

# 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 Climate Action Network groups attending COP15 in Copenhagen in December 2009. ECO email: econewsletter@hotmail.com ECO website: <http://www.climatenetwork.org/eco> Editorial/Production: Nithiyananthan Nesadurai/Sander Wijsman*

## Making history in Hopenhagen

COP15 is making history, but it remains to be seen if it will be for the right reasons. After days of near grid-lock, we have negotiations happening on three tiers, with text on Shared Vision being fashioned even as Heads of State address the same issues in opening statements. *ECO* is determined that the outcome will upstage all the speeches and process precedents.

The privileged few NGO observers allowed in the Bella Center on Thursday reported a palpable change of atmosphere before lunchtime, as Parties agreed to resume real negotiations on two tracks and using Chairs' texts. This was not long after an announcement by the US, in a press conference, showing willingness to contribute to long-term finance with the right order of magnitude. China has indicated willingness to engage on provisions for transparency and national communications and to integrate its carbon-intensity target into the country's next five-year plan.

*ECO* is encouraged that a number of pledges, considered risky for some making them, seem to reflect some serious diplomatic work behind the scenes. Now we need some more moves in the full light of the UN process. It is high time for the EU to shift their 2020 emissions reduction target from 20% to at least 30% below 1990 levels. At the same time every country with conditional targets should activate them and make decisions for the success of Copenhagen. At the time of writing, we have at least 24 hours to go and an apparent will to pick up the pace.

Now is the time for leaders to deploy the political will articulated in speeches and turn it into text for a treaty. We need lots of "shall" language, with commitments that add up to at least keeping the world well below 2°C. There is also the need to close the loopholes that currently preclude Annex I Parties' stated ambition from being transparent or secured.

We are confident that a collective of so many Heads of State will not concede defeat. This is why civil society calls upon you to deliver a real success in the collective interests of humanity and the ecosystems on which we depend. We don't need another political statement promising concern about climate change or recycling Bali outcomes. We need commitments and a strengthened mandate for the process to conclude legal instruments that will deliver a "climate safe" world.

With regard to finance, there is much speculation and probing on who might settle for what, not to mention who may be offering what to whom, on what terms. The scale and governance of public finance has been flagged as a potential deal-breaker. Perceptions of appropriate ambition are clearly grist for any blame game, but it would be premature to assume that blame will need to be assigned. It would be more productive to move on the basis of honest assessment of how much finance can be found where, in order to meet the well-researched needs.

*ECO* has learned that even with the actions on the table as Heads of State assemble, we  
– continued on page 2, column 3

## Close the gap

The last day of a two-year negotiation process has dawned. This morning, when world leaders look in the mirror they must ask themselves a simple question. Today, will I do what is necessary to ensure the world avoids catastrophic climate change, or will I ignore the alarm bells and sign up to a greenwash deal?

The latest alarm bell comes from a leaked report from the UNFCCC secretariat, which assesses the impact of the upper end of the emission reduction pledges on the table from all Parties. It warns that without strong additional action, "global emissions will peak later than 2020 and remain on an unsustainable pathway that could lead to concentrations equal or above 550ppm with the related temperature rise around 3°C."

Surely this bombshell message from the very heart of the UN process cannot be ignored? Sadly *ECO* has grown accustomed to leaders delivering fine speeches pledging support for the 2°C goal – and then, by their actions, failing to take the measures which are clearly necessary to deliver it in practice.

The Secretariat's findings must be the final wake-up call. It has been clear for months that industrialised country targets fall far short even of the bottom end of the 25-40% reductions by 2020 that the IPCC says are needed to give even a 50/50 chance of staying below 2°C.

The Secretariat's conclusions are also fully in line with recent assessments from experts such as Lord Nicholas Stern and UNEP, Project Catalyst and McKinsey, and  
– continued on page 2, column 1

# Welcome to Copenhagen, President Obama

*ECO* pushed hard for you to come here and is looking forward to the global leadership that the world is confident you can provide.

*ECO* is aware that you have been busy with other issues over the last two weeks, and would like to offer some context. Here in Copenhagen, the overall level of ambition of developed countries has been inadequate on emission reduction commitments, especially in light of the scientific requirements, and on necessary financial support for adaptation and mitigation actions in developing countries.

*ECO* needs to better understand yesterday's announcement from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton about "jointly mobilising \$100 billion a year by 2020." It's a breath of fresh air to see the United States finally putting longer term funding on the table to solve the climate crisis, and prioritising the needs of vulnerable developing nations. But the world demands to hear more.

President Obama: *ECO* along with citizens of the world (even Americans) insist that the US follow up on its commitment to work towards \$100 billion of finance by clarifying the US contribution to this goal and by specifying what revenue will be generated from predictable and sustainable public sources. We also need to hear a commitment

## Australian two track thrust

*ECO* cautiously welcomes Australia's apparent admission yesterday that it takes two tracks to get a train moving. Prime Minister Kevin Rudd told the high-level plenary that he wanted to resolve "the future of the Kyoto Protocol and its intersection with a new Copenhagen Accord."

He added: "We can I believe accommodate a common and integrated future for both international instruments which embrace the legal responsibilities of all Parties – developed and developing."

Rudd also spoke about his desire to do "everything in his power" to avoid dangerous climate change. Yet, *ECO* knows there is a good deal in his remit that remains undelivered – long-term finance and an unconditional 25% mid-term emissions reduction target?

## Oh no, not nukes again!

Yesterday, negotiators received 50,000 postcards sent from across the world asking them to support an ambitious and nuclear-free climate agreement. This dynamic action aimed to highlight the subtle efforts of lobbyists to have nuclear power included in the CDM.

The lobbyists have been effective. The Marrakech addendum which banned nuclear power from flexible mechanisms, is now supplemented by other options. As a result, nuclear would either be only banned for the next commitment period. Or it could even become eligible for all subsequent periods, starting from last year!

*ECO* asserts that nuclear power is neither clean nor climate friendly and is not a cost-effective energy source. We call upon Heads of State to refrain from diverting urgently needed money from real solutions which includes renewables, into nuclear! Our goal here is sustainable development, not dangerous and heavily-subsidised projects.

– *Make history, from front page* – are on track for 3°C. Hence, some people's definition of success may be slipping. Yet, the science is moving in the opposite direction, requiring ever-greater urgency. Leaders must work together to identify where the resources, including for adaptation, and the additional emissions reduction will come from.

that these funds will be new and additional to current development assistance ensuring that vital health, education and economic development programmes remain intact.

On Wednesday, your science adviser Dr John Holdren shared with us the dangers we face in a +2°C degree world. His presentation worries *ECO* because "even if we stop all emissions now – we can't bend the curve enough to avoid serious impacts." Holdren admitted that the current status of the Copenhagen agreement does not go far enough; therefore quick action to help vulnerable communities adapt to these unavoidable effects as well as faster and deeper emission reductions are necessary. You are here – you can make this happen!

It is now imperative that you help raise ambition and build trust among world leaders.

You are poised to take advantage of this unique opportunity to realign our common trajectory and invest for the long haul in a path that promotes jobs, energy independence, national security and economic sustainability. Finally, when you return home from the Copenhagen talks it is essential that you prioritise action on climate change. It's the number one issue on our minds and should be the first on your 2010 agenda.

into a yawning gulf.

Step two must be to greatly increase the size of industrialised country targets. As a group, Annex I countries need to reduce emissions by at least 40% below 1990 levels by 2020. This is a big stretch, given where things stand, but it is nothing less than what the science demands.

Step three must be to ensure full delivery of US\$195 billion in new, additional and predictable finance and other support to help developing countries move to a low-carbon, climate resilient future.

Step four must be to introduce robust new mechanisms to reduce emissions from deforestation and degradation, and also to bring the rapidly growing international aviation and shipping sectors under control.

We're at the end of the dinner. It's time to pay the bill and no-one is offering to pay the difference. Every country with a target needs to consider whether it has any more to bring to the table – and do so now. Leaders can no longer pretend that they acted in ignorance – the choices before them have never been clearer.

### – Close the gap, from front page –

Ecofys and the Potsdam Institute. Indeed, its assessment is relatively optimistic – some credible studies say we are on course for 3.5-4°C warming.

So if we are heading for the rocks, what options are available to steer the ship back to safer waters? How could leaders find the missing gigatonnes of carbon reduction in 2020 – not just to give a coin-toss chance of a safe climate, but to make sure we stay well below 2°C?

Step one must be to make sure that industrialised countries' weak targets are not neutered completely by loopholes. Action must be taken to tackle the huge quantities of "hot air" created by unused allowances from the first – and potentially second – commitment periods. Accounting rules for land use and forestry must be placed on an honest footing and not used as an accounting trick to further weaken targets. And leaders must stop pretending that all offset credits represent real emission reductions. Unfixed, all of these problems turn the gigatonne gap

---

# The finance fudge

So, finally, after the near collapse of the Copenhagen negotiations, US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton arrives and announces that the US will "...work with other countries toward a goal of jointly mobilising \$100 billion a year by 2020 to address the climate change needs of developing countries."

This is the same amount that was mentioned by British Prime Minister Gordon Brown before the G8, and more recently supported by French President Nicolas Sarkozy and others. As Brazil and Sudan among others acknowledged today, this is welcome but still insufficient.

After all the hype about "fast start" finance last week, it is refreshing to hear Parties talk about long-term finance in Copenhagen.

According to Hillary Clinton, this funding is expected to come from "...a wide variety of sources, public and private, bilateral and multilateral, including alternative sources of finance." It would be great if the US would now support promising alternative sources such as bunkers mechanisms, international auctioning of AAUs, special drawing rights,

financial transaction levies, etc.

Just as *ECO* has called for "carbon clarity" and put a spotlight on the loopholes in Annex I reduction commitments, we also need to watch out for dodgy numbers in their financial commitments. We need "dollar clarity". Counting private investments in this total opens a loophole big enough to drop a medium-sized planet through. Indeed, *ECO* wonders if there is anything that couldn't be counted towards this total – foreign direct investment, speculative capital flows, subsidies to promote pet export industries. In short, this could become the wild west of creative accounting.

In order to secure a FAB (fair, ambitious and binding) deal, at least \$195 billion of public finance is required to meet the needs of developing countries by 2020. Clinton and Brown's announced amounts would get us more than half-way there – IF the entire amount were public funds. The total would be in the right order of magnitude, and these public funds would then help to catalyse much larger amounts of private and other funds to shift the more than trillion dollars a year of

investments necessary to achieve a low carbon and climate resilient global economy. It will also prevent the much higher costs of dealing with the impacts of climate change.

Recent movements on long-term finance make *ECO* anxiously look for a leader push for higher ambition. Current pledges – while wrapped in bright red ribbons – are at best insufficient. Today is the last chance for the EU to step out and specify its own public finance offer to developing countries, pressing the US, Japan and other developed countries to do likewise. The EU also needs to concede that recycling of old commitments is not acceptable and ensure that climate finance will be new and additional to ODA, and that innovative global sources of finance need to be a part of the package agreed in Copenhagen.

So far, Clinton, Japanese Prime Minister Hatoyama and Swedish Prime Minister Reinfeldt have fallen short of delivering the clarity on the equitable finance offer required for a strong agreement. A strong EU finance announcement today could be the true leadership that Copenhagen needs.

---

## Adaptation: The good and the bad

A paper from the Secretariat now in the public domain estimates that current mitigation pledges by developed countries and some of the emerging economies will put the globe on a path to a 3°C warming – and likely even more. This would melt Greenland's glaciers irreversibly, submerge island states and culture, and threaten agriculture in most of Africa. Many impacts are already being felt, especially by the poor and those that have contributed the least to the problem, as reported by leaders from LDCs and AOSIS over the last two days.

A large scale adaptation effort is therefore a must for vulnerable developing countries. Much of the scale in adaptation actions depends on the scale of the mitigation actions, and secondly on the finance provided – which must come from industrialised countries. And if the funds are to reach those in greatest need, suitable institutional arrangements need to be negotiated. *ECO* is surprised over the failure in the finance text even to mention

one existing institution – the Adaptation Fund.

The means for adaptation are one essential element, but the text also needs to spell out the actions needed. *ECO* sees good and bad in this respect in the existing text.

The Good:

- 1) Special attention to most vulnerable people
- 2) Climate change-induced migration is addressed (for the first time)
- 3) Stronger language on support for regional centres and cooperation

The Bad:

- 1) No mention of historical responsibility, which clearly should guide the provision of financial support from Annex I countries.
- 2) Finance will likely fall significantly short (especially if the world is heading for 3°C)
- 3) Key industrialised countries diverting money from promised development budgets into adaptation (by not

specifying finance as additional to ODA targets)

- 4) Does not facilitate the paradigm shift in attitude from seeing developing countries affected by climate change as entitled to support, rather than the needy waiting for aid handouts dependent on donor whims.

There are still some big issues being handed up to ministers for decision. One is a serious response to address loss and damage, a crucial issue for those countries which are fighting here for their right to survive. Leaders, you have to face this spectre, for it will not disappear. There will be losses which can't be addressed by adaptation. The other issue needing high level political action is the removal of response measures. This is compensation for the loss in oil revenues which some Parties would like to label as adaptation.

As COP15 comes to a close, it is essential that we get real adaptation right – in with the good and out with the bad for a fair, ambitious and binding agreement.

# Outrage over lockout

*ECO* must express its outrage at how we, the NGO community, have been treated here in Copenhagen. Since Wednesday we have been unceremoniously kicked out of the Bella Center, in the name of security and overcrowding. Apparently the UNFCCC conference organisers forgot this would be one of the largest UN negotiations of all-time! The irony here is that Secretariat staff in Bali two years ago were already trumpeting how well prepared they and the Danish government were for the anticipated turnout of 30,000. So what happened?

While we understand that security levels rise upon the arrival of Heads of State, the botched accreditation process for NGOs surely could have been avoided. Furthermore, we don't understand why some NGOs were singled out and banned from the Bella Center altogether, or why participation is now so limited at less than two individuals a country. That makes it virtually impossible to interact with the media in person or offer fresh ideas to tired negotiators.

From more than 25,000 registered civil society participants, we are now down to 300 in the Bella Center. The rest of us are scraping by in hotel lobbies with shoddy internet connections and facing a logistical nightmare. The infamous Copenhagen lockout was not only totally outrageous, it also appears

to breach the Aarhus Convention, which mandates that civil society must be able to participate in climate change discussions. As this is a UN convention that came into force in Aarhus, it makes Denmark's efforts to exclude civil society participants from this crucial conference unforgivable.

Civil society represents the billions around the world who are and will be affected by climate change and who are demanding a fair, ambitious and binding deal. The fact that talks are in disarray is the best argument for NGO access, so that we can be there to press for progress and provide solutions. We have an important role to play both in crafting an

agreement and in preventing leaders from spinning the media.

Those of us working late inside the Bella Center on Wednesday night further had to suffer

the ignominy of being unceremoniously thrown out of our offices by Danish and UN security together while we were still working.

But you cannot get rid of us so easily. Our outrage only reinforces our drive to reengage. We're on email and blackberry and text and Skype to our fantastic tireless troopers inside the building and to the press. So don't think you have neutralised us just by locking us out of the building. We are watching you closely, even at 4:40am, and waiting for you to deliver.

**“ From more than 25,000 registered civil society participants, we are now down to 300 in the Bella Center. ”**

# Up for swap

**Wanted:** Annex I countries willing to take responsibility for increasing emissions from forests and ready to commit to a 5-year period of steady self-improvement.

**Have:** Annex I countries with great creative flair and a knack for technical subtleties, fabricates fantastic excuses for inaction, unfortunate tendency to hide emissions in forest sector.

# J rgen

The sleep-deprived Jørgen has a vision! He has still not managed to find out what is in the relevant text, or where such text may eventually settle, but he has a vision. It won't go away! Even in the small hours of the morning, it seems to hover above him, as if on a huge screen. He has to share it! Jørgen sees an unprecedented assembly of world leaders, working together for the collective health and security of humanity! Has Jørgen become an outrageous optimist? Or will delegates come up with a shared vision to make all of our dreams come true?

# FOSSIL OF THE DAY AWARD

## First place – Australia

Australia yesterday was awarded first place for putting pressure on Pacific Island nations – and Tuvalu in particular – to agree to 2°C and 450 ppm of carbon dioxide. We were so discouraged and angry to learn that Australia, one of Tuvalu's bigger, richer neighbours has been acting like a big bully and asking Tuvalu to give up on its strong commitment to a legally binding agreement that keeps the world to 1.5°C of warming and 350 ppm. Tuvalu stood firm in the face of this outrageous display of aggression.

## Second and third place – Canada, Australia and Japan

These three countries were awarded joint second and third places because of their inability to even keep up with the US on long-term climate finance. These Parties are pretending to behave like poor developing countries that are reeling under the impacts of climate change. Both Canada and Australia have been trying to hide behind the low ambitions of the US and have not been constructive in Copenhagen at COP15. Japan has so far just repackaged discarded gifts from last year.



Thousands were locked out of the Bella Center

Picture by Christian Charisius-REUTERS