

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.

Blind Spots in REDD

Rather than the waiting game that we had in Poznan, with discussions on REDD primarily in the SBSTA and limited to technical issues, Bonn gives the opportunity to start negotiating policies and positive incentives for REDD as we move towards Copenhagen. ECO looks forward to parties signalling their preferences for the different options for REDD – but ECO supports the view of the G77 and China that the focus document does not capture everything and believes that certain key elements are missing from the focus document.

The focus document makes such a superficial reference to co-benefits that even SBSTA would be ashamed. ECO would like to see biodiversity recognised in its own right as a core benefit of REDD. REDD must contribute to the conservation of biodiversity and thus should be closely linked to discussions in the Convention on Biological Diversity. Impacts on biodiversity must be explicitly considered by REDD activities, rules and modalities. Conversion to plantations and peatland degradation should be acted against and priority placed on high conservation value areas.

But at least biodiversity gets a mention. The document fails to mention the importance of the full and effective participation by Indigenous Peoples and local communities in the design and implementation of REDD mechanisms. REDD must recognise and respect the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities and must ensure consistency with applicable international laws and standards – including the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Whilst ECO is pleased to see a reference to governance, the text fails to “get it”. Funding for REDD must be tied to strong requirements for good governance. If not, effective implementation and monitoring, reporting and verification will not be achieved. Another element which has not been sufficiently addressed in any of the bodies so far is international equity between developing countries. ECO believes

that it is important that broad participation – both of countries with high and low deforestation rates – is encouraged and incentivised. If these elements are not addressed under the AWG-LCA, where will they be?

Moreover, to ensure lasting forest protection, leadership is required from developed countries to apply demand-side measures to reduce demand for, and trade in, forest products (especially those produced unsustainably or in contravention of national and international law). ECO would like to highlight that, when considering how to address REDD, the overlaps between different bodies and negotiating tracks should complement each other – and not let anything fall through the gaps. We should not forget that the AWG-KP is discussing rules and modalities for Annex I LULUCF which may directly impact REDD. In addition, within the AWG-LCA we now have REDD featuring in both finance and mitigation – but let’s not ignore that REDD can also help in enabling developing countries to adapt to the effects of climate change. ECO recognises the importance of REDD within all these elements but would like to see coordination between the different discussions and in that regard supports the view of

–continued on back page, col. 1



More Speed Needed

CAN believes adaptation must be locally focused and livelihood focused, strengthening ecosystem resilience, while being integrated into national strategies for sustainable development. It was refreshing, therefore, to hear several Parties make interventions in the Contact Group on Adaptation reflecting these points. This was particularly significant as the Contact Group is identifying key issues and specific provisions for a negotiating text for Copenhagen that should accelerate implementation of adaptation.

Setting the scene, Australia proposed an approach that was fair, effective and efficient, and that would especially prioritize those countries most vulnerable to climate change. Japan supported this, emphasizing that support should be provided to specified countries most vulnerable to climate change, and where support could be directed to improving and resourcing implementation of NAPAs.

The need to focus on the most vulnerable communities and at a local level was echoed by a number of countries, leading to calls for flexible and context-specific approaches that build on local and traditional knowledge. The G77 and China came out strongly in support of ecosystem- and livelihood-based approaches to adaptation that would be part of a comprehensive and binding agreement that provided new, additional and predictable financial resources. Uganda encouraged approaches that would draw on local and traditional knowledge in the development of strategies for adaptation. Costa Rica also highlighted the need for adaptation to include ecosystem-based approaches.

Speakers reinforced the idea that an integrated approach to deploying development assistance and adaptation resources in complementary ways was desirable. Several remarks cautioned against developing separate

–continued on back page, col. 2

Model Fund Makes Good Progress

The Adaptation Fund Board (AFB), rightly recognised as the first of its kind by Chair Jan Cedergrén, made good progress at its fifth meeting here in Bonn last week. Closely scrutinised by observers, the Board almost completed work on adopting the Operational Policies and Guidelines and hopes to have the Fund up and running later this year.

The Kyoto Protocol's Adaptation Fund scores a first in representative governance, as well as for being truly outside the aid structure. It is based on a 2 percent levy on the Clean Development Mechanism, and is governed with a Board with majority representation from developing countries.

Board Members seemed well aware that their work is being scrutinised with scepticism by some developed country governments, and set about to prove them wrong. All members were clearly in favour of safe-

guarding the integrity of the Fund, while addressing problems that have plagued existing finance arrangements – including long and complicated processes for accessing funds.

ECO calls on developed country governments to shed their scepticism and come out in full support for the Fund and what it represents: a first small step toward more democratic global governance. The Fund deserves a genuine effort by all countries to make it work. It is too early yet to judge how effective it will eventually be in promoting effective adaptation and easy access by the poor and vulnerable. For now, we remain supportive and hopeful that it will serve as a model for the future architecture of climate finance.

Amid the gloom of potential climate catastrophe, the emergence of such democratic structures will prove a ray of sunshine.

Time for Canada to Get Serious

ECO is pleased to hear that the Canadian Conservative government, for the first time since it took office in 2006, intends to hold a series of public consultations on climate change prior to each of the UN negotiating sessions in 2009.

That being said, we are still trying to understand why on earth none of these sessions will be about mitigation?!

If Canada had a strong record on tackling climate change, if its emissions were close to its 1990 base year, if it had a vigorous climate change plan... then perhaps we could cut them some slack.

Unfortunately, Canada has one of the worst track records in the industrialised world, with GHG emissions having risen 23% above 1990 levels. It has no climate legislation to speak of and a weak 2020 commitment – 3% below 1990 levels – that independent experts say they won't even be able to achieve.

Canada likes to claim that it only accounts for little over 2% of global emissions. Yet, the Least Developed Countries, which represent

over a billion of the most vulnerable people on the planet, account for only 3% of global emissions. ECO would like to believe that Canada might start to feel some moral obligation to do its share.



The Mounties always get their man – how about sending them after a target?

Show us the Numbers!

It's hard to imagine how there will be any progress in this session if developed countries refuse to put any numbers on the table for financing for developing country adaptation and mitigation, or for an aggregate reduction target under the KP.

The absence of any clear signal from Annex 1 countries on financing led the LCA contact group on delivering finance and technology to bog down, and the chair had to repeatedly call on the delegates to focus on the issues at hand. The AOSIS delegate summed up the climate best as he called on his developed country colleagues to “show us the numbers. Show us the money.”

Developed countries continued to weave and dodge as they tried to keep up the pretence of negotiating.

Canada kicked off the afternoon's session on a shared vision with a helpful alternative to substantive negotiations, suggesting negotiators should “reflect on the principals underlying the Convention”, and as if to prove they actually read the document, cited a few principles.

The chair noted that one of the cited principles wasn't, in fact, in the Convention, but cited another principle of international law in Latin, which he translated as “treaties are to be carried – in *bona fide*.”

It's no doubt a coincidence, but Canada happens to be the only country to have ratified the Kyoto Protocol and then announced it will not comply with it.

LUDWIG

Ludwig was late this week, having overslept following the riotous farewell party in Texas. He arrived to find the Maritim much as it was on his last visit – hot! Perhaps the management could be persuaded to turn the heating down a little – 2°C should do it.

And straight away he came across a rumour. Apparently, if the proposed formal meeting in August doesn't go ahead, Denmark is considering hosting something informal. In which case, Ludwig wonders, what kind of transparency might there be? Would Ludwig, as an observer, be able to observe?

Finally, quirky facts from the Antipodes. Not many people may know it, but not only is the leader of one of New Zealand's governing parties a declared climate sceptic, but the Prime Minister – who says he thinks climate change is happening – still wants to keep domestic policy flexible, in case the sceptics are proved right. Go figure.

–REDD, from front page

some parties that a REDD focus group should be convened within the AWG-LCA mitigation contact group tasked with drafting negotiation text specific to REDD.

ECO believes the elements identified here are critical for a REDD mechanism to be successful and to provide multiple benefits, but these elements are currently lacking attention in negotiations. With several streams emerging for REDD, parties should ensure coordination between the different negotiation tracks, should use Bonn to make constructive progress and should put all aspects of REDD firmly on the table.

–More Speed, from front page

or parallel institutions and processes, with a preference for deepening agreement on the scope of adaptation prior to discussion of institutional mechanisms. While drawing attention to the existing commitments to support adaptation, there were renewed calls for a specific implementation framework and a results-oriented and transparent reporting approach. Although it was not the role of this Contact Group to address financing or delivery, it remains to be seen whether the Contact Group on Finance will be as constructive in identifying suitable mechanisms to raise the necessary resources.