

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 Bonn, June 2011.

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

Spinning Back to Bangkok?

A little bird told ECO that today's LCA spin off groups are reason for concern. Unfortunately the compromise agenda that was adopted in Bangkok did not resolve the many differences of opinions between governments on what should be negotiated first. ECO learned that in the shared vision group there is a clear division over whether priority should be given to the two issues that are in the Cancún agreement, the global goal and peaking, or whether all important issues should be dealt equally. In the finance group there was clear division over whether the group should start discussion

on fast start and long-term financing. And in the review group countries discussed whether the review should deal with the adequacy of the long-term goal as stated in the Cancún agreement, should review the full implementation of the Convention, or should review the Convention as such. ECO has always said that countries should implement Cancún undertakings, and go further on the road to building a real fair, ambitious and legally binding deal. Given the amount of time that has already been spent on agenda fights we feel countries should get on with the work at hand.

Money - Now, New, and on the Table

In Copenhagen and reaffirmed in Cancún, developed countries collectively pledged USD 30 billion in 'fast-start' finance from 2010-2012 to support developing countries' mitigation and adaptation efforts, and helping to maintain Parties confidence in the process.

Based on the fast-start finance reports submitted by developed countries, about USD 16.8 billion has been committed or allocated in 2010. However, opaqueness remains. Several countries are clearly not meeting the agreed criterion that the finance should be "new and additional," and constitute a "balanced allocation between adaptation and mitigation." On balanced allocation, e.g. France has stated that 80% of its fast-start finance will go to mitigation and REDD+, with the rest to adaptation. This imbalance is not unique and implies that adaptation will remain heavily underfunded. Denmark has a better track record, with 48% of its fast-

start finance in 2010 supporting adaptation and capacity building.

Furthermore, countries are not being entirely comprehensive, comparable or complete in reporting information on their finance. While countries do report on whether e.g., grants or loans have been used, they do not provide information on the terms (concessionality) of loans when used, nor on which projects are supported by loans versus by grants. While there is no political agreement on how to define 'additionality,' countries should at least be transparent about the baseline they are using to define this. Enhanced reporting guidelines are clearly needed, building towards a common reporting format in the longer term.

Despite this opaqueness, we can and should give developed countries credit for making a perceivable effort to get fast-start finance flowing and reported on,

- Continued on Page 2

Time to Walk the Walk on Civil Society Engagement

"We can't do this by ourselves"... "NGOs provide a valuable perspective and expertise"... "NGOs support is essential for the success of the UNFCCC process".

ECO was delighted to hear these statements and many concrete proposals echoing from the plenary hall Wednesday morning at the SBI workshop on NGO participation. But now, ECO wonders...will they walk the walk? Talk is nice, and everyone loves to be praised for being valuable (we'll take it!). But ECO knows all too well that talk is one thing, action is another.

ECO is hopeful that the report coming out of the workshop, and formal negotiations to (*hopefully?*) follow in the SBI will take the statements and turn them into positive actions. Will informals be open to ensure NGOs are able support the process? Will NGOs be able to provide their "valuable perspective" through more and flexible opportunities to intervene as is common practice in the UNFCCC's sister convention the CBD? Many questions remain.

Unfortunately, across the hall from the SBI workshop, there wasn't much reason for hope for improvements. At door after door, NGOs were kept out of LCA informals throughout the day.

In a particularly illustrative exchange in the LCA plenary, Tuvalu made a strong case for the opening of the informal group on REDD to observers and indigenous peoples in particular. Unfortunately, PNG tried to block the idea, alleging among other things that Tuvalu did not have enough trees to allow it to speak on behalf of forest peoples. Cameroon had the gall to questions whether indigenous peoples groups actually represent indigenous people. ECO questions whether all government here also represent the interests of their people.

ECO urges Parties to listen to their friends who spoke in the SBI workshop and take the comments to heart, both in these days ahead in Bonn and in its work in the SBI to promote longer term improvements to NGO engagement. We are "essential" after all...or least that's what we've heard from the Parties.

☂ Series Part 1: Canada and the Case of the Missing Tar Sands Emissions...

The tar sands are Canada's fastest growing source of emissions. While the country's emissions in 2009 decreased overall, in large part due to the recession (as we know they ain't doing nothing on the climate front), emissions from tar sands jumped a whopping 10-20%, and now account for 6.5% of Canada's overall emissions. This means that emissions from Canada's dirty oil sector have grown by over 250% since 1990, and with no federal action to keep them under control, the tar sands are poised to balloon even faster in the years to come.

Where does ECO get these numbers from, you may ask? You would think the answer is, of course, Canada's 2009 National Inventory Report (published in 2011), but in fact, they come from investigative reporting by a Canadian journalist – which has been stirring up quite the press coverage in Canada, the US and even the UK. It seems Canada opted not to report on emissions from tar sands this year, in contrast to their 2008 report (see tables 2-16 and 2-18).

To be fair, Canada contends that the current UNFCCC guidelines do not require separate tar sand emissions reporting (though ECO will wait for the ERT report before commenting). Their NIR does account for these emissions, but only under very broad categories like "Mining and Oil and Gas Extraction" or "Fugitive Emissions." Yet, the nagging question remains: Why the change, Canada?

ECO welcomes your 2008 NIR effort at transparency, but can only be a bit suspicious that you drop the data category a year later (when emission are on the rise). After all, you are the only country to downgrade your target after Copenhagen and like to play number games with your targets (Canada's new target of 17% below 2005 levels by 2020 is equal to a 3% *increase* above 1990 or 9% above that pesky Kyoto target, compared to the country's previous unilateral 2020 target of 20% below 2006 levels or 3% below 1990 levels). And it's a bit convenient, shall we say, to drop sectoral numbers just when the government is talking about introducing sector-by-sector regulations.

In today's mitigation workshop, ECO hopes Canada acknowledges that tar sands are its fastest growing sector **and** outlines how it plans to tackle those emissions — as well as those from the rest of the economy — with the speed and gusto required by ever-more-dire climate science.

Bioenergy: the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly

Renewable energy is playing a starring role in new energy policies, but ECO fears that bioenergy may be seen as 'carbon neutral' under false pretences.

Many forms of bioenergy have a substantially unrecognised carbon footprint. Under existing IPCC guidance, GHG emissions from bioenergy are not accounted for in the energy sector. Rather, the guidance assumes that the emissions associated with bioenergy use in Annex 1 countries will be reflected in accounting in the LULUCF sector.

However, current LULUCF rules have ambushed this intention. While emissions from land-use change are accounted in the first commitment period of the KP, accounting for forest management and cropland management is voluntary. And it is the products of forest and cropland management that are burnt for bioenergy. As a result, these emissions are not necessarily accounted anywhere. Proposed accounting rules for forest management (in the second commitment period) could still allow Annex I parties to avoid accounting for the atmospheric impacts of forest-

based bioenergy production and use, if Parties build pre-2010 bioenergy policies into their business-as-usual Reference Levels. There is no proposal to make accounting of cropland management mandatory.

Further, bioenergy sourced from non-Annex I countries and used in Annex I countries may escape capture in Annex I accounts.

The mistaken assumption that bioenergy is always 'carbon neutral' underlies a wide range of policies subsidising and otherwise favouring bioenergy. This will catch up with us, and the planet.

It is time to bite the bullet and account for emissions from bioenergy in the sector of origin (the LULUCF sector) or in the end use sector (the energy sector). Ultimately, it may be necessary to account for different components of the carbon life cycle of bioenergy in different sectors, but the emissions *must* be included somewhere!

To find out more, saddle up and ride on in to the CAN side event 3:15 today in Tram.

- Continued from Page 1

despite a lack of formal guidance on how to do so. The EU yesterday hosted an open forum on their fast-start finance, which reflected on lessons learned – from the donor side and from the recipient sides – for improving the future provision of, access to, and reporting of financial support. Such stocktaking will help ensure the transparency, effectiveness and efficiency in the delivery of finance in the future, and build much-needed trust between developed and developing countries in the international climate negotiations.

Open Participation is not a Gadget

Adaptation negotiators are busying themselves laying the groundwork to operationalize the Adaptation Committee in Durban. In designing the composition and modalities of the Committee, ECO reminds Parties of the importance of taking in the expertise of all relevant stakeholders, including civil society. The principles of the Cancun Adaptation Framework require that adaptation be undertaken in a gender-sensitive, participatory and fully transparent approach, taking into consideration vulnerable groups, communities and ecosystems. The Adaptation Committee also should embrace these principles. The input from stakeholder and experts will greatly enhance the effectiveness, legitimacy and credibility of the Adaptation Committee.

Concrete suggestions to ensure an active, transparent and inclusive working-mode of the Committee include:

- Open all sessions to accredited observers and webcast them, as does the Adaptation Fund.
- Allocate specific time for a dialogue with civil society and experts. Moreover, the Adaptation Committee should in cooperation with IGOs, and other NGOs host a biennial international conference to raise the profile for adaptation as part of an international climate regime.

Lies, Damned Lies, and NZ Statistics

Delegates will be fascinated to discover that New Zealand won't release its forestry emission and removal projections to NZ NGOs so that it can "avoid prejudice to the substantial economic interests of NZ," and "enable the Minister to carry on without prejudice, or disadvantage, negotiations."

This raises the question of what forestry projections has New Zealand been providing to Parties in the UNFCCC negotiations these past couple of years? Perhaps New Zealand's Minister of Climate Change Negotiations hides the real figures in his briefcase while his officials hand out merry works of fiction to fellow delegates. ECO encourages readers to enquire for clear information from the NZ delegation on its LULUCF assumptions (and while you're at it, you might want to ask about the substantive amounts of offsetting that is core to New Zealand's positioning).