

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.

EU – Time to Step up

All EU negotiators stop and listen up! Today is a nice day and the day to start engaging in a successful outcome on technology cooperation under the UNFCCC. The scope for this is endless. How else can the EU deliver sustainable development and energy security without ambitious global technology cooperation with the US, Japan, China, India and other players? How else is the EU going to reach the increasing needs of the poor that need to adapt to climate change? A few more bilateral government aid projects? A bit of CDM for the large emitters?

The waiting game is over, now is the time to say what you really think and ask for help from others, because the Copenhagen clock is ticking. We know that you didn't bring any money to the table for this meeting, but we want to see some ambition and passion about the task at hand and a willingness to engage with others. In particular since there are so many common views on how you really want to set this up. Show us what you, the negotiators, want to see, and the world will make sure that you get the political backing at home.

This is a window of opportunity, do not let it close. Just as the G77 and China has

proposed a scale-up of finance for technology, the European Commission also wants to see a doubling of research, development and demonstration by 2012 and a quadrupling by 2020. The Commission stresses that significantly enhanced research for adaptation and mitigation technologies are needed and that this should be done jointly with developing countries. Just like the G77 and China, the EU can see the value of establishing national and regional centres to promote technology development and transfer, and stimulate capacity building. The EU also agrees with the G77 and China that bilateral activities may be considered as contributions to the Convention, but there is a need to sort out the structure for this and other issues. The EU acknowledged that cooperative technology oriented agreements and specific technology demonstration has a role to play under the Convention, which is in line with G77 and China's idea for Technology Action Plans. Or is it? Well you might not know unless you start to show genuine interest, ask questions and explore how on earth we are all going to live together. There is not a day to waste: is today the day we will see real action?



Spillover effects – when MRV goes wrong...

Climate crisis? G20 misses opportunity

G20 leaders yesterday failed to recognize the opportunity to shift the global economy to a low carbon, sustainable pathway.

Search for the word “climate” in the communiqué you get to the second to last paragraph of the document. Action should be “based on common but differentiated responsibilities” – hmmm wonder who put that in? But the only action was to “reach agreement in Copenhagen”.

“Reach agreement?” On what? Where to eat dinner?

They gave no signal to negotiators here in Bonn that they were serious about the climate – they did say it was “irreversible” but that didn't seem to be particularly important.

Money was pledged for the IMF, MDBs and to fight poverty (not without qualifications), but not a word was said about the financial commitment sorely needed for adaptation, mitigation and ending deforestation.

They seem to have forgotten to come up with the numbers for fighting climate change. A search for any reference to at least some part of the trillion dollars they pledged reveals that none of it is tagged for their stated “transition towards clean, innovative, resource efficient, low carbon technologies and infrastructure.”

They reaffirmed their commitment to meeting the Millennium Development Goals, but we all know that the impacts of climate change will send those goals up in smoke.

The only good news is that there will be another meeting in the Autumn, after the MEF and more meetings, and maybe they might have talked to some economists by then about what “irreversible” climate change is.

ECO was going to write a full and detailed analysis of the G20's efforts on climate change, but we ended up putting as much effort into it as they did.

Global Fund to be Launched to Support the Saudis

By Wael Hmaidan, *IndyACT*

Facts: Current GDP per capita for Saudi Arabia is around US\$24,000, ranking among the 40 highest GDPs/capita in the world. Just for the heck of it, let's compare this number with some other "developing" countries: Rwanda's GDP/capita is around \$900 (ranking at 165); that for the Democratic Republic of Congo is around \$300 (ranking at 178). Now let us perhaps make a comparison with a couple of relatively rich developed countries, which have binding targets to reduce their emissions. Bulgaria for example has a GDP/capita around \$12,000 (ranking at 65); or even Portugal, with a GDP/capita of around \$22,000 (ranking at 39).

These figures make you wonder how come Saudi Arabia, which is much better off than a whole bunch of industrialized countries, has managed to get off the hook of being bound by reduction targets? They must have damn good negotiators, especially considering that they made their fortune by selling oil, one of the main substances behind the problem of climate change.

But the skill of their negotiators does not stop at this point. They have even been able to make sure that, if the world comes to an agreement on solving the problem of climate change, we must consider the effect of this action on their oil trade. This is one of the subjects under discussion at this negotiation session: the issue of adverse effects of response measures, where the Saudis are trying to ensure that they receive compensation for any loss in oil revenues due to climate change

mitigation measures.

Yep, people... what audacity... Can you imagine a world built on this concept? Do we really want to compensate people when we stop them from doing harm to others? Should we pay drug dealers when we remove drugs from the street. Okay, fine... Drugs are illegal... but what about cigarettes? Should we compensate cigarette companies for increasing taxes on cigarettes to reflect health costs?

The issue of response measures is important. It provides LDCs and the most vulnerable countries a chance to address the impacts of the measures adopted to reduce climate change by the developed countries. But in no way should this agenda item compensate Saudi Arabia for expected future oil revenue losses. And let's not worry about feeling guilty for impoverishing the Saudis owing to their loss of oil trade. According to a study done by the Saudis themselves, action on climate change will cause a loss of 5 to 20 percent of GDP. So if we even take the worst scenario, the GDP/capita of Saudi Arabia will become \$20,000, which is equal to that of Greenland or Hungary (ranking 40).

So what kind of arguments is Saudi Arabia using to explain its position? Well, if you haven't been attending the 'response measures' session, here is a typical line being pushed by the Kingdom: developed countries should not strive for energy security, or apply 'eco labelling' because this prevents trade in polluting and planet-destroying products, such as fossil fuels, batteries filled with heavy metals, and mercury thermometers!!!

Most Vulnerable Demand Strong A1 Target

ECO applauds the intervention made by Micronesia yesterday on behalf of AOSIS and a number of Latin American and African countries in the AI Aggregate Targets contact group calling on all Annex I Parties to commit, as a group, to at least 45% below 1990 levels by 2020 and more than 95% below 1990 levels by 2050.

The AOSIS submission highlights the hypocrisy of those who argue that the cost of moving too quickly on climate change will reverse the developing world's emergence from poverty. That's not at all the way many of the poorest nations, threatened by drought, flooding and even submergence, see the matter.

ECO is happy to see some Parties re-

sponding to the urgency of the science and putting ambitious numbers on the table.

ECO urges all Parties to conclude discussion on an aggregate target in line with the science and that will keep us as far below 2°C as possible at this session (and as set out in their agreed work programme).

Memo to the Bureau

Today when you decide on when, where and how many sessions there will be, Eco insists that you fulfil one request: that all sessions must be open to NGOs (and the media). The ability to hold press conferences is not enough.

Bioengineering LULUCF


It was a war of ideas in the LULUCF contact group yesterday: account for emissions or engineer outcomes. Tuvalu presented its proposal to add 'Forest Biomass Decline' as a new mandatory accounting activity for Annex I Parties. 'Forest Biomass Decline' is defined as "a human-induced activity leading to a decrease in carbon stocks and/or greenhouse gas emissions on forested land remaining forested land." Translation: account for the emissions that occur when you cut down trees.

ECO has previously written on the importance of accounting for emissions from forest degradation. But when every country proclaims 'sustainable forest management,' who's going to admit to it? Tuvalu's point is that, 'sustainable' or not, forestry practices lead to carbon stock declines...and some more than others. Conversion of primary forests to secondary forests and conversion to plantations are the best examples of forest biomass declines that we should be accounting for, and trying to reduce. Referring to 'forest biomass decline' focuses on the carbon stocks rather than the political issue of what is forest degradation. And it makes it mandatory.

Sounds good.

On the other hand, Canada proposed a special non-accounting clause so Parties would not receive debits when croplands reach carbon saturation. This is another 'get out of jail free' card to avoid accounting for LULUCF debits. The EU explained that The Bar could be used to create positive incentives for the forest sector; however, it could also be used to ensure that 'QELROs' are politically palatable (i.e. not to have too many debits from LULUCF!). Brazil rightly asked, where will the fixes end?

ECO prefers the simplicity and goal of the Tuvalu approach: let's just reduce emissions in the commitment period.



ANOTHER THEORY OF GLOBAL WARMING.