

# 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 cooperatively by the Climate Action Network at the UNFCCC meetings in Durban in Nov-Dec 2011. ECO email: [eco@sunlightdata.com](mailto:eco@sunlightdata.com) – ECO website: <http://www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters> – Editorial/Production: Fred Heutte*

## Arrgggh, Canada!



We really thought thought Canada couldn't get any worse . . .

But now credible reports are saying that before the end of the year, Canada is going to formally withdraw from the Kyoto Protocol. This can only be seen as an unacceptable breach of trust in the global climate talks, where the vast majority of the world recognizes the urgent need for meaningful action on climate change including a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol.

With the intention to abandon Kyoto next month, Canada is negotiating in outrageously bad faith here in Durban. Countries should be asking why Canada is sitting at the Kyoto negotiating table with a hardly-secret plan to withdraw from the protocol. They should demand to know Canada's position, and if they really are planning to let the world down, they should immediately leave the KP negotiations.

Canada has been singled out as a global laggard on climate change in recent years, so this newest and grandest failure is not a surprise. In the midst of dire warnings about climate risk from even the International Energy Agency, Canada's position is both dangerous

and immoral.

Canada is acting on behalf of polluters, not people. It is no secret that Canada's climate and energy policy is focused on rapidly expanding their tar sands oil production and attempting to kill clean energy policy abroad.

Yesterday, activists around the world protested against Canada's push to open markets to dirty oil at the expense of the climate. In Canada, Greenpeace activists used LED emergency lights to write "Climate Fail" in huge letters on the lawn of Parliament -- a message that is even stronger following yesterday's revelations.

Demonstrations also took place in capitals including Paris, Berlin, Oslo and Stockholm as well as outside of the Department of Transport in London, protesting the UK's support for allowing tar sands oil into the EU.

Canada's plan is a slap in the face to the international community. Canada is isolating itself even more in these talks as a country that not only is refusing to take meaningful action at home, but also one that has lost the trust and respect of the international community here in Durban and around the world.

## UNEP: Bridging the Gap

Many delegates at last year's COP in Cancun failed to take note of a rather large elephant lurking in the meeting rooms and corridors. And now that elephant has made its way to this COP – and has grown even larger.

Just last week, the UN Environment Programme issued an updated version of its landmark Emissions Gap report. Once again, UNEP concludes that by 2020 global emissions need to be reduced to 44 gigatonnes if the world is to be on a credible pathway to keeping warming below 1.5° C or even 2°.

First the bad news – UNEP finds that the gap between what is needed and what is on the table increased even more over the past year. Even if all countries go to the top end of their pledge ranges to cut emissions, and all loopholes are closed, the gap in 2020 will still be 6 gigatonnes – as much as the annual emissions of the US.

In the real world the gap is more likely to be around 11 gigatonnes. Developed countries are stuck on weaker, conditional pledges and their targets are riddled with loopholes. In fact, with the current weak pledges and lenient accounting rules, UNEP says that developed country emissions will be hardly any different than business as usual.

But there is also some good news in the report. UNEP says that with strong action now, it is possible to do even more than close the gap, without significant technical breakthroughs or prohibitive cost. How? By strongly focusing on energy efficiency and clean, renewable energy. By a major drive to halt deforestation. By improved waste management and agricultural practices. And by taking action on the currently unregulated sectors of international aviation and shipping.

To enable these real, practical solutions to prosper, the ambition of current pledges must – *UNEP, continued on page 2*

– UNEP, continued from page 1

be increased. All countries can and must do more. But first, developed countries need to raise their game dramatically. The Cancun Agreements recognised that developed country targets should be in the range of 25-40% below 1990 levels. In ECO's view, the ambition must rise above 40% if you are serious about 2° C – let alone the 1.5° C small islands need to keep afloat.

In a rational world, countries at Durban would listen to the trumpeting of the elephant and increase their pledges here and now. So ECO lives in hope.

**Land use, land use change and forestry.** UNEP says that weak LULUCF rules could contribute 0.6 gigatonnes to the emissions gap. These rules would allow developed countries to increase emissions from forestry activities while still claiming credits. Parties must discard these bad rules, and instead focus on accounting options with environmental integrity.

**Surplus AAUs.** The use of surplus allowances from the first commitment period could increase global emissions by as much as 2.9 gigatonnes in 2020, UNEP says. Strong rules to prevent or minimise the carryover of this surplus are essential.

**Double counting of offsets** against both developed country targets and developing country pledges could, along with fake offsets, increase the gap by 2 gigatonnes. Governments can and must rule this out once and for all.

Here in Durban, governments must also agree a robust process to formally recognise, quantify and close the gap. They must also agree to a peak year of 2015 in the Shared Vision. And they must agree a second commitment period to the Kyoto Protocol, alongside a mandate for a comprehensive legally binding agreement to be concluded no later than 2015 and enter into force on 1 January 2018, a timeline that will not rule out the prospects for an early peak in emissions.

Delegates should pay heed to the wise words of African proverbs. "A man who is trampled to death by an elephant is a man who is blind and deaf". Or, more positively: "When an elephant becomes as small as a monkey, it ceases to be an elephant."

**If you want to find out more about the Bridging the Emissions Gap report, UNEP is holding a side event in the African Pavilion at 18.30 on Thursday 1 December.**



[www.unep.org/pdf/UNEP\\_bridging\\_gap.pdf](http://www.unep.org/pdf/UNEP_bridging_gap.pdf)

## LULUCF: Are We Outraged Yet?

One of the most important principles in the climate negotiations is that of common but differentiated responsibilities. CBDR means that while it is everyone's job to reduce emissions, Annex I Parties have the lion's share of historical emissions and therefore should demonstrate leadership with more ambitious emission reductions.

Specifically, to have a chance of keeping warming below 2° C, Annex I Parties must reduce emissions 40% or more below 1990 levels by 2020, while developing countries should begin low-carbon development that rapidly diverges from their likely business-as-usual (BAU) emissions.

How on earth, then, do Annex I Parties justify accounting for their forest industry emissions against BAU levels, and not a much more ambitious benchmark. And as you might have guessed, it's even worse – many of these proposed BAU reference levels are inflated to hide future emissions increases, and so are worse than "real" BAU.

How is it that Annex I ministers and heads of delegation have allowed a whole sector to

avoid contributing a fair share of ambition? Seriously, this isn't some obscure technical issue. It's a basic point about whether the forest sector is helping to solve the problem or is just a free-loader.

Furthermore, how hypocritical is it for Annex I Parties to set forest reference levels with no ambition for themselves, and then include calls for ambition in their recent submissions on the evolving REDD+ mechanism?

If you're not outraged, you're not paying attention!

And yet there is still time here in Durban and there are better options in the LULUCF text. These options may not be perfect, but they are better than Annex I countries' wholly unacceptable projected BAU reference levels.

Come on, LULUCF negotiators and heads of delegations! It's not enough to deliver a set of rules everyone can agree on. These rules must neither undermine the integrity of the KP nor set damaging precedents that could see ambition undermined in other areas. Clearly they must deliver for the climate – and time is running out!

## A Menu for the Adaptation Committee

Can COP 17 conclude with a fully fleshed out adaptation package? ECO has a few healthy ideas. A good place to start is the Adaptation Committee negotiated under the AWG-LCA.

The comprehensive draft decision text from Panama provides the basis. The AC should be operationalised and start its work as soon as possible, and it will help if Parties have nominations for members in Durban.

Parties should agree on a strong role for the AC under the guidance and authority of the COP, and allow it to report directly to the COP rather than only through the SBI. While consideration in the SBI could be productive, e.g. during the Bonn sessions when the COP does not meet, the SBI should not become the supervisory body of the AC.

The section on composition contains a proposal for two advisory members each from southern and northern civil society. It is not relevant which Parties made this proposal; rather we encourage delegates to look at the value of the meaningful engagement of civil society.

There is a wealth of supporting examples. For example, in the Global Fund to fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, civil society representatives are full board members with voting rights. For the Committee on Food

Security in the FAO, there is a mechanism whereby CSO representatives from different constituencies (fisherfolk, farmers, herders, landless, etc.) are selected and have full access and the right to talk but not vote in the procedures of the Committee. Currently, there are four CSO members as well as some from the private sector.

Further, it would be beneficial to assure a developing country majority in the AC, including specific seats for LDCs and SIDS, as well as gender balance.

Finally, Parties should ensure that the AC can provide recommendations to other institutions, including those of the financial mechanism, thereby contributing to a more coherent approach to adaptation and widening the application of conclusions and experience gathered by the AC.

### Fossil of the Day

#1 CANADA

Heading for the KP Exit Ramp

#2 UK

Supporting Canada's Tar Sands

#3 CANADA

Playing 'Hardball' in Durban