STATEMENT OF HELENE D. GAYLE, MD, MPH

PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

CARE USA

BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

* * *

Full Committee Hearing

Global Climate Change: U.S. Leadership for a New Global Agreement

Mr. Chairman, Senator Lugar, Members of the Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to join this important discussion about climate change, especially as the Senate considers U.S. climate change legislation and a post-2012 global climate agreement.

I congratulate the new Administration and Congress for your renewed engagement in the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and welcome the positive tone that the U.S. delegation brought to the recent meeting in Bonn. I also applaud President Obama's pledge to prioritize climate change, even as the country and the world face other major challenges, and the strong start on U.S. climate policy in the U.S. Congress made by House Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman Henry Waxman and Congressman Edward Markey. Finally, I want to acknowledge the importance of the work of Senator Barbara Boxer and the Subcommittee on International Operations and Organizations, Human Rights, Democracy, and Global Women's Issues.

I speak today on behalf of CARE, an international development and relief organization that has worked for more than 60 years in some of the poorest communities in the world. In addressing two elements of the Bali Action Plan – forestry and adaptation – my goal this morning is to represent the interests of poor, marginalized people in the developing world and to shine a light on how they are likely to be affected by climate change – a phenomenon they bear little responsibility for, yet are forced to confront – and by its global response.

My overall message is that, above and beyond doing our part to preserve the planet, U.S. climate policy and legislation must respond to the impact that climate change will have on people in some of the world's poorest communities.

THE HUMAN IMPERATIVE

The exponential increase in climate change research in the past decade demonstrates overwhelming scientific agreement that climate change is already happening and has been triggered by human activities. In fact, according to the UN, climate change is happening with greater speed and intensity than initially predicted, and we may be closer to an irreversible tipping point than first thought.

In the U.S., economic arguments for addressing climate change have gained some traction among businesses and policymakers. Business coalitions, such as Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy and the U.S. Climate Action Partnership, have called for U.S.

legislation to help stimulate the development of a low-carbon economy. Last fall, during the Presidential elections, both John McCain and Barack Obama argued that U.S. climate policy would be more of an opportunity for, rather than a hindrance to, the U.S economy.

National energy security arguments have also gained traction. Last year, the U.S. Center for Naval Analysis released a report stating that climate change poses a serious threat for U.S. national security; the report argued that climate change will threaten some of the most volatile regions of the world and add tensions even in stable regions. In addition, when oil prices skyrocketed last summer, there was a push from policymakers and the American public for reduced U.S. reliance on foreign oil in the interest of national energy security.

While we at CARE would not argue against these economic and national energy security rationales, we support strong action on climate policy for another reason. That reason is based on our mission and more than 60 years of experience working alongside poor, marginalized communities, where people already struggle to live with dignity even without climate change. Our policy position is firmly and explicitly underpinned by our commitment to reducing poverty.

The projections are stark. Economist Sir Nicholas Stern estimates that, if economic models took into account three crucial factors – the direct non-market impacts on the environment and human health, the risk of catastrophic weather events, and the disproportionate burden of

climate change impacts on poor regions of the world – the total cost of business as usual emissions would be equal to an average reduction in global per capita GDP of 20 percent.[1]

In other words, unmitigated climate change will pull the rug out from under progress the world is making on the Millennium Development Goals (to which the G20 in its most recent meeting reaffirmed its historic commitment). In fact, it threatens to wipe out decades of development gains, and it is likely to contribute to mass migration, refugee crises, and increased conflict over scarce natural resources, undermining global stability and security.

There is no doubt that everyone will be affected by the consequences of climate change; in the U.S., for example, storms will likely become more severe and coastal communities along the Gulf and Atlantic coasts will be especially stressed.[2]

However, while climate change will affect us all, the world's poorest people will be hardest hit. Today, more than one billion people survive on less than $1.25 a day and already live on the edge of crisis.[3] If left unchecked, climate change may push them off that edge. Major projected impacts include:

---

[1] Stern, N. 2007. *The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review*. Cambridge University Press, UK.

[2] Field, C.B., L.D. Mortsch,, M. Brklacich, D.L. Forbes, P. Kovacs, J.A. Patz, S.W. Running and M.J. Scott, 2007: North America. *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, M.L. Parry, O.F. Canziani, J.P. Palutikof, P.J. van der Linden and C.E. Hanson, Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 617-652.

[3] Chen, S. and Ravallion, M. 2008. *The Developing World Is Poorer Than We Thought, But No Less Successful in the Fight against Poverty*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 4703.

- **Agriculture.** The negative impact of unmitigated climate change on agricultural production will likely be more adverse in tropical areas and the poorest developing countries, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa.[4] Agricultural production in many African countries is likely to be severely compromised by climate change and climate variability, with yields declining by as much as 50 percent by 2020.[5]
- **Freshwater resources.** Climate change will intensify the water cycle, resulting in billions of people gaining or losing water. Areas likely to gain water, like South and East Asia, will face more flood disasters. Arid and semi-arid regions, like southern Africa, will become even drier and be at dire risk of increased water stress, while current water management practices will likely be inadequate. In addition, as temperatures increase and glaciers retreat, river flows, particularly in the Hindu Kush-Himalaya and the South American Andes, will increase in the short term; but as glaciers melt, river flows will gradually decrease over the next few decades.[6]
- **Human health.** Climate change will likely increase health risks. Projected trends include increased malnutrition, increased morbidity and mortality in heat waves and weather-related disasters, and changes in the geographic range of some infectious disease vectors,

[4] FAO, 2003. *World Agriculture: Towards 2015/2030. An FAO Perspective.* Available online at: http://www.fao.org/docrep/005/y4252e/y4252e00.htm

[5] Boko, M., I. Niang, A. Nyong, C. Vogel, A. Githeko, M. Medany, B. Osman-Elasha, R. Tabo and P. Yanda, 2007: Africa. Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, M.L. Parry, O.F. Canziani, J.P. Palutikof, P.J. van der Linden and C.E. Hanson, Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK, 433-467.

[6] Kundzewicz, Z.W., L.J. Mata, N.W. Arnell, P. Döll, P. Kabat, B. Jiménez, K.A. Miller, T. Oki, Z. Şen and I.A. Shiklomanov, 2007: Freshwater resources and their management. *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change,* M.L. Parry, O.F. Canziani, J.P. Palutikof, P.J. van der Linden and C.E. Hanson, Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 173-210.

such as malaria. These health risks will be heavily concentrated in poorer populations at low latitudes, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa.[7]

- **Disasters.** According to a CARE/UNOCHA report, people in extreme poverty, especially in Africa, Central and South Asia, and Southeast Asia, will face even greater risk of disaster as the frequency, intensity and duration of weather-related hazards, such as floods, cyclones and droughts, increases as a result of climate change.[8] By late century, millions more people than today, particularly in low-lying coastal regions, such as the mega-deltas of Asia and Africa and small islands, will likely experience floods every year due to sea level rise.[9]

The severity of the consequences of climate change described above and the effort required to adapt to the consequences depend on what we do now. The IPCC recommends that global greenhouse gas emissions be reduced 25-40 percent from 1990 levels by 2020 in order to improve the odds of avoiding dangerous warming of more than 2º C in average global temperatures.[10] The longer we wait to stabilize the atmosphere, the greater the probability that the world will exceed the 2º C threshold. Adverse impacts on ecosystems, agricultural production, freshwater resources, human health, and the risks from extreme climate events are

[7] Confalonieri, U., B. Menne, R. Akhtar, K.L. Ebi, M. Hauengue, R.S. Kovats, B. Revich and A. Woodward, 2007: Human health. *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, M.L. Parry, O.F. Canziani, J.P. Palutikof, P.J. van der Linden and C.E. Hanson, Eds., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 391-431.

[8] CARE and UNOCHA, 2008. *Humanitarian Implications of Climate Change: Mapping Emerging Trends and Risk Hotspots*. Available online at: www.careclimatechange.org

[9] IPCC, 2007: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Core Writing Team, Pachauri, R.K and Reisinger, A. (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 104 pp

[10] IPCC, 2001. Climate Change: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

projected to increase significantly when the increase in average global temperature from pre-industrial levels exceeds 2º C.

The UNFCCC is grounded in the principles of equity and "common but differentiated responsibilities" (Article 3.1) –principles which were reaffirmed by the G20 in its most recent meeting. Developed countries, including the U.S., have the largest historical responsibility for climate change, as well as the most resources to address the problem. Developed countries must, therefore, lead efforts to combat climate change and its impacts.

At the same time, it will be impossible to keep the global temperature rise as far below 2º C as possible unless the largest emitters among the developing countries do their part. Many have already expressed willingness to do so. At the 14th Conference of Parties (COP) of the UNFCCC in December 2008, key developing countries, such as Brazil, China, Mexico and South Africa, came forward with plans to reduce their own greenhouse gas emissions, demonstrating their willingness to engage at the global level.

Successful global climate negotiations, culminating this December in Copenhagen, may well hang on concrete U.S. action and the impact it will have in bringing all countries together around shared goals and responsibilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL ADAPTATION AND FORESTRY

A global solution to climate change begins but does not end with deep and immediate reductions in domestic greenhouse gas emissions. Based on our extensive field experience, CARE believes that it is also vital for the U.S. Administration and Congress to commit to passage of domestic legislation that:

1. *Protects rights***.** Supports the reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries (REDD) in a manner that protects the rights and interests of indigenous peoples and other forest-dependent communities;
2. *Funds adaptation***.** Sets aside substantial revenues – new and additional to official development assistance and reflecting U.S. commitment to funding its fair share – to support adaptation in developing countries vulnerable to climate change; and
3. *Reaches the poorest and most vulnerable***.** Ensures that adaptation funding reaches and responds to the priorities of the poorest populations most vulnerable to climate change.

I will address each of these three recommendations in further detail, grounding my observations in CARE's field experiences.

1. Social Standards and Safeguards Essential for Successful REDD

The inclusion of Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) in U.S. climate legislation is crucial if we are to avoid dangerous global warming. Deforestation accounts for some 20 percent of human-induced greenhouse gas emissions.

However, CARE believes that REDD must be accompanied by adequate social standards and safeguards from the outset. While investments in REDD have the potential to offer significant benefits for indigenous peoples and other forest-dependent communities in developing countries, they can also do substantial harm. Past experience with forest conservation worldwide tells us that, without appropriate standards and safeguards, forest-dependent communities face numerous social and economic risks to their livelihoods, their access to resources and land, and their ability to share in the benefits of REDD activities.

Take the case of Uganda, a country with one of the highest deforestation rates in the world. In 2002, the Ugandan government took forested land away from local populations in the Butamira Forest Reserve and gave it to large commercial sugar companies. Forests were mowed down and cleared for profit. Natural resources from the forest were no longer available to forest-dependent communities. Pig, cattle and goat rearing projects were forced to close due to lack of access to water and grazing land. Crafts and household goods, which women used to sell at local markets, ceased to be produced because women no longer had access to raw materials. As a result of the loss of income, parents had to pull their children out of school. Women were forced to use leftover sugar cane waste, instead of fuelwood, for cooking, which meant that they could only make food that could be cooked quickly. Sugar cane leftovers burn fast, making preparation of nutritious beans impossible.

In 2006, CARE worked with women from the former Butamira Forest Reserve to stop rampant deforestation and change national policies. Their protest led to a reversal in

government attitude in February 2007. Unfortunately, within a month of winning that policy change, there was another reversal and the Cabinet re-endorsed the giveaway. [11]

What is happening in the Butamira Forest Reserve underscores the kinds of risks that forest-dependent communities face without proper safeguards in place. What is happening in the Butamira Forest Reserve also underscores the importance of standards to ensure that such communities can exercise their rights and participate in the management of forests that directly affect their well-being.

Forests provide a range of environmental services and livelihood opportunities, serving as a safety net for poor, forest-dependent communities. This becomes particularly important in light of projections that climate change will reduce agricultural yields in certain parts of the world. We need to help developing nations find alternatives to cutting away that safety net. We also need to find alternatives that respect affected communities' rights and strengthen their stake in, and rewards from, conservation efforts.

We know this is possible because for years, CARE has been working with poor, forest-dependent communities to conserve forests and forest ecosystems as part of a strategy to promote sustainable development. From 2002-2009, for example, in collaboration with the Weyerhaeuser Company Foundation, USAID, World Wildlife Fund (WWF), and local partners, CARE worked with poor, forest dependent communities throughout Nepal to promote biodiversity and forest conversation as well as the democratic management of forests, the equitable distribution of benefits derived from forest management, and livelihood security for

[11] CARE, 2004. Reclaiming Rights and Resources: Women, Poverty and Environment.

the poorest and most marginalized, including women and dalits (the so-called “untouchable caste”).

Today, poor and marginalized groups are no longer excluded from community forests, as they once were. There are now more women and dalits on the executive committees of forest user groups. Forest user groups are holding public hearings and public audits on a regular basis to promote transparency and accountability in financial and management decisions. Moreover, the poorest and most marginalized have improved their incomes, and therefore their livelihood security, by rearing pigs, keeping honey bees, cultivating high market value medicinal herbs and high market value vegetables and fruits for sale in local and regional markets.

CARE's program was also the first of its kind in Nepal to ensure access to and control over natural resources exclusively by landless and marginalized households. This practice has gradually spread throughout Nepal. Furthermore, because of the program, CARE succeeded in influencing the formulation of the government of Nepal’s Three Year Interim Plan (2008-2010), particularly the chapter on pro-poor forestry policy, as well as the government’s 2008 Community Forestry Operational Guidelines. These policy changes have benefited more than 14,500 community forest user groups, which account for about one-third of the total population of Nepal.

From our field experience, we know that social standards and safeguards for REDD must include measures to ensure participation by indigenous peoples and other forest-dependent communities in forestry management; prevent human rights violations; and guarantee free,

prior and informed consent, equitable benefit sharing, the right to access and use resources, and access to legal recourse and fair compensation for damages. These standards are essential not only to guard against risks but also to ensure environmental success, i.e. the sustainability and permanence of emission reductions.

CARE is now working with partners, such as FIELD and the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance, to map out, in concrete terms, what social standards and safeguards for REDD would look like within the UNFCCC framework as well as under voluntary carbon markets. We are also looking, specifically, at the potential opportunities and threats that REDD poses for poor and marginalized women within forest-dependent communities in developing countries. This is new and cutting edge policy research. It will help identify the kinds of social standards and safeguards that need to be in place to ensure that REDD contributes to climate change mitigation in a way that protects the rights and interests of indigenous peoples and other forest-dependent communities.

CARE has also joined strategic forces with WWF to improve the livelihoods of the world's most vulnerable people, to transform their abilities to control their own destinies and natural resources, and to establish sustainable patterns of resource use. Through the alliance, CARE and WWF will create pro-poor, sustainable development models on the ground that can reach significant scale and to drive policy change both in the countries where we work and in the U.S.

2. New, Additional Funding for Adaptation in Developing Countries Necessary for Long-term Success.

We need to reduce domestic greenhouse gas emissions as well as emissions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries. We need to do this because if we don't, it will erode decades of development gains and make the struggle to survive even harder for the world's poorest people.

At the same time, we must also help developing countries – and the communities and groups most vulnerable within them – adapt to new conditions. Even if we stopped all greenhouse gas emissions today, a certain degree of climate change is inevitable. Past emissions have set in motion longer-term changes to which people in extreme poverty will need to adapt.

While no single weather event can be directly attributed to climate change, numerous examples from all over the world testify to a pattern of new climate conditions much different from what we have seen or experienced before. In Tajikistan, for example, CARE conducted climate vulnerability and capacity assessments to determine how climate-related risks were affecting the lives of people in three villages at different altitudes within the same watershed. What we heard is that the snow pack is increasing, winter is shifting and getting longer, and rainfall is becoming increasingly erratic. All of these local observations are consistent with the meteorological data for the region. In assessing the consequences of these changes for local

livelihoods, communities focused on the sensitivity of livestock, gardens and orchards to climate risks.

The communities CARE supports are doing the best they can to adapt to new conditions with limited resources. The amount of funding available to help communities in developing countries adapt is, however, *severely* insufficient. A number of analyses have been conducted on how much money is needed for adaptation in developing countries. The World Bank suggests that costs will run between $9-$41 billion per year (the low figure assumes no investment in community-based adaptation)[12] while Oxfam puts the price tag at more than $50 billion per year by 2015[13], the UNFCCC estimates that costs will range between $28 billion and $67 billion per year by 2030[14], and the UNDP projects annual costs of $86 billion per year by 2015.[15] While the range varies, consensus is growing that the need, annually, is on the order of tens of billions of dollars and will be significantly higher if greenhouse gas emissions are not reduced substantially in the near term.

Unfortunately, few public financing options exist to help developing countries reduce their vulnerability and adapt to climate variability and change. There are three adaptation funding

[12] World Bank, 2006. Clean Energy and Development: Towards an Investment Framework. DC2006-0002. Available online at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DEVCOMMINT/Documentation/20890696/DC2006-0002(E)-CleanEnergy.pdf

[13] Oxfam, 2007. Financing adaptation: why the UN's Bali Climate Conference must mandate the search for new funds. Available online at: http://www.oxfamamerica.org/newsandpublications/publications/briefing_papers/financing-adaptation/Financing-Adaptation-120407.pdf

[14] UNFCCC, 2007. *Climate Change: Impacts, Vulnerabilities and Adaptation in Developing Countries.* Available online at: http://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/background_publications_htmlpdf/application/txt/pub_07_impacts.pdf

[15] UN Human Development Report 2007/2008. Fighting climate change: Human solidarity in a divided world.

mechanisms under the UNFCCC. However, as of December 2008, pledged commitments to the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) total only $262.3 million. The UNFCCC estimates that the third fund, the Adaptation Fund, has the potential to raise between $25 to 130 million through 2012 and between $30 million to $2.25 billion by 2030.[16] There is a huge gap between what is needed and what has been pledged or can be raised through the UNFCCC mechanisms.

Poor countries bear the least responsibility, are the most severely impacted, and have the least capacity to cope with climatic changes. If international adaptation continues to be inadequately resourced, climate change is projected to contribute to increased conflict over scarce natural resources, mass migration, and refugee crises.

The good news is that we know that investments in prevention and preparedness work. We can draw this lesson from our experience with natural disasters. The number of disaster-affected people grew from 1.6 billion in 1984-1993 to 2.6 billion in 1994-2003. Material losses also grew from $38 billion in the 1950s to $652 billion in the 1990s.[17] These rising numbers are due to several factors, including population growth and changing habitation patterns. One number, however, has gone down. Fewer people are dying as a result of natural disasters as a result of investments in disaster risk reduction. We can apply this lesson to climate change.

[16] Developed Country Climate Financing Initiatives Weaken the UNFCCC. South Center. Analytical Note SC/GGDP/AN/ENV/7 January 2009. Available online at: http://www.southcentre.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=909&Itemid=1

[17] World Bank. 2006. *Hazards of Nature, Risks to Development: An IEG Evaluation of World Bank Assistance for Natural Disasters*. Available online at: http://www.worldbank.org.

Investing now in adaptation will help save money down the road. More importantly, it will help save lives and build people's resilience.

The U.S. must do its fair share and provide substantial new and additional funding, above and beyond official development assistance, to support adaptation in developing countries vulnerable to climate change. New and innovative mechanisms that can raise significant funds for adaptation and create incentives for mitigation should be pursued, such as the auctioning of emission allowances and levying the use of international maritime and aviation transport (so called "bunker") fuels.

Some policymakers may argue that this will be a tough sell. But I disagree. Deputy Special Envoy for Climate Change Jonathan Pershing made a statement in Bonn earlier this month about the American people. He said that the U.S. has a tradition of supporting people, not "buying" people. I believe he is referring to the American sentiment that, with a little help and the right enabling environment, people can lift *themselves* up from hardship. I agree with Deputy Special Envoy Pershing. I, too, believe that most Americans understand and support the U.S. doing its fair share to help people in developing countries adapt to new conditions. People in poor communities vulnerable to climate change are doing the best they can. With some external assistance, they can contribute their fullest potential to social and economic development.

3. **Pro-Poor Adaptation Funding to Safeguard Development Progress and Global Stability**

Robust funding for international adaptation is crucial. So, too, is guiding those funds so that they reach the people who need them most. Vulnerability is more than exposure to climate shocks and other stresses. CARE's experience has shown that vulnerability varies within countries, within communities, and even within households. It is, in large part, determined by the economic, social and political systems and structures that govern people's lives.

Climate change will have the greatest impact on the poorest communities and most marginalized groups. Women and other marginalized groups are particularly at risk. Women tend to rely more than men on natural resources. They are the primary food and healthcare providers in their families and are responsible for tasks that will likely be made more difficult by climate change. They are less mobile then men, confined to their homes save for trips to gather water, fodder and fuel. They have more limited access than men to vital information about climate change mitigation or adaptation strategies. And they are less likely to be reached by government extension agents.

Women and girls tend to lack access to information and opportunity to feed their own knowledge into community or national-level adaptation and mitigation strategies. This jeopardizes larger processes of reducing climate change and its impacts. It also means that women are more likely than men to be injured or killed during hurricanes, floods and cyclones. They are less likely to hear official warnings and to be able to swim or to escape quickly, especially if carrying young children.

Well designed, top-down, scenario-driven approaches to adaptation can play a role in reducing vulnerability to climate change; yet they may fail to address the particular needs and concerns of the most vulnerable communities. CARE believes that the most effective approach is to empower local communities and facilitate their ownership of adaptation strategies. Through community-based adaption, we can foster more resilient livelihoods, link people to basic services, strengthen local capacity, and support social and policy change to address underlying causes of poverty and vulnerability.

Again, the good news is that we know how to do this. I want to share with you an example from Bangladesh, a country that will likely face more frequent and severe floods as well as sea level rise as a result of climate change. In southwest Bangladesh, CARE worked closely with local organizations to help communities, especially the women within them, decide how best to adapt to more frequent and severe floods. We recruited female staff, gave gender training to all staff, and prioritized female headed households in the project. We also organized community meetings at times that fit women's daily work schedules. We engaged women in all steps – from conducting climate-related vulnerability and capacity assessments to the design, implementation and evaluation of adaptation strategies.

By doing so, I believe that we got better and more effective results. We discovered that men and women come to different conclusions about what aspects of their lives are most vulnerable to climate variability and change and how to build their resilience. Women prioritized health, housing, and water (citing increasing salinity), while men focused on income and food security. Women also prioritized adaptation strategies that they could implement close to home. When

given a choice of options to diversify their incomes, for example, many women chose to rear ducks. They can do so right near their homes. The start-up costs are low, and therefore the risks in investing in duck rearing are also low. The activity does not create a heavy workload in terms of time or labor. Ducks produce eggs and meat for food or cash. And unlike chickens, they can swim, so they can survive floods.

Women also participated in the evaluation of the project. They told us that before the project, they coped during the lean season by skipping meals or eating non-traditional foods, like water hyacinth, in order to ensure that the rest of the family had enough food. After the project, they reported that they no longer skipped meals during lean seasons, and that, by bringing cash into the home, they had more say in household decisions. In the end, the project helped tackle gender inequities as well as build community resilience to more frequent and severe floods. The next step is to scale up our local experiences and incorporate women's interests and knowledge into national-level adaptation strategies and plans.

The U.S. can provide leadership in ensuring that adaptation funds reach the people who need them most by ensuring systematic identification of the most vulnerable groups; inclusive, transparent and participatory decision-making on the design and in the monitoring and evaluation of adaptation activities; and mechanisms to support community-based adaptation.

* * *

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. You have an opportunity to make an extraordinary difference throughout the world by reducing U.S. greenhouse gas emissions, protecting the rights and interests of forest dependent communities, funding international adaptation and guiding those funds so that they reach people in poor countries most vulnerable to climate change.

As Special Envoy Todd Stern put it in Bonn, we cannot have a global solution to climate change with U.S. action alone; nor can we have a global solution without the U.S.

The time to act is now. The world is waiting for the United States to show leadership by setting the example of what must be done and why it must be done now. The cost of further delay or an inadequate response will be too high – in dollar and human terms.

I would be pleased to answer any questions.