



Who we are

CIDSE is an international network of Catholic social justice organisations¹ working together with others to promote justice, harness the power of global solidarity and create transformational change to end poverty and inequalities. It aims at challenging systemic injustice and inequity as well as destruction of nature. CIDSE promotes just and environmentally sustainable alternatives and believe in a world where every human being has a right to live in dignity.

The CIDSE network works for a society based on social, economic and gender equality and solidarity, where the economy is at the service of society and functions within planetary boundaries. We aim at a fairer share of and limits in the use of global resources, democratized governance where people regaining control over their choices, economies based on the commons.

CIDSE works for reforms with transformative potential: move away from fossil fuels and extractivism, limit global temperature rise below 1.5 degrees, promote the right to food and agroecology, regulate business to enforce human rights, secure sustainable finance and fair wealth distribution, support local communities to speak for themselves, confront gender inequalities, enabling sustainable ways of living.

To make this happen CIDSE contributes to global movements and alliances of change, promote peoples solutions and alternatives and advocate at the international level.

CIDSE brings together 18 member organisations from Europe and North America and its international secretariat is based in Brussels.

CIDSE and its member organisations would like to thank the presidencies of COP23 and COP24 for their joint efforts to organize the Talanoa Dialogue with participation of non-party stakeholders. As Pope Francis wrote in his Encyclical “Laudato Si”, more and broader dialogues are necessary to carry out the shift to a just and sustainable path of development. All groups of society in all countries, regions and on local level should start an honest dialogue about current development models and practices, and a shared vision for our future path. In the Talanoa Dialogue we expect that it entails the informed and empowered (and free) participation of all parties, especially the most vulnerable to social and ecological degradation worldwide. Moreover, participation is in good faith only if it is not controlled by powerful voices. This submission draws from the principles of Catholic Social Teaching, as well as CIDSE’s experiences of working with some of the people most vulnerable to climate impacts around the world.

¹ CIDSE members are: Broederlijk Delen – Belgium • CAFOD – England and Wales • CCFD - Terre Solidaire – France • Center of Concern – USA • Cordaid – the Netherlands • Development & Peace – Canada • Entraide et Fraternité – Belgium • eRko – Slovakia • Fastenopfer – Switzerland • FEC – Portugal • FOCSIV – Italy • KOO – Austria • Manos Unidas – Spain • Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns – USA • MISEREOR – Germany • Partage.lu (formerly Bridderlech Deelen) – Luxembourg • SCIAF – Scotland • Trócaire – Ireland

I. Where are we?

The scale of the problem posed by climate change cannot be overstated. Climate change is dramatically affecting people's lives – especially the lives of the poor and vulnerable – threatening the progress made in reducing poverty. If we fail to address it, climate change will have grave implications for the environment, society, human rights and the global economy.

Despite the huge challenge posed by climate change, it is only one striking example of people's impact on the planet. The way we live today is causing environmental degradation, destruction of ecosystems, and large-scale land, water and air pollution. At the same time, people are living in poverty and there is increasing inequality and overconsumption. In Agenda 2030 of the Sustainable Development Goals adopted in 2015, the international community recognised the link between environmental, social and economic challenges and the need for a coherent response to those.

We will not be able to alleviate poverty and shift towards low-carbon development pathways without recognising the connection between ourselves and nature. Likewise, we will not tackle climate change without addressing the social, economic and political factors that drive our current development pathway, putting us at odds with the stability of the planet on which we depend. At the heart of this problem is a need for our own cultural and spiritual transformation, “an awareness of our common origin, our mutual belonging, and of a future to be shared by everyone” (Pope Francis, *Laudato Si*, 202).

The climate crisis offers us an opportunity to deeply reassess our fundamental vision of development and engage in an unprecedented level of cooperation and solidarity within and between countries.

Our actions will affect not only current generations but all generations to come. To succeed, every country, every government department and every community must play its part.

a. Policy context

The Paris Agreement sets out a goal of holding global average temperature increases to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels, aiming for a limit of 1.5°C. To achieve this goal, net zero global greenhouse gas emissions need to be reached in the second half of this century. However, to do this while protecting the poorest and most vulnerable people, the solutions chosen must tackle wider systemic issues and not simply reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Prior to the negotiations, individual countries submitted their contributions to the agreement – now referred to as Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) – which are to be periodically revised to increase their ambition. Unfortunately existing contributions are not sufficient to limit climate change to agreed levels. A recent United Nations analysis of the NDCs concluded that they “cover no more than a third of the emission reductions needed, creating a dangerous gap.” (UNEP, 2017). In some regions and vulnerable ecosystems, high risks are projected for warming above 1.5 °C. Limiting global warming to 2°C is not sufficient to protect the poorest and most vulnerable people. The IPCC concluded that to have at least a 50% chance of staying below 1.5°C, cuts in global CO₂ emissions in the order of 70-95% below 2010 levels by 2050 are needed². This requires eliminating fossil fuels as soon as possible, and no later than 2050. Preventing temperatures from exceeding the agreed limits is only possible with urgent action. As countries revise their NDCs and develop national policies for dealing with climate change, there is an

² https://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar5/syr/AR5_SYR_FINAL_SPM.pdf

opportunity to ensure that the policies, processes and actions implemented are done holistically, for the good of the planet and for all people. Focusing all policies and economic plans towards the higher ambition would function as a catalyst for transformative change moving beyond “business as usual”, towards a just, equitable and sustainable use and distribution of global resources by citizens of the world.

Energy is the key sector

The energy sector, based mainly on the fossil energy sources like coal, oil and gas, is a key sector for climate protection. After all, it is responsible for one third of the global greenhouse gases. In light of the demand expressed in the Paris Agreement, there is little scope for additional emissions in the countries of the Global South. Yet in this region of the world, large sections of the population live without sufficient access to energy.

This energy poverty restricts people’s fundamental needs and rights in a variety of ways. Food and vaccines cannot be kept cool, energy for cooking is more costly than the food itself and the lack of lighting on the roads comprises a safety risk, especially for women. Access to sufficient energy is a cornerstone of adequate development opportunities. In line with this, Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 7 calls for equal access to clean, sustainable and safe energy for all by 2030. This includes both electricity and energy for cooking and transport. To combat energy poverty effectively, it is essential to connect local realities of poor population groups with energy strategies, which are often developed exclusively at the national level. Reliable, affordable access to electricity is often the key issue for the people concerned in this area. At the same time, there are a number of additional less obvious layers to being disadvantaged and energy poverty that also have to be fought. In many countries, the participation of the people affected or of civil society actors in energy policy issues is not provided for in general, or their participation is even deliberately obstructed.

“We know that technology based on the use of highly polluting fossil fuels – especially coal, but also oil and, to a lesser degree, gas – needs to be progressively replaced without delay.” Pope Francis, Laudato Si’, On Care for our Common Home

The need for a change in agriculture models

Today we find ourselves facing converging food and climate challenges of an unprecedented scale. While on the one hand we live in a world in which 815 million people are suffering from chronic hunger in 2016 (i.e. 11 of global population)³, this situation is set to be exacerbated by climate change, which poses a major threat to food security. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) predicts that food insecurity could increase by between 15-40% by the year 2050.

Agriculture and the food system have a unique and complex role to play within this context. Firstly, as a source of food and nutrition security, they serve as a lifeline to millions, yet despite decades of increased production, millions of people remain without access to adequate food. Secondly, they are also major contributors to the causes of climate change, and therefore an integral part of the problem driving food insecurity. Thirdly, agriculture is a sector that is immensely vulnerable to the impacts of climate change, and in this context, it is crucial that small-scale food producers are enabled to build farming practices that make them more resilient to such changes. To achieve food security for everybody it is therefore imperative that global agriculture and the food systems are reformed in such a way that they:

³ <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/2017/world-hunger-report/en/>

- Are more resilient to the impacts of climate change (known as ‘adaptation’) and other shocks and crises (such as food price volatility, the ongoing economic crisis, and depletion of natural resources);
- Contribute less to global climate change (known as ‘mitigation’);
- Ensure the right to food of people through appropriate levels of production as well as through distribution and equitable access.

II. Where do we want to go?

Overall, to comply with the Paris Agreement, CIDSE urges all parties to:

- Phase out all fossil fuel emissions as soon as possible and move towards a 100% renewable energy future by 2050;
- Ensure sustainable energy access for all as early as possible (no later than 2030);
- Set up a framework for a meaningful Global Stocktake to monitor the pledges and ambition level of all Parties in an appropriate body [of the UNFCCC] that will be informed by transparent, comparable information from the national and regional levels;
- Set up and support a deep transformation of our food systems based on the principles of agroecology and a food sovereignty approach.

Energy as a key sector for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and achieve energy justice

CIDSE asks Parties to the UNFCCC to:

- Commit to phase-out from fossil fuels and shift to 100% renewable energy sources no later than 2050 including “sustainable energy access for all”;
- Ensure consistent policy frameworks and financing support by developed countries;
- Rapidly implement the new Sustainable Development Goal N. 7 to ensure access to affordable, reliable, safe and sustainable energy services for all.

A transformative energy sector should have the following characteristics:

- **The end of the use of fossil fuels worldwide**, especially the use of coal and petroleum for generating energy. To this end, we need clear international frameworks that must be enshrined in national legislation and implemented by public authorities, the private sector and private persons. Each country’s energy strategies must push coal, oil and gas out of the energy mix. It also includes the discontinuation of (direct and indirect) subsidies and the termination of state support for coal infrastructures (especially from development funding).
- **Renewable energy sources and decentralised structures:** to fight energy poverty, provision with decentralised structures, fed by renewable energy sources, must be accorded priority. For both urban and rural regions, a whole range of adapted solutions are already in place. These solutions must enjoy better support so that more people can take advantage of them.

- **Good governance:** a good energy system requires good coordination between the governmental levels and close coordination of planning in the energy sector and climate policy. Good governance, in which civil society can also participate, is essential for counteracting corruption and poor planning in the energy sector.
- **Make human rights a priority:** states must oblige companies operating in the energy sector to observe human rights, and this obligation must be binding. Energy projects must not be allowed to destroy the livelihood of nearby communities. Resettlements must be undertaken only after the people affected have been informed early on, have received in-depth consultation and with their agreement and appropriate compensation.
- **Add cooking energy to the political agenda:** cooking energy is a key field of activity for energy justice, health and climate protection. Policies must regulate the use of biomass. At the same time, they must promote alternative, affordable and healthier methods.
- **A culture of energy efficiency:** in order to stop overuse and waste in a 'good energy' system, a shift in awareness among individuals and institutions is necessary. A culture of energy efficiency with the use of efficient technology must be worthwhile for everyone, rather than a poverty-related necessity.
- **Transform jobs in the energy sector:** In countries in which the fossil resource-based energy sector offers many people employment, shaping the transition is paramount. A good energy system offers job opportunities for various occupations with which people can secure their livelihood. This process must be jointly shaped by representatives of workers, the government, the energy sector, as well as of broader civil society. It includes the integration of energy topics in basic and further education and training.
- **Promote participation:** participation does not come about automatically. Socially disadvantaged groups in particular must receive support for preparing to participate in energy-planning processes. A good energy system accompanies people and offers them further training to enable them to clarify their needs, safeguard their interests and take decisions. It includes research and development on an ongoing basis and ensures that it is possible to choose among different locally adapted technologies.

Agroecology as the only approach, science and set of practices, which is truly productive in the face of climate change

CIDSE asks Parties to the UNFCCC to:

- Support a transition towards (and scale up of) agroecology (in all its dimensions – political, environmental, socio-cultural and economic – away from reductive views limiting it to a mere set of sustainable practices)
- Implementing a rights-based approach;
- Strengthening local and regional food systems;
- Strengthening small-scale farming systems to support local economic development
- Support towards food production processes and distribution practices which are more resource efficient and less detrimental to the environment in terms of GHG emissions;
- Support for producers’ and processors’ organisations and cooperatives in order to facilitate enhanced post-harvest methods, preservation techniques, packaging and distribution systems to reduce waste and losses and add value at local level (e.g. processing facilities and food hubs);
- Investment in public awareness strategies for helping citizens to improve their dietary choices (by, for example, consuming less meat – where it is over-consumed – and more local and seasonal products), and reduce food waste, particularly in developed countries.

Understood as a set of principles covering the political, environmental, socio-cultural and economic dimension of sustainability, agroecology can contribute greatly to climate change adaptation and mitigation while ensuring food security. Specifically, it can:

- **Achieve the right to food:** as highlighted by Olivier De Schutter during his tenure as UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, agroecology can produce positive impacts on several dimensions of food security, such as:
 - availability (by increasing yields);
 - accessibility (by enhancing on-farm fertility production and reducing farmers’ reliance on external inputs);
 - adequacy (by increasing the diversity of agroecosystems, leading to diversified diets and nutritional gains), to name but a few.

Moreover, agroecology can also increase the sustainability and resilience of food systems. These impacts are made possible because agroecology delinks “food production from reliance on fossil energy.”

- **A positive impact on climate and environment:** through its environmental dimension and by applying principles, which tend to mimic natural ecosystems, agroecology contributes to building more complex agro-ecosystems. Agroecology increases resilience and the capacity for systems to adapt to climate change in contexts where climatic risks are common. For instance, “it has been demonstrated that increased biodiversity in the soil improves water use, nutrient uptake, and disease resistance of crop plants”. By delivering resilience, biodiversity often acts as a “buffer against environmental and economic crisis”. Through its environmental dimension, agroecology helps to build self-sufficient, healthy, pollution-free systems that provide an accessible and diverse range of safe food, energy and other domestic needs. As a co-benefit of the application of its principles, agroecology also contributes to mitigating climate change e.g. building healthy

soils and restoring depleted soils – thus contributing to carbon sequestration – or by reducing direct and indirect energy use – thus avoiding greenhouse gas emissions. Through efficient use of resources (such as water, energy use, etc.), agroecology also contributes to building resilience and increasing its efficiency. Beyond this major potential for resilience, mitigation and adaptation, agroecology provides a healthy, safe working environment for farmers and farm labourers as well as a healthy environment for rural, peri-urban and urban communities while providing them with healthy, nutritious, diversified food.

- **Carbon sequestration as a co-benefit:** whilst soil carbon sequestration may result from such practices, it should not be considered the primary goal of mitigation policies, but rather “an outcome of good agricultural management” (e.g. restoring soils and tackling fossil fuel dependency through agroecological methods). Nor should it be considered as a way to further develop carbon market mechanisms.
- **Increase resilience and secure livelihoods:** agroecological practices are economically viable as agroecological production methods reduce the cost of external inputs and therefore allow greater financial and technical independence and autonomy for food producers. By diversifying production and peasant activity, food producers are less exposed to market-related risks such as price volatility or loss due to extreme weather events exacerbated by climate change. Small-scale farmers in particular benefit from implementing agroecology, as they can sustainably increase their yields, improve their food and nutrition security and raise their income.
- **Shorten food supply chains:** by decreasing the distance between producer and consumer, agroecology reduces storage, refrigeration and transport costs, as well as food loss and waste. Agroecology takes externalities for society and environment fully into account, as it minimizes waste and reduces effects on health, and supports positive externalities such as ecological health, resilience and regeneration. More direct marketing also reduces the food system’s carbon footprint and pollution by reducing processing, packaging and transport.
- **Common but differentiated responsibilities:** as there is a differentiated impact of models of agriculture on climate, CIDSE believes that differentiated responsibilities are also needed, and that the burden of mitigation should not be placed on the shoulders of developing countries or on the shoulders of small-scale food producers alone.
- **Beyond farm gate: addressing the entire food system.** CIDSE believes that mitigation policies must address both production and post-production activities that are part and parcel of the food system. In addition, there is a need to acknowledge the limits and dangers of industrial farming systems. To this regard, Parties must acknowledge that the way our food systems are designed is currently exacerbating the climate problem, and as such radical changes are urgently needed in order to cope with the effects of climate change. Investments and climate finance dedicated to agriculture should therefore aim at reshaping our food systems in a sustainable and resilient way.

III. How do we get there?

Climate action must contribute to a socially and environmentally just form of development; it must go beyond “greening” our current mode of development. It must prioritise the needs of the poorest, and eradication of the vast inequalities in consumption, wealth, and power. The following set of questions will help to reflect on our approach to responding to climate change and how we make the transition to where we want to be.

1. How are our actions addressing poverty and strengthening human rights?

The system changes and investments required by climate action represent major opportunities to meet development needs. Climate action can strengthen the fight against poverty through:

- Targeting energy investment at meeting the needs of energy poor populations, through efforts that expand access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy.
- Promoting agroecological practices and tailoring solutions to the needs of smallholder farmers to enhance food security and sovereignty at the same time as addressing greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture.
- Recognition of land tenure and traditional use rights while putting in place sustainable land management practices.
- Ensuring gender-responsive climate plans.
- Strengthening support for climate change adaptation that is grounded in local knowledge and coping strategies, and in which the empowerment of communities to take their own decisions is central.

2. Does our ambition match the scale of the climate challenge?

Are we living up to our individual responsibilities? To achieve a strong likelihood of limiting global warming to 1.5°C, the required decarbonisation transition must start immediately and be rapid. The precise meaning of urgent action will differ between countries, just as countries' economies, societies and poverty eradication requirements differ. The Nationally Determined Contributions must state the ethical and moral basis on which their efforts can be considered a fair contribution and are consistent with the underlying principle of equity.

Climate policies must go beyond their costs and aggregate economic benefits to address the distribution of impacts among different socio-economic groups and stakeholders – the impact on basic needs, on the fundamental elements of well-being, and on rights to access and opportunity.

3. Does our response to climate change consider the environment as a whole?

Climate action must include investing in protecting and restoring biodiversity, soil, water, air and other natural systems. We must not endanger other aspects of the world's natural habitats and systems in our efforts to limit climate change. A climate-myopic, carbon-centric environmental policy will exacerbate the pressures on other planetary boundaries.

4. Have our climate plans embedded dialogue and inclusive, democratic participation at all levels?

Climate action must be defined, designed, and undertaken in an inclusive, participatory, democratic way, with the active and empowered involvement of all stakeholders. The Long-term Low Emission Development Strategies and Nationally Determined Contributions that countries are to submit to the Paris Agreement represent opportunities to engage the most affected communities and constituencies, ensuring they are involved in envisioning and developing those strategies. Special care must be shown to indigenous communities and their cultural traditions as “they are not merely one minority among others, but should be the principal dialogue partners, especially when large projects affecting their land are proposed” (LS 146).

The process of generating strategies could form the basis of a society-wide dialogue on equitable and sustainable development paths, giving a platform to individuals, communities and diverse constituencies for discussion of the priorities and principles raised in *Laudato Si'*: What is quality of life? What is the nature of progress? How can we act in solidarity? What must we do to realise justice? Legitimacy and inclusion of stakeholders who typically lack voice and power is critical in such processes.

Tackling climate change will have wide impacts and will require action across all sectors of the economy. A joined-up approach within national governments will therefore be required, with all departments or ministries engaged in the long-term planning process. *Laudato Si'* makes a significant appeal to those in political office to avoid short-termism and to look beyond their immediate terms of office – to “leave behind a testimony of selfless responsibility”.

5. Are we delivering a just transition?

The transition to a zero-carbon, climate resilient world must not have a negative impact on the poor and marginalised. It must be ‘just’, managing disruptions and paving a path for new decent, green jobs, while revitalising those communities that have been dependent on the fossil economy.

Governments must set out an equitable, long-term vision for the transition, which must include ecological education. In doing so, they must engage both with those workers and communities whose livelihoods are potentially in jeopardy due to climate action and wider communities to promote an understanding of ecological citizenship. They must build upon social dialogue and democratic participation of relevant stakeholders, including workers and trade unions, based on legitimate, informed, empowered engagement. Human and labour rights should be the foundation for an effective and smooth transition, attending to their strong gender dimension to promote equitable outcomes. The vision must be coherent across economic, trade, environmental, social, education, and labour policy, and provide a consistent context for enterprises, workers, investors and consumers to support a just transition.

6. Do our plans and solutions acknowledge and support the personal and spiritual dimensions of addressing climate change?

While effective climate action relies on an extraordinary transformation in the technological basis of the global economy, the personal and spiritual transformation required is perhaps even more extraordinary. Responding to climate change will require a global mobilisation, demanding our political attention, material resources, personal diligence, spiritual commitment and global solidarity. Technologies employed for climate action must be judged to serve socially determined goals. Investing in cooperative solutions to problems, building resilience, social capital, and effective governance will be central to addressing the underlying causes of climate change. While supporting greater solidarity and mutual concern, this can provide an alternative to the inwardly focused responses that contribute to the isolating of individuals and fracturing of communities. It is important that we resist the temptation to isolate, allow trust to falter, and build walls, whether on the individual level or inter-cultural levels.

Article 12 of the Paris Agreement – which addresses public awareness, information and education on climate change – is essential to the Agreement’s implementation. Investment in public education and awareness based on science, faith, and ethics should be strengthened. Such programmes have the potential to generate different lifestyle choices, which can play their part in sparking greater change. There is much we can do to rebuild our connection with nature and we must learn from those who have succeeded in protecting land and habitat, providing spaces where we can go to rejuvenate and restore our personal relationship with nature.

Examples of Stories worldwide

Story 1: Energy poverty & overconsumption of biomass – a grave danger for biodiversity and climate

In the Democratic Republic of Congo huge energy poverty can be observed all over the country. Only nine percent of the total population has access to electricity from the national grid – only one percent of the rural population - and this number gives no indication about the quality of services since brown-outs occur regularly. Especially rural households (61,8% of total population) cover their energy demand with wood, whereas urban households (38,2% of total population) use more charcoal. Biomass is number one of energy sources in DR Congo (98 percent), the rest is shared between electricity and lamp oil. Considering that the data might not be absolutely valid since independent electricity production is quite common among more affluent citizens and large companies (mainly through diesel generators and independent hydro power stations of different sizes) the official data give a good impression of the reality in DR Congo: energy poverty and insufficient energy supply is normal in DR Congo. Poor and marginalized groups of society depend on charcoal and wood and are using these energy sources mainly for cooking and heating.

This massive dependency on fire wood and the growing population in DR Congo has led to a threat of the tropical forest areas especially in the surroundings of bigger cities. According to FAO the consumption of wood for energy use is much larger than the removal of wood of other forestry purposes. The extraction of biomass happens in informal markets and takes place especially in the proximity of cities (Kinshasa, Kisangani, Lubumbashi and other). Main factors of this development are poverty and the failure of energy supply through the electricity grid. Extraction of wood without reforestation has led to the extinction of forest in the environment of Kinshasa. The remaining forest areas consist of young forest and savannah forests. The average consumption of charcoal in Kinshasa are estimated at 4.7 million-m³ wood. The price for biomass energy is rising and gets more and more unaffordable for poorer households. Even though some projects have been implemented to cultivate fast growing biomass – compared to the demand their impact can only be seen as symbolic.

Story 2: Decentralized electricity production – making a big difference especially for health centers and hospitals - Ultrasound scan with sunlight

In many hospitals in DR Congo doctors and nurses are using torches to carry out emergency surgeries. Without electricity for fridges a storage of blood reserves is impossible. Instruments of surgeons and medical doctors are sterilized with water that has been boiled on a charcoal fire. Without electrical laboratory devices many diagnoses are a lottery. And even at routine tasks like intravenous infusions the risk of infections is high.

Diseases that are no problem in other parts of the worlds are fatal in DR Congo. “If everything is dark we cannot treat our patients appropriately and cannot even sterilize our instruments”, says a senior nurse at Pangoni hospital.

Development organisations like the CIDSE member organisations use (official) climate finance and donations to support hospitals by financing rooftop solar appliances. In hospital with a better energy supply patients can be treated in a solid manner and the general health of communities can be improved. Although renewable energy systems have higher upfront costs they can deliver significant savings after

relatively short time. An example from Monrovia/Liberia shows: until four years ago four clinics in Monrovia produced their electricity with diesel generators. The diesel costed up to 20.850 USD per year. Because it was so costly the generators were used only 8h a day – during the night only in emergencies. After applying solar systems funded by a German development organization the remaining diesel costs fell to 5.510 USD per year. There were lightning throughout the night and the generators were used as emergency power supply or if the operating room is used with air conditioning. After 4,5 years the clinics paid off their investment of the solar systems.

Story 3: Eco Uganda: Restoring local food- and ecosystems

The Ugandan economy and the welfare of the population are inextricably linked to the natural environment and are therefore highly vulnerable to climate change. Drought, conflict, floods, animal and human diseases are the most common hazards in Nakapiripirit district in Karamoja region, north-east Uganda. The cyclic extreme weather and other hazards affect the crop production and pastures, and thereby have a negative impact on the communities' living conditions. From 2011 until 2014, the Ecological Christian Organization (ECO) Uganda together with Cordaid implemented a climate-proof disaster risk reduction project. ECO Uganda supported nine rural agro-pastoralist communities with various risk mitigation and adaptation measures. They were guided through a participatory disaster risk assessment and planning process and implemented disaster risk reduction plans, including early warning systems (preparedness). A total of 6,000 people were trained in resilience activities for natural resource management and climate adaptation. They learned how to grow native trees, made small orchards, developed small-scale irrigation systems, planted drought-resistant crops and vegetables and diversified their income sources, for example by keeping bees and rearing goats. In addition, they improved their water harvesting practices and participated in savings and credit groups. In this integrated approach, involvement of local and national governments is key. In this program, structural communication infrastructures were built. A network of community organizations was set up, to jointly and directly interact with national and regional authorities. At the same time, there was political and institutional support for the local and national government to integrate disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and ecosystem management in their existing plans, programs and policies

Useful resources:

CIDSE 2015 [*Climate-Smart Agriculture: the Emperor's new clothes?*](#)

CIDSE 2015 [*Paris for the People and the Planet*](#)

CIDSE 2017 [*Climate Action for the common good*](#)

Misereor 2017: [*Good Energy*](#)