

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.

A Brief Note on Canada...

You're not leaving much to the imagination when you say, as Canada's Environment Minister did last week, that it's time to "move past Kyoto." Speaking to an economic think tank, Minister Prentice described Copenhagen as the moment "where the world will turn the page on Kyoto." ECO wonders if he checked with the rest of the world about this – because outside of Canada and its southern neighbour, Kyoto is alive and kicking.

But ECO doesn't stop at mere speeches in its relentless quest to understand Canada's motivations. Instead, thanks to the magic of Canada's *Access to Information* laws, ECO peeked behind the curtain to review a set of Canadian negotiation briefing notes **from 2008**.

Unfortunately, they make for some very

depressing reading.

The storyline in a nutshell is this: after losing its fight to keep the 25–40% range out of the Bali Action Plan, Canada embarked on a futile search for allies to support its weak targets and "strategic vision" of "binding emission reduction targets for all major emitters."

The journey took them to Europe, where Canada's government chatted up its peers in France, Germany, Croatia, Latvia, Italy and Malta, asking those countries "to push within the EU to ensure that all large emitters take on obligations."

Overlooking its Convention obligations completely – easily done, perhaps, when you have lots of practice ignoring your Kyoto commitments – Canada instead "seeks to
–continued on back page, col. 1

More Trouble in the Amazon

It's Latin America's turn in 2010 to host the world's climate negotiators, and ECO hears that Peru is lobbying hard to hold the next COP. It's a shame that, while Peru's delegation in Bonn engaged in diplomatic dialogue to resolve differences of opinion and politics among Parties, Peru's government back home has chosen to end two months of peaceful protest by its Amazonian indigenous peoples with an armed crackdown that has resulted in dozens of deaths on both sides. The protests are a response to a series of laws passed without any consultation process last year, which indigenous groups believe are a serious threat to their basic rights to their lands, and to the forests of the Peruvian Amazon – part of literally the most biodiverse and intact forests left on the planet, which could now be destroyed by large oil and gas exploration and agrofuel projects.

The issues at stake in Peru are extremely complex, but the government's violent response isn't. It won't make the problem go away, rather, it will cause violence to keep recurring, as it has not addressed the root causes. The lack of respect – not only for indigenous peoples but also for basic human rights and dialogue processes – goes against the basic principles enshrined in UN agreements. Upholding these principles is critical to creating the kind of climate agreement that we need. Perhaps Peru should focus on getting its own house in order before inviting the rest of the world to Lima in 2010.

Norwegian Proposal Explained

After years of negotiations over the need to come up with "innovative" ways of generating financial resources, ECO is glad to point out that Norway has actually done so. We would like to offer a brief explanation of the "Norwegian Proposal", as it seems there has been some misunderstanding of what it involves.

Its core idea – referred to as international auctioning – has caught the interest and support of the NGO community, for a very important reason: it should be capable of generating financial resources without being dependent on yearly contributions from the developed countries' treasuries, which, as we all know, have not yet always delivered on promises.

The concept of international auctioning is relatively straightforward:-

First, emission allowances are considered to be common property.

Second, the international community, under the UNFCCC/COP assigns a certain number of allowances to each Annex 1 country,

based on their emissions reduction target.

Third, the UNFCCC, rather than distributing all the allowances for free (grandfathering), holds back a certain proportion of them, and auctions or sells them to those developed countries who need them in order to achieve their target.

Finally, the proceeds of these sales would then be applied towards the costs of mitigation, adaptation and forest protection in the developing countries.

The idea of international auctioning should not be confused with domestic auctioning of emission allowances: this is something developed countries can choose to do nationally, once they have received their quota of emission allowances from the UNFCCC.

ECO hopes that this introduction to international auctioning will inspire Parties to ensure that this important idea stays on the negotiating table, and that parties begin developing this concept in order to integrate it into the forthcoming Copenhagen agreement.

Credits

The photo yesterday of Saturday's rally was by Robert van Waarden / Spectral Q

Last Monday's cartoon was by dont.panic. cartoons@gmail.com

Solidarność Klimatyczna!

Today EU finance ministers are meeting in Luxembourg to hopefully (!) decide on the EU's position on the financial architecture, and support for developing countries, under a future Copenhagen agreement.

ECO is very disappointed that instead of being concerned with the climate crisis and its severe impacts on the developing world, EU countries so far seem busy with passing the bill around. In this blame game the 'old' EU member states point at Poland, while Poland, in its turn, blames the E15 for not taking financial concerns seriously.

Let's start with the Polish perspective. Poland refuses to accept the 'polluter pays' as the main EU burden sharing principle for climate finance. Poland is an economy in transition, and its energy system is deeply dependent on coal. It would be unreasonable to present the bill to the Polish people. The Polish government has announced that until

the EU decides internally on burden-sharing of financial contributions, Poland will prevent any progress ECOFIN. A second point is that Poland was not a member of European Community (which is in Annex II) at the time the UNFCCC Convention was signed and therefore has no financial obligations.

The 'old' EU member states see Poland's argument in completely different way. They stress support for the 'polluter pays' principle, combined with capacity to pay. According to these states, Poland is now part of the industrialized world, and should contribute its 'fair share', like all the other countries. They argue that Poland is simply doing everything it can to pay as little as possible.

ECO does not want to take sides. But what the successful international negotiations need is a strong consensus between EU member states, and a clear commitment for adequate climate finance for developing

countries.

Last week, Poland celebrated the twentieth anniversary of the collapse of communism. In this context, environment and humanitarian organizations in Poland have launched a "Solidarity Manifesto" calling for solidarity with developing countries facing the disastrous impacts of climate change. Just as the Polish Solidarity movement played a crucial role in bringing freedom and democracy twenty years ago, it is now clear that climate solidarity with developing countries is a moral and political obligation.

The EU finance ministers' decisions will have a big impact on the negotiations here in Bonn. ECO calls both on Poland and on all other EU countries to get their act together and solve the internal EU burden sharing discussions. It is time to look beyond European borders, it is time for climate solidarity today!

Adaptation: who should review what?

If anyone was wondering why Parties here at Bonn II aren't making *real* headway even on adaptation, ECO might point to the fact that Annex I Parties, such as the EU, have their keen eyes on ensuring how any (if any!) finance for adaptation would be effectively spent, rather than starting with what ECO believes would be the natural first step: to acknowledge the scale of finance needed, and the revenue generating instruments to reliably (and, well, enforceably) deliver it.

Most Annex I countries seem to see adaptation funding as aid money, with the donors deciding how much they are ready to offer, based on how developing countries agree to use the money. ECO encourages these Parties to read the text of the Convention again: supporting adaptation is a commitment, not a voluntary aid-based relationship. Annex I countries seem reluctant to endorse (or even acknowledge the potential of) some of the instruments for raising funds, such as the LDCs proposed air passenger levy. Is this because such funds could be beyond the control of

finance ministries?

Adaptation, and use of funding, needs to prioritise the most vulnerable communities, peoples and populations in the most vulnerable countries. It needs to involve them in the planning, implementation and review process, and support them in increasing their resilience and reducing their vulnerability. Yet, ECO reminds Parties who agree with these principles that this is different from wanting to tell them exactly how to use the cash.

Here is a simple analogy: your bad driving leads you to crash into someone's house, damaging their house. Naturally you would feel obliged to pay for damage and loss. It would be unthinkable to withhold payment on the grounds that you should have a right to determine how the owner should best go about rebuilding their home before handing over the compensation.

To be sure, adaptation is a challenge, involving a lot of 'learning-by-doing' (this concept should be kept in the text). After all, capacity building happens when people are

given support and space to explore new challenges, not when every step is monitored and micromanaged.

There are convincing arguments on assessing how funding is spent – but the focus by Annex I seems to be on planning, monitoring and reporting, without much engagement in identifying the sources of the substantial funding required. ECO smells fat fees for consultants, set against small sums for adaptation. How about a U-turn? Find the money, quickly, now, and put language into the LCA text that finance should also be provided to enhance, build and support the necessary in-country processes for planning, implementation and review. This should of course involve those who can best judge whether funds have achieved their purpose – the most vulnerable communities, peoples and populations. ECO invites Parties to make specific textual proposals to the LCA text to this end, and then ensure that finance and other support for the necessary capacity building will be forthcoming in the near term.

–Canada, from front page leverage financial and technological assistance to extract binding emission reduction commitments from the emerging economies.”

In a rare nod to reality, the documents explain that “Canada's negotiating challenge is compounded” by a 2020 target of “roughly 2% below the 1990 levels,” while the EU and developing countries “are looking at significantly deeper cuts.” (The notes dismiss 25–40% below 1990 in 2020 as “not realistic”.)

Amazingly, the notes even identify “a

small but growing number of Least Developed Countries and Small Island Developing States which are becoming sympathetic to Canada's position given the impacts their countries are facing.”

It would be funny if it wasn't so sad.

The bottom line is this: 2009's briefing notes simply cannot be more of the same.

Canada's government must state loud and clear, this week, that it has put this troubling track record behind it. This Bonn session is a chance for Canada to start over and get it right this time – and as ECO likes to remind delegates, the clock is “tcking.”

LUDWIG

Ludwig's memory of Saturday night's party is slowly coming back to him – some of the details are still hazy... did he really see Saudi Arabia engaging in *much* better relations with AOSIS than we have come to expect? Ludwig would like to encourage other Parties who may think they have little in common to break the ice, preferably in very informal personal surroundings. He feels this would immeasurably increase the chances of agreement in Copenhagen.