

# 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 Cancun in November-December 2010. ECO email: [eco@sunlightdata.com](mailto:eco@sunlightdata.com) – ECO website: <http://climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters> – Editorial/Production: Fred Heutte*

## CRP.1: Steps toward a Package

Many parties commented in the COP plenary about this year's record temperatures and extreme weather events. This comes as ECO reflects on the Royal Society's recent treatise on a rapidly warming +4 degree world . . . the kind of world resulting from a lack of ambition. The need for dramatic action on mitigation has never been so clear.

Which brings us to the LCA. ECO welcomes the work by the Chair this year. Her approach to helping parties reach consensus is to be commended. In a spirit of mutual support, we present the following recommendations on the Chair's possible elements.

The **Shared Vision** must safeguard the planet for future generations. Limiting warming to 1.5° C is necessary to avoid severe impacts, such as a loss of the Mesoamerican Barrier Reef System, a small part of which is off the shores of Cancun, the second longest in the world and a locale for priceless biodiversity. Parties must aim for a 1.5° C temperature threshold, commit to a process that examines this objective, and agree a global peak in emissions no later than 2015. Mere preparation of a review in 2015, as currently proposed, would not be a call to action but a homily to squander a once-only opportunity.

The **Finance** section of the Chair's note is useful in streamlining the text and identifying potential middle ground in some areas. It is also missing some crucial elements, such as a proper balance between mitigation and adaptation finance, participation of vulnerable populations, civil society and women. And yet it is a very promising basis to build on. With additional refinement, it can provide a way forward to a substantive decision on

creation of a new fund under the COP, establishment of an effective oversight body, and a process to decide on sources of funding, including innovative sources of public finance.

The text on **Technology** unfortunately does not ensure that the technology mechanism will be under the authority of and accountable to the COP. This weakens the objectives of setting up the architecture of cooperation through the Technology Executive Committee and Technology Network Centres, as there is no rules-based multilateral mechanism proposed. It also allows an *ad hoc* set of arrangements to emerge that invites prominent roles for the World Bank and regional development banks. Just to be clear, they still fund fossil fuels over conservation, energy efficiency and renewables. Even US clean energy companies are sceptical of the role of the World Bank. They and others would benefit from institutional arrangements that are clearly under the COP's guidance.

CRP.1 as drafted effectively sidetracks CAN's proposed building blocks for **Capacity Building**. The text drops the proposed CB Technical Panel, which should be the front end of a design-and-build programme for new, real and integrated CB to start happening in real places, in real time, backed by real and new resources. Without the front end the entire pathway essentially vanishes. Additionally, the text drops a proposed legal lock creating an obligation on developed countries to adequately support new CB.

The establishment of a strong **Adaptation Framework for Implementation** is essen-

– CRP.1, continued on page 2

## The Climate Right-to-Know

As the SBSTA opens today, ECO would like to remind delegates of a crucial item on the agenda: the proposal for a technical review of the science relating to long-term temperature increases of more than 1.5° C above pre-industrial levels.

What's this all about? It's about clarifying what is really at stake here. It's about urgently bringing in the latest science to inform the ongoing negotiations, and spelling out the choice that governments now face – a choice between raising ambition to a level high enough to avoid climate chaos, or accepting the devastating consequences of a failure to act in time and at scale.

This issue was first put on the agenda in Bonn in June. There, AOSIS – alarmed by recent reports suggesting that the future of their nations could be at risk even if global temperature rise is stabilized at 2° C – proposed that the Secretariat produce a summary of recent scientific studies.

During the negotiations in Bonn it was clarified that this task lies well within the mandate and capabilities of the Secretariat, and that this by no means would be duplicating the work of the IPCC. With these common understandings in place, the vast majority of governments supported the proposal from the small island states.

In the end, however, a few governments still resisted the idea of an overview of recent science. One even went so far as to suggest that vulnerable countries who wanted to know more about the impacts they are facing

– Right-to-Know, continued on page 2

– *CRP.1, continued from page 1*

tial and within reach. While not perfect, the Chair's text lays out steps for a post-NAPA process for developing country parties and for loss and damage. The text also demands a decision on an Adaptation Committee but remains weak on linking the provision of finance to adaptation actions, a necessary connection. ECO is most pleased that references to response measures have been removed from the text.

Ironically, while **Mitigation** is arguably the most important element of a climate agreement, progress has seemed beyond reach. While the Chair's text delivers only a very general and concise outline of the expected outcome, agreement on specific elements of mitigation is an essential part of the outcome from Cancun. Elements could include the creation of a mitigation registry to track action and provide support, recognition of the Gigatonne Gap that exists between targets and the level of action required, a process for addressing the gap, and preparation of zero and low carbon action plans.

Given the complexity of issues related to **Mechanisms** (both market-based and non-market-based), the Chair's suggestion to establish formal processes to examine them is sensible.

The principles laid out in the Annex V include some useful language such as 'moving beyond offsets' to 'net decrease in global GHGs' and 'preventing double counting' of emissions. However, Parties should bear in mind that there is no room – or indeed need –

for offsets with the current inadequately low pledges by developed countries.

The **MRV** text remains a blank canvas. A mere 36 words are dedicated to an issue that has blocked progress in these negotiations. Robust MRV is crucial for environmental integrity, but it must be equitable. Critical issues such as common accounting standards for Annex 1 countries, modalities for MRV of support in national communications, and a differentiated approach for verification of voluntary/unsupported actions taken by developing countries must be tackled in these negotiations. Let's not forget that transparency should apply to the MRV process as well, assuring public access and participation throughout, and developing countries must be supported in their efforts to build domestic MRV capacity.

Finally, the text is silent on the ultimate **Legal Form** of the LCA outcome. Parties are going to have to come to terms with this question soon, since it is inextricably tied to progressing a second commitment period under the KP. Moreover, the text is silent on what mandate the LCA will have going forward. A clear sense of how both the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA will proceed after Cancun is essential to ensure progress towards a **Fair, Ambitious and Binding** deal.

The analogy of Swiss cheese has been suggested in this regard. Dearest delegates, ECO urges you to plug the remaining holes in this text – the result of which could well be the **politically balanced package** you have been looking for.

– *Right-to-Know, continued from page 1*

from climate change could just use Google.

Cancun must not be the COP where governments decide to stick their heads in the sand and ignore the latest science relating to the consequences of the path they are now taking.

Furthermore, governments must remember that while some countries are confronting imminent threats to their very existence, every last one faces severe climate risk. AOSIS and the rest of the world's most vulnerable countries are standing at the front of the line, but the rest of the world is right behind.

Clarifying the scientific realities about climate change must not be an issue just for AOSIS to push. Dear governments – speak no evil – don't block a technical review to clarify the impacts facing us all if we exceed a long-term temperature rise of 1.5° C. Sooner or later all countries are highly vulnerable, and we *all* have a right to know.

## Fossils of the Day

### #1 - Canada

This month, the federal Senate killed a progressive climate change bill without even bothering to debate it.

### #2 - Canada

Conservative government plans to cut the only major renewable energy support program, funding for Canada's climate science foundation, etc.

### #3 - Canada

Reduced its national target after Copenhagen and brought back environment minister John Baird.

## Canada Adrift

Let's say you're a tar sands loving North American government with a bit of a carbon dependency problem. You need a clever way to get away with doing nothing on climate change, and you notice that your neighbor to the south won't have an easy time getting a cap-and-trade bill through its Congress.

For Canada's Prime Minister, Stephen Harper, the solution surely seemed obvious: announce that you just can't lift a finger to deal with climate change unless the U.S. moves first. As they say in Canada: problem solved, eh?

Not quite, as it turns out. With the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency moving to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from new industrial facilities starting in 2011, Harper's plan of outsourcing climate policy to the U.S. meant that Canada would have to do the same. That's bad news for the tar sands (oil

bearing deposits in central Canada), where plans for a massive expansion just don't line up with pesky limits on their emissions.

Enter John Baird, Canada's brand new – er, not so new – environment minister. (Veteran observers will remember him as the last minister in Bali to oppose the science-based target range of 25-40% below 1990 in 2020.)

Confronted about lining up with the neighbors to Canada's south, Baird had some choice words: the US proposal is 'patchwork' and 'very, very preliminary stuff', covering 'a small, tiny percentage of new plants'. Yes, that would be in contrast to Canada's comprehensive proposal of doing nothing whatsoever for any percentage of its new plants.

And this isn't the first time that Canada's policy – 100% harmonized, as long as the US doesn't do anything – has reared its ugly head. Internal emails from the Department of Foreign Affairs released yesterday show Canadian diplomats hard at work to 'kill' a 2007 US clean fuels policy. They enlisted all

lies at Exxon and other oil companies in the battle to, as they so lyrically put it, 'keep the oil a-flowing'. And when one official from Environment Canada pointed out that curbing tar sands emissions is a good thing, her comment was dismissed as 'simply nutty'. Is it a coincidence that this sorry little episode took place the last time John Baird was environment minister?

Anyway, adding it up, it's clear that Canada's three-bagger of Fossils from the first day of the Cancun talks is the most appropriate way to welcome John Baird and the government he represents back to the negotiating table. Oh, Canada – how could you!