

# eco

## Avoid The Bar

Even as the G77 and China have rightly been calling to focus negotiations on the targets, and Annex 1 Parties have rightly been highlighting the importance of finishing the LULUCF rules before targets are set, LULUCF negotiators have instead unleashed a new idea into the Talks: *The Bar*.

What does it mean? Eco has found few answers in the fog of uncertainty surrounding this idea, which no one has put on paper. But this much is clear: there is danger in the air.

*The Bar* would allow each Party to negotiate the standard against which its forest management compliance will be measured: lower the bar, get more credits! ECO is convinced that this approach will not have environmental integrity, encouraging Parties to argue for a bar that makes them the winners, even if the atmosphere loses. This is black magic.

In his briefing for observer organizations on the in-depth LULUCF discussions, the Chair of the AWG-KP expressed optimism that *The Bar* could be the basis of common ground. But ECO is concerned that the detour down this unlit road will instead delay the LULUCF negotiations further. What will happen to target-setting? The biggest danger here is that Parties complete their negotiations on *The Bar* after targets are settled. *The Bar* could then be an opportunity to undo commitments, just as happened with LULUCF after Kyoto.

ECO also notes that it is in fact possible to put forward new ideas in a *constructive* way. Tuvalu has made a comprehensive and interesting submission in the form of a *draft decision text*, rather than a nebulous cloud. Perhaps the EU could consider similar disclosure with *The Bar*. Or are they spending too much time *at the bar* to write about it?

## Call For Leadership from the G20

Today's negotiations take place against the backdrop of the G20 Summit in London and widespread calls for a "global green new deal" to lead us out of the worst economic crisis in two generations. Apart from action on the crises at home, people across the world are calling on the G20 to provide billions of dollars in emergency funding for poor countries, a crack down on tax havens, a bigger place for poor countries in global decision making, and urgent action on climate change. Expectations of what the Summit will deliver have faded in recent weeks, but make no mistake: the issues being discussed in London have profound implications for the post-2012 climate regime under negotiation here in Bonn.

The G20 accounts for at least three-quarters of global GDP, energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. Most of them have also been invited to the new Major Economies Forum announced by President Obama this week, which will meet in Washington DC on 27-28 April to discuss climate change. Between them they have announced economic stimulus packages amounting to over \$1.6 trillion over the next 12-18 months, or around 3% of global GDP. If these resources are invested wisely the current crisis could mark a profound turning point towards a more just, equitable and sustainable world.

In practice this means four things. First, major economies should prioritise stimulus spending that not only creates jobs but also improves energy efficiency and reduces emissions. South Korea leads the way here, with 80% of its stimulus package focused on "climate friendly" investment. Elsewhere the record is less impressive, but many countries are still deciding how to spend the money. We call on them to follow South Korea's example.

Second, richer countries must lead by example. Analysis of what the US and

some European countries are doing suggests that their stimulus packages are even less climate friendly than initially thought. All such packages must be subject to independent and transparent "environmental integrity audits" to ensure they make a major and verifiable contribution towards achieving the deep emissions reductions expected of these countries. Strong leadership by the G8 in particular would create confidence that a low carbon future is within reach, building the base for a fair and effective Copenhagen agreement.

Third, given the large-scale "green fiscal stimulus" packages announced by some developing country members of the G20, they should review and apply learning from the experience to the critical discussion underway in these negotiations on "nationally appropriate mitigation actions". China, for example, has indicated that its stimulus spending will not be directed towards energy intensive industries. By applying their learning from fiscal stimulus investments, G20 members can help inform ongoing negotiations and identify another suite of mitigation actions that can be enabled through the MRV finance and technology called for in the Bali Action Plan.

Finally, all countries need to be much more transparent about where they are investing their resources. The proposed "environmental integrity audits" for developed countries would be a first step, but greater transparency is also needed from developing countries. The G20 should embark upon a collaborative effort, financed by G8 countries, to measure the emissions impacts of the stimulus packages in non-G8 countries and report them to the UNFCCC to inform the ongoing negotiations. Lessons learned could be used to inform the updating or preparation of low carbon development strategies.

## How old will our children be in 2050?

Yesterday in a plenary intervention, the youth representatives in Bonn called on Annex 1 countries to reduce their emissions by at least 40% on 1990 levels by 2020, and total decarbonisation by 2050. What the scientists in your delegations are telling you is true; AOSIS knows the stakes: anything else is not enough.

The youth in Bonn also named some names. In particular Canada, Australia, Japan, New Zealand, and Russia: "We condemn your ambition as it now stands, go back to your governments and tell them that. We will support you if they rise to the challenge, naming the targets, uniting on finance, sealing a

fair and effective deal in Copenhagen, and beginning the change that we will complete from now until 2050".

Giving her speech, Kirsty wore a striking blue T-shirt with the slogan 'How old will you be in 2050?' and a badge bearing the same message. Thanks to CAN Europe for chipping in with funds, and all the delegates who donated too. They paid for the shirts with their pocket money. This campaign will be ongoing and donations welcome. Euros and emissions reductions targets welcome – but the youth only accept one currency: at least -40% by 2020.

There is definitely a sense that the youth

climate movement is growing ever stronger and they thank the chair of the LCA for giving them the chance to speak and ask the plenary: how old will you be in 2050? This campaign was conceived at a meeting in Brussels this year, where representatives from all around Europe and beyond came together to found the European Youth Climate Movement – with the welcome support of CAN Europe. They will be here for the rest of the year and beyond, providing the frank, moral presence that these negotiations need.

Because they will still be here in 2050. Will you?