

# 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 groups attending COP15 in Copenhagen in December 2009. ECO email: econewsletter@hotmail.com ECO website: <http://www.climate-network.org/eco> Editorial/Production: Nithiyananthan Nesadurai/Sander Wijsman*

## We have done the math!

Upon arriving in Copenhagen, US Special Envoy on Climate Todd Stern said: "Emissions are emissions. You've just got to do the math. If you care about the science, and we do, there is no way to solve this problem by giving the major developing countries a pass."

*ECO* does care about the science and we have done the math. Stern and other developed countries may be interested in the conclusions.

IPCC AR4 highlighted the need for 25-40% cuts on 1990 levels by 2020 for developed countries and substantial deviation from business-as-usual (BAU) for developing countries by 2020. Subsequent peer reviewed science identified this substantial deviation as being in the range of a 15-30% deviation from BAU (subsequently adopted as the de facto yardstick by EU and others). As the IPCC has also pointed out, these mitigation targets give the world a 50-50 chance of averting a rise above 2°C. More importantly, the disparity between woeful developed country ambition and the levels of actions proposed by developing countries are fairly stark.

According to recent estimates of Project Catalyst, an initiative of Climate Works, it is developing countries that are within their proposed emissions reductions range, and towards the upper end of it.

Using the high range figures for proposed mitigation actions and plans, Project Catalyst estimates that every developing country stating a target fell within the 15-30% range. And two exceed it – Brazil with 39% deviation from BAU and Indonesia with 41%.

The Maldives and Costa Rica have proposed going carbon neutral by 2020, humbling even the most ambitious Annex I ambitions.

South Africa has just announced it will

undertake mitigation actions which diminish emissions below baseline by around 34% by 2020 and by around 42% by 2025. Like other developing country pledges this will depend on international finance. This means South Africa's emissions would peak between 2020 and 2025, plateau for around a decade and then decline in absolute terms.

South Korea has a target of 30% reductions from BAU, and has committed almost US\$100 million in environmental industries as part of its economic recovery package.

Of course, *ECO* acknowledges that there are genuine challenges with defining BAU. China and India's intensity targets also are more difficult to quantify because they also rely on accurate projections of economic growth. It is also crucial to note that from developed country finance is a fundamental prerequisite for many of these mitigation efforts by these countries which struggle with poverty and still need resources for human development.

But, returning to Stern's comments, let us take a look at how developed countries' pledges measure up to what the science requires. Recall that developed countries need to make cuts of up to 40% on 1990 levels by 2020. Even on the lesser goalpost of 25-40% ranges the figures are seriously underwhelming. Of course, there are some climate leaders – notably Norway and Scotland with targets of 40% or above.

Calculations carried out by Ecofys and Climate Analytics show that developed country emissions reductions as an aggregate are projected to be only 8-12% below 1990 levels by 2020 after accounting for forestry credits. Other calculations taking full account of the various loopholes available to developed

– continued back page, column 3

## Adaptation Fund Board showcase

Today, the chair of the Adaptation Fund (AF) will explain the achievements of the Adaptation Fund Board this year in a side event. *ECO* urges all those who still perceive the AF as a politicised negotiating body and not as an existing institution caring for effective adaptation to attend the event and update your knowledge.

At Bali two years ago, three innovative characteristics were already agreed: automatic funding through a 2% levy on CDM projects, majority developing country representation on the Board, and the mandate to provide direct access to funds.

The Board has recently added two other innovative features: a strategic priority directing Parties to give special attention to the most vulnerable communities when submitting proposals, and transparency in decision making (including live webcast of all meetings and the future possibility for public comment on submitted proposals).

The Board will soon approve the first projects. But resource limitations at present continue to make it difficult to adequately respond to programme-based needs.

But given the Board's important advances, *ECO* is concerned the AF is getting little notice in the post-2012 financial architecture negotiations. Yes, it is a Kyoto Protocol instrument, but the lessons learned for developing appropriate institutional architecture and delivering fast-track action can be applied everywhere.

What *ECO* finds particularly worthwhile is the convergence between features and functions of the AF and the various proposals

– continued back page, column 1

## Viable climate is a human right

The sixty-first anniversary of the Human Rights Day was celebrated yesterday across the world. It was especially relevant to the negotiations in Copenhagen as the realisation of all human rights depends on a viable climate. Climate change threatens livelihood, health, access to water and survival. Hence, the Copenhagen outcome must especially acknowledge and protect human rights.

*ECO* applauds delegates for the most recent Shared Vision text acknowledging that climate change has implications for a range of human rights. However, this good start misses some crucial elements. Shared vision must require mitigation and adaptation activities to be undertaken in a manner that respects, protects and promotes human rights. Vulnerability based on poverty, gender, age, indigenous or minority status and disability should be added to the text acknowledging geographic vulnerability. And more than “seeking” stakeholder participation, shared vision must guarantee access to information, effective participation and access to justice.

*– Adaptation fund board, from front page –* put forward for a new financial mechanism. The joint proposal by the UK, Mexico, Norway and Australia calls for direct access where fiduciary standards allow it with certain safeguards. The US submission proposes to let projects and programmes be administered by domestic institutions, while also calling for strong fiduciary standards. This resembles the AF direct access approach, where National Implementing Entities can be accredited if they meet certain fiduciary standards and are the direct recipients of AF resources.

The proposals however vary on governance structure. But as the Board model shows, a slight majority does not permit developing countries to rule by fiat. In practice, the Board is achieving consensus based on in-depth discussions of complex matters.

Another key issue is the generation of resources. The AF can receive funds

*“And that is why helping farmers feed their own people — or nations educate their children and care for the sick — is not mere charity. It is also why the world must come together to confront climate change. There is little scientific dispute that if we do nothing, we will face more drought, famine and mass displacement that will fuel more conflict for decades. For this reason, it is not merely scientists and activists who call for swift and forceful action — it is military leaders in my country and others who understand that our common security hangs in the balance.”*

Excerpt of US President Obama’s Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech, delivered yesterday in Oslo, Norway

Climate justice for the poorest and most vulnerable requires integrating human rights into all aspects of the agreement, not just the shared vision. The mitigation and adaptation texts must reiterate Parties’ existing human rights obligations. Adaptation text must recognise the fundamental human rights of internally or internationally displaced people.

In addition, the text on spillover effects must ensure that human rights guide efforts to identify and prevent such harm. Finally, the agreement must require mechanisms for the consideration of communications on behalf of individuals, local communities or indigenous peoples harmed by implementation of the Convention.

While *ECO* appreciates that delegates have refrained from exercising the right to “reasonable limitation of working hours” guaranteed in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, out of a service commitment to the global community, you must work harder to protect human rights. Today is the perfect time to start.

from multiple sources, whether from a Kyoto mechanism or not. For example, if Parties chose a levy (e.g., for aviation and maritime transport) or to provide mandatory contributions to address historical responsibility for climate change, the AF could receive the resources.

*ECO* suggests again that the AF be scaled up through substantial additional financial resources in conjunction with the second commitment period of Kyoto Protocol and a legally binding agreement under the Convention, possibly as an operating entity under a reformed financial mechanism. The AF can play a role in both, although this may require political decisions and legal adjustments. *ECO* strongly cautions against drying up the AF if the CDM generates too little resources or is phased out. There have already been too many casualties from climate change.

## Crafty Canada

Canada’s government must be working overtime chatting up reporters here in Copenhagen. The news they’re so eager to spread is that, according to Yvo de Boer, Canada has been “negotiating very constructively” this week.

The Canadian delegation is obviously as surprised as we are that anyone has good things to say about Canada, the home of one of the weakest mid-term emission targets in the industrialised world.

It cannot be Canada’s record on Kyoto compliance that impressed the UNFCCC’s chief official. (In case anyone has forgotten: Canada’s emissions are now a solid 34% above that pesky Kyoto target.) The lack of financing pledge probably hasn’t won Canada any new friends either.

We also doubt de Boer was impressed by Canada’s decision to show up in Copenhagen without a serious plan for domestic emissions reductions. (Note to Canada: “waiting for the US” is not actually a plan. Nor is “massively expanding the tar sands.”)

But maybe the Executive Secretary was just anticipating even worse behaviour with the arrival of Canadian Environment Minister Jim Prentice this weekend. That would be the environment minister who recently vowed not to “be a Boy Scout” at the negotiating table, and swore not to “panic” when faced with the “hype and drama” of Copenhagen. In other words, the world better get used to Canada being the laggard.

This is the same Minister who dismissed a reduction target of 25% below 1990 levels for 2020 in Canada as “divisive” and “irresponsible” — even though a study has shown that Canada could meet this target while growing its economy by over 20% and creating nearly two million net new jobs.

If this is what constructive looks like, we’d hate to see destructive.

*– We have done the math, from front page –* countries arrive only at a dismal -2% to +4% change in emissions on 1990 levels.

And Project Catalyst’s analysis of key developed countries puts only the EU’s high-end pledge into the -25-40% range. Japan, the US, Russia and Australia all fall short, with Canada potentially heading for increased emissions. At the lower end of the pledges by countries analysed not a single one made the grade.

When you do the math, it seems that developed countries are the ones getting the free pass.