

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.

Don't Get Too Comfortable

The decisions made in the next two weeks could make or break the chance of success in Copenhagen. The decisions made here and in the following six months may very well determine the future of people on this planet.

Unfortunately, recent events have left ECO with little reason to believe Annex 1 countries are serious about achieving an ambitious outcome in Copenhagen. Around the world, developed countries are showing they are far too comfortable with a 3-degree world.

Where developing countries, in line with the latest science, have called for 40% re-

ductions by 2020, what is on the table falls short. The EU is dragging its feet on a 30% reduction, which is still far from ambitious or sufficient. Canada is still wandering around in circles of tar as it thinks about an embarrassing 3% reduction in emissions. While the world watches President Obama with admiration and pride, the country's actions on energy and climate change are not yet enough.

Attention is also on Japan this week, as it decides whether it will join the world leaders by committing to 25% reductions by 2020, the most "ambitious" of the weak options it

has chosen to consider.

ECO would like to remind these countries that a 3-degree world is nowhere near acceptable. We must remember that even 2 degrees is too much. AOSIS, who are already seeing impacts firsthand, say 1.5 degrees is the limit.

There are many meetings ahead of us this year, but this is among the most important, as any. ECO is pleased to finally see text on the table, but is deeply concerned with what is missing. Options for mitigation, adaptation, technology cooperation, financing, and other climate solutions seem incomplete in many ways, and far from ambitious in others. In these two weeks, delegates must rectify those mistakes and supply the full suite of options that could actually solve the problem. What follows are just some of the specifics.

The technology portion of the text is full of bits and pieces. Some are good and some are bad. However, what's missing is a framework for keeping them together. It is still unclear what they will mean in terms of commitments, and how they relate to the rest of the text.

It's also time for a wake-up call on LULUCF. While we applaud Parties' efforts to close accounting loopholes (for example, by introducing symmetry into accounting for currently "unbalanced" activities), we also see support building for several approaches that have the potential to erode the effectiveness and integrity of the LULUCF framework in the second commitment period. Rather than Parties fixing a flawed accounting system to take greater responsibility for emissions from this sector, support seems to be building for an approach that would allow every country to measure its performance against country-specific baselines, designed by each country to reward the status quo. We need consistent rules for all Annex 1 Parties that ensures compliance is based on actual emissions during the commitment period, especially from for-

—continued on back page, col. 2



Climate Olympics 2009

The Silent Crisis

A new report released on Friday by Kofi Annan's Global Humanitarian Forum reveals that already, each year climate change is responsible for a massive 300,000 deaths and costs the world in excess of \$125bn – more than all the current world aid. The study's authors, who have painstakingly collated all relevant available information on human impacts of climate change, estimate that by 2030 this will rise to 500,000 deaths and costs of \$340bn annually.

More serious is the fact that 99% of deaths from weather-related disasters are in developing countries. Yet the twelve countries least at risk – nearly all from the North – have made \$72bn available for their own adaptation needs while pledging only \$400m to help the Most Vulnerable Countries, the hardest hit by climate change but who have done the least to cause it. This, according to the report is "less than one state in Germany is spending on improving its flood defences".

Annan has laid the blame squarely on politicians for the impasse in the negotiations, citing widespread ignorance and weak leadership in many countries. Further, he has called upon the negotiators either to reach "the most ambitious agreement ever negotiated or to continue to accept mass starvation, mass sickness and mass migration on an ever growing scale. Climate Change is a silent human crisis. Yet it is the greatest humanitarian challenge of our time".

The report was based on data provided by the World Bank, WHO, the UN, Oxfam, the Potsdam Institute and others and reviewed by ten leading climate experts including IPCC chair Dr Rajendra Pachauri, who said: "Four billion people are vulnerable now and 500 million are now at extreme risk. The scale of devastation is so great that it is hard to believe the truth behind it, or how it is possible that so many people remain ignorant of this crisis".

Up for Adoption?

As climate negotiators come together in Bonn for these critical discussions on climate change, they might take notice of some fresh faces. Representatives from several countries have come to "adopt" their negotiating teams.

As part of a new support group that will "Adopt-a-negotiator" these enthusiastic new parents will be watching and monitoring the actions of the negotiating teams between now and Copenhagen. And like any large family, they will be calling on all back home to speak up in praise or not so much praise depending on how the delegation behaves.

Individuals from Sweden, the US, the UK, Canada, Japan, Australia, Italy, India, and Germany are here to provide the love and attention only a parent can. ECO hopes that delegates will take notice of their adopters in red highlighting that the clock is *tek tek tcking*.

Adaptation – Homework Done?

Six weeks ago ECO said farewell to negotiators and gave them homework to work through until their return to Bonn. Welcome back to Bonn! Have you done your homework? Let's check.

We will start with the developing countries. ECO asked them to illustrate options for country-driven adaptation planning and implementation, which will ensure the effective use of adaptation finance and demonstrate how to prioritise the most vulnerable groups and ecosystems. Indeed, many developing countries, including the African Group and Central American countries, have at least done the first step to comply, by highlighting that special attention has to be paid to particularly vulnerable people, communities, groups or ecosystems. South Africa has proposed a national coordinating body on climate change, an appropriate approach if it is set up as a multi-stakeholder body with decision-making power and meaningful participation of particularly vulnerable people. This is similar to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis.

We asked developed countries to come back with a clear mandate to negotiate over a level of adaptation funding of 50bn annually in addition to the still not fulfilled ODA target. Unfortunately, the submissions do not give us any indication that developed countries have addressed this task seriously.

We also questioned the devotion of

Lost

...or stolen or strayed.

Key parts of the LCA text seem to have been mislaid.

NGOs have been searching the guiding principles section of the REDD text for biodiversity and social safeguards but they are clearly missing. Would anyone finding them or knowing their whereabouts please inform the Secretariat. There will be a substantial reward

... In moral terms, of course.

–Don't Get Comfortable, from front page est and peatland degradation.

Meanwhile, negotiators have not made much progress since Poznan with regards to flexible mechanisms. A long list of options is still under consideration for the future of the CDM and other mechanisms. With Copenhagen just around the corner, consensus needs to be reached to move forward on this.

This week and next we need some kind of courage. We need new coalitions between countries, between people. We need strong voices at every negotiating table. We need governments that speak for their people. And we need decisions that speak for each other.

Remember why we're here, so we can reach where we want to be – together.

developed countries to existing financial institutions such as the World Bank or GEF as the natural entities to operate the future mechanisms. ECO thinks that the form of institutional arrangements has to follow the functions needed. If the existing institutions are ill-prepared, both their substantial reform and the establishment of new ones should be considered at the same time. ECO questions if current institutions are up for the task. The World Bank continues to be a large funder of global warming, and the GEF's delivery capacity as shown the Least Developed Countries Fund is underwhelming. Just stating that creating new institutions takes time and bears transaction costs is not sufficient. While the KP Adaptation Fund still has to prove it works, it at least follows the right principles such as direct access and equitable representation.

ECO also asked developed countries to come back and get serious about filling the NAPA funding gap of around USD 2bn. Rumour has it that the G8 is discussing action on NAPAs and the US government has decided to contribute to the LDCF. Good signals, but to be clear: filling this gap is to fulfil an eight-year-old promise. It is not the adaptation part of the Copenhagen deal. It is just a precondition for serious negotiations about a much larger scale of adaptation support. This will be the core of the adaptation negotiations.

African Ministers Meet Civil Society

African Ministers of Environment met last week in Nairobi, Kenya to prepare a common African position on the climate change negotiations. Their statement will go to the African heads of state meeting on climate change to be held in Libya on 2nd and 3rd July. African civil society also organised a pre-Ministerial meeting of over fifty representatives from all over Africa. The meeting, organised by the Pan African Climate Justice Alliance (PACJA) two days ahead of the ministerial meeting, produced a communiqué that was presented to the Ministers. This laid emphasis on the issues of equity and justice and the fact that, while Africa has the lowest levels of emissions, it is most vulnerable to the adverse impacts of climate change. The Ministers agreed on a joint statement to be placed before the heads of state meeting calling for an equitable and ambitious deal in Copenhagen which takes the concerns of the African countries into account. Eco is excited to see that collaboration between the African ministers and civil society is finally taking place, and would love to see that happen more often on the global level.