

ECO



ECO has been published by Non-Governmental Environmental Groups at major international conferences since the Stockholm Environment Conference in 1972. ECO is produced co-operatively by the Climate Action Network at the UNFCCC meetings in Panama, October 2011.

ECO email: administration@climatenetwork.org – ECO website: <http://climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters> – Editorial/Production: Joshua Darrach

Breaking News: Emissions up 5.8% While Delegates Dither

Parties, we have a problem!!!

Global CO₂ emissions did a full swing after the recession, growing more than 5% in 2010, according to a report published last week by the Netherlands Environmental Protection Agency. This is the highest increase in the last two decades and only fuels the climate crisis. Without accounting for the land-use sector, global CO₂ emissions reached 33 billion tonnes, a 45% increase since 1990, driven mostly by a 7.6% increase in coal consumption. This means the world now uses coal for a third of its energy demand – the highest share since 1970. Use of other fossil fuels soared too, with natural gas consumption increasing by 7% and oil consumption jumping by 3%. (This increase takes place mostly in the developing countries, in order to reach decent living standards.)

The report, which uses data from the Statistical Review of World Energy, shows that the growth of emissions was driven in part by economic growth in China and India, with 10% and 9% increases in 2010 respectively. While India's per capita emissions remain fairly low, China's 6.8 tonnes per head per year already overtake those of large historic and de-facto polluters such as France, Italy and Spain. This follows at least in part because of moving manufacturing industries into developing countries, the outputs of which are largely used by developed countries.

So, clearly all Parties, especially those bound by the existing commitments for emission reduction commitments, need to do their share in Durban to lay the

- Continued on Page 2, Column 1



Don't Lose Sight of the Laggards

ECO has consistently reminded A1 that they committed to a second commitment period when they ratified Kyoto. Furthermore, ECO is dismayed that the countries that respectively put the Kyoto in the KP, brought it into force and started negotiations for its second commitment period – Japan, Russia and Canada – are behaving like petulant toddlers, hiding in the corner rather than joining the Kyoto party. Meanwhile, other countries - the EU, Australia, New Zealand, Norway and others - are expressing various degrees of lukewarmness about the KP second commitment period.

However, this analysis misses what is needed from two other groups of countries in order to have a balanced package in Durban, both in terms of the form and substance of the outcome. The KP second commitment period is absolutely essential. But the global climate crisis requires global action.

Thus support from developing countries for a mandate for a legally binding agreement under the LCA, which ECO thinks needs to be in the form of a protocol or other appropriate legal instrument, is fundamental to the solution.

However, there is another group of countries that seem to be trying to escape responsibility. The non-KP developed country[s], from which and about there has been the greatest silence of expectations, need to be called out. It seems clear that whatever is agreed under paragraph 1(b)(i)

- Continued on Page 2, Column 1

- Continued from Page 1, Column 2

foundation for a of solution to the problem (hint, hint: KP 2nd commitment period, LCA mandate for legally binding instrument, close the gigatonne gap, operationalize the Green Climate Fund, develop the technology mechanism and a robust MRV framework). Inspiration can also be found in more and more countries – in particular in the developing world – working towards a shift to low carbon economies. While the upward spiral of emissions in China is concerning from a global point of view, the country managed to double its wind and solar capacity for the 6th year in a row. If the developed countries and other major emitters followed China's lead and achieved similar renewable energy growth rates, along with a push for energy efficiency, the world's prospects of staying below 1.5° C or 2°C would be much better than they are now.

- Continued from Page 1, Column 3

the Bali Action Plan (developed country mitigation) in Durban, it will be in the form of a COP decision, but it is also clear that **all** developed countries need to offer more than inadequate pledges as their contribution to the global effort to avoid a 4 °C world. Those that remain in the KP will at least maintain a solid legal framework with economy-wide targets and a strong common MRV and compliance system, even if their current targets are at woefully low levels. ECO would love to explore with Parties ideas to strengthen 1(b)(i) so that it does not become the grotesque poster child of a pledge and review 4 °C world.



A Disturbing Disturbance

Parties don't want to have to account for forestry emissions not caused by humans, like wildfires, for example. Fair enough you might say, but this is being used as another attempt to hide emissions.

Until recently, only events classified as *force majeure* - large-scale events beyond the control of Parties - would be excluded. However, the language of "force majeure" has now been dropped in favor of the less specific "natural disturbance." Whether it's called natural disturbance or *force majeure*, the CAN view is that any mechanism agreed in the LULUCF rules must transparently and conservatively factor out emissions and removals from extraordinary natural disturbances only.

So what the heck does that mean?

"Extraordinary" has to be defined. And its definition shouldn't be wildly at odds with a plain language meaning of, well, extraordinary. Common sense suggests that it should only be used for statistically extremely rare events and the

same provisions for natural disturbance should be consistent for all Parties.

It also means you can't hide just any (or all) of your debits. And it means you shouldn't hide emissions if they come from stuff you did (like harvesting, or salvage logging). Because it's natural disturbance, remember? It means you need to really clearly say where, why, and how much you are calling natural disturbance (i.e. show your work!)

It means that you have to treat natural disturbances in exactly the same way in your baseline as you do in the commitment period you're accounting emissions. Finally, it means you have to be able to measure them really well, and that requires high quality data.

So in short, a natural disturbance mechanism for LULUCF has to retain the common sense meaning of *force majeure*. If parties are worried their carbon sequestration will go up in smoke, they should discount the credits.

Building Capacity Building

Just as CAN's approach to mitigation has always been for Parties to focus on the reality of "What the atmosphere actually sees," so CAN's approach to capacity building (CB) in the LCA has always been for Parties to concentrate on the realities on the ground. These realities are fourfold:

1) The vast majority of Parties are mid to small sized developing countries with under-developed economies containing immense potential for human and economic development;

2) Most of these economies are already in the frontline of initial climatic impacts that their populations are already experiencing, can witness, and can understand;

3) Governments and populations of these countries understand the implications of established science; things will only get worse without action, and mitigation action capable of limiting warming to 2 degrees or less will require: a) robust action from wealthy economies and b) deviation from business-as-usual high-carbon development pathways for

developing countries;

4) Very few of these countries have the political, economic or institutional capacity right now to rapidly design and build low-carbon development pathways on their own.

Unfortunately, up to now the CB negotiations in the LCA have largely turned around almost anything else except these basic realities - despite insistent pressure and constant calls for focus. However, there was a significant exception for a short period during the Bangkok and Barcelona sessions before Copenhagen when CB was negotiated on its own and suddenly started to make significant progress.

The Panama session is crucial for CB in the LCA. By contrast to progress on both technology and finance, negotiations on institutional arrangements for CB were almost completely unproductive at Cancun. Some forward movement was established at Bonn this June. However that progress now needs a new sense of purpose and focus if we are to get a decision at Durban.