

# eccc

29

OCTOBER

BACK-TO-BASICS  
ISSUE

## Delhi Declaration: Back to the Drawing Board

COP8 offers an opportunity to generate new, much-needed momentum in the fight against global warming. A Delhi Declaration must acknowledge that the science demands urgent action, call for much greater efforts both on adaptation and mitigation, and launch a process leading to a just, equitable and truly adequate global climate agreement. That would be a significant accomplishment.

Unfortunately, the draft Declaration unveiled yesterday falls well short of the mark. In fact, it seems that the only Annex I country happy with this draft is the US, along with its developing country ally, Saudi Arabia. The mini-celebration of these two Parties should make others nervous. It should, in fact, compel them to join the EU in rejecting this document

as the basis for negotiation.

To start with: nowhere does the Declaration mention the Kyoto Protocol – even though many G8 meetings as well as the WSSD managed to find consensus language on this issue. Instead of a clarion call for entry into force and implementation of the Protocol as the first small step forward, the draft merely “takes note” of “the process initiated by the Berlin Mandate,” seven long years ago.

Even worse: while the draft mentions “sustainable development” in its title and seven times in the text, nowhere does it clearly state that the current slow pace of efforts to reduce emissions of global warming gases represents one of the greatest threats to achieving such

–continued back page, column 3

## Stop Press Donor countries close ranks on funding

Last night's contact group on the financial mechanism saw precisely the kind of North-South polarisation that could destroy COP8. Saudi Arabia did not even need to intervene because the meeting was going so badly on its own.

Instead of providing constructive suggestions to improve the Chair's text, the “donor” countries formed a united front, rebutting every intervention from countries as diverse as Barbados, Burkina Faso, Malaysia, Brazil, India and China.

Why was the EU lining up alongside the Umbrella Group, enabling the US to say, “We agree with the EU,” several times? Why did they insist on language praising the GEF over and over when the issue of inaccessibility of funds has come up again and again?

Why were they leading the charge to delete language taken from the memorandum of understanding between the GEF and the COP that calls for joint determination of Convention funding requirements? Why did they support Canada's attempt to limit LDC funding to NAPAs?

Providing guidance for the new funds should be a relatively simple matter. Of course the Marrakech text could do with some improvement. For instance, the economic diversification provisions' call for improved fossil fuel use instead of a reduction in oil dependency.

But it seemed as though the North was bent on blocking progress on every aspect of

–continued second page, column 1



## COP8 fiddles while storms rage

Last Friday, while delegates were pondering the intricacies of climate convention language, the strongest Pacific hurricane in decades hit the coast of Mexico.

Hurricane Kenna, at one point the most severe category five with winds of up to 260 km/hr, came ashore near Puerto Vallarta, wreaking havoc on the resort town and nearby fishing villages. Efficient evacuation appears to have kept the loss of life to a minimum, with only three deaths reported so far. But the damage to property and livelihoods of fishing and tourist villages along the coast was extensive, with up to 95 per cent of the homes in the village of San Blas destroyed, and thousands left homeless.

Then on Sunday, a severe storm named "Jeannett" killed at least 27 people in Europe, including 10 in Germany and nine in the UK. Record wind speeds of 183 km/hr hit the area around Bonn, home of the UNFCCC Secretariat, particularly hard. As ECO went to press, reports were not available on whether the Secretariat's buildings were still standing.

A local German newspaper reported: "Jeannett has ravaged whole regions. Trees and electricity pylons were uprooted, buildings damaged, roofs blown off and scaffoldings blown through the air. Strong rainfall flooded streets and basements. People were told to stay at home to avoid serious injuries. Rail and air traffic was stopped in many areas. Hundreds of towns and villages were left without electricity."

— *Stop press, from front page*

developing country funding agreed at previous meetings. This was a clear case of throwing the baby out with the bath water.

We expect to be shocked by this kind of behaviour from countries that will not commit new funds, but not from the EU. It definitely will need to have some diplomatic capacity building by this evening's negotiations.



Some of the havoc wreaked by "Jeannett" in Europe

## HFCs getting phased-out in Japan

Non-fluorocarbon technologies are gaining significant ground in Japan, according to a report in the Asahi newspaper on October 28. It indicates high-tech progress is already outpacing weak policy expected at COP8, which is preparing to adopt vague recommendations on ozone- and climate-friendly initiatives.

Japan has made three major new advances. Last year saw the introduction of hot water supply equipment using a CO<sub>2</sub> heat pump which replaced HFCs. Developed by a major

utility company, the system reduces electricity consumption by two-thirds and is selling very well.

This year saw several of the largest home-appliance companies begin selling refrigerators using hydrocarbons. These products are already market leaders in Europe and are safe, efficient and reliable.

And later this year, Toyota will launch a fuel cell car with a CO<sub>2</sub>-based air conditioning system, instead of HFC-134a. This initiative will be trendsetting on several fronts.

These technologies emphasise that the days of high-global warming potential (GWP) substances like HFCs are numbered. The question now is: will Parties take the policy steps needed to foster their market development?

It is most crucial to help developing countries take up these new technologies as they phase out CFCs.

This presents COP8 with a real test to see if all the COP rhetoric about technology transfer is more than just talk.

# Adaptation held hostage to OPEC fortunes

COP8 was to be the Adaptation COP.

Funding to help the most vulnerable countries adapt to the impacts of climate change is urgently needed – many are facing these impacts right now.

The Marrakech Accords include adaptation as one key chapter, with new funding mechanisms: the special climate change fund, the adaptation fund and the least developed countries fund. The Accords also provide for further discussions on insurance against the impacts of climate change and extreme weather events. And not a moment too soon. This funding was promised nearly 10 years ago in the Convention, and little progress has been made in delivering it.

This interminable delay has been partly due

to the donor countries – as spectacularly demonstrated again in last night's contact group on financing. But the other major obstacle has been the implicit OPEC claim that its oil sales are as important as the very existence of small island states. Saudi Arabia has insisted on tying adaptation funding for the impacts of climate change to "compensation" for any losses in oil revenues that might occur due to mitigation measures.

Although both are mentioned in the Convention, helping an (oil-)rich nation cope with a potential drop in revenues caused by decreasing sales of fossil fuels is fundamentally different from helping a least developed country adapt to rising sea levels, a changing climate and more frequent extreme weather

events. The adverse impact of climate change and the adverse impact of response measures are issues that must be dealt with separately. Even as diplomatic a commentator as Dr Barry Smit, lead author of the IPCC TAR's adaptation chapter, describes this link as "inefficient and confusing." CAN, a less reticent reporter, would call it obscene. And so, Saudi Arabia added yet another Fossil of the Day to its collection last night.

Any attempt to make tradeoffs between the two concepts (adaptation and adverse impacts of response measures) will further delay meaningful action on adaptation. Developing countries serious about advancing the discussion on adaptation are urged not to give in to OPEC.

## Sinks have sunk, for now

The contact group for afforestation and reforestation projects in the CDM had its final meeting on Monday.

It met its intended purpose – to discuss definitions and modalities for CDM sinks based on submissions received from Parties and a number of observers, including CAN, last August.

COP8 was not intended to be a forum to conclude decisions on these issues. As a result, information was often exchanged in good faith and, on occasion, with good humour.

The only decision made at this COP was one already made at Marrakech – on the base year for reforestation projects.

The insistence of opening an already closed decision on baselines agreed to at Marrakech bodes ill for the remainder of the CDM rule setting process. Any prospective good rules such as requiring environmental and social impact assessments for projects could be held hostage, weakened or eliminated by this ploy.

The meetings were quite illustrative in laying out some of the difficult choices that Parties will have to make, and that civil society will need to influence, if CDM sinks is to retain one shred of environmental integrity.

A few key comments from the last day illustrate the long road ahead to COP9 and possibly acceptable CDM sinks rules.

Parties unwilling to agree on any mandatory environmental and social impact criteria launched the idea to "fast track" small scale community-based projects to provide all these "wonderful co-benefits" for people and biodiversity.

A conclusion from Chile that "small scale"

projects would need to be at a "minimum" 5,000 to 10,000 hectares was especially enlightening. Australia wanted to send a clear signal to investors, now, that sinks would be included in future commitment periods. This contravened a previous decision to review sinks in the CDM in the first commitment period.

Canada proposed that the Secretariat should refuse to consider submissions from non-Parties (like civil society groups) in preparing the options papers that would form the basis of final rules.

## "Fossil of the Day" Awards

Saudi Arabia was declared winner yesterday for its efforts to slow down and reverse progress in the negotiations. It requested that the issue of "impacts of response measures" be inserted in almost every agenda item.

Second prize was awarded to the US for holding up approval of the CDM Executive Board rules of procedure, by trying to modify text agreed at Marrakech. This is especially inappropriate for a country that does not plan to participate in the Kyoto Protocol.



## Rally against climate injustice

The Climate Justice Summit held over the weekend culminated yesterday in a 5,000-strong rally against climate injustice, and the release of the Climate Justice Delhi Declaration.

It states: "We affirm that climate change is a human rights issue – it affects our livelihoods, our health, our children and our natural resources. We will build alliances

across states and borders to oppose climate change-inducing patterns and advocate for and practice just sustainable development. We reject market-based principles that guide the current negotiations to solve the climate crisis: Our world is not for sale."

A delegation of 30 summit representatives was allowed into the Vigyan Bhawan to read the statement to COP8 delegates.



Indian youth were prominent in the rally

– Delhi Declaration, from front page development. While the need for "urgent attention and action" on adaptation is acknowledged, and certainly features much more strongly in the text than mitigation (a word that joins Kyoto as taboo language banned from the text), there is nothing in this Declaration that will move us any closer to increased capacity and financing for adaptation.

All in all, this draft text is based on old rhetoric and old ideas. The world deserves bolder leadership from the Ministers now arriving in Delhi.

Much has happened since the 1995 Berlin Mandate, both in the negotiations and in the climate around us. The impacts of global warming are already being felt, especially in developing countries. The scientific community, in ever-stronger terms, warns of much worse to come.

*Yesterday's CAN statement lays out the key elements of a declaration that moves the process forward, rather than backward.*

These facts demand a Delhi Declaration that recognises that deep cuts in global emissions will be necessary to avoid dangerous climate change. Of course, these cuts must be achieved in accordance with the principles of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities. Yesterday's CAN statement lays out the key elements of a declaration that moves the process forward, rather than backward.

Ministers should use their time together to draft a completely new Delhi Declaration that brings us closer to a safer, more equitable future. We must not, as some would wish, move back to the time before Kyoto when all we had were meaningless voluntary aims and empty pledges for technology transfer and capacity building. Back to the drawing board, please.

### THANKS

The Climate Action Network would like to thank the Swedish NGO Secretariat on Acid Rain, individual contributors, RAC France, Kiko Network, WWF International, David Suzuki Foundation, NRDC, UCS, Greenpeace International, NET, VERTIC, BBL and CAN Europe.

ECO can be contacted at [ecopaper@hotmail.com](mailto:ecopaper@hotmail.com)  
ECO website : <http://www.climatenetwork.org/eco>