

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 Poznań, December 2008.

20/20 Vision on 2020

Discussions on the 'shared vision' this week have illustrated how governments are lacking in decisiveness if not in words. But today is your chance to shine! The LCA chair is welcoming additional submissions for the assembly document by 6pm. The document will form the basis for the full negotiations that will (finally) be launched on the basis of a mandate agreed here in Poznań. ECO wants to highlight some crucial gaps in the document. Feel free to share.

The importance of the Copenhagen agreement cannot be underestimated: in transforming the world economy into one that is low-carbon and sustainable in its production and consumption patterns, and in that all countries need to achieve their development goals in a manner compatible with this goal. A science-based Copenhagen agreement will codify the peaking of global emissions before 2020, consistent with the findings of the Fourth Assessment Report and other more recent scientific data, as agreed in the AWG-KP in Bali. The agreement needs a strong review clause, with the COP reviewing all commitments in light of the best available scientific information. It should be able to take appropriate action, including increasing the stringency of commitments, as necessary on the basis of this regular review.

Building on Kyoto, rich countries will need to take on legally binding commitments that are multi-layered. Firstly, developed countries should take on deeper economy-wide quantified emissions limitation and reduction objectives at the top end of the 25 to 40% below 1990 by 2020, and 80 to 95% by 2050 ranges. A large majority of these emissions reductions must be achieved domestically. Further, sectoral measures are required to reduce emissions from international aviation and shipping. Developed countries should also commit to specific financial and technological support for enhanced mitigation and adaptation actions by developing countries, enabling them to substantially deviate their emissions below the business-as-usual baseline. Clear rules need to be established to avoid double

or triple counting between the various types of commitments. Enhanced actions by Non-Annex I countries must be enabled and supported by financing, non-financial measures and flexible mechanisms from Annex I countries – measurable, reportable and verifiable financing must be additional to the use of flexible mechanisms by Annex I countries intended to achieve their own targets. The combined package of multi-layered commitments and enhanced actions need to deliver on the ultimate objective of the Convention and keep warming well below 2°C.

At the core of the Bali Action Plan stood the decision to make further commitments and enhanced actions measurable, reportable and verifiable. The MRV concept established the political foundation for developed and developing countries to take bold, ambitious, and creative actions and is thus a key policy design question central to achieving a fair, equitable and environmentally integral Copenhagen agreement. It is not an operational issue to be addressed after Copenhagen. Robust MRV mechanisms for both Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) in developing countries, balanced by technology, finance and capacity building support from developed countries, will help build the required trust among parties. Some countries have already proposed principles for framing the MRV of technology, finance and capacity building support, but a fuller range of perspectives is needed, as well as MRV of NAMAs.

The Copenhagen agreement should contain an overall Technology Development Objective that serves the ultimate objective of the Convention, with a goal of achieving true global cooperation on technology, and a focus on increasing overall levels of innovation and access, not just narrow technology transfer. A first step would be to provide financial and technical support to developing countries in order to strengthen their innovative and absorptive capacity to successfully use and adapt new technologies. This can include examination of multiplying factors at the national and inter-

national level, but should not get caught up in malicious debate on enabling environments. CAN proposes that the future technology efforts under the UNFCCC be organized in a set of Technology Action Programs. These programs would run for periods of five years, and have clear targets. Up to twenty different programs should be developed for critical adaptation and mitigation technologies, including solar and wind energy, early warning systems, pro-poor technologies to avoid salinity intrusion, energy savings in buildings (and in sectors like cement) as well as a phase-out of HFCs. Poznań and Copenhagen provide opportunities to initiate the first action plans, which will increase trust and accelerate action. It needs to be recognized that where intellectual property rights issues are a barrier to technology access, a clear framework should be established that balances the need to protect the rights of innovators with the urgent need to share technology fairly in order to solve the climate problem.

A Copenhagen agreement must give adaptation equal importance to mitigation, technology and finance. Adaptation should be covered by a comprehensive framework, consisting of an adaptation and prevention pillar as well as an insurance pillar, both funded through an adaptation finance mechanism. It is worth building on and strengthening existing processes, such as implementing the priorities of the Hyogo Framework for Action, thus conserving time and effort and enabling adaptation among the most vulnerable communities in a timely way. This should be integrated with ecosystem adaptation: many poor people depend on their natural environments for their daily needs. Steps to scale up adaptation efforts under the UNFCCC can get under way well before 2013. Increased and imme-

NGO Party tonight!
7pm – 5am • Tuba Club
ul. Mała Garbary 6
free entry with conference badge

One hand clapping on technology and finance

Yesterday's LCA contact group on delivering on technology and finance exposed a yawning gap between what's needed and what the world's richest countries are tabling.

Developing countries have advanced on several fronts since Bali, engaging on the shape of their MRV mitigation actions through reducing deforestation and sectoral approaches, and domestically in many cases by climate plans and analysis of mitigation potentials. Work is well advanced on adaptation needs.

So when the G77 and China present constructive and considered proposals for institutions to provide financing and technology support for their activities, in line with the Convention and the Bali Action Plan, they deserve a response. The contact group would have been the ideal forum to begin a serious engagement with these proposals.

But instead, a resounding silence on their proposals. Unless, that is, rejecting the proposals out of hand can be considered engagement, as Canada, Norway, and the limping quackers appeared to do.

Instead there was lots of talk about the role

of the private sector, enabling environments, and how it's too early for Annex I countries to approve this or that proposal. After listening carefully, ECO heard nothing about Annex I countries' concrete plans to provide new, additional and predictable public funds to developing countries to cope with climate change.

Or as Japan so charmingly put it, they can't be expected to become "the ATM for the world."

Study after study has confirmed how massive the needs truly are, with last month's updated financial flows paper from the UNFCCC Secretariat just the latest example. The Secretariat's report states that the estimates of adaptation funding needs alone remain in the tens, and possibly hundreds, of billions of dollars per year. And the paper is crystal clear about where the responsibility lies, stating that "it is increasingly important" to determine how developed countries will support developing countries in adapting to and mitigating climate changes.

But as New Zealand noted at the contact group, it's hard to find time to read through

all the information these days. Maybe the UNFCCC paper dropped to the bottom of the pile, along with all those developing country proposals that (most) Annex I countries have so far utterly failed to respond to.

There's no doubt that the private sector has a key role. Bilateral and multilateral arrangements outside of the Convention might as well. But as the G77 and China proposal states, the right home for the new financing mechanism we need is under the Convention, where it can be governed in an accountable, equitable and transparent manner.

This will come as news to Canada's delegation, who suggested yesterday that the Convention should be used instead for – wait for it – "information sharing". Canada also somehow managed to keep a straight face while suggesting that it wants credit for its contribution to technology transfer through the Bush administration's "Kyoto lite" Asia-Pacific Partnership.)

The G77 and China are doing more than their share to move these negotiations forward. They deserve more than a snub.

A Warm Warsaw Welcome for the Finance Ministers

The climate crisis demands a serious and concerted response from finance ministers meeting Monday and Tuesday in Warsaw.

In their consideration of how (and surely they are all beyond whether) they should fulfill their commitments to massively scale up financing and technology support for adaptation and mitigation, we trust they will treat the climate crisis at least as seriously as they treated the economic crisis, for which they mobilized trillions of dollars in short order.

Indeed, the financial crisis is an opportunity for finance ministers show resolve to tackle the increasing economic, environmental, and humanitarian threats posed by global warming, while also taking advantage of the substantial economic stimulus and job creation opportunities from investment in climate action. In short, this economic crisis is the time to step up efforts to address climate change, not backtrack.

Finance ministers need to answer three interrelated questions: How will they mobilize the massively scaled up public funding needed to respond to the climate challenge; how will these funds be managed at an international level, and how can these funds be channeled and used most effectively to generate and leverage a technology revolution and low-carbon development worldwide.

There are serious proposals on the table for all three of these areas. In particular, Norway has made a very promising proposal for generating the resources needed, and the G77 and China have proposed mechanisms for

managing and investing these resources.

Meanwhile, most developed countries have been silent on these issues, proposing merely tinkering with existing programs and institutions that have failed to address the climate crisis, and in many cases, contributed to it. The EU, which has so often played a leadership role in the climate negotiations, is risking losing this status. The commitment of some EU countries to leadership now appears to be flagging, and some member countries which should be key to solutions on financing are not even sending their minister.

Developing countries are approaching the climate problem constructively, advancing serious, ambitious and realistic proposals and ideas. It is now time for an equally serious response from developed countries. Finance ministers should not shirk their duty to ensure that resources are made available, adequate to addressing the adaptation and mitigation needs of developing countries. This requires the willingness to commit to generating hundreds of billions of dollars annually, which should be governed by an accountable UNFCCC financial mechanism. Such finance must be adequate, predictable, sustainable and additional and closely aligned with the principles of the climate convention.

Without a substantial commitment by finance ministers to climate change investment, it is unlikely that there can be a successful conclusion to climate change negotiations. The consequences could potentially dwarf those of the current financial crisis.

– 20/20 Vision on 2020, from page 1

diat efforts to support the most vulnerable people in developing countries to adapt to the now unavoidable impacts of climate change should include operationalisation of the Kyoto Adaptation Fund; a NAPA implementation Initiative; and, an Adaptation Implementation Work programme 2010-2012.

The level of financing provided for both mitigation and adaptation should be based on the precautionary principle and keeping global warming as far below 2°C as possible. Finally, full compliance by countries with the commitments undertaken is imperative, and any Copenhagen agreement will need to develop compliance mechanisms. The basic structure of the Kyoto Protocol provides a useful model, as it includes both facilitative elements and enforcement elements.



Japan's comment that it is "not an ATM" echoes the sentiment expressed by many countries comfortable in their affluence, who often seem somewhat reluctant to cough up for those less fortunate than themselves. Mieszko would like to point out that, though it is true that ATMs contain plenty of money, in general not very many of them, in the process of acquiring the cash, have spent decades, or even centuries, giving off substances that seriously detriment the lifestyles of their customers. Perhaps the metaphor needs a little more work.