosphere -- it is already too late to prevent some climate change. However, if we start reducing emissions now, we may be able to avoid some of the worst effects. What is more, many of the alternatives to fossil fuels are actually good for economies and will create jobs.

Over 230 environmental organisations from around the world, ranging from the big international groups such as Greenpeace, WWF and Friends of the Earth, to small local ones in developing countries, have joined forces in the Climate Action Network (CAN). By working together they can be more effective in pushing for cuts in greenhouse gases. They can also better resist the powerful influence of the oil and coal industries, who have used the massive resources at their disposal to oppose any suggestion that consumption of their products should be reduced.

New CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK (CAN) RECOMMENDATIONS TO MINISTERS AT COP4 [SHORT VERSION](#) [LONG VERSION](#)

CAN Interventions at COP4 [by an NGO from the South](#)
[by an NGO from the North](#)

In due course this site will contain the following. Material already in place appears as a link.

[About CAN](#)

Regional CAN nodes

[Climate Network Africa - CNA](#)

[Climate Action Network Central and Eastern Europe - CANCEE](#)

[Climate Network Europe - CNE](#)

[Climate Network Latin America, CANLA](#)

[Climate Action Network South Asia - CANSAs](#)

[Climate Action Network South East Asia - CANSEA](#)

[Climate Action Network UK - CAN UK](#)

[United States Climate Action Network - US-CAN](#) . US-CAN is the first region to have its own site.

[Climate Action Network Contact Point in Russia](#)

[Climate science updates](#)

The [CAN directory online](#) . This contains full contact details, descriptions and information on activities and issue involvement for **all 263 of CAN's members**. It is currently the largest part of this site.

[UNFCCC negotiation information](#)

*Improvised Press Conference of CAN NGO after failure
of COP 6 – Roda, Bill, Jennifer and John*





Creating the first CAN-talk list involved lots of discussions around should we use the Internet? Not every country back then had this access. So the communication between us really relied on the UNFCCC meetings. Historically this has been one of the reasons why for CAN the UNFCCC has been a huge focus, because it's a key meet-up. We also did a CAN Directory that was distributed for free, to let people from media, governments, etc. know who to go to for climate information. The 2nd directory became a fat book – it showed in a physical manner the presence and weight of our role in the negotiations and on the issue of climate change.

—**Delia Villagrasa**

Getting the treaty was one thing, of course. Getting it delivered was another. The trouble started pretty much the day after Kyoto. Ministers of the Environment reported back home, and pretty much every government said 'You did WHAT ?! We didn't know you were going to do this.'

—**Pat Finnegan**

After the Kyoto Protocol was adopted, I realized that the job had just begun. Three years of technical negotiation, followed by intense national campaigns for ratification after Marrakech (COP 7). After Kyoto, a lot of good campaigners who were in CAN regional coordination roles moved into bigger organizations, and a shift happened in the EU when they adopted their own carbon market, then shifted their position to facilitate the development of the Kyoto mechanisms, and CAN member groups who opposed those flexible mechanisms at Kyoto engaged with the more complex negotiations on technical aspects including CDM, ETS, and helped to establish some rapport with European governments that continues even up to now.

—**Yuri Onodera**





Cheer as the world takes its first steps to tackle climate change!



Jeer as the outlaws, Australia and the US, hatch their evil plans!



Climate Action Network Australia Presents:

FROM RUSSIA WITH LOVE PARTY

Saturday Feb 12
8pm

Forresters Hotel Upstairs
386 Riley Street, Surry Hills

Feat. DJ's catalyst, Chris Coco, Rich Nirof
Suggested donation of \$10



As the Network began to assess the next steps in the negotiating process, they also began to develop new advocacy tools. The 1999 negotiations, held in Bonn, marked the beginning of what would soon become, alongside ECO, one of CAN's signature activities. It was here that the first Fossil of the Day awards were given out. Originally organized by the German NGO Forum, the awards were given to the three countries or country blocs that had done the most to stall progress in the negotiations that day, with a "ceremony" media event held at the close of the day's negotiations. Over time, voting on the Fossil awards was held at CAN's daily coordination meeting, with the awards ceremony coordinated by a local NGO and additional participation from CAN members, as needed.

Alongside new negotiation tools, CAN members had been discussing new organizational structures for CAN-International. Many wanted a separate entity that could take over the international coordination and secretarial functions that individuals from member organizations were so far contributing out of their own time and organizational budgets. The discussions did not mature during that time into an actual formalization of CAN-International, but, they began a dialogue and informal planning process that would blossom as the new millennium dawned.



We didn't have Fossil in the 90s. It has become a very good tool for Japanese media. At the beginning it felt funny. I remember in Marrakech, the Japanese negotiators were more than frustrated about putting national flags on display in such a way. Those kinds of complaints came in from them, and the Saudis of course, but it was a very simple, visualization of the negotiations, including some complex topics, to explain to Japanese media. They loved it. We used it to the maximum. Especially in 2000 when COP 6 failed, it was not exactly that Japan blocked the negotiations, but they had a very negative position, so we used Fossil as much as we could to the media and parliamentarians. The delegation was summoned, the Minister had to answer all of these questions to the parliamentary inquiry. Ever since then, Fossil has been a key tool for us to highlight what is happening.

—Yuri Onodera



CAN South Asia members meeting in 2009



Fossil of the Day went on-site to embassies during the Copenhagen COP to deliver Fossils at home





When I started in 1999 with CAN Europe, CAN did not exist officially. It was a loose cooperation between the different nodes. And I think that was a big problem for CAN. In between the international negotiations, everybody was working more or less on their own. We noticed it became more and more difficult to be one voice without an official structure. So we agreed with people of different nodes that we needed to have a more formal basis to agree on positions for all the work that we did.

—**Karla Schoeters**

It's a funny beast, this CAN. It works best at international meetings; you tend to use your regional networks otherwise. But it's much harder in other regions. It makes a huge difference if you actually, physically meet people.

—**John Lanchbery**

There were these regional nodes that were, like any network at some point, outgrowing a flexible structure – my little elevator spiel at the time was about 350 member organizations – and that was the beginning of the talks about some kind of international governance or something that could take the work to the next level.

—**Nathalie Eddy**



In the middle of the discussions at this time, however, came two significant moments in the CAN family and in the negotiations, which drew CAN members' attention. A CAN wedding in conjunction with a Bonn intersessional and the failed COP 6 in The Hague.

Special edition ECO to celebrate
the marriage of CAN members

WEDDING CELEBRATIONS BOON JUNE '00 NAG NEWSLETTER

eco

12
1999
PUBLISHED
BI-MONTHLY

The Ultimate Joint Implementation Project

After a lengthy interregional period, Dalia and Stefan finally entered into a binding commitment on June 12, 1999. The two now stand immediately into a joint implementation project. For once, all Parties agree that no steps or activities limitations will be needed, especially if one voluntary burden can be shared.

The Climate Action Network applauds the unprecedented CAN development. Early on, time is expected immediately.

Agreeing History
Geneva, December 1996. Hanoi, Longkhaung - Daily Avenue Hotel Lening just one week of the NAG party on site one dance with Dalia's initial commitment period begins. In January, Dalia goes, however, because not possible.

Switzerland, December 1996. Christmas Eve Holiday - They were historical with Dalia's words in a document that will a paper of intergovernmental relations. April in Paris, December 1999.



ISSUE NO. 03 VOLUME 0000 FREE OF CHARGE





Stephan and I met when we were both at WWF. And then I went to Brussels, and suddenly there was this German chap from WWF calling all the time. And then at COP 2, in 1996, we started to write a lot of EU ECO articles together. And then at the NGO party, we got together. And then at the fights at 1997, Stefan was the one defending the WWF position, and I thought the Greenpeace position was the right one. And then we sort of split up. And I went on a Japan trip alone. And when I came back, he was at the airport waiting for me.

We did the wedding after the June 1999 negotiating session, because it was between where the two of us are from, and also easy for all of our climate friends, who helped us to get back together, my colleague telling him when my flight was coming back. And so we wanted

to have our CAN family. We have two girls now, 11 and 13, and we're still fighting about climate change. There is a whole series of romances that came out of the negotiations. I have my family through coming out of CAN.

—Delia Villagrasa

Before the wedding, a group of us, sort of male friends of Stephan, cooked up this scheme where we proceeded to get the then-head of the German delegation, Cornelia Quennet-Thielen, who is very sharp, very intelligent, and also very good looking, to give Stephan this cryptic message, saying she needed to meet with him to talk about something very sensitive. She said she would meet him at this bar in central Bonn. So, of course Stephan immediately goes there to meet her. But she's not there. So he's waiting, waiting, waiting, and one by one, we start

wandering in, not saying anything, not acknowledging him, sitting separately in different parts of the bar. Eventually, he looks around and realizes all of these CAN members are there. And he knows he's been had.

That was the start to the night. We had a few drinks there, and then made our way to other bars in town. We made Stephan wear a pair of white long underwear that we all autographed with black marker, as if you broke your leg and were getting your cast autographed. So he's wandering through town, from bar to bar with us, wearing these autographed white long johns. Then we took him into this duckpin bowling alley...

It was pretty late before we returned him to his hotel room. He was still quite hung over when he had to go to the Petersberg castle that morning to get married.

—Alden Meyer

I met my husband through CAN. I was coordinating USCAN and he was at NRDC. I had a big crush on him for a while and he liked the way I managed a meeting. And now we just celebrated our 10th anniversary. I will forever be a fan of CAN.

—Nathalie Eddy

It was at Lyon in 2000 and we were all staying in this university housing, like dorms. And we all had these less-than-twin beds, no Internet, shared co-ed bathrooms with no toilet seats. And so some members from RAC-France went and presented a toilet seat, and we would go and use it. So if you can't bond over that, I don't know what you can bond over. It was good preparation for The Hague.

—Nathalie Eddy





Action outside COP 5

“

A big turning point in my life was my first ever CAN meeting – the first CAN strategy meeting before The Hague. I'd been travelling for 36 hours continuously — 2 boats and 4 trains all the way from Ireland. I was unwashed and unshaved. I was a gardener back then, and not dressed too much smarter than just gardening clothes. It was the first time CAN saw me and they were probably like 'What on earth is this?'

I remember Alden was facilitating and I thought to myself that this guy was good. The whole meeting was a turning point for me. 'Wow, OK, so there are other people worried about climate change, just like me. They've already formed a network. Not only that, the

Network is open even to people like me. I'm not just talking to the moon or the wall any more, like in Ireland. Best of all, they're organized.' Particularly impressive was the power of ECO and Fossil. Governments were scared of

Fossils back then. So I spent the first week of The Hague watching CAN in business. As huge as ECO and the Fossils were, everything happened in the open in CAN daily meeting. It was very empowering for someone as weird and new to the game as I was to be allowed to participate in such a powerful forum, validly claiming to represent global civil society. I'm sure a lot of people were thinking 'who on earth is this guy, only just showed up here, and already he's raising a ruckus.' But it wasn't just me, there were others doing the same.

—Pat Finnegan

There was a big action which was piling up sand bags around the conference centre, to symbolize that we have to stop sea level rise. We also had football matches with 'heads of state' playing against each other to visualize what the negotiations looked like with teams and competitors. It really helped the media to understand something very dry.

—Delia Villagrasa



USCAN, led by John Passacantando, hosted an action in the halls of the Maritim calling out the US for faking climate action in 2000





The dike protest at COP 6 was truly massive. Basically, Friends Of The Earth Netherlands spent the whole year organizing the truly massive logistics, which including shipping in lorry loads of sand right into the middle of The Hague – enough sand to make a pile of sandbags 3 feet high right around the conference centre. Jan Pronk, the COP President, came out to the dike, took a sandbag, and said, 'I believe and support the NGOs. I will take this inside and leave it on the podium as a reminder to delegates of the importance of this COP.' Everyone thought it was a just a stunt, but he took it inside and it stayed on the podium right to the end.

—Pat Finnegan

Sinks issues began to come up well before Kyoto. How to cope with emissions from LULUCF was difficult because of high uncertainty in the estimates of emissions. The biggest impact I probably ever had was circulating a briefing paper that contained a table of uncertainties from the IPCC. The head of the Brazilian delegation and chair of SBSTA waved the paper and told SBSTA, 'you should all read this.' It was the NGO position that we didn't want land use or gases other than carbon dioxide going into Kyoto because we didn't think you could estimate them really well.

—John Lanchbery

The substantive story is the power of ECO. Around Tuesday or Wednesday of the second week of The Hague COP, very carefully timed, the Americans produced their sinks proposal. They sent it to the EU first. The EU sinks people had a quick look at it, and agreed they could likely work with it. Bill Hare, Malte Meinshausen, John Lanchbery and the other CAN Sinks folk took the spreadsheet for the proposal back to their B&B, dug deep into it, and pretty soon found a number of things pretty wrong, including things like decimal point errors, which may or may not have been deliberate. In particular, they worked out how

seriously the Americans were manipulating the discount rates. They spent most of the night performing the analysis, wrote it up as an ECO article, and there it was, front page of ECO the next day.

The EU then had a big internal discussion on what to do next – basically without a sinks deal with the USA, there was no agreement possible at COP 6. CAN was saying that this is a bad deal, yet the EU had already said that it was fine. They ended up totally split. As President, Dominique was presiding the call, and eventually, to the disgust of the UK, the EU sent the sinks proposal back to the Americans telling them it wasn't good enough. The conference timed out with no agreement. The building had to be cleared on the Saturday for a Christmas exhibition or something due in on the Monday. CAN's view was that no deal was far better than a seriously bad deal, and the EU finally came round to that.

—Pat Finnegan

That was our high point, when LULUCF crashed the whole process. Well, not really.

—John Lanchbery

The process broke down at The Hague because no one knew what the final outcome of the US election would be. There was a huge EU/US conflict on sinks. The EU wanted a tough line on crediting for domestic sinks. The US was saying, 'are you crazy? You could be dealing with the Bush Administration. You want to deal with us.' This was probably the low point in terms of CAN unity and messaging strategy. There were two impromptu press conferences going on at the same time. The big international groups were telling the EU to stay strong. Two of the US groups were saying the EU is crazy not to cut a deal. They were standing on tables at different ends of the hall and journalists were shuttling back and forth. All this as ministers were leaving for the airports and the talks were breaking down. It was crazy.

—Alden Meyer





It was a nightmare in The Hague, when the whole thing broke down. We put out a press release saying that 'the rich countries have decided to build higher and broader dikes from which they can watch the rest of the world suffer and drown.' We basically printed it on black paper. Jennifer and Bill and Rhoda jumped up on tables and gave this press conference. And when they were done, some Americans stood up and said 'and now we'd like to give you the American take' and one of my American colleagues was so embarrassed she crawled under the table.

—Steve Sawyer

I still remember, I and all the other CAN folks, after a long night at the end of the conference, the COP President, Minister Pronk said that they had failed and everyone was shocked and depressed. We had a real mental setback for the next few months.

—Yuri Onodera

One important push for the need of a permanent structure and a more sophisticated way of defining our position was COP 6. For the NGOs, this was a very hard lesson because we could not make clear with one voice what we wanted. And that was an important element of where we said, 'This should not happen any more'.

—Karla Schoeters



Amidst the fallout from The Hague, CAN members made a renewed effort to even further coordinate the organization's work, with a survey among key regional people on network governance that fed into a discussion that produced a more concrete proposal for establishing a CAN-International charter, which would lay down the essential rules for the Network's governance.



One of the guys active in South Africa CAN, Stefan Raubenheimer, was appointed to develop a process for the constitution for CAN. He'd done a lot of mediation with stakeholders coming from many different places, and understood concerns about the south being drowned out.

—Richard Worthington

The meeting was in Bali in early 2001. That was the first that I recall an in-person discussion of how we create this new international experience. It was so cool – you knew something was changing and this was the beginning of a new chapter. Great international representation and all of the nodes were there. We had a bazillion posters and stickies and flip charts up on the wall. It was getting to the heart of international advocacy of how to get us on the same page. We're all sitting in the pool in our bathing suits and drinking, but have the draft documents all around us.

—Nathalie Eddy

It was very uncommon for CAN to have a meeting outside the negotiations. We were there for five days with about 30 people. We had prepared the basis of what should be the backbone of CAN-International. We had a document of what we could achieve. In Bali, everyone agreed that there was a need for the formal structure.

—Karla Schoeters





But amidst this internal progress came another pivotal moment in the negotiations, the COP 6-bis in Bonn. This continuation of the meeting at The Hague, which brought civil society, including CAN together, allowed the UN climate process to continue on to the COP 7 in Marrakech.

“

The highlight for me would really be the recovery from the mess in The Hague. That took a lot of damage control. By the time we came together for COP 6-bis in Bonn, it wasn't quite a smoothly oiled machine, but it was much better.

—Steve Sawyer

”



Friends Of The Earth Germany's Daniel Mittler, organized a boat as a protest for COP-6-bis. The logistics were massive. The boat stood for Noah's Ark and it was huge, about the size of the terrace at the Maritim. They built a steel boat frame and asked people from all around Europe to come and clad it with personalized wooden shingles.

For the first week it was parked up in the MünsterPlatz, right in the middle of Bonn—a huge effort to get permission for it, let alone build it. For a whole week people were building it, adding on hand-painted shingles. On the middle Saturday of the conference – the same day as the huge and notorious Genoa G8 protest – there were still 4000 people in Bonn for the demonstration, 4000 people who believed it was important enough. The Ark was pulled all the way down from the MünsterPlatz to the Maritim. At that point a deal was nowhere in sight, so there were some really tough negotiations going on inside the Maritim.

Negotiators really felt the pressure, a lot of people had come a really long way to fill those sandbags in The Hague and build that boat in Bonn. They were thinking that this was pretty significant. They thought that everyone was going to be in Genoa. There were all these people outside the conference and yet they knew CAN also had highly competent experts inside it, watching every move. So this is the lesson: CAN has the capacity to go inside a negotiating room and spot highly technical errors in a really complex spreadsheet, or to understand the implications of moving one small word in a treaty text. However, that capacity doesn't have the full impact unless we also have large numbers of people outside the room, standing on stilts, making music, building boats, filling sandbags, all those things, supporting those inside the room. All of that also needs a real sense of belief and determination, to be totally genuine and committed, not just a crowd showing up simply because it happens to be a huge media event, like Copenhagen unfortunately was.

—Pat Finnegan



Part of what helped unify everyone was George W. Bush. That helped everyone to say that you're not the decider on whether Kyoto lives or dies. Japan was a major target – we had flooded the place with these buttons and placards, with the Japanese rising sun, which read 'Honor Kyoto.' And it worked. The US was totally isolated, and everyone went on to do the Marrakech Accords. That was another high point, to put pressure on Japan to break with the US and save Kyoto.

—Alden Meyer

One of the exciting parts of getting involved in CAN was the first time I was at an international meeting at COP 6-bis and people sat down as an equity group. They had been having discussions about what to do with equity in the system and how to give force to the equity principles. I didn't go to the CAN Equity Summit, which was particularly important for people concerned about equity in the CAN.

The first COP I went to was a hell of an empowering experience for me. I came in on the coattails of Richard Sherman. We had regional coordinators who helped to coordinate work in between the COPs, which has now become part of the Political Coordination Group. The coordinators group, Richard was the Southern Africa coordinator, so I was getting access to some high-level people right off the bat, and they gave a lot of time and goodwill in getting us up to speed, so the Network was really investing in people. Sitting in the Equity Group was a very steep learning curve, and before I knew it Richard was gone and I was the coordinator and getting pulled into the substance of the negotiations and the quite painstaking process to formalize the board and bylaws in a way that didn't give all the power over to a few groups, and many of these groups were trying hard to develop a more global approach.

—Richard Worthington

The amazing dike action that required months of sandbag preparations at COP 6



“

In Marrakech, the intensity of lobbying meant people sleeping only a few hours. Some of the compromises that had been reached across groups in Kyoto, despite some misgivings, were carried into COP 7. It was key for me to see people who were really solutions oriented, for example coming up with the Gold Standard for CDM, as a way to address some potential inequities in this system. Still, the flex mechs and CDM were often presented as some support to developing countries to undertake mitigation, but it was really quite clear that it was to reduce the cost of mitigation of developed countries. The very frank discussions we had in CAN were a surprise to me, as we had a lot of technical experts and a more nuanced approach to how we talked about these issues—this has been a great strength of CAN over the years, in my experience.

—Richard Worthington

We had the NGO Party somewhere like on a boat. Back then the Friends Of the Earth groups were represented by Kate Hampton. It was fun to work with her, she is very outspoken and she loved the parties, so she declared at the beginning of the party that there was no mentioning of any 'c' word – climate, carbon, any negotiation-related word. And if you did say it, you had to buy a drink and also finish whatever drink you had. And I think it caught on with most of the participants. We went on the 2nd party, the 3rd party, and I think I wound up on the bathroom floor of my hotel without remembering a lot of what we did. And when I came back to the negotiations, there were many negotiators and NGO members smiling at me, and I thought to myself, what had I done? And later I learned that I had been mimicking the 'Data' character from Star Trek most of the night. I was both embarrassed and had a lot of fun.

—Yuri Onodera

”



2002-2005: LEGALIZE CAN



Then we had Rio+10 in Johannesburg and most of the groups there were working on renewable energy targets. There the US and others opposed to such targets won. Most people felt pretty disappointed by that meeting. It felt like Bush had won against any commitment to global and national targets for renewables.

—Alden Meyer



With Marrakech and Rio+10 behind them, CAN members again focused on building the Network. The first CAN General Assembly met in October 2002 around the COP 8 negotiations in New Delhi. As part of the initial charter that had been prepared for discussion, CAN members agreed that:

The vision of CAN is a world striving actively towards and achieving the protection of the global climate in a manner which promotes equity and social justice between peoples, sustainable development of all communities, and protection of the global environment. CAN unites to work towards this vision.

The charter formalized, among others, the rules for regional demarcation, ascribed membership duties and rights, and set forth the establishment of a CAN General Assembly as the main decision-making body and a Board of Directors, whose main roles would be:

1. to manage the staff of a to-be-established legal entity, the Secretariat, and;
2. to help resolve conflicts in the Network.

With the interim adoption of the CAN Charter, also the first Board of Directors was elected. It consisted of eight members, in which one was slot was specifically reserved for large CAN organizations. No Board officer roles were determined by the Board, as these had not been foreseen by the Charter. The Board was then in charge

of overseeing the creation of a legal entity in the name of CAN-International and finding start-up financing.

In June 2003 in Bonn, the legal entity of CAN was formalized with the Board of Directors including such CAN individuals as Bill Hare, Jennifer Morgan, Gurmit Singh, and Karla Schoeters. They drafted the statutes for CAN-International and took it to the German courts. The Board also sent out a job announcement for a coordinator position with the CAN Secretariat. Before that, it was mostly the US and the Europeans (based on their bigger capacity than other nodes) who coordinated the international network along with their regional work.

Following successful fundraising from the German government. Interviews were held at COP 9 in Milan, Italy in 2003 and Sanjay Vashist of India was hired. The CAN Charter was also finalized at this COP.

A host for the new CAN Secretariat was sought, but despite a preference for a Southern location, none could be found and the decision was taken to establish the office in Bonn, Germany close to the UNFCCC offices, which had inherent advantages for the yearly Bonn sessions of the subsidiary bodies and contact to UN staff. Additionally, the Mayor of Bonn offered free office space for five years.



The charter wasn't adopted at the first General Assembly, but we agreed to proceed on the basis of what we had. An interim board was elected with a view to moving the Board into a more formal structure. It was interesting times around the formation of the Board and anxiety about whether this wouldn't be a way of strengthening the mandate but not addressing capacity. So there was a lot of effort in creating balance and regional representation. People were elected in their personal capacity, but with a view toward regional representation, but not trying to mirror the UN. There was no legal structure that regions could answer to at that time. Election without hidden ballots is a tradition that continues in CAN. There would be discussion and shows of hands toward narrowing down the slate. The process has been to identify a prospective board and move on this as a collective. It's the only way to make sure that you have regional balance.

—Richard Worthington



For these reasons, the organization had to be legally registered in Germany. To distinguish the legal organization from the international network it served, it was named “Climate Action Network Association e.V.” Since the Charter was the only document adopted by the General Assembly, bylaws for the new organization were written with the help of German NGO members fluent in the legal requirements of German charities. All of these efforts finally accomplished, the CAN-International Secretariat began its official operations as a registered legal entity in February 2004. CAN-Europe, as the largest regional node office and the one closest to the newly established Secretariat, supported the start-up with financial and administrative management, and helped sort out these formal arrangements with German institutions.



When meetings happened in Europe and Latin America and all the people coming from Asia were sleeping due to the jet lag. The Milan CAN strategy session was my first, it was happening in the evening, and I was the one desperately sleeping through it, while trying to get engaged in the Adaptation Working Group.

—Sandeep Chamling Rai



But members would have little time to sleep during the drama of COP 11 in Montreal, Canada.



My first memory of CAN is attending the Montreal COP. It was my first COP, my first exposure to the international climate negotiations, and I was hideously confused. CAN provided a structure for me to understand the negotiations through, and whilst I was having trouble understanding what was going on, at least I had CAN meetings to attend. I remember being amazed about how CAN members managed to keep so much information, so much intelligence, so much technical information together. There was a matrix being produced and updated each day about the issues we were concerned about and how they were progressing. I was very amazed, although very little of it made sense to me, how well coordinated these CAN people were.

—Julie-Anne Richards





Our Canadian colleagues did an amazing job. During the COP, it became clear that CAN needed something like a political coordination group, and it's the first COP I'm aware of that an attempt was made to formalize what would later become PCG. The group would exchange political information and then interact with the policy advisers of the COP Presidency. Engagement with emerging economies colleagues was key. For the first time, we had a lot of young colleagues from those countries and the pressure on them was enormous – they were looked at as the sole representatives of their countries – and when the politics got heavy some of them almost broke down under the pressure, but the personal friendships that was used to support them worked really well.

—**Hans Verolme**

The crowning glory was where we walked in to the negotiations in Montreal where everyone was saying there was absolutely no chance for a 2nd commitment

period, but guess what, we walked out with an agreed process to get one. And that was through a combination of being smart, fast, and opportunistic, yet inclusive to the extent that inclusivity was possible. We held the Canadian minister's hand throughout COP 11, and it worked. They faced down the Americans, who threatened a walkout, and everyone else said, 'well, we're carrying on.' Although there were many soiled undergarments in the Canadian delegation, it paid off in the end.

—**Steve Sawyer**

There was a key moment of Japan staying with the EU and leaving the US, and this helped to save the new negotiating track, the Dialogue. This was conveyed by the top official of the Japanese delegation to the Kiko Network, and we conveyed this to CAN coordinators meeting. This helped to stop the panic that was going through many governments, which helped us to achieve success—this was a very important moment for both CAN and the negotiations.

—**Yuri Onodera**



“

One of my last CAN moments was standing in the back of the room and watching the process in Montreal unfold. Until quite late. Well, quite early. And from that I learned a lesson that I will never forget— ignore the Russians at your peril. They are not just being quiet—they will extract their pound of flesh and will need to be part of your strategy from the beginning.

—**Steve Sawyer**

The negotiations on that second track was where the chief US negotiator, Harlan Watson stormed out, claiming other countries were trying to trick the US into accepting binding commitments. 'If it walks like a duck, and talks like a duck, it's a duck,' he said. His walkout happened at one or two in the morning, and at dawn National Environmental Trust sent its staff to buy every rubber duck it could find at every toy store in Montreal. By mid-morning, everyone had

them. Delegates were carrying them in their pockets. I remember going into a speech that President Bill Clinton was giving, and security confiscated my duck, as if it were a dangerous weapon. Fortunately, my friends at NET gave me another duck.

It was also the best NGO party ever. An industrial dance hall had been rented, with a DJ who was playing 45 minute blocks of pulsating techno music. There was like a 50 foot high ceiling with women hanging down doing trapeze acts. Lots of CAN members were lifting women on their shoulders and dancing like they were in the pool. That was a real highlight for CAN. The NGO Party has become a tradition that creates relationships and breaks down barriers.

—**Alden Meyer**

”

Talks

21 - 27 August 2008

CAN presser in Accra at 2008 intersessional

United Nations Network Convention on Change

2006–2008: A NEW BEGINNING

2006 marked not only a new negotiating season following Montreal, but a recommitment by Central and Eastern European (CEE) NGOs to rebuild their Network. A CAN-CEE regional node was created in 1994, since groups from these regions had been active in CAN from close to its beginning, but maintaining the Network had been challenging over the years, and even with the 2006 commitment, no funding nor coordinator were immediately available. Despite these challenges, the Network would continue and become CAN-Eastern Europe, Caucuses and Central Asia (CAN-EECCA).

By late 2006, difficulties in securing funding for the Secretariat and to support Southern regional nodes prevented CAN from continuing to employ a coordinator. At the General Assembly convened at COP 12 in Nairobi, along with the farewell to the CAN Coordinator, Sanjay, a new Board was elected that had a record overall number of thirteen directors. This brought with it a wave of fresh voices on the Board and the election of two chairs to help manage its larger size. An agreement with CAN-Rac Canada was also reached for them to take over financial management of CAN-International from CAN-Europe.

“

I was on the Board the year between Bali and Poznan, which was the period of time when CAN didn't have a paid Secretariat. So the Board had to keep CAN running – which we did by being run by an iron fist. People wrote reports on what they would do, many Excel spreadsheets were used in that period to keep it going.

—Julie-Anne Richards



Out for dinner with WWF in 2008.

My first interaction with the international network was in managing the website for CAN during Nairobi. The only person who was actually contributing to this blog we were doing was Julie-Anne. I remember waking up every morning, and there was a post from Julie-Anne describing a day in the life.

—David Turnbull

”

“

Nairobi launched adaptation in a big way, building on the results of the Delhi meeting a few years earlier. CAN developing country NGOs did a lot to get adaptation on the agenda.

—Alden Meyer

CAN has been very helpful in supporting adaptation. I work very closely with the LDCs. They need special treatment and their voices need to be heard over and above their level of economic development. And I've always received very good support from CAN. CAN's biggest advantage is that it speaks to the citizenry of the LDCs.

—Saleemul Huq

”



*Kat and Karim,
CAN Europe staff in 2008*



In Bonn in June of 2007, I remember walking into the CAN Daily meeting—I came in midway through the session. The room was about a quarter of the size of the rooms we use now, in what is now the small NGO office. I had no idea what words people were using and what the acronyms were and was feeling like everyone was really smart, and Karim Harris, who was comms director for CAN Europe, took me under her wing and showed me around and showed me to the folks at the UN media shop, key reporters. It was amazing how quickly the things fell into place. Julie-Anne also sat me and another new to the process person, Tove Ryding, down and between Karim and Julie-Anne and Matthias from CAN Europe, it was kind of crazy how quickly you could jump right in.

Within a couple of days, I felt like I had friends I could come up to and ask questions, I felt like I knew where I was supposed to be and had this connection to this Network that was making sure that I was making the most of my

time. You can't be in CAN and not have something to do. I remember sitting for the first time in the Insel and having beers and playing soccer and feeling like this is a really cool family and cool international network of people, and having this really amazing bond just from hanging out in Bad Godesberg.

— **David Turnbull**

Lord Monckton was always a funny one. In Bonn at the back of the Insel, there is a little meeting room, and at the back is this huge portrait of a woman, who looks a lot like Lord Monckton. David and I were facilitating a meeting back there, it was going really late, everyone was getting grouchy, and to lighten the mood I looked at the portrait and said, 'it looks like Monckton is looking down on us,' which got a chuckle. Our meeting went on for about half an hour more, and then when we came out, who was having dinner in the Insel, but Lord Monckton.

— **Julie-Anne Richards**





Somewhere in this, I hope someone talks about the Insel. There was a lot of table dancing at the Insel.

—Nathalie Eddy

Equity came to a head in Bali. There was a very large contingent of people from the Third World Network, the FOE network and climate justice community, who very openly started to challenge some of the 'dinosaurs' in CAN. That was partly because there was an influx into the climate negotiations of people who had worked on other issues, like trade. As a result they were framing the politics of climate change more in terms of trade and development than in environmental terms. There was a serious disagreement about how to assess both the tactics and substance of the negotiations. That battle around equity became very deep and deeply personal because people felt that their personal integrity was being called

into question. It led to several organizations leaving CAN. Yet, after a year or so it led to a much deeper exploration of what equity means which, in my view, has contributed to the growth of CAN and the deepening of positions. Those groups that left have become less visible in the UN process, in which CAN is now the dominant NGO player.

—Hans Verolme

Of course, halfway through Bali I got food poisoning, and on my way back to my hotel in the taxi, I stopped at the hotel where we were going to have the NGO party, and we needed to put a credit card down, so on my way to my hotel to go throw up and be sick for 36 hours I paid for the CAN party, and people like to say that was one of the best NGO parties. I feel like it was a special role I played in making that happen.

—David Turnbull





My memory is that Bali was the first COP for me that went into extra extra...extra extra meetings, where we all got sent home after sitting around for hours waiting for it to end. And so at 9am they open the plenary for like 3 minutes and we waited around for hours, and it was the plenary that refused to die. I'd recommend watching it if it's still on the UNFCCC webcast. Yvo burst into tears on stage after China accused him of working against the G77 and he runs off stage, and everyone in the plenary is just gob smacked.

By the time it came to a climax many people had already left, but here were a bunch of hardened NGOs in the back of the room, with no chairs, sitting on the floor. When the US said they would block consensus on the Bali Action Plan—that's when the booing started. From vicinity very, very close to where I was sitting. And the booing picked up, and overtook the whole plenary hall. It was an amazing moment—it doesn't come through very well in the webcast. The US delegates just sat there, there are pictures of them,

including 3D pictures taken by Peter Bahouth of USCAN, just smiling like idiots.

It was very uncomfortable, and moments later there were phone calls back to Washington, saying that this position is untenable, they won't live with this. Then the US backed down and the enthusiasm was palpable. All the press jumped out of the room to file.

—**Julie-Anne Richards**

CAN of course played a critical role in working with the EU, South Africa, and other developing countries to craft a strategy on the floor to isolate the US and get them to reverse their position on opposing the Bali Action Plan. John Coequyt was then at Greenpeace USA, and had a friendship with Dave Banks, who was a deputy at the Bush White House's Council on Environmental Quality. Dave actually used John's cell phone to get back to the White House so that they could send instructions to the State Department to get them to drop their objection to the Bali Action Plan. There, a personal relationship helped to broker the deal.

—**Alden Meyer**



“

It involved so many different aspects of what's good about CAN: political intelligence from all corners of the earth, policy analysis that was able to understand what we needed and what was the best outcome, communications from doing our daily press briefing, the best spokespeople we could find from different voices, the Fossil of the Day where they were really kicked-up a notch from Avaaz and the youth. All the tools were making that strategy a reality. While there were shades of grey about how positive people were about the outcome, people really felt like we had what we needed.

— David Turnbull

”

In Bali, a new slate of directors were also elected, and the Board was reduced to nine members. Successful fundraising enabled the start, in May 2008, of a hiring process for a new Secretariat Coordinator for CAN. This process concluded in August with the hiring of David Turnbull, until then with USCAN, as Director of CAN-International, starting October 2008.

“

I remember my first speech after I started as CAN Director, Matthias introduced me at the CAN Strategy session and made a big point of introducing me as the new director. It was in this steeply pitched auditorium, and just looking up at the crowd, I knew probably 2/3 of the people, but it was super overwhelming, to think that this is the Network I'm serving now. I was so humbled and excited, but also totally petrified.

—David Turnbull

”



CAN Europe Director sports a FoE shirt at the CAN Equity Summit while hanging with FoE

CAN-Rac Canada had also hired Montana Burgess to manage the CAN-International financial portfolio in 2008. David brought her on more substantively for the Poznan COP and she continued with CAN-International as Program Manager and later as Operations Manager, as part of the CAN Secretariat.

Alongside the restarting of the Secretariat, fundraising efforts continued with a view to increasing the capacity of CAN, with a focus on strengthening the voice of Southern nodes and colleagues. This was hardly the first time that emphasis had been

put on capacity building among CAN members. CAN-Rac Canada had, for example, organized a 3-day training weekend prior to the Montreal negotiations to help new participants in the negotiations become more effective advocates. Julie-Anne Richards, as CAN Australia Coordinator, organized a capacity building day for all CAN members ahead of the Bali COP.

CAN hosted an Equity Summit in late 2008 in India. Where CAN members came together to discuss equity and effort sharing for the Network and the climate negotiations. Friends of the Earth (FoE) International left CAN shortly thereafter along with a few country FoE organizations. CAN continued on nonetheless at the Poznan COP, where CAN's capacity building and policy coordination efforts continued, although negotiation progress was lacking.

“

Poznan was sort of a frozen nothing. People felt there wasn't a lot of progress and there was a lot of concern about the run up to Copenhagen.

—Alden Meyer

”





2009 COPENHAGEN: THE ROAD OF HOPE, DISAPPOINTMENT, AND RECOVERY

The Southern Capacity Building Program (SCBP), as it would come to be known, marked a renewed effort by CAN to recognize and support talented members in developing countries. The first Southern Capacity Building Program Coordinator, Shruti Shukla, was hired in 2009 and worked on the program for a year and a half. She supervised over 20 Southern Capacity Building Program Fellows in 2009 and launched the Voice newsletter. This newsletter continues today online, where the Fellows contribute to write articles and blogs that aim to give voice to communities in developing countries most affected by escalating climate change impacts.

CAN members kicked-out of the Copenhagen climate conference found same alternative space to hold the CAN daily coordination meeting

*CAN Secretariat band (staff)
in Tianjin in 2010*



Matthew Maiorana joined the team as Program Assistant, along with Julie-Anne Richards as International Policy Coordinator in mid-2009. Hunter Cutting was also lent-out by Resource Media to help coordinate CAN communications during 2009 and 2010 UNFCCC meetings, after having helped CAN in a similar capacity in previous years. With this additional capacity, CAN was able to coordinate more effectively members with full-time staff, as well as coordinate internally.

Alexander Ege also joined the staff in the run-up to Copenhagen as the COP 15 Logistics Coordinator and worked closely with David for the two months he spent living in Copenhagen. Alex stayed on in 2010 to work with Julie-Anne as Program Assistant. This position was also held by Enrique Maurtua Konstantinidis, a CAN Latin America representative, who later helped coordinate and build CAN Latin America coordination.

The CAN Secretariat held its first staff retreat in 2011 in the US





In 2009, we had a large number of the Southern Capacity Building workshops, and Shruti was travelling all over the world from the Cook Islands to Argentina, to Uganda, and China. I was able to go to two in Nepal and Uganda, and both of them were new places, new people to meet, who were doing really cool stuff on the local or regional level you might not know otherwise. I remember dancing outside of the conference centre in Africa with all of our Africa colleagues. Geoffrey Kamese, was on the CAN Board, and is really great and helped out with the Adaptation Working Group. He took us to an adaptation project outside of Kampala, where they were working on reforesting land and water harvesting, and you realize that the Network is from that super local scale out in a part of Uganda all the way to the WWF Internationals of the world. It was the most rewarding thing to see this work on the local scale. I will always cherish that experience.

The same with Nepal, sitting one night in the workshop

with some of these long-time climate activists from India and Bangladesh and Sri Lanka and Nepal and Pakistan, hearing about Indian renewable energy targets and the wind and solar mission and realizing that they were having the same strategic conversations we were in the US – how do you push your government and what is the correct baseline. In 2009 we were able to pull off like six or seven trainings. It was a really impressive undertaking and so important in helping to ensure all these folks from around the world were involved in Copenhagen.

—David Turnbull

The Southern Capacity Building Program was a catalyst, having contributed to developing a large and representative membership. It allowed the consolidation of CAN West Africa and its expansion in seventeen countries from West and Central Africa, with almost forty members. The Program increased West African members' participation to CAN activities and to UN conferences on climate change. At least fifteen members from Western and Central Africa were able to benefit from this program by taking part at the UNFCCC or Regional Capacity Building workshops.

—Emmanuel Seck



*Alden Meyer lets out a sigh of relief
as the long and difficult Copenhagen
COP comes to an end*



“

Later on, before Copenhagen, the development NGOs, first in the UK probably, started coming in. Things went up a notch; there were many, many more of us. That helped in a number of ways, like Gordon Brown in the UK didn't really get the environment very well, but he got development, so we started getting meetings with the Prime Minister. Effort's been sustained since then, though with some organizational cutbacks after Copenhagen.

—John Lanchbery

And then you're into the snows of the Bella Centre in Copenhagen.

—Alden Meyer

”



One key moment for me was in a meeting about NGO access when I challenged Yvo de Boer. Tuesday or Wednesday night of the second week. Yvo brought the NGO Focal Points in, sitting with UN Security and the head of logistics on the other side of him, and he told us that he was going to have to kick all of the NGOs out. He talked about how he was concerned about safety, etc. It was like he was trying to pretend that he didn't want to make this announcement but he had to, and he says, 'do you have any questions?' So I raised my hand and go on this long sort of soliloquy about how everyone in the room was there with one single purpose, to achieve success in Copenhagen, and were there to support a success and progress in Copenhagen. I ended by saying that it was doomed for failure if all the NGOs were kicked out and he was going to be blamed because no

agreement made behind closed doors was going to be accepted by NGOs and civil society.

It was one of my first times seeing him without anything to say. And I remember Anabella from the Trade Unions saying, 'I agree with everything David had to say.' And then of course the business guy was like 'well, it's fine with us if NGOs are kicked out as long as there are closed circuit televisions' which drew some jeers from others. But in the end we were able to negotiate the limited access of some NGOs for the remainder of the COP. After I got out of the meeting, I remember Jennifer Morgan walking up with two beers in hand, asking, 'what's going on?' and it was the most well-timed beer I ever had. In the end, I think it's likely we had some impact in the waning hours of Copenhagen because of that, the intervention, not the beer.

—David Turnbull



“

Copenhagen was a truly crazy time. Arriving each day at 7am for the first meeting (which at least meant we avoided the queues in the snow). The CAN daily meetings were giant! When we got split between the inside and the outside, I was tasked with coordinating activities on the outside. Montana had a very tough time trying to organize a space for 200 CAN members to meet for the CAN daily meeting outside the conference venue. We tried a couple of different venues. We tried first in the NGO space and Richard Worthington and I facilitated that meeting.

We were trying to Skype to the folks on the inside to find out what was going on. People were relaying rumors of rumors. The next meeting we had in the student hall. I recall it being an awful meeting, mostly because no one had any idea what was going on; by this stage it was obvious that a train wreck was coming and everyone felt so

disempowered. With the benefit of hindsight, we probably could have slept for days and then worked out in the end what was happening.

I recall watching the final plenary, back in my hotel room, starting to nod off because I was so tired, and then Ambassador Lumumba Di-Aping, the Chair of the G77, started to talk about climate change and Africa and how what the developed countries were doing was worse than the gas chambers at Auschwitz and that jolted me out of my slumber. I have memories of meeting David and Alden when they came back on the final night (from inside the conference centre) with my left over pizza, and Alden saying 'this is the end of multilateralism.' It was that kind of moment. Copenhagen was an awful experience that I never want to repeat.

—Julie-Anne Richards

”



I wound up on this working group monitoring negotiations to make the call, within CAN, on when to move on press statements. It was really unclear whether we'd have a clear outcome or not, and at one stage the WWF media guy came to us and said, 'we have to go now.' He appealed to me as a WWF colleague, but I said, 'WWF can't move alone, we agreed it would be a group decision,' and he wasn't happy about it, but he stuck to it. So that organizational and collective discipline was impressive. So it was a collective decision on when to go to media and what the key messages would be. The whole experience of solidarity, I haven't found among such a broad group of people. There will always be people who say that it was dominated by the North and I'll say, while it wasn't perfect, it provided enormous opportunity for people to engage and the people who complained were those who didn't participate.

—Richard Worthington

One of my favorite moments was on the very last night of Copenhagen, when we were sitting in the NGO meeting room, it was just a few CAN members who were still able to stay in, around 2am standing in a circle biding time waiting for the negotiations. Jennifer, Alden and other long-time CAN members were there, sharing stories of Kyoto and Buenos Aires, sharing war stories. It was this moment when you realize how long these people have been fighting for this and dedicated their lives to it, and this was the biggest of the biggest now and we're trying to process what's going on now, and you felt like it was a band of brothers and sisters, a family. Gaines – this lovely comforting figure – was as usual sort of keeping folks centered and calm.

—David Turnbull



After Copenhagen CAN underwent a strategic planning process to determine how to move forward, learning lessons from Copenhagen with integrity. CAN members first met in March for 3 days following a short intersessional in Bonn to begin developing a strategic plan.

CAN internal strategy meeting in Bonn

2011–2013: CAN OVERHAUL

Early 2011 saw the release of two major administrative firsts for CAN: an annual report and Southern Capacity Building Program Coordinator in 2011 and joined the CAN Secretariat at the first ever CAN staff retreat in the US.



After the debacle of Copenhagen, getting equity into the negotiations was one of the early things CAN identified – that there wasn't a shared agreement on who was going to do what and who was going to pay. So we started to advocate hard for that. We've been pushing for that a long time, before Copenhagen of course, where CAN has been in the vanguard really, writing papers and positions, which is not easy, and has involved lots of very difficult conversations and a lot of tension, to come to grips with, to reconcile the politics. But it's not possible for us to say that countries should come to terms with equity if NGOs can't. CAN's ideas are being picked up by countries. So I think that's quite a win for us because it's a really important issue and it's so foundational for whatever else gets agreed.

—Julie-Anne Richards

In Durban, it was the final day, and the rooms were starting to be demolished, so we were looking for a place to have the CAN daily meeting. We met in a small outdoor area, and we were all huddled around having our meeting, and who should wander by and sit down, clearly very close trying to listen to us, but Lord Monckton. We attempted to have the CAN Daily in whispers, and someone, I think it was Matthias, came up with the brilliant plan to play this extremely annoying music from the 1980s on his laptop, and turned it toward Monckton, and we had the meeting on the opposite side of the computer, away from him.

—Julie-Anne Richards



Shortly after the closing of the Durban COP, came the close of David Turnbull's time as Director. Wael Hmaidan, then of IndyACT, was hired to replace him. Also in 2012, Ria Voorhaar, Communications Director, and Samantha Harris, Policy Officer, also joined the Secretariat.

“

Wael was first 'discovered' at CAN's strategy day for the opening of the Poznan COP, back in 2008. We needed a Southern voice for the kick-off press conference, and he volunteered himself from the floor. No one seemed to know who the heck he was exactly, but as I looked around the room I saw several thumbs up to go with the unknown, and so we went for it. The rest is history.

—Hunter Cutting

The Bangkok intersessional in 2012 was Sam's first meeting. We had the opening strategy session, and somehow in this meeting it was decided that Sam should write the opening ECO article, to introduce what we wanted to see. This was preposterous to ask someone



19. The CAN Secretariat's staff retreat in 2013 in Amsterdam

who had been working for CAN for six hours to write this. We got a tuk tuk back to get dinner and cocktails. She was completely freaking out, so we sat there, and over piña coladas and red curry, in the extreme heat, put together the opening article. A couple of other folk helped us—Ulriikka and someone else. Many ECO articles were written in that small row of restaurants and bars.

—Julie-Anne Richards

”

Before COP 18, CAN got an update with a new logo for the International organization and CAN nodes to use as well.



At the Doha COP, CAN's involvement helped strengthening the climate movement in the region to stay active beyond COP 18, by working with high-level individuals to have CAN's message heard by the ruling family and mobilizing Arab and global civil society into requesting "Qatar to lead" in the region. The outcomes of this work where that Qatar interacted with civil society and CAN advised the Presidency daily on how to achieve a strong COP 18 outcome. Qatar also pushed the countries of the Gulf region to commit to climate action and along with Saudi Arabia, UAE and Bahrain, pledged to submit emissions reduction targets in 2013. This is a completely new rhetoric that was welcomed by Arab civil society. Internally, at the CAN General Assembly, a two-year

CAN booth hosting Fossil of the Day at COP 5 in 1999



Before becoming the CAN-International Director, Wael Hmaidan was the Executive Director of IndyACT.



process to update the CAN Charter, led by the CAN Board under the direction of Morrow Gaines Campbell III, was completed and CAN adopted a revised Charter.

During 2012 and 2013 CAN undertook a major review of the Network in the form of developing a 2013–2015 strategic plan. CAN identified three key roles for CAN. Firstly, CAN needed to continue doing what it does best: coordinating civil society work around international processes relevant to climate change, especially the UNFCCC process. Secondly, CAN needed to complement this international work by coordinating campaign opportunities among its members on national and regional levels. Thirdly, CAN would upgrade its role as civil society convener, by becoming the builder of a more holistic climate movement on the international, regional, and national levels within and outside the Network and reaching out to other social and development movements.

In order to meet these objectives, CAN began restructuring the Secretariat. In 2013, CAN staffed-up to be the largest CAN Secretariat in CAN-International's history. Siddharth Pathak succeeded Julie-Anne as International Policy Coordinator. Additionally, Ashwini Prabha joined the CAN communications team, Liga Efeja took on the role of Executive Assistant, Sarah Strack became the Network Development Manager, and Geoffrey Keey and Wawa Wang teamed-up to begin CAN's work on global campaign coordination.

Additionally, CAN took its equity work to another level in 2013 by developing its ideas on an equity reference framework presented in a brief paper which was used at the Warsaw COP.



CAN staff took internal coordination very seriously, meeting all the time, even in gondolas

THE FUTURE OF CAN

With so many successes, challenges, and stories behind them, CAN members now turn their attention to the future, celebrating their history while preparing to become an even better and stronger Network.



The difference between the CAN legalized 2004 and the one I see now is extremely large. In the run-up to Copenhagen, the organization had to become more professional. For many of the larger member organizations, the northern bias went away via natural causes. People were also very focused on making these networks truly global. In parallel, this also happened inside CAN. Many more people in the Network are from southern organizations; they have become the majority in the Network.

—**Hans Verolme**

The evolution on issues like adaptation has become much better balanced in terms of south and north. The NGOs have played an important role, particularly CAN. I think CAN is still the biggest group and has been a very positive one.

—**Saleemul Huq**

Previously there was a distinct between the north and south perspective within CAN. It's OK, because we come from different backgrounds, but the gap has narrowed down because there is now more understanding across what it's like to be from the other perspective, more respect for each other's views. What people give to CAN has increased a lot. There are many new members —young bloods coming into CAN and making it more diversified. We're getting to a point where we can be in a good place for the Paris COP.

—**Sandeep Chamling Rai**

CAN has got everything more organized in the interim because Copenhagen was just chaos, generally speaking. But I thought we recovered very well. It's very efficiently run nowadays, compared with the completely ad hoc days of the past.

—**John Lanchbery**





CAN is a better organized and better financed organization in many ways. At the same time, the new generation of CAN members, whom I don't know as well, their breadth and depth of knowledge on the issues is better than before on each specific area – it's individualized and compartmentalized; it's very effective and technical – but can feedback into the big picture. Bridging more to the civil society groups from the South becomes even more important. Better collaborations between CAN and non-CAN groups is needed; an even greater role for CAN members from the South.

—Yuri Onodera

I was away for 10 years and came back, and there was this army, and it was just awesome. Back then, I'm not sure I totally got when people were saying, 'this has to happen.' I think it's fantastic that we have the leaders we now

have. The role of CAN is enormous. I would never have guessed that it would get that big. I look back now and I'm impressed that I even survived.

—Nathalie Eddy

CAN is quite an amazing organization. It brings together civil society from around the world, from totally different countries, political systems, social backgrounds and gives them a way to directly work with an incredibly complicated, and anachronistic international system. I think that's the role for CAN, and CAN's the only one that can play it. We have this understanding now, especially after COP 15, though we had it before, that we need to work more on domestic politics, and that this is quite crucial. CAN is moving in this direction, but it's important that it continues to do so and find ways to link domestic politics with the international negotiations and vice versa. 2015 is our chance again, is a big deal, and needs to be. It's widely recognized that we can't treat it like 2009 and say it's all or nothing, there are a range of other

important things too, and an international agreement is only important in so far as it ensures countries take action domestically. Hence the need for domestic and international campaigning to work synchronistically.

—Julie-Anne Richards

The window is smaller, but the light is brighter.

—Pat Finnegan

We've been somewhat uneven in our public engagement and mobilization. There wasn't enough of a critical mass, and we needed outside messaging and mobilizing arms. Thus the rationale for launching the Global Campaign for Climate Action in the run-up to Copenhagen. I think, in the wake of Copenhagen, and the bad taste that left in our mouths, you've seen many of the bigger groups pull back from the UNFCCC, and fewer believe you can get much value in the international process. To CAN's credit, both its leadership and Board, recognizes you need a combination of national and international action to have success. And CAN

couldn't afford to pull out of the negotiations, as it's part of an overall strategy. I think that CAN is still pigeon-holed in a delegate's mind. It needs to broaden out at the national level and in other fora to do leadership accountability and put pressure on corporations not to side with the fossil fuel industry. In the current strategic planning, there's a focus on leadership strategies and strengthening the capacity of CAN nodes and key countries to ramp up mobilization in key countries.

—Alden Meyer

The challenge CAN has, that all of us have, is that the world is so much different from the world of the late 80s when we started. How do we now approach this problem? I think we're seeing at the United Nations a struggle to figure out what is the path forward. But it's encouraging that we now have hundreds and hundreds of group working on climate change, that didn't exist 10 or 15 years ago.

—Jacob Scherr





I think a big question is how much faith, effort and expectation to invest in the UNFCCC process. What happens to global governance? It's premised on countries acting in their collective interest, but countries don't do this and it's not set up to facilitate this. So it's an open question of whether they ought to spend more time acting on things parallel to the UNFCCC. While what has been delivered to date has been abysmal, it's the only place where countries could agree. So with the mandate for Paris, there is more of the same probably, but perhaps with less resources put in by participating organizations because they were soured by past experiences.

—Richard Worthington

We need CAN and the people involved, to be those eyes and ears watching to make sure that the international negotiations make progress and actually move forward, and are not slyly and sneakily adding in loopholes to agreements, but instead making sure the infrastructure is actually being built from the bottom up and being developed, so when we achieve the successes on the national level, the international negotiations are ready for it. That's an unheralded thing. It's not as sexy as running a No Keystone XL or pro-Australian emissions trading scheme campaign, but CAN is just such an important part of the puzzle, and without CAN it could go totally awry. Even if we don't think that an agreement is going to be reached this year, we need CAN working so that when we have the right conditions, we're not playing catch up and the regime is ready to absorb and lock in those goals. CAN is the Network to do it.

—David Turnbull

A threat and opportunity to CAN is for sure the richness of its membership, covering so many issues. Because climate change is so broad, touching upon development, human rights, the economy. But the threat is that these concepts mean different things to different people and can dilute the issue of climate, making it hard to find positions that really push governments forward. How do you balance those while keeping CAN a fun, hard-hitting, nimble organization? I believe that in between the global negotiation sessions, CAN should try to achieve the most on the regional level. There's more regional work that has a lot of potential that we have not yet explored enough and that politically could make quite an impact, beyond the purely UNFCCC work.

—**Delia Villagrasa**

People from different cultures with very different beliefs could meet each other only two times two weeks a year, and form a family because we had a similar goal. Even if we couldn't agree on something, we always appreciated each other for the work we did. That family feeling was where I got my energy from. I worked already at different places, but I've never had that same group feeling as I had with CAN. During the negotiations, the times that we worked together was amazing. Even today I still have a lot of friends from CAN.

—**Karla Schoeters**

CAN has established itself as very reliable to the process. Its points of argument are always made on solid science, voices on the ground, and this broad and good understanding of Parties' constraints. Respected by both Parties and the UNFCCC Secretariat, it's not just a one-off— they've had success for 25 years.

—**Megumi Endo**



AFTERWORD

When Wael and Montana first approached me about helping to tell the story of the Climate Action Network, it struck me as an excellent contribution to celebrating CAN's 25th Anniversary. I was eager to contribute. Telling a concise but interesting story about the many struggles and triumphs of this amazing Network was no easy task, for many of the same reasons that trying to coordinate a network of climate change advocates from around the world is such an accomplishment. This booklet is subtitled "*A History*" because there was no way to tell every story or interview every hero in our movement in the time and space allowed. Many other parts of our history have already been told, and many more are still left to share. These are left for others.

For *this* history, I am particularly indebted to the many interviewees who took time out of their busy schedules to share their memories with me, usually with at least one of us waking up much too early, staying up much too late, or while running down the corridors in between hectic UNFCCC sessions. These include, in no particular order: Alden Meyer, David Turnbull, Delia Villagrasa, Hans Verolme, Julie-Anne Richards, John Lanchbery, Karla Schoeters, Megumi Endo, Nathalie Eddy, Pat Finnegan, Manfred Treber, Richard Worthington, Saleemul Huq, Sandeep Chamling Rai, Steve Sawyer, Emmanuel Seck, Alister Sieghart, Jacob Scherr, and Yuri Onodera. This history also draws on several doctoral theses and CAN historical documents, including research by Christian Holz and Ian McGregor. Thanks is particularly due to Wael for first conceiving of the idea, and to Montana for shepherding it through.



Kyle Gracey



CLEAN ENERGY NEPAL
स्वच्छ उर्जा नेपाल
140 Bolele Marga, Thapagan, Kathmandu
P.O. Box No: 24501
Phone: +977-1-4454901
Email: info@cen.org.np | Website: www.cen.org.np

United States
JOIN THE MOVEMENT FOR TAKING ACTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

© Climate Action Network-International 2014.
All Rights Reserved.