

# 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 Bangkok in April 2011.*  
 ECO email: [administration@climatenetwork.org](mailto:administration@climatenetwork.org) – ECO website: <http://climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters> – Editorial/Production: Joshua Darrach

## Plan (and then DO) the Work: Don't Bicker Over the Agenda

ECO has been impressed with the quality of both the presentations and Q&A sessions in the workshops over the past two days, and hopes parties will keep focused on content in the coming days. Alas, we hear, hears parties are gearing up for a multiple day discussion about the agenda over the next three days, rather than developing a robust work programme for all of 2011. ECO has been around the block enough times to know that parties are very good at talking about what to talk about. So we will insist on a prompt 6pm finish today, with adopted agendas, for both the LCA and KP. To help ensure parties adhere to this deadline and turn up on Wednesday ready to work, ECO has put together its own LCA agenda (see page 3) as well as some thoughts on what is to be agreed by the end of this week.

The provisional Agenda is missing some key elements (namely a mitigation negotiating space, consideration of innovative sources of finance, international transport and compliance for developed countries). Parties need to fill those gaps, and then agree to a work plan to fill the real gaps in ambition and financial support by the end of 2011!

Cancun was a modest success as it buried the ghost of Copenhagen. However, the Cancun Agreements postponed important issues that underpin the success, or otherwise, of efforts to fight catastrophic climate change. In 2011 ECO expects parties to be up and ready to BOTH implement the Agreements AND fill in the gaps (gigatonne, finance and others) that remain! You must be able to run and chew gum at the same

time. Even ECO can do it (and ECO isn't the most coordinated).

By the end of the week, ECO expects a detailed work programme for 2011 that will deliver on both. This work programme must include elements like:

- The number of sessions this year;
- What issues will be dealt with and when;
- Number, timing and content of technical workshops;
- Invitations for submissions from Parties and observers;
- Technical papers, etc.

Of course, the specific requirements will vary according to the agenda item. By way of example, ECO expects parties to produce MRV rules by Durban that, will drastically increase the length of the Cancun Agreements! So the work plan needs to enable informed discussions and the negotiation on such rules.

With so much to discuss and plan out, there is no time to waste bickering about the agenda. Progress can and must be made in technical forums on these issues this year, while retaining strong linkage and political oversight by the overall LCA negotiations and making progress on the remaining crunch issues.

If parties implement and operationalize all of the agreements made in Cancun (including, and improving, the Kyoto Protocol), we can build a robust regime. However, good architecture alone will not produce the level of ambition needed. Concrete steps need to be made in 2011 to close the gigatonne and finance gaps in order to avoid dangerous and devastating climate change.

## Developing Country Mitigation Getting on Track but not Quite There Yet...

Yesterday's second mitigation workshop put the spotlight on developing country actions. ECO was intrigued that developed countries didn't use the opportunity to get payback for being grilled the day before on their pledges. This may have been, ECO speculates, because many developed countries are quite aware that their own pledges are pathetically below the 25-40% range, and full of loopholes. It may also be that developed countries have to admit that several of the developing countries, even if they haven't yet pulled out all the stops, are much closer to their fair share of the global effort than their developed country friends. ECO would welcome such recognition but must insist that the gaping gigatonne gap is there because of a lack of ambition on many sides.

ECO was pleased by greater clarity by South Africa and India on the level of finance needed to implement developing country pledges. This may have helped remind developed countries that, as part of their fair share of the global mitigation effort, they need to support (through finance, technology and capacity building) ambitious mitigation actions by developing countries.

In order to ensure environmental integrity, ECO agrees with several developed country Parties that greater clarity on the assumptions behind business-as-usual baselines would help to bridge the trust deficit between countries. It would also go a long way to building trust to have a process under the UNFCCC to assess overall developed and developing country contributions to our global mitigation goals. ECO supports the Mexican notion that international guidance for establishing such baselines may be a next step to take en route to Durban. The suggestion to convert the long lists of NAMAs into information on expected economy wide emission levels would also be useful, with special treatment for LDCs and SIDS due to their particular circumstances.

*- Continued on Page 2*

- Continued from Page 1

# Design by Committee

It seems incredible. In the age of super-advanced information technology, where communications of all kinds fly around the world and across borders in an instant, the countries in the UN Asian regional group felt that the *only* way they could agree their nominees to the Transitional Committee (TC) to design the Global Climate Fund was by meeting face-to-face. In a few short weeks, citizens across North Africa and the Middle East have reshaped their governments and opened up new political horizons. The Asian group has yet to manage to select 7 members to sit on a committee. It wouldn't matter if there wasn't so much at stake. The work of the TC is vital to make a fair and transformational climate fund operational as soon as possible. Starting that work has now been delayed by more than a month, meaning that parties missed the deadline set in the Cancun agreement.

By way of comparability the Africa Group, with more than 50 countries, not only managed to complete their delegate selection on time, but also got agreement on proposing an important new agenda item on finance, that can help ensure there is money to go into the fund as soon as it is operational.

Let's hope the Asian Group – and the GRULAC Group, which is also holding things up – have at least used the extra

time to think through the kind of experts they will nominate. The TC badly needs experts in areas that matter to poor people's lives and livelihoods, in areas like gender, agriculture and low carbon climate resilient development.

As of now, one can count the number of women currently nominated to the TC on one hand, or rather on two fingers. That may be a 100% increase on the number of women on the UNSG's Advisory Group on Climate Finance, but it is still a token number. Women are the worst impacted by climate change. They must be at the heart of this new fund, not excluded from its core decision making structures.

The Asian and GRULAC groups can still get the job done, and do it right.

Now that the two workshops are over, ECO expects Parties to feed the reports of both workshops into the LCA and KP negotiations. We support the Brazilian proposal that these workshops should have a connection to negotiations around ambition and finance. On the design of upcoming workshops ECO invites Parties to make future presentations more focused on the actual questions that need answers, e.g. assumptions behind pledges or baselines or crystal clear explanations on emissions accounting. This would enable better use of time and allow concrete conclusions to guide negotiations. Workshops could also benefit from more detailed presentations from experts and stakeholders, as well as their inclusion in ensuing discussions.

Next, ECO strongly suggests developed country Parties make submissions before Bonn on their assumptions on LULUCF accounting, AAU banking and access to international credits.

Developing countries should make submissions on the assumptions behind their BAU projections, including information on key factors such as energy use and prices, economic development, population, etc. ECO suggests that the secretariat paper focus on these assumptions.

Workshops in Bonn should then cover potential policy measures developed countries could undertake to go beyond current inadequate pledges and common guidelines for methodologies and assumptions underpinning the definition of BAUs – to get a better understanding of the combined effort of all Parties.

Yet, if it were not already crystal clear, there is one key message that ECO believes the workshops made obvious: Parties urgently need to address the gigatonne gap, and soon. And hey, why not start here in Bangkok, in order to produce substantial progress by Durban.



"Moving Planet" Launch in Bangkok - A group of cyclists in Bangkok helped launch 350.org's "Moving Planet" mobilization with an event in Bangkok during the UN climate negotiations.

# ECO's Agenda for Adoption

---

### 3. (TOO NARROW) Global goal for emission reductions and global peaking.

*Expand this item to include a discussion on an equitable effort sharing agreement as this will allow Parties to agree on ambitious and science-based long-term goals by Durban.*

#### 3bis. (CURRENTLY MISSING) Mitigation.

*While the workshops have been useful in clarifying assumptions (and clarity is an important first step), action must follow. There must be space on the negotiating agenda to feed-in and build on information and recommendations that comes out of the workshops in order to close the gigatonne gap by Durban. The Secretariat's technical paper and further submissions from Parties will also help. The scope of this agenda item should include the AOSIS proposal to examine options and ways to increase the level of ambition.*

#### 4. (OPERATIONALIZE) Adaptation Committee.

*50% of future resources in the Green Climate Fund should be earmarked for adaptation.*

5. (OPERATIONALIZE) Work programme on enhanced measurement, reporting and verification for Parties included in Annex I to the Convention.

#### 5bis. (CURRENTLY MISSING) Compliance by developed countries with their commitments.

*Strong domestic enforcement of commitments is always welcome but there must be an international minimum that ensures that all countries fulfill their international obligations. This is especially helpful when there is no domestic law to speak of (here's looking at you: USA, Canada, Australia....).*

6. (OPERATIONALIZE) Work programme on enhanced measurement, reporting and verification for Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention.

#### 7. (OPERATIONALIZE) Registry.

8. (RESOLVE) Financing options for the full implementation of mitigation action in the forest sector.

#### 9. (OPERATIONALIZE) Standing Committee.

#### 9bis (CURRENTLY MISSING) Innovative Sources of Financing.

*ECO supports the African Proposal to urgently scale-up new, additional, predictable and adequate funding to support the mitigation and adaptation activities of developing countries. A key way to ensure such funding levels will be met is to identify and implement innovative sources, such as levies on international transport.*

9ter. (CURRENTLY MISSING) Review of information provided by developed countries on their fast-start finance commitments.

*ECO supports the LDC Proposal and reminds developed countries that their FSF reports are due in May!!*

#### 10. (REMEMBER KYOTO) Market-based and (FOCUS ON THE 'F's) non-market-based mechanisms.

*Time is of the essence and thus Parties are reminded that any markets developed under the LCA must COMPLEMENT, and not undermine, those under the Kyoto Protocol. These mechanisms should be based on large segments of the economy of the host countries (rather than being project based) and must be as strict as (or stricter, as we have learned some valuable lessons with KP mechanisms) the Kyoto rules to ensure environmental integrity. On the non-market side, Parties should focus on **phasing out HFCs** as well as eliminating **fossil fuel subsidies**.*

#### 10bis. (CURRENTLY MISSING) International aviation and maritime transport

*Countries should resume their negotiations on how international aviation and maritime can contribute to global emissions reductions and innovative sources of finance. After all we need all the "gigatonnes" we can get!*

#### 11. (TOO NARROW) Arrangements to fully operationalize the Technology Mechanism.

*Ignoring the tough issues, namely IPRs, does not make them go away (if this were so, the battle to stop climate change would have been won long ago!) Commissioning a study on whether or not and how IPRs are a barrier to technology transfer, followed-up by a technical workshop would go a long way this year in advancing the discussion.*

#### 12. Capacity-building.

#### 13. (OF CRITICAL IMPORTANCE) Review.

*Preparing for a robust review in 2013-2015 which will enable Parties to go even further in their mitigation and adaptation efforts is crucial. This item must remain on the agenda and significant time devoted to it.*

14. Issues relating to Parties with economies in transition and Parties with special circumstances.

#### 15. (OF CRITICAL IMPORTANCE) Legal options.

*In 2010, it was a struggle to even get legal issues discussed in the LCA. In 2011, it's officially on the agenda and needs to be ever present in the discussion, as it is **the end goal** after all. On the **Kyoto side**, their legal issues group needs to resolve any issues related to the **provisional application** of amendments as this is now the only way to ensure there is no gap between the first and second commitment periods.*





## Important Lessons From My Tuk Tuk Driver on Technology Transfer

### 1. Make sure you agree with your passengers from the outset on their destination. Otherwise everyone will end up unhappy and short changed.

Start by establishing the key issues and objectives for the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) and their respective roles and interaction, including with national bodies. The priorities for the CTC and its location should be driven by developing country needs. A preliminary list of "To Dos" includes: capacity building; technical help for diffusing and deploying technologies; support for country-driven regulatory policies (e.g. FITs); guidance for countries developing funding proposals to submit to the Green Fund.

### 2. Work out the best route and agree on the fare.

The point of departure is a scoping exercise on the scale of resources (financial, technical, human) needed to help countries transition to a low-carbon pathway while addressing their development and energy needs. Overall, resources should be focused

on filling gaps and not duplicating existing efforts.

### 3. Know which shops and restaurants offer the best deal for your customers.

What existing institutions are best suited to participate in the technology network? Are there any gaps in areas of technical expertise that may require the creation of new institutions? A database for mitigation and adaptation-related institutions/expertise should be established.

### And finally, some handy hints from my tuk tuk driver to ease your journey on the road to Durban:

- Be courageous! Deal with the big traffic jam like Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) head on. There is no need to be afraid of those big trucks blocking your way.

- Be decisive! If needed, weave through the traffic to arrive on-time and at the main destination you want in Durban, which is to establish a balanced and equitable representation on the TEC and other elements to speed up the deployment of low carbon energy in the developing world.

So do as my driver did and hit the gas!

## Fossil of the Day

Extra Extra! The US wins the first Fossil of the Day for 2011!

This fossil is formally presented for their complete refusal to accept the concept of a common/standardized accounting system for measuring national emissions reductions towards their target.

During Sunday's workshop on national mitigation targets and strategies, the US made it exceptionally clear that they do not envision a common accounting framework. ECO noted the continual expressions of that view by the US, while noticing that the US seemed to be pretty alone in that view. The irony of that position became even more glaring as the US raised several questions in the developing country session regarding a common framework for developing business-as-usual scenarios for developing emissions. The irony wasn't lost on ECO. One can only hope that the US will "review the tape" and remember that the US has always been a strong proponent of rigorous rules. Maybe a relaxing spa treatment in Bangkok will refresh their memory.



## Building a Strong Adaptation Committee

Getting an effective and credible Adaptation Committee up and running in Durban will be a chance for parties to show their commitment to dealing with the consequences of climate change. ECO believes that the Committee is urgently needed to ensure coherence in implementation of the Cancun Adaptation Framework.

The Committee needs to get to work on identifying gaps in adaptation information, research, implementation and support, turning scientific assessments and knowledge from the field into clear political and technical recommendations for key institutions, to make sure the rubber hits the road on implementation of the Cancun Adaptation Framework. To ensure

legitimacy and effectiveness the Adaptation Committee must report directly to the COP, and draw on the experience and expertise of key adaptation and development experts from Parties as well as civil society and research organisations. There will be lots of opportunity for political posturing, pontification, and preening at the ribbon cutting ceremony.