



MINISTÉRIO DO AMBIENTE, DO ORDENAMENTO DO TERRITÓRIO E  
DO DESENVOLVIMENTO REGIONAL  
*Gabinete do Ministro*

**REUNIÃO INFORMAL DE MINISTROS DO AMBIENTE  
SOBRE ALTERAÇÕES CLIMÁTICAS**

Praga, República Checa

14 - 15 de Abril de 2009

**Sessão 1 – Adaptação às Alterações Climáticas**

Intervenção do Ministro do Ambiente, do Ordenamento do Território  
e do Desenvolvimento Regional

Dear Martin Bursic, President of the EU Council

Dear Colleagues

Being mainly a coastal country located in Southern Europe, as you know one of the most sensitive areas, Portugal faces numerous challenges in terms of adaptation to climate change.

Therefore, we support the development of an EU-wide adaptation strategy and welcome the Commission's white-paper as a step in that direction. It will provide us all with a common framework for our efforts.

Portugal initiated last year the elaboration of a National Adaptation Strategy, which is currently in draft form, and which the government intends to adopt still this year.

Like others, we will be learning by doing, and trying to build on our past experience, in particular, in dealing with weather related extreme events such as floods, droughts and forest fires. This is why we fully recognize the need to share experiences.

The idea of establishing a Clearing House Mechanism for sharing those experiences and developing our knowledge base, is certainly a promising idea. Similarly, on the second set of questions, we agree that the creation of an Adaptation Steering Group should be considered and its mandate should be discussed.

However, we must ensure that we avoid “institutional overload”. We must resist the too often temptation to organize too many meetings and working groups.

On the third set of questions that were raised by the Presidency, we believe there are currently a panoply of instruments and policies which are relevant to climate adaptation, although in most cases the link have not yet been properly identified.

But there are areas where we would need more attention... and more action!

For instance, following the informal meeting under the Portuguese EU Presidency in 2007, we see that water scarcity and drought are increasingly being taken into consideration in the context of the implementation of the Water Framework Directive. But we may need further impetus in this regard going forward as, unfortunately, water scarcity and droughts are only likely to increase in the future.

We further think the EU adaptation strategy should include the international dimension of water resources. Climate change impacts require transboundary, cooperative solutions in all areas, as we all know, and certainly EU shared river basins provide an excellent ground for cooperation.

We also think that it is more urgent than ever to protect soil and the crucial functions it plays – indeed both in terms of climate adaptation as well as mitigation.

The EU thus needs to adopt promptly a common legislative framework for soil protection.

Finally, we are content with the White paper's focus on the three main priority areas of water resources, biodiversity and ecosystems and land use. We endorse the cross-cutting nature of water as it truly impacts all other areas.

But as said, the adaptation strategies will be all the more successful if they truly mainstream adaptation into planning and policymaking across the board. That is precisely the stated aim over time of the draft Portuguese adaptation strategy under preparation.

For instance, the Portuguese adaptation strategy will build upon water storage and renewable energy production plans as tools to address, inter alia, water scarcity and drought management, forest fire-fighting and reduce our dependence of fossil fuels. Coupled with demand side, efficient management measures we will seek policies' synergies on all these areas.

Indeed, the adaptation White Paper is a good basis to start working together. It is very important to work on the basis of a common approach which Portugal fully supports going forward.

***Francisco Nunes Correia***

Ministro do Ambiente, do Ordenamento do Território  
e do Desenvolvimento Regional

+++++

**Sessão 2 – Financiamento para as Alterações Climáticas e Liderança**

Intervenção do Ministro do Ambiente, do Ordenamento do Território  
e do Desenvolvimento Regional

Thanks for giving us this opportunity to assess the status of our international climate negotiations in the run-up to Copenhagen. And I think it is appropriate to couple this

assessment with the issue of financing as it certainly is a key issue and one of Europe's challenges this year.

I heard attentively the presentations by Jules Kortenhorst, on the Catalyst project and financing issues, and by Maas Goote, on the strategy for the negotiations in Copenhagen. I very much share their points of view. I also fully agree with Conie when she says that the EU needs to keep the leadership that we proved to have in Bali during the Portuguese Presidency.

We very much believe that Europe's leadership over the past 8 years is not to be foregone. Our leaders have been particularly clear on this over the years – even when, as in the recent spring council, they fell short of putting forward specifics on financing.

We must be aware that Europe didn't lead on climate policy because of the former US administration. In fact, I cannot accept that we owe our leadership to George W. Bush. Rather, perhaps surprisingly to many, Europe led because it identified climate as an important area of, I dare say, geopolitical projection, in particular in terms of "soft power". I know that we, as Ministers of Environment should not adventure very far into other areas like geopolitics, but it is very clear to me that there is much more at stake than "climate change" as an environmental process.

Europe led because it now has developed a key interest in the form of the EC and member states Kyoto targets and, crucially, the EU ETS and the recent energy-climate package.

I dare to say that it is important for our economies that we keep that leadership, especially in a period of economic and financial crisis. We are in a process of changing the paradigm of our economies and this process requires leadership if we don't want to have an obsolete economy in ten or twenty years with all social and political consequences that follow from that. Of course it is very positive, and I think it is possible, that we share that leadership with the US.

We are all pretty much sure that the US will become again a constructive and leading partner. But we should aim at that this time it is co-leadership – actually as professed by President Obama just last week here in Europe.

Whether Europe does lead is really up to us Europeans not to a reengaged US. To Portugal, therefore, it is key that EU leadership is expressed through:

- First, continually pressing for the most ambitious possible international agreement post-2012 (as such ambition is unmatched by any major power), while at the same time seeking a politically realist outcome from Copenhagen.
- Second, although we need to put pressure on major players such as China to stop hiding behind the G77 protective banner, we need in that regard to put forward a balanced message in terms of both what we expect from developing countries with respect to mitigation and what we are prepared to support – that’s exactly why we lack a financing proposition.
- Third, we need to ensure the carbon market is enhanced and really made global. Here, too, we need a coherent message, not an ambiguous one.
- Finally, against this policy backdrop, we need to give our negotiators the flexibility to try out solutions and outcomes with third parties. If we don’t do that, soon enough others will be negotiating amongst themselves and the EU is, again, locked into close quarters debating not the essential.

**Francisco Nunes Correia**

Ministro do Ambiente, do Ordenamento do Território e do Desenvolvimento Regional

+++++

### **Sessão 3 – Preparação para a COP 15 e Estratégia Negocial**

Intervenção do Ministro do Ambiente, do Ordenamento do Território  
e do Desenvolvimento Regional

We had a good and lively discussion this morning. I agree with many who believe we need to figure out the right type of contribution that the environment ministers should make on financing in the run up to Copenhagen.

First of all, we perhaps need to remind ourselves of the fact that it is environment council that leads on the international negotiations. It is therefore an obligation of the environment ministers to steer the debate and assess at any given moment what the EU needs to convey on the negotiation table so as to move us closer to a deal in Copenhagen. We need to cooperate with other council formations, for sure, and we should be happy that the ECOFIN and the European Council are so involved. But to put it bluntly it's our face the one showing up in the negotiations. We are the ones that will be blamed if things go wrong.

This is why the financing debate is so crucial, because we all know there will be no Copenhagen deal without the right balance between developing countries actions and developed countries support. Unless and until we start putting on the table concrete ideas on support – as the G77 have – we'll have an unbalanced position which only focuses on mitigation actions and hardly anything on the financing quid pro quo.

Our Prime Ministers and Ministers of Finance have set a course we must now follow up. The ECOFIN is now closely involved as well, and that should be welcomed. Our job now is to discuss what is then the ENV Council role in going forward? What are the messages that we should convey to our Governments?

For me, it can be summarized as follows:

1. Indicate WHEN do we need to have more precise financing propositions between now and Copenhagen so as to effectively test them with our negotiating partners;
2. To contribute to the ECOFIN discussions in terms of outlining the key issues we believe are at stake, notably:
  - a. scale of needs – we believe a “ball park” figure should be in our minds
  - b. sources of resources e.g. pledging and Assigned Units auctioning
  - c. types of support e.g. multilateral, plurilateral or bilateral
  - d. governance requirements
3. Internally, criteria for burden sharing so as to ensure everyone contributes in a fair manner. We believe though we should not lock into burden sharing before Copenhagen. In other words, we might discuss principles but I'd recommend we don't lock in criteria. Otherwise we might spend our precious time negotiating internally where we should be negotiating externally.
4. Finally, make clear that there is much more at stake than a mere environmental inconvenience. No action is more costly than appropriate action and, above all, the geopolitics and the geo-economics of the 21<sup>st</sup> century are being forged throughout this process. If the EU doesn't play a proactive and leading role it will certainly pay a very high price for that.

***Francisco Nunes Correia***

Ministro do Ambiente, do Ordenamento do Território  
e do Desenvolvimento Regional