

# 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 the Climate Action Network at the UNFCCC meetings in Bonn in May/June 2010.  
 ECO email: [econewsletter@hotmail.com](mailto:econewsletter@hotmail.com) – ECO website: <http://www.climatenetwork.org/eco> – Editorial/Production: Fred Heutte

## Green Shoots for the Financial Mechanism

As a low-key session in the all too familiar confines of the Maritim draws to an end, the pressures, ambitions and disappointments of Copenhagen are fading into the background.

Green shoots are appearing in the LCA finance negotiations, where the dry discussions of institutions, functions, accountability and authority are turning into a rich and productive engagement. Largely stalemated since Accra almost two years ago, polarized positions are giving way to an open discussion and perhaps real movement towards agreement.

ECO noted the Philippine delegation responding positively to the US proposal on the outline of a governance structure. This is the clearest indication to date that the US may finally be willing to engage constructively in setting up a climate fund in accordance with contemporary best practices in global governance.

However, the history of international negotiations is littered with hard-fought but under-resourced funds and institutions. So while we

## Cut the Nonsense

With an issue as serious as the survival of entire nations, you would think all governments would be able to negotiate the matter seriously and in good faith. However, as last night's teeth-rattling exercise in negotiations dentistry showed, even agreeing a technical report about potential 1.5° C scenarios is not immune.

During the SBSTA evening session, Saudi Arabia managed to plow through every possible diversion, suggesting for instance that vulnerable countries just use Google if they want more knowledge about the scientific findings relating to their survival, or that it is beyond the capacity of the Secretariat to produce a summary of recent scientific studies. Finally they hit on procedural issues as a last resort.

Keep in mind that early in the week Saudi Arabia agreed to having the report, as long as references to spillover

effects were included (as is now in the proposed scope). Instead of the random chaos of Copenhagen, things are reverting back to previous form, and this makes a nonsense of important matters.

Deep feeling was expressed about potential impacts on developing countries that export rice, cocoa, tomatoes, coal, oil, manufactured goods, etc.

Instead, many of those countries wish there was room for serious concern about the climate impacts to which they are most vulnerable and the increasing speed at which they are experiencing them.

Recent science has sounded the alarm: the 2° path might not be enough to guarantee the survival of small island states and dynamic coastlines. Google is all well and good, but every policy maker ought to know that 'search' is one thing and 'assessment' quite another.

celebrate progress towards agreement on the institutions, we can't lose sight of the need for agreement on the innovative sources of public finance that can generate financing at the scale required, the need for developed coun-

tries to step up and take the lead with truly ambitious emissions reduction efforts, and for near-term global emissions peaking and reductions to levels that will ensure our children and grandchildren a blossoming planet.

## Progressing the Nairobi Work Programme

Let's face it, there hasn't been that much progress here in Bonn to address the climate challenge. So ECO wants to share some thoughts about the Nairobi Work Programme (NWP).

The NWP was set up by decision 2/CP.11 to support all Parties in addressing vulnerability and impacts of climate change and adaptation. It was established as a 5-year programme and is due to end at COP 16.

Through a succession of workshops involving Parties and observers – including NGOs – the NWP has created an open forum where information and experiences are shared in a cooperative manner across nine broad themes encompassing the whole range of adaptation needs. It has provided opportunities where observers can meet informally with Parties to dis-

cuss different approaches to similar challenges. Through an informal system of pledges, many different stakeholders have committed voluntarily to sharing knowledge and contributing in practical ways to capacity building.

So it is not surprising that Parties are recommending to the COP to continue the NWP beyond Cancún. ECO also supports continuation of the NWP – it is one of the few activities under the UNFCCC that has actually made progress in building capacity to address the impacts of climate change.

However, even a good thing can always be improved. The NWP has synthesised a lot of information and made it available to Parties and observers, but it still has some gaps to be filled.

Here are some issues that the NWP

should address in the next phase. Has the programme had an impact on those most affected by climate change – the vulnerable communities in the LDCs and SIDS? How could the NWP be enhanced to meet their needs? How can a wider range of stakeholders, including indigenous peoples, be engaged to share their knowledge?

In a spirit of participation, there will be an informal meeting including observers, and an opportunity for all stakeholders to make submissions to the Secretariat, to collect views on the performance of and future scope of the NWP.

ECO recommends that Parties engage more in the NWP and fully recognize its lessons not just on adaptation but also on cooperation in other areas of work under the UNFCCC.



Ludwig in Bad Godesberg

Photo: Fred Heutte

## LUDWIG

As Ludwig observed the evening SBSTA session, his mood changed from mid-week ennui to the edge of irritation. Clearly, what the OPECs need to do is take a lesson from the Annex I forest management folk. After all, fossil fuels are merely dead vegetation and we all know that emissions from dead vegetation need not be accounted for, or else only voluntarily. A well constructed forward-looking baseline, with all BAU fossil fuel burning incorporated into it, would obviate the need to account for any fossil fuel emissions. Zero carbon economies would then be attainable almost immediately with no behavioural change required whatsoever. Oil would take its proper place as the new biofuel. There is the small matter of staying below any temperature limit at all, but in the event we could easily agree a global deal by Friday and make life a lot simpler. Of course, as the saying goes, if the rising water swamps the other end of the lifeboat, your side will also drown.