


# 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 Climate Action Network (CAN) groups attending the SBI, SBSTA, AWG-KP and AWG-LCA in Bonn in June 2008. ECO website: <http://www.climatenetwork.org/eco>

## Seeking STPs of Merit

The chair of the AWG-LCA laid out the path from Bonn to Poznan yesterday in his draft conclusions. The centrepiece is an open-ended request for submissions of “specific textual proposals” (STPs) on the five building blocks of the Bali Action Plan, with real-time posting on the UNFCCC website, and a compilation by the Secretariat of submissions received in advance of the Accra and Poznan meetings. ECO notes the Chair’s pledge that submissions by international government organizations and non-governmental organizations will also be compiled for use by Parties in the negotiations.

The Chair made clear that these submissions of specific text will make it possible to move into the negotiating phase; he also made it clear that this is the start of a process that will probably see submissions on the issues under negotiation right up to the end of 2009.

Informal consultations are now underway on what technical papers and/or information notes should be requested from the Secretariat. The Chair was emphatic that Parties should not demand technical papers on their “pet subjects,” but only on those issues that are essential to the negotiations. Parties should ask themselves “is this paper needed because otherwise we will not be able to negotiate on an issue?”

In that spirit, ECO suggests the following topics for technical papers between now and Poznan:

- Indicators and criteria for assessment of comparability of effort among Annex 1 Parties, and for differentiation of emissions reduction objectives taken on by such Parties in the next commitment period.
- Analysis of the advantages and possible limitations of various options (auctioning of AAUs, levies on various emissions sources, performance indicators for bilateral and/or multilateral financing, etc.) for generating substantial dedicated, additional funding streams for clean technology development and diffusion, adaptation activities, and reductions in emissions from deforestation and degradation.
- Review of assessments of barriers to rapid deployment of clean energy technologies in both developed and developing countries, and of experience to date in eliminating and reducing such barriers.
- Capacity building to facilitate accurate measurement, reporting and verification of emissions limitation actions by developing countries, and experience to date in this regard

While there are many other topics that could benefit from technical analysis, these appear to us to meet the stringent test of usefulness to the negotiations set by the Chair. ECO looks forward to constructive resolution of this issue by the end of the week here in Bonn.

## ~~Litigation?~~

Eco was concerned to see recent news of a potential lawsuit filed against the CDM Executive Board. Is ECO wrong to assume that Parties understand the threat to the environmental integrity of the Kyoto Protocol if developers can use pressure tactics to push for getting credits from the CDM? It’s simple: Privileges and immunities protection must be extended to the Executive Board in its service to Parties.

On the other hand, lest we be too hasty, there may well be an argument for settling many disagreements within the UNFCCC through lawsuits. Some possible headlines of the future:

*Polar Bears Sue Annex I for Damage to Property*

*AOSIS Files Class Action Against the Brollies for Reckless Endangerment*

*US To Sue Australia for Divorce Claiming Irreconcilable Differences*

*Parties suspect DUI\* to blame for US Intervention Claiming Full Compliance with Convention Obligations*

And along these lines, Eco has recently retained counsel in regard to issues of libel.

ECO challenges delegates to put their legal wit to use to come up with the funniest faux legal headline of the future. Submissions are being collected at the CAN table. Wittiest submission to be printed in Thursday's Eco.

\*drafting under the influence

## African Vision?

The IPCC Fourth Assessment Report emphasized the vulnerability of Africa to the impacts of climate change even at the lowest concentrations of greenhouse gases that were modelled. An increase in average global temperature of 2° C is likely to raise the annual average in some African areas by 4° or more and result in increased water stress for approximately a third of the continent's population.

For years CAN Africa has asked why the Africa Group does not endorse the objective of keeping global warming as far below 2° C as possible? Adaptation is essential, but the less mitigation is achieved, the greater will be the challenge and costs of adaptation, the risk of reaching tipping points and the limits of adaptive capacity. One might expect vocal African support for a strong global level of ambition.

Also in Africa's interests is that comparability of effort of all Annex I countries is determined on an objective basis that recognizes the right to development for non-Annex I countries, including all of Africa itself. One such proposal is the framework for Greenhouse Development Rights (GDR). This equity-based approach to quantification of responsibility and capability recognizes national circumstances and offers a basis to determine an appropriate scale of effort.

A shared global vision of a world below 2° warming also requires unprecedented cooperation. Auctioning of AAUs, possibly encouraged by a universal levy on emissions above a per capita minimum, could provide finance on the scale required for adaptation. A dedicated institution to drive technology development, deployment and transfer would enhance such cooperation. Is there any good reason why Africa as a whole should settle for anything less?

## European Parliament showing the way to Copenhagen?

While some here in Bonn are busy recycling old, bad ideas that could sink and nuke the Kyoto Protocol, the European Parliament (EP) has grasped the lessons of Bali and the IPCC's AR4.

Satu Hassi, the EP rapporteur responsible for setting and sharing the 2020 reduction efforts between EU Member States, has proposed a 30% **domestic** emission reduction target (compared to 1990 levels). On top of this domestic action, European member states would commit to supporting binding, measurable and verifiable emission mitigation in non-Annex I countries. Hassi proposes an additional effort of 850 Mtonnes

CO<sub>2</sub>[e] mitigation by 2020 in non-Annex I countries to be fully financed by the EU-27 Member States. This approach is consistent - *if* mirrored by other Annex I countries - with a decent chance of keeping temperature rise below 2° C compared to pre-industrial levels.

ECO sees this as a hopeful and constructive signal by European lawmakers towards achieving a global post-2012 deal on climate change. Key decision makers are ready to move beyond watering down domestic efforts through off-setting to a solid scientific and equity-based future climate regime. Are you up to the challenge, delegates?

## Ludwig

Ludwig is puzzled at the 6<sup>th</sup> suggestion for modification of the scope of the CDM. What, he wonders, are nuclear "activities"? Is the AWG suggesting jazzing up the action at EURO 08 by adding a little depleted uranium to the football? Or playing a few rounds of pebble bed billiards? Or maybe a quick dip in a fuel cooling pond? Ludwig suggests that solar, wind and small hydro activities (like gardening, wind surfing or water polo) would be better for the planet (and they won't make you glow in the dark either).

Meanwhile, somewhere else in Europe yesterday, a Texan duck quacked loudly. "I think we can get a global agreement on climate change during my presidency – just so you know".

Noting the duck's acknowledgement that "As you know, I am close to retirement", Ludwig wonders: if a lame duck quacks in Slovenia, does anybody hear him? After an eloquent plea by the Slovenian Prime Minister for the EU and the US to take a "leading role" in reaching a global agreement on climate change because "there is not much time left. The time is running out", the duck drawled: "It's called technology." No, Mr. President. It's called leadership! Just so **you** know!

**CORRECTION:** ECO yesterday criticized Prime Minister Fukuda's emission reduction proposal for 2020 as amounting to only a 3-4% cut compared to 1990 level. We were right to do so. But we got the EU reduction numbers wrong. They are actually 30% by 2020 – provided everybody negotiating at the UNFCCC does their work.