

eco

13
JunePole
Issue

ECO has been published by Non-Governmental Environmental Groups at major international conferences since the Stockholm Environment Conference in 1972. ECO is produced co-operatively by the Climate Action Network at the UNFCCC meetings in Bonn, June 2013.

ECO email: administration@climatenetwork.org - ECO website: <http://eco.climatenetwork.org> - Editorial/Production: Kyle Gracey

ECO is printed on 100% recycled paper

Poles Apart

Poland is an extraordinary country. It has overcome many years of oppression and poverty to transform itself into a significant economic powerhouse and a proactive European player on diplomacy.

But it appears the Polish government is willing to risk their status as rising international star, and allow its politics to be captured by high carbon incumbents.

If the Polish government continues to pursue this position, it is quite likely that the EU will lose patience, and a diplomatic backlash is quite possible. This will result in Poland losing its say to shape the future of Europe's energy regime, widening the gap between its ageing and inefficient energy infrastructure and a more dynamic, smarter and innovative power system across other EU countries.

ECO wonders if the Polish government is kicking itself in deciding to put their names forward for the Presidency of COP19 later on this year. Warsaw will not be a Poznan. Back

in 2008, the Poles were still only agitators as opposed to today's outright blockers of the EU's energy and climate ambitions. Poznan was a low-key COP, unlike Warsaw, which should agree on the outlines of an Equity Reference Framework for the post-2020 deal; outline further efforts on public finance (with the engagement of Finance Ministers); close the pre-2020 mitigation gap; affirm the political significance of the Loss and Damage debate and set in place a series of processes to deliver a 2015 agreement.

Warsaw will be a high profile event. But Poland's diplomatic strategy is flawed – they are invisible, and there is an emerging disquiet amongst many Parties and observers if they were the right choice. Among those are established voices such as Raul Estrada-Oyuela, a legend to those of us in the climate and diplomatic arena, who unforgettably locked delegates in the room in Kyoto to hammer out the subsequent protocol, who calls Poland's ability to host such an important event into ques-

tion, based on the Polish SBI chair's failure to resolve this issue. (Link to Estrada's letter here <http://bit.ly/estrada-oyuela>)

What is needed from the Polish government is not just to be a rising star, but a sophisticated diplomatic actor that understands how to build consensus around ambitious action climate change. An actor who has a more mature and deeper understanding of its national interest. An actor who understands that a reliance on coal undermines the long term prosperity of its own people, and recognises that modernising its economy is essential if it is to compete in a globalised world. Instead, what we have is a government that plans to build new coal fired power plants and open new lignite reserves, which recent studies state have the worst implications upon health within the EU, and that also displace 20,000 people. Such aggressive coal expansion, and its persistent objections to greater European ambition, cannot be reconciled with its desire to be an international player in the run up to 2015.

Ludwig & Ludwiga

Hello ECO readers. Just because the SBI won't start this Bonn session (seriously Russia!!) it does not mean that ECO could conclude the fortnight without at least one piece of acerbic commentary from me, Ludwig

(and my gender-balancing friend, Ludwiga). And do not be disappointed, we've got a good one for you!

In Tuesday's ADP informal, a big country down-under came up with a great idea to deal with adaptation financing – "let's just ignore the costs and focus on the opportunities!"

The text at that time had (and we hope still has) a request for the Secret-

ariat to prepare a technical paper on the costs of adaptation at various temperature levels. It seems these mates had so much fun making up new colours for their temperature maps during the extended heat wave in their summer that now they want everyone to benefit from such "adaptation opportunities"!



ADP: A Detailed Proposal

Have You Hugged Your Climate Scientist Yet?

In case you forgot that yesterday was "Hug a Climate Scientist Day", here's a handy guide:



Credit: Australian Conservation Foundation

With less than 5 months until COP19, there is much homework for Parties to do on specific proposals for the nature and structure of the 2015 deal. By Warsaw, Parties need to broadly be able to answer the 5 Ws (who, what, where, when, why and how) for all elements of the deal. Take mitigation for example.

Who – well that’s easy – all Parties.

What – binding mitigation commitments that respect Parties' common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities in a dynamic manner, and long term global temperature and reduction targets that provide a strong signal to the investment community that fossil fuels are done!

Where – in a Protocol.

When – for the 5 year commitment period of 2021-2025.

Why – to save your *gluteus maximus* (and the planet).

How – ECO really hopes the answer to this question is obvious considering how much airtime Parties have been giving to CAN's Equity Reference Framework these past two weeks.

Hummm...upon reflection, perhaps the homework is not that challenging, as all that is needed is to flesh out the "what" to be committed. This should ensure that Parties have enough clarity on the nature of commitments to be able to table initial offers by the Ban-Ki Moon Summit in

the autumn of 2014.

Of course, the final agreement is not all about mitigation. Thus ECO was pleased to see in the draft conclusions for the ADP a technical paper on adaptation costs for each degree of temperature raise. Mitigation, adaptation and loss & damage exist in a continuum. Less ambition on mitigation means substantially more efforts are required to adapt. Similarly, if adequate actions for adaptation are not taken in time, we need to spend more resources to address loss and damage. This technical paper should be focused on the cost-temperature interaction – anything on "adaptation opportunities" (which seems like an oxymoron) can be addressed elsewhere.

Staying with the ying and yang relationship of adaptation and mitigation for a minute, ECO sees a much greater lift on the workstream 2 side of things. Here the list of possible actions is known – increased targets, new pledges, phasing out fossil fuel subsidies and HFCs, enhancing renewable energy and energy efficiency and so on. While AOSIS made a constructive suggestion on the technical way forward, what is really needed is political will and actual commitments. The Obama/Xi announcement on phasing out HFCs is a step in the right direction, but still needs to be translated into firm action.

ECO is anxiously awaiting New Zealand's expected pledge by Warsaw. With that in mind, it seemed timely to revisit an article from last year's "CAN Collectibles" series:

Countries That Can Increase Their Ambition

New Zealand	
National term of endearment/greeting	Bro/Mate
Best things about New Zealand	Beautiful environment - some of it still unspoiled. Maori Culture. Wine
Worst things about New Zealand	Wanting to be Australia. Addiction to cars. Pathological need to spoil the unspoiled bits
Things you didn't know	New Zealand isn't all clean and green. New Zealand is the first country in the world to catalogue its entire known living and fossil life from 530 million years ago to today
Existing Unconditional pledge on the table	It's all conditional, which means the unconditional pledge is to do nothing
Existing Conditional pledge (upper end)	10-20% reduction in net emissions below 1990 gross emissions levels by 2020
Next step to increase ambition by COP18	This year: Submit a meaningful QELRO that would require a 40% reduction by 2020, produce a low carbon development plan, tell us when gross emissions will peak, listen to the voices of progressive business leaders and agricultural scientists who can help us get there rather than the usual head-in-the-sand lobby groups, and get a new attitude
Rationale	Untapped low cost abatement opportunities. The potential economic benefits of low carbon economic development. Making good on the promise to create a low carbon development plan
Extra rationale	A clear conscience