

# eco



*Eco has been published by Non-Governmental Environmental Groups at major international conferences since the Stockholm Environment Conference in 1972. This issue is produced co-operatively by CAN groups attending the climate negotiations in Bonn, March-April 2009.*

## Leadership starts at 40

There is something special about the number 40. It actually symbolizes order, unity and leadership. Did you know that the word “forty” is the only number that has its letters in alphabetical order in the English language? Also, -40 (negative forty) has a strong link with unity, coming together, and agreement. It is the temperature at which the Fahrenheit and Celsius scales correspond: that is,  $-40^{\circ}\text{F} = -40^{\circ}\text{C}$ . And who doesn't know the saying “Life begins at forty”, the age where a person reaches maturity and is ready to lead? (although ECO is a strong advocate and fan of youth leadership).

Negative forty (-40) is also very relevant to how to take leadership in saving the planet. It is the least amount of GHG emission reduction Annex 1 countries need to commit to by 2020 compared to 1990 levels. If delegates reach this conclusion, then the excuse that has been heard over and over again that Annex 1 countries are not showing enough leadership can not be used any more. This would provide enough trust to actually move everything

forward. (Of course, provided that Annex 1 delegates DO want to move things forward.)

Nevertheless, there is an even more important reason for Annex 1 countries to commit to 40% reductions. This reason, seemingly forgotten by many delegates, is SCIENCE: ECO is not talking about the most recent peer-reviewed science, which some delegates claim is not credible. In fact the figure derives from the IPCC science, which everyone has approved politically (in case there might be delegates who also doubt the IPCC science).

The IPCC clearly says that beyond a  $2^{\circ}\text{C}$  global temperature increase we will suffer from irreversible and catastrophic climate impacts. So governments have two options: either they accept that some small island states be left behind, or they agree to limit warming to well below  $2^{\circ}\text{C}$ , which may require a return of GHG concentrations to 350ppm  $\text{CO}_2$  equivalent.

According to the IPCC, to limit global  
*—continued on back page, col. 1*

## Getting the Lawmakers to Work

Helped by interesting submissions from Australia, parties are considering the legal form(s) of the agreement in Copenhagen. On this front, ECO would like to suggest some homework for parties for Bonn 2 including:

How will the legal form(s) of the agreement in Copenhagen promote effectiveness, urgency, equity, transparency, accountability and resilience?

How will parties ensure that there is no backsliding on existing commitments, including those for the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol and for economy wide emission reduction targets for Annex 1 parties?

How will the legal provisions create incentives for early entry into force, avoid gaming, and encourage full participation?

How will parties ensure comparable emission reductions and compliance among Annex 1?

How will the legal form(s) promote positive incentives for action, implementation and for parties to undertake greater levels of action?

How will MRV criteria for Annex 1 support and non Annex 1 actions respect common but differentiated responsibilities and promote effectiveness, accountability and transparency?

How will the legal form(s) create incentives for compliance among all parties including strong enforcement triggers and consequences for non-compliance for Annex 1?

How will the legal form promote the flexibility needed to evolve to a stronger system including a robust review mechanism?

While parties have a lot of homework to do for Bonn 2, the final legal text is likely only to be decided in Copenhagen. It is therefore crucial that parties keep all options on the table after Bonn 2 and circulate text for an amendment, protocol or other legal instrument under both the Kyoto Protocol and LCA tracks. ECO looks forward to getting A+ answers from all parties.



*Friends of the Chair drafting new text*

## Don't Negotiate Your Own Bar

An idea put forward by the European Union (EU) at the Bonn Climate Change Talks could introduce a loophole that would result in countries not being accountable for some of their emissions from forest management. The EU introduced the concept of "The Bar": a reference against which countries would measure their forestry emissions. The potential loophole results from the option that countries could negotiate their own "bar". This could be like getting to start a football match with your team 4-0 ahead. So far, no details have been released about how this loophole might be constrained.

Climate Action Network released an initial calculation today illustrating a potentially significant impact of this flexibility on the emission accounts of industrialized countries. In order to calculate the impact this flexibility would have on the scale of forest carbon credits for industrialized countries, CAN looked at sixteen years of historic emissions (1990 – 2006) for thirty-six industrialized nations (not including USA), using the last five years as a hypothetical commitment period.

In measuring the size of the potential loophole, CAN considered the relative impact of setting a weak and a strong bar. The strong bar was set as the lowest level of historic emissions, meaning countries would be expected to do even better than this. The weak bar was the highest level of historic emissions, creating little expectation for improvement. We also compared the accounting impact of these two scenarios to the current accounting rules for forest management.

The accounting difference between the strong bar and the weak bar was roughly seven billion tons of CO<sub>2</sub>. This range corresponds to roughly twelve percent of total emission allowances for the first commitment period. The weak bar produced 2.8 billion tons of CO<sub>2</sub> credits more than would be created with the current rules for forest management.<sup>1</sup> This 2.8 billion ton increase corresponds to roughly five percent of total emission allowances for the first commitment period. Our calculation did not consider other improvements in the forest accounting rules that might be made. In all sce-

narios, the actual emissions to the atmosphere were the same, but the method would make a massive difference in the level of accountability of countries.

Creating a disconnect between accounting and real changes in emissions would not provide the proper signals for governments to unlock the mitigation potential from forest management. These numbers also illustrate the very significant impact that this potential accounting loophole could have on a Party's overall emission reduction target.

This potential loophole could be most effectively closed by removing the ability of Parties to negotiate their own 'bar'.

<sup>1</sup>The strong bar resulted in 820 Mt of carbon debits. The weak bar resulted in 1113 Mt credits of carbon. Application of the current rules for forest management, which include gross-net accounting with a cap would result in a credit of approximately 349 Mt of carbon if all countries included in the Appendix of Decision 16/ CMP.1 elected to account for forest management. Application of net-net accounting with a 1990 base year would result in a credit of 189 Mt of carbon.

## Six Weeks on: Dog Eats Adaptation Homework?

As adaptation negotiators board their flights home, perhaps they will be wondering if they might soon be paying for adaptation funding through a ticket tax? They might also be feeling rather smug at having made some progress on adaptation here in Bonn. ECO must remind them that in fact the real deal breakers still lie ahead. Admittedly, some convergence was found during yesterday's contact group. Parties recognised that adaptation must be a country-driven process, that there is a role for risk management and insurance, that regional centres and networks can help, and, most importantly, that priority must always be given to the most vulnerable. So far so good. ECO hopes that all this will give Annex I finance ministers the confidence they seem to crave, that future adaptation funding for developing countries will be well spent.

ECO also notes that there is plenty of Easter homework for adaptation negotiators before they come back to Bonn in just over six weeks time. And ECO does not want to hear any negotiator

complain that the dog ate their homework.

Developed countries must recognise the sum required for adaptation financing: at least US\$50 billion annually in public funds and additional to ODA *targets*. They must also come back to Bonn with a mandate to negotiate on the instruments needed to raise these funds.

Developing countries could use the next weeks to illustrate options for country-driven adaptation planning and implementation, which will ensure the effective use of adaptation finance and demonstrate how to prioritise the most vulnerable groups and ecosystems;

Developed countries must reconsider their devotion to existing institutions such as the World Bank, the MDBs or the GEF. This love affair gives ECO the heebie-jeebies. There is one existing institution that has the trust of developing countries; the Adaptation Fund. Building on, and investing in, the Adaptation Fund is crucial for the post-2012 world. ECO wants to see developed countries cheerleading

with pom-poms outside of the next AF Board meeting.

It was intriguing to hear developed countries highlighting the importance of near term adaptation. Hurrah! Now ECO wants to see them deconstructing, brick by brick, the barriers for NAPA implementation, and filling the LDCF with at least \$2 billion to make urgent adaptation a reality on the ground. ECO reminds developed countries that full NAPA financing is an eight year old promise.

ECO wants a detailed response from developed countries to the AOSIS multi-window mechanism, with clear-cut answers on how to compensate when adaptation is no longer possible, and insurance no longer feasible.

ECO's advice to adaptation negotiators who are daunted by their homework is to make good use of idle time on the plane home and lobby their mitigation colleagues in the seats next to them. After all, ambitious mitigation remains the best form of adaptation.

–*Leadership begins at 40, from front page* mean temperature increase in the range 2.0–2.4°C, a range of 50 to 85% global emission reduction by 2050 from 2000 levels is needed (so based on 1990 levels, the reduction would need to be even greater). The IPCC also suggests a mid-term reduction target for Annex 1 countries in the range 25 to 40% by 2020 compared to 1990 levels.

Then there is this little something called the 'precautionary principle', which is enshrined in the Convention. ECO has a compelling urge to explain what this principle means, because it seems that countries think that it has been put there to fill empty space in

the convention text. The precautionary principle says if there is more than one option, you are obliged to take the safer path.

If this is still not clear, the above scientific argument clearly states that, well below 2 degrees means more than 40% GHG reductions by A1 by 2020, and more than 80% GHG reduction globally by 2050 compared to 1990 levels, leading to a 350ppm CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent, with emissions peaking within the first five year commitment period (2013-2017).

Many countries have been saying this will be very difficult to agree on. ECO tells those countries, we can't change the science, but we can change politics.

## LUDWIG

Ludwig was amused to learn that the €131 donated – in cash – by schoolchildren to the Adaptation Fund, apparently is not only its first, and only contribution so far, but is also more than certain developed country Parties have given to any of the process's funds.

On which note Ludwig reaches the end of a non-week of non-negotiations, in which non-papers have attracted non-comments, presumably from non-parties. As he departs, he is considering becoming a Zen monk, in order to better contemplate nothingness.