

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.

Technology: More Questions Than Answers

After many years of serious neglect, the discussions on the implementation of existing technology transfer obligations and the negotiation of new ones is firmly under way in the LCA. However, it would be wishful thinking to suggest that we are making anywhere near the kind of progress that we should be. Now that significant elements of technology proposals are included in the LCA text, developed countries may finally have to pay attention to technology issues.

ECO believes that properly addressing technology cooperation and sharing requires the Copenhagen outcome to include: a dedicated mechanism under the direction and authority of the COP to assess and approve technology cooperation; a fully supported and dedicated technology fund or window; and a clear framework to proactively evaluate and determine when intellectual property rights become a barrier to effective global technology cooperation and to provide options for corrective action. All action under the technology mechanism should be guided by a global technology objective addressing global goals for multiplying technology research and development: deployment, diffusion and market penetration.

The LCA legal text is, at best, a patchy framework that needs to be significantly filled

out. Each negotiating group has a responsibility to further address the missing issues, clarify areas that they have only vaguely hinted at, and to fully engage with the technology transfer issue. If we are to move forward, there are crucial questions that must be answered.

To the G77 plus China we ask: What provisions and safeguards are you pursuing to ensure that adaptation technologies are as strongly supported as mitigation technologies?

To the EU we ask: What criteria do you propose for selecting, monitoring and evaluating any institution responsible for delivering on technology cooperation? What criteria will be used for assessing which technology cooperation activities will be funded or how it will be governed?

To the US we ask: How do you intend to ensure that the outcome of discussions on technology in the Major Economies Forum is fed back into the UNFCCC process and meets the standards and criteria for equity, participation and historical responsibility under the Convention?

To other developed countries: When will we hear from you on this crucial element of the Copenhagen deal?

ECO hopes that many answers will be forthcoming and we look forward to actual progress on technology, after having been neglected for far too long.

LCA First Reading Lite

It has taken two days for a first reading on two sections of the LCA draft text – this seems slow progress for the *lite* reading requested by the LCA Chair. ECO would like to highlight some key points, and indicate some tensions that will need resolving during the second reading.

The distinguished delegate for the Philippines, speaking for G77 and China, made some opening remarks that ECO was very happy to hear, on the need to ensure that the text reflected the Bali Action Plan: Adaptation must receive at least equal treatment as mitigation. And the text must show a commitment to implementation, not merely ‘facilitation’ of adaptation. There was concern, which we share, that reference to monitoring referred to implementation of adaptation – whereas, in the first place, it must refer to monitoring the delivery of the funding that is the responsibility of developed countries to provide.

While some planning for adaptation, particularly to assess the needs of the most vulnerable, is essential, *action* on adaptation is crucial, and will involve learning by doing: there must therefore be flexibility in accepting different processes of adaptation planning, reflecting different country’s existing processes and institutions. ECO urges G77 and China to remember the needs for urgent and near term adaptation action, including funding for implementation of NAPAs and capacity building.

Ecuador reminded us of the importance of reference to the vulnerable people, in particular women, and the ecosystems on which they depend. Let us all remember that the purpose of the Copenhagen Agreement is ultimately about protecting life on earth, in particular the lives of the most vulnerable people and the survival of the fragile ecosystems on which many depend.

In comparison to the text on adaptation, the section on finance was seen by G77 and China as scanty and fragmented – lacking the substance of strong submissions from developed countries. This section should, of course, include legally binding commitment to provide new, additional,

–continued on back page, col. 3

Canada’s Not-so-hidden Agenda

If Canada’s negotiators happen to be quiet today, rest assured that the government will be hard at work back home.

ECO has learned that Canada’s Environment Minister, Jim Prentice, is taking part in an under-the-radar “roundtable discussion of key negotiating issues” for Copenhagen today, accompanied by more than a few oil and gas industry bosses.

The event, which, is called, *The Search for a Canada U.S. Climate Change Accord: the Road to Copenhagen and Beyond*, is being held June 4-6 in Alberta.

According to the agenda, this-sponsored

shindig sponsored by the Government of Canada will get to the heart of the matter with questions like (and yes, we’re quoting) “Should developing countries be forced to accept targets for GHG reductions?”

The participants will also ponder “Canada’s bottom line for signing an agreement in Copenhagen,” hopefully after being enlightened by their discussion on “How to ensure that an agreement in Copenhagen is an environmental instrument rather than a wealth transfer instrument.”

C’mon with meetings like that, who needs negotiations?

Ecosystem-based adaptation

As we all know, language matters in the UN and clarity is vital...but when considering new(ish!) terminology such as 'ecosystem-based adaptation', let's not lose the purpose and importance of the underlying concept.

Natural and managed ecosystems, and their functions and services, play a vital role in underpinning climate change adaptation, sustainable development and life on earth. They are particularly important for many of the poorest and most vulnerable people and places who depend most directly on natural resources and ecosystems. They are also vital for mitigation. This is inherently recognised in the Objective and Definitions of the Convention.

Taking account of ecosystems, their functions and services in country driven adaptation planning, strategies and implementation can help deliver cost-effective, no regret and multiple benefit measures, and help avoid mal-adaptation. This can protect the natural resource base of vulnerable communities, as well as help reduce vulnerability and increase resilience for all to

present and future climate change.

There should be an overarching principle in the LCA text that recognises this, as well as appropriate references to ecosystem-based adaptation in 'Enhanced action on adaptation'.

CAN has a position and briefing paper on ecosystems and adaptation and a working definition for ecosystem-based adaptation. We hope these will be helpful to delegates in their deliberations. We suggest that ecosystem-based adaptation is applying an ecosystem approach to adaptation, which includes managing and maintaining ecosystems for the services that people depend on to adapt to climate change.

Additional technical note: The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), to which many parties are also signatories, defines and has twelve guiding principles for the Ecosystem Approach (<http://www.cbd.int/ecosystem/principles.shtml>).

For copies of the CAN position and briefing paper ecosystems and adaptation, please visit www.climate-network.org

Alert – This is Serious!

On Friday 1st May 1500, from Vera Cruz in Porto Seguro, Pero Vaz de Caminha wrote to King Manuel I of Portugal announcing the "Finding" of Brazil. Some have called this Brazil's birth certificate. In this letter, he gives an emotional and passionate description of his first observations: the exuberance, the vastness, the diversity and the beauty of all that had been discovered. But, from this moment on, man worked his will on Brazil and now we know whom to thank for the disgrace that hangs over all that is so precious to Brazilians and the rest of the world. What have we done to deserve this curse, this corrupting disease that threatens the wellbeing of millions of people in the Amazon and billions more around the earth. An exaggeration you say? Judge for yourself.

On Wednesday 3rd June 2009, the Brazilian Senate gave final approval to a law (PLV n°9, of 2009) which regulates land ownership and tenure in the Amazon. Initially this measure was to deal with a social issue for millions of small property owners that have been trying for decades to obtain legal title to the land they have occupied. Many of these occupations were the result of internal migrations stimulated by the government in an attempt to populate the Amazon many years ago.

But, as the Provisional Law slid slowly through the hands of sly and greedy legislators it got maculated, violated, and severely scarred. What was left for the Senate to approve is but a pale reminder of its former self for all the hard-working people it was to serve, those with small lots. Now the law serves the interest of those with a big fat eye on speculation in the forest, including private companies which can purchase and

legalize 1,500 hectares in the name of the company and another 1,500 hectares, bordering on the former, in the name of the company's owner. The Pará State Attorney has declared that the new law will legalize unlawful land occupation in the Amazon and will destroy more than fifteen years of arduous work by Federal and State authorities in combating illegal land occupation.

Do I muddy the waters or is it getting easier to see why environmentalists, President Lula's own party and Senator Marina Silva, his long time friend and former Environment Minister, are publicly asking him to honor the names of all those who were sacrificed because they engaged in the fight to save the Amazon for Brazil and the Brazilians that live in Amazonia. Sister Dorothy, Chico Mendes, Father Jósimo, Wilson Pinheiro and countless others left their blood on Amazon soil but never even got an obituary. They are all asking President Lula to veto this law, or at the very least veto the articles that open the gates for this impending stampede of land speculation and destruction of the Amazon forest. You can help. You must help, because on Wednesday 10th June President Lula will sign the law with or without the vetoes. Let him know which way to go with a letter like the one from Pero Vaz de Caminha.

European Election Party

*CAN Europe invites all representatives from European delegations to follow the election results with us on Sunday. We can watch the television and online coverage together. Share the thrill of the European Parliament's composition for the next five years! At DIE INSEL, Theaterplatz, Bad Godesberg, Sunday 7 June 8pm
We look forward to your company!*

Good? Bad? Or Ugly?

The LCA text on finance, somewhat unsurprisingly, is a bit of a mixture. ECO has taken the Sergio Leone approach to text analysis...

The Good: Buried deep in the text are options – mostly put forward by developing countries – for sources of financing and financial architecture that would actually be able to deliver the resources needed worldwide for mitigation, adaptation and capacity-building. Fortunately for the planet, someone is thinking about climate financing at the scale needed to address the problem.

The Bad: The promising ideas are undermined at every turn by options and text inserted by developed countries aimed at avoiding their responsibilities to provide financing and technology support to developing countries for mitigation and adaptation. These involve at most a slight tinkering with status quo institutions and a blind faith that markets and the private sector alone will shift developing countries to a low-carbon development path. After all, developed countries were able to achieve great successes like implementing the Marshall Plan, putting a man on the moon, and responding to the current economic crisis, all with negligible public funding, right?

The Ugly: The low hanging fruit in terms of starting to generate some serious financing from a predictable, reliable international source that doesn't depend on national treasury approval is international maritime and aviation fuels. Here one and the same mechanism can generate significant revenues and provide incentives for mitigation. Yet, there are still parties that want to continue to work through ICAO and IMO, who have delayed for a decade and will bring nothing to Copenhagen beyond voluntary, aspirational efficiency goals. Developing countries who hope for adaptation finance from shipping should be aware that a certain Annex I Party has made a proposal at IMO to recycle 75% of revenues back to the shipping industry. Perhaps this is a matter best discussed under the Convention...

NGO & UN Security Party!

from 9pm tonight at the Piano Bar, Maritim
All welcome – show badge for entry

–LCA First Reading Lite, from front page predictable and sustainable resources for the building blocks of the BAP.

We strongly disagree with the views expressed by the US (and others), that leveraging private finance is the key, together with the carbon market (stressed repeatedly). BUT who will invest commercially in adaptation for the poorest most vulnerable people? ECO is firmly of the opinion that this is the role for public finance – but, we stress again, this publicly committed finance must be in addition to the commitment to 0-7% of GDP for development.

By the way, in case there is any doubt, response measures are NOT part of adaptation, as several Parties repeatedly reminded the Saudis.