

**Short WORKSHOP REPORT FORM**

**Number and title of workshop:** WS 3.3 Mutual Trust: the Gamut of Actors in International Climate Change Policy

**Coordinator:** Clarisse Kehler Siebert, Stockholm Environment Institute

**Date and time of workshop:** 11 November 2010, 17.30-19.30

**Moderator:** Richard J.T. Klein, Stockholm Environment Institute

**Rapporteur:** Asa Persson, Stockholm Environment Institute

**Panellists:**

Ashok Khosla, IUCN  
Jacob Werksman, WRI  
Izabela Ratajczak-Juszko, RMIT

**Main Issues Covered**

The workshop was introduced by raising the issue of a trust deficit between developed and developing countries in international climate negotiations, which is widely held as the key reason for lack of progress. What causes that lack of trust? How can trust be restored between developed and developing countries? In particular, the concept of MRV – measuring, reporting and verifying – was introduced, with the debate and disagreements surrounding it. The Copenhagen summit (COP15) did not resolve exactly what is to be measured, by the different groupings of Parties respectively. It was noted that it is more difficult to subject adaptation to MRV than mitigation.

To illustrate the trust deficit and how concretely it is expressed in climate negotiations, a film of the 'Bali breakthrough' from the COP13 meeting was shown. The three panellists were then invited to reflect on the concepts of trust, transparency and accountability, followed by a lively and highly interactive discussion with the workshop audience. The discussion touched upon four major themes, summarised below.

## Main Outcomes

**Need to define and problematize the notion of trust** – Participants recognised that there are several good reasons for the lack of trust between developed and developing Parties to the UNFCCC, including a series of broken promises on providing climate finance, extremely high stakes at play, and a fundamental lack of shared vision and expectations. However, the need to broaden the perspective on trust away from this one type of deficit was also demonstrated. There are also trust deficits within the group of developing countries, due to different development and vulnerability profiles, and within the group of developed countries, due to different legal as well as perceived responsibilities. In addition, lack of trust in institutions was mentioned as an issue. A further broadening is to understand climate policy not only as an international regime but also as a societal challenge, which makes public trust important. Public trust refers not only to trust in the regime but also in national leaders and delegations, and how well they represent individuals and groups. Public trust deficits also need to be reduced.

**Need to articulate theories of change with regards to transparency, accountability and trust** – In addition to a better understanding of the nature of the trust problem, participants called for a clarification of assumptions of how increased transparency on commitments and their fulfilment by Parties might lead to higher accountability – to other Parties but also to citizens and civil society – which would then enable stronger trust. One problem that was noted is that recent improvement in transparency on climate finance has not in the short term led to higher trust from developing countries, but has raised more suspicion regarding accounting methodologies and hidden agendas of developed countries. It was also argued that going for trust is futile and civil society should instead focus on accountability directly.

**Towards mutual accountability between developed and developing countries** – It was proposed that mechanisms for ensuring mutual accountability need to be found, regarding commitments to provide new and additional finance by developed countries and commitments to use funds wisely and undertake domestic mitigation actions by developing countries. One of the key problems here is the 60-year-old legacy of development aid which still shapes institutions. The transition from this paradigm to climate finance as restitution has begun, but funding conditionalities still exist and priorities are still not always country-driven.

**Reframing climate change away from a zero-sum game to an opportunity for systemic reform** – It was argued that as long as climate change is perceived as a zero-sum game and an issue of burden-sharing, there will be trust problems among actors. If it is seen as offering opportunities for investing in new energy systems, for example, benefits of taking action – both internationally and domestically – will be more apparent. It should further be seen as a systemic challenge, encompassing issues such as population and social development, which will have great impact on future emissions. At the same time, expanding the agenda in this way involves the risks of overburdening and slowing down international cooperation.

## Main Outputs

--

### **Recommendations, Follow-up Actions**

While the discussion revealed the need for better understanding of key concepts of trust, accountability, transparency – and the relationship of these concepts – a number of concrete issues and areas for civil society action were identified. Climate action generally needs more tools for visualisation; we need to see images of achievements, targets and impacts. There has so far been limited participation of civil society in major climate finance institutions (e.g. Climate Investment Funds), which needs urgent change. Civil society should also exploit the transparency on data on climate policy (e.g. CDM projects) that actually is available and hold decision-makers to account for results. This also requires better identification and capacity-building of relevant constituencies. A particular arena for capacity-building for accountability is the direct access modality, recently introduced with the UNFCCC Adaptation Fund. As developing country institutions can now directly access multilateral funds, national civil society should be supported in holding them accountable for using resources wisely. Watchdog functions are needed both at the international and national levels.

### **Workshop Highlights (including interesting quotes)**

“Some people call the Copenhagen meeting as the first world summit on accountability, rather than climate change.”

“Why do we need trust? We should go directly for accountability.”