

## Plan of Personal Commitment and Action

A. Promote checks and balances, improve administrative processes, and enable accountability mechanisms under new financial flows for global climate funding.

1. Promote safeguards and grievance mechanism within the new financial architecture of funding for low-carbon development.

Currently, there is a debate within the UN climate negotiations and the G8 meetings over what entities should be responsible for the management and distribution of tens of billions of dollars in new climate funding. While some countries (particularly within the G8) are demanding funds to be channeled through the World Bank and other existing financial institutions, other countries are calling for the creation of an entirely new entity operating under and directly accountable to the Parties of the UNFCCC (similar to the Adaptation Fund Board established in 2007). Recognizing that dynamics between donor and recipient countries are politically complex, the prospect of new funding nevertheless offers an incentive to imbed enhanced accountability and governance mechanisms within the system channeling these new funding flows. While existing institutions such as the World Bank have a set of policies and safeguards that ought to apply to projects subject to funding distributed under their jurisdiction, it is unclear what, if any, safeguards will apply to new entities managing climate funds.

I hope to help craft the rules, safeguards and policies attached to these new climate funds. In furtherance of this effort, I would like to influence UNFCCC negotiations by (1) elaborating a concept paper outlining the administrative process under which safeguards and policies should apply to new climate funding (including funding for forest-related activities, adaptation projects, and mitigation activities) and (2) drafting decision text to facilitate consideration of this process under the new climate agreement governing funding beyond 2012. In further elaboration of number (1), I can commit to publishing a paper that will help outline consideration of customary rights of access to traditional use of resources for both indigenous and historically resource-dependent communities.

B. Improve US accountability for actions abroad under reforms to the Foreign Assistance Act

The U.S. House Foreign Affairs Committee is currently considering wholesale reforms to the entire system of foreign aid dispersed by the United States government. While many lobbying groups are active in ensuring that their “piece” of assistance receives the fullest funding possible, few (if any) individuals are engaged in considering the administrative process by which assistance is administered have already worked with Dinah Bear (formerly of White House CEQ) to submit a memorandum to the committee detailing the need to clarify the application of NEPA abroad. If additional time and resources are available, I would very much like to help craft a proposal detailing (1)

regulations applicable to activities involving official U.S. assistance abroad, perhaps in a form roughly coherent with IFI safeguards and domestic NEPA and similar project-related administrative processes, and (2) establish an office of administrative law judges who can apply these regulations and hear complaints of communities abroad who are adversely impacted by projects.

C. Utilize CSD processes and individual convention meetings in the lead-up to Rio + 20 to improve coherence between the Rio conventions (UNFCCC, CBD, and Convention to Combat Desertification).

The international environmental arena is very much in need for increased respect and adherence to the rule of law, particularly for multilateral environmental agreements. In the lead-up to Rio+20 proceedings, it would be helpful to promote an increased focus on the question regarding why UNFCCC negotiations and implementation has been taken so much more seriously by the global community than the other Rio conventions on biological diversity and desertification. These latter two conventions have significant overlap with climate matters, particularly in relation to forests (CBD/REDD) and adaptation (desertification/ adaptation). I would like to help educate climate negotiators (many of whom pertain to their ministry of environment which is responsible for all three conventions) on the overlapping nature of obligations contained in biodiversity and desertification conventions with the aim to enhance implementation and commitments for all of these treaties as we approach 2012. Additionally, it may be helpful to harness the more advanced commitments under the UNFCCC to enable compliance bodies at all levels. I would like to help enable a grievance mechanism under the auspices of the UNFCCC (but perhaps implementable at different scales, including a supranational expert fact-finding body such as the inspection panel and increased support for national entities to hear claims brought by local communities, to consider violations of laws applicable to climate funding, including relevant international obligations (such as the CBD, UNDRIP, etc) so that it can provide a model for the other agreements and perhaps become a compliance mechanism for a broader subset of MEAs than purely the UNFCCC.

Clearly these commitments far exceed the scope of what is possible for the Forum itself in Geneva, but looking forward over the medium term, I very much hope to pursue these particular items in furtherance of enhanced global environmental governance.