Dear Ministers

At these negotiations, one thing is clearer than ever – countries willing to protect their citizens and their environment from dangerous climate change must move forward under the Kyoto Protocol.

Why? Because it is the only international agreement on curbing climate change that is actually working.

Both industrialised and developing countries need to ensure they deliver sustainable development benefits. Adaptation is the first priority for most developing countries. More dependable financing for adaptation and technology transfer will be necessary for a successful post-2012 regime. The flexible mechanisms of the Kyoto Protocol have put, for the first time, a price on carbon dioxide emissions. Emissions trading makes it financially more feasible to reduce carbon pollution. Industrialised and developing economies such as Brazil, India and China are engaging in emissions reduction projects and calling for more.

Parties to the Kyoto Protocol should now strengthen the Protocol’s tools by agreeing to deeper emissions cuts in industrialised countries and more action by all in the second phase of the Kyoto Protocol, as well as strengthening the respective institutions.

Parties need to send a strong signal that deeper cuts of emissions will happen after 2012. The conference here in Montreal is the place to send this signal by implementing a plan under the Kyoto Protocol with the following characteristics:

1. PROCESS: A clear process must be launched to negotiate the next commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol after 2012. A formal “Ad Hoc Open-Ended Working Group” must be created under the Kyoto Protocol which will elaborate the second phase of the Protocol;
2. REDUCTIONS: This process must have the stated aim of bringing about substantial further reductions from industrialised countries;
3. REPORTING: The Chair of the Working Group must be mandat ed to report back to the Kyoto Parties, based on a synthesis prepared by the UNFCCC secretariat;
4. DIFFERENTIATED RESPONSIBILITIES: The process should seek to identify possibilities for additional action by the richest and rapidly industrialising among developing countries, taking into account the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, and focusing on equitable access to the atmosphere in addressing climate change while being supportive of their economic and social needs;
5. ADAPTATION: The process should be developing a large scale, reliable source of funding for adaptation costs of developing countries that are linked to the operation of the flexible mechanisms;
6. CONTENT: The core issues and elements to be tackled in the negotiations must be set out, and terms of reference for the negotiations must be developed;
7. TIMING: A clear end date for negotiations should be set for 2008.

---

How to Engage the US?

Leave Bush Behind!

The strong participation of US civil society in these meetings reinforces the strategic value of holding COP11 and COP/MOP1 in North America.

A large and diverse group of trade unions, business leaders, faith groups, and state and local officials is participating here in support of effective climate action. Yet the Bush Administration continues to oppose forward progress on the climate regime and immediate reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

Mayors from around the world are meeting at the Montreal City Hall. Seattle Mayor Greg Nickels spoke of success in reducing the city government’s own greenhouse gas emissions, laying the groundwork for deep community-wide reductions, and a safer, cleaner and prosperous future. He highlighted that 192 states, have signed the US Mayors Climate Protection Agreement. Among them, just months before Hurricane Katrina, was Mayor Ray Nagin of New Orleans.

On Tuesday, 24 US Senators, including leading Republicans, released a letter to President Bush, reminding the Administration of its “continuing legal obligation to participate in the COP in a constructive way,” and noting that “a deliberate decision by the Administration not to engage in such discussions…is inconsistent with the obligations of the United States as set forth in the UNFCCC.”

Members of many delegations may have...
A Latin American View

By CAN Latin America

Preventing dangerous climate change must involve all countries with significant emissions, including Latin American countries. The current negotiations will be crucial to deciding the fate of the regime established by Kyoto Protocol and the process for determining the shape of future efforts to address climate change. Our countries must help strengthen the regime under the Protocol by exploring creative ways to address greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions – without backing off on demands for real and deep emissions reductions from industrialised countries.

During the Bonn 2004 International Conference for Renewable Energies, Argentina, Brazil and Mexico, along with 26 other countries from all continents, committed to increase their use of renewable energy. This is a useful strategy to develop our region’s huge potential for renewable energy, while meeting local needs within the context of sustainable development and climate protection.

Climate Action Network Latin America (CANLAT) calls upon all countries of our region to explore, in a constructive and flexible manner, creative ways to make new contributions to the Kyoto regime, in the limited time remaining in this negotiating session. For example, they could explore new mechanisms to promote renewable energy sources and energy efficiency, and control deforestation.

CANLAT supports the position paper prepared by the Brazilian Forum of NGOs and Social Movements (FBOMS), which calls on Brazil to expand its own contribution to the global efforts under the Kyoto Protocol to prevent dangerous climate change, with special emphasis in the near term on reducing deforestation using new approaches. For those countries like Brazil, with vast areas of forests and high deforestation rates, reducing these rates should be key to their contributions in the short term to address global GHG emissions.

Finally, CANLAT welcomes the discussion kicked off by the proposal of Papua New Guinea and Costa Rica to explore innovative ways to reduce emissions caused by deforestation. Such new mechanisms can not only prevent climate change, but also stem loss of biodiversity and reinforce cultural values and rights of communities that live in those forests. We strongly support a process to proceed rapidly with this discussion and consider the COP/MOP the best forum for addressing this issue, especially since the US appears prepared to block any serious progress under the Convention.

“Fossil of the Day” Award

The first prize for yesterday’s Fossil of the Day award was given to Italy for its intervention at a side-event. While illustrating different emissions scenarios, Italy’s Director General of the Ministry of Environment stated that technological advances in fossil fuels, emissions intensity and nuclear, as well as investments in “gap” technologies like carbon capture and storage were needed to reach the goal of greenhouse gas stabilisation. Italy then affirmed that the Gleneagles Plan, and not the UNFCCC, should be the reference point for setting new commitments for developed and developing countries.

Saudi Arabia was awarded the second fossil of the day for blocking the adoption of the compliance mechanism of the Marrakech Accords. Their action will not improve compliance as the Saudis claim but divert time and resources from moving forward on Kyoto at the conference.

The US won the third fossil for intervening to object to the word “dialogue” in the President’s draft COP decision text.

CCS: Why Ask GEF?

The report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on carbon capture and storage (CCS) has only just been released. And before SBSTA has fully considered this report, this issue is already being passed on to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and other implementing institutions. In the absence of technical and policy guidance to these institutions, the action seems completely premature.

Instead, the role CCS should play under the Convention should be decided in the Convention, not delegated to the GEF (or any other implementing institution). The issue of CCS is no less controversial than Land-Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF).

Yet, delegates may remember spending several years discussing LULUCF guidance for the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) before proceeding with CDM afforestation and reforestation projects. And it was SBSTA that negotiated LULUCF-CDM guidance, not the CDM itself.

Serious questions need to be asked about CCS. Issues that should be considered in the Convention include detection and consequences of release of carbon dioxide from storage, and whether CCS would fit within the greenhouse gas inventory guidelines and accounting rules.

Youth to Reaffirm Commitment to Kyoto Protocol

The youth, also known as “Generation Impact,” are working hard to protect the climate for themselves and for future generations. Today, at 11:00 they will pledge an International Youth Declaration of Support for the Kyoto Protocol. The event will be held at the Bay Du Nord room.

Apart from declaring their passion and experience for the climate, they will also call for help, guidance and mentorship from representatives of the Parties and senior climate activists.
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