

# 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 CAN groups attending the climate negotiations in Bonn, June 2009.*

## Can You Hear Me Now?

Proceedings concluded early last night, thanks to dexterous guidance from the LCA chair, however ECO worked into the night to provide delegates with a world news round-up.

In Brussels this week, European finance ministers showed gross incompetence by not agreeing on the scale of financing required to support developing countries to transition to a low-carbon economy and to adapt to the unavoidable impacts of climate change.

After ten lost years, the US House of Representatives seems set to introduce a cap on emissions that could, according to some analysis, reduce US emissions 1% below 1990 levels by 2020. The complicated and delicate legislative process seems to confuse even US negotiators, who in Bonn are trying to sell offset credits as MRV support. This move to "double count" was quickly picked up by other Annex I countries. In fact the contagion could well reach pandemic proportions and contaminate the upcoming MEF meeting in Mexico.

A lot of hot air surrounded the announcement of a 2020 target by Japan. In the end, Japan announced its target would be 8% below 1990 levels. For the record, Japan's binding target for 2012 is 6% below 1990. To add insult to injury, Japan seems determined to suck up all the hot air available in the market – a transparent attempt to avoid making

reductions at home. Ukraine seems happy to provide this development assistance.

We will not complain about Brazil showing up late to the party. Negotiators were perhaps busy consulting with President Lula's office: after an intense campaign, involving over 14,000 phone calls from local and international activists, he vetoed sections of a bill that would have put back rainforest protection by thirty years.

Back to Bonn. Now that everything is on the table, the lack of progress is clear for all to see. Let us recap. As the Secretariat's analysis shows, the pledges by rich countries add up to a negligible cut in carbon pollution, jeopardizing the welfare of our children (and yours). The Umbrella Group, especially Japan and Canada, is deaf to the science and to the most vulnerable, who tell them they must make deep cuts and make them soon! Setting an aggregate target for Annex I was on the official agreed agenda for this meeting. Failure to do so kills prospects for building trust. Instead of focusing on what can be jointly accomplished, Parties are focused on what they can get away with. Russia, Switzerland, New Zealand, Belarus and the Ukraine all refused to even put an initial target on the table. Such tactics will not succeed in the limelight of

*–continued on back page, col. 1*

## Latest Number-Crunching

An article published by Nature yesterday reports the Potsdam Institute's (PIK) work showing us that halfway to Copenhagen, given national commitments in current position statements, we have as yet no way to stay below 2°C.

Overall, for the Annex I countries as a group, greenhouse gas emissions from industrial sources (excluding land-use change and forestry) would be in the range of 8-14 percent below 1990 levels by 2020. This is far less than the 25-40 percent reductions the IPCC

says is required to have a reasonable chance of limiting global temperatures to around 2°C.

The collective commitments of non-Annex I countries would reduce their emissions to about 4 percent below anticipated BAU emissions for 2020. This is also substantially less than the 15–30 percent below BAU needed by 2020.

Unless there is a major improvement in national commitments to reducing greenhouse gases, the authors see virtually no chance of staying below 2°, let alone 1.5°C.

## Stress Reduction

ECO has noticed that more and more Parties apparently believe that the next commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol, and the first under a Copenhagen agreement, should end in 2020. Why 2020? Perhaps because of the familiar IPCC box 13.7: the one with the 2020 25-40% reduction range. (Incidentally, ECO believes Japan may have read the wrong line in that particular box.)

Hellooo! Firstly, the IPCC has nothing to say about 2020 being the end of a commitment period. And just because the EU has defined new targets for its internal ETS up to 2020, this is not an argument for imposing this date on the rest of the world! In fact, it makes much more sense to have a shorter commitment period, sticking to the current Kyoto rule: five years, i.e. a 2013-2017 period.

Why? First it gives an opportunity to adjust the ambition of targets and actions shortly after the release of the next IPCC assessment, planned for 2014. Surely we shouldn't have to wait seven years after new science is available to adjust the ambition of the Copenhagen Agreement? You wouldn't expect a responsible car driver to go seven miles beyond a speed limit sign before slowing down.

Another excuse used to argue for an eight-

*–continued on back page, col. 2*



*Never, ever, think outside the box*

–*Can You Hear Me?*, from front page Copenhagen.

On the way to the Maritim, ECO's editor stepped into a giant loophole and was surprised that it had not already been tabled by LULUCF negotiators. Meanwhile in the name of increasing transparency (sic) on the Kyoto rules, they propose that up to 2.4 billion tons of emissions should be stocked under the bar. This is more than the total annual emissions of Japan, Germany and the UK combined. ECO is similarly frustrated with those non-Annex I Parties that are unwilling to showcase the enormous potential that can be unlocked if the financing and technology is made available. Recycling last year's speaking notes is simply not acceptable. They suffer the consequences of the inaction and as long as there is no serious money on the table they will also bear the full costs of climate change. No amount of LCA text can cover up that fact. It is fair to ask why the least developed and most vulnerable countries would agree to a deal in these circumstances.

If the planet were a bank, the minimum

\$150 billion per year bail-out package would have been ready by now. Even the Lost & Found office has received no new constructive financing proposals. So why are some trying to push the Norwegian proposal off the agenda? It is the only proposed mechanism that would automatically generate significant amounts of money.

Finally, is this process experiencing a leadership crisis? While the real crisis – the climate crisis – is underway elsewhere. We have precious little time left for peaking, and the ambition and political will are lacking. The elements for a credible Copenhagen treaty are among the proposals now on the table. To guarantee real negotiations take place, the AWG chairs need a strong mandate for consolidating options before Bangkok. This process requires Parties to be willing to do what's really needed. As a start, it is time that the rich countries' heads of state and government deliver new pledges of finance and technology support, as well as much deeper cuts in emissions. In the meantime, the clock on the podium keeps ticking...

## Fossils of the Week

Realizing that not everyone is aware of the dishonorable "fossil of the day" awards that have been conferred during the negotiations, ECO would once more like to highlight those countries who have been the best at being the worst since we last reported.

### Friday

1. **Switzerland**, for suggesting that Micronesia "needs to be realistic" after it proposed a 2020 developed country aggregate target of at least 45% on 1990 levels.
2. **Saudi Arabia**, for opposing an expanded and more substantive High Level segment at Copenhagen.
3. **Russia** and **Japan**, for trying to wriggle out of a strong compliance mechanism under the UNFCCC.

*Honorable Mention:* **Canada** with support from **Japan**, for insisting that x% below 1990 by 2020 be considered as an option for a developed country aggregate target.

### Monday

1st and 2nd place: banked in the 'strategic fossil reserve'

3. **Canada**, for Environment Minister Jim Prentice's speech saying that Canada's goal in these negotiations is to "move past Kyoto".

### Tuesday

1. **Canada** and **Japan**, for wanting to consider more than one base year from which to measure emission reductions, arguing that more numbers would be better for clarity.
2. **Saudi Arabia**, for objecting to the reporting out of the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA conclusions at Copenhagen, meaning that no COP decision could be reached in Copenhagen and we'd require an additional COP to

come to a final agreement.

3. **Saudi Arabia**, for their addition of a preamble to the new LCA adaptation text requiring special treatment for oil producing countries.

### Wednesday

*Special Fossil Award:* **Japan**, for announcing an especially weak domestic 2020 target.

1. **Russia**, for saying nothing on national 2020 emission targets and for opposing meetings ever going past 6pm.
2. **New Zealand** and **Japan**, for seeking to remove numbers for aggregate Annex I targets at an informal meeting of the AWG-KP.
3. **Australia**, for making a very unhelpful intervention supporting plantations at the first formal meeting to discuss, among other things, a possible REDD mechanism.

### Thursday

1. **Japan**, for using uncertainty as an excuse to ignore historical responsibility.
2. **All Annex I countries**, except Norway and Switzerland, for their lack of constructive finance proposals.

–*Stress Reduction*, from front page  
year commitment period is the need for a long term price signal for investors. However, does anyone in their right mind believe that national and regional policies and measures – on transport, energy, buildings, forest protection, agriculture – will have a five-year lifespan to mirror international negotiations? Let's be realistic here! If you want investor confidence, commit to creating national plans with emissions reduction pathways up to 2050. That should reduce your stress levels... And ECO loves to help you relax!

## Are You Being Adopted?

Dear Negotiators,

Recently, many of you have had this eerie feeling that you were being watched. Perhaps you've seen fleeting flashes of red in your peripheral vision.

You have been tracked by a Negotiator Tracker from the Adopt-a-Negotiator Project.

Of course, you know that. You've talked to your tracker about your positions, about your performance here, and about what the folks back home want.

Your willingness to chat and your commitment to transparency are appreciated. The more, civil society and community members are engaged in this process, the stronger the agreement will be.

Decisions may be made here, but it is the people in our home countries who will implement the decisions, who will be affected by the decisions, and ultimately provide support or opposition to the post 2012 agreement.

During future negotiations, your tracker will help your country understand what is going on and what positions you are taking.

We will stalk you later!

[www.adoptanegotiator.org](http://www.adoptanegotiator.org).



## LUDWIG

Ludwig understands that on Wednesday frogs literally rained from the sky in Japan, just as its much-derided 2020 targets were released. Negotiators may not of course believe this to be any kind of message, or even that it might be synchronicity. However, no-one can deny that it's a terrific example of serendipity. And Ludwig can't help wondering if there might be locusts next week...