

eco



ECO has been published by Non-Governmental Environmental Groups at major international conferences since the Stockholm Environment Conference in 1972. ECO is produced co-operatively by the Climate Action Network at the UNFCCC meetings in Cancun in November-December 2010. ECO email: eco@sunlightdata.com – ECO website: <http://climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters> – Editorial/Production: Fred Heutte

Vulnerability is Not a Beauty Contest

In recent UNFCCC sessions some developing countries that are not small island states, LDCs or African countries have challenged the Bali Action Plan language specifying those three groups of countries as being particularly vulnerable. This has led to an unhelpful contest within the Group of 77 and China. ECO believes that with increasing impacts of climate change around the world, such as the devastating floods in Pakistan earlier this year, it is undeniable that all countries are now vulnerable, even developed countries.

However, in the context of the UNFCCC process it is not helpful to compete on which country is more vulnerable than another. Instead, the focus should be more explicit and open about the main issue which is how to allocate the currently very limited adaptation funds across different countries, with a view to the urgency of their situations.

ECO urges Parties to discuss the possible elements of an adaptation resource allocation framework that takes the impacts of increased climate vulnerability into account along with other relevant attributes such as poverty and gender.

We believe that this discussion needs to be held primarily among the developing countries and a smaller group should be mandated to work further on this issue. This group should include representatives from LDCs, SIDS and African countries, as well as others. Such a representative body already exists in the Adaptation Fund Board with its 32 members including representatives from all UN country groupings.

We suggest that parties could mandate the

AFB itself to address this issue by providing options by COP17 next year. The AFB, which meets in Cancun immediately after COP 16, can in turn solicit expert advice and report back to the COP next year with its recommendations. Alternatively, the LCA could allocate more time over this coming year to develop thinking on these issues than has been possible thus far, taking into account the knowledge and experience of the AFB. Furthermore, ECO encourages BASIC countries and others to come forward and voice their support for prioritisation of funding to the most vulnerable countries, such as LDCs, SIDS and African countries – indeed, the definition in the Bali Action Plan.

CAN-Europe Side Event EU climate financing: NGO analysis and recommendations

- *Has the EU kept its FSF promises?*
- *What did you think of the EU's presentation of its fast start finance report yesterday?*
- *Is the EU living up to its commitments? How can it do better?*

CAN-Europe warmly invites you to a discussion with high level speakers from the EU and two developing countries, and a presentation of NGO recommendations for further improvement.

**Room Monarca, Cancun Messe
Wednesday 2 December
16.45-18.15**

LULUCF: Moment of Decision

The future of Annex I forests and their role in climate change mitigation is about to be decided here in Cancun.

ECO has long highlighted how inappropriate and possibly fraudulent LULUCF accounting rules could be used by Annex I Parties to avoid accounting for their forestry emissions. This week a group of NGOs assessed the scale of these impacts, in particular, the magnitude of proposed forest management baselines relative to the ambition of Parties' pledges. Astonishingly, the emission reduction efforts of some Parties could be reduced by up to 66% as a consequence of unaccounted emissions from logging their forests.

There is still more than one proposal on the table, and it is clear that the impact of forest management accounting on countries' pledges will differ depending on the approach agreed upon.

A review process was proposed by developing countries earlier this year to evaluate the robustness of favoured baseline proposals by Annex I countries. The new KP Chair's text calls on Parties to provide the required information by February 2011 and for expert reviewers to conclude their review by May.

But let's be clear. The impact of the proposed reference levels is unacceptable and a review won't fix that. However, broadening the review to include an objective analysis of all accounting options could help Parties make an informed decision about which approach should be used in the second commit-

– LULUCF, continued on page 2

High Time for Bold Moves on Legal Form

Today, Parties are expected to consider the numerous proposals for a new legally binding instrument under the Convention as well as proposed amendments to the Kyoto Protocol in the COP and CMP Plenaries, respectively.

ECO remembers that last year this discussion caused quite a fuss. In the end, the consideration of legal form was relegated to informal consultations on the basis that Parties had not had sufficient time to consider proposals and . . . well, we all know how Copenhagen ended.

Now Parties have had a full year to consider the proposals that have been tabled – a year when the impacts of climate change over and over again made themselves apparent with Pakistani floods, Russian forest fires, Chinese landslides, and Caribbean islands inundated by hurricanes.

It's high time to get serious about climate change action and discuss these proposals in an open and transparent manner.

Parties should establish a Contact Group to do so rather than putting the issue to bed again (as they did in Copenhagen) by referring it to informal consultations.

While ECO is painfully aware that Parties will not be concluding a fair, ambitious and legally binding deal to save the planet here in Cancun, it's time to reaffirm that this is what we are aiming for.

Moving toward deciding on the legal form is possible, necessary and will enable more effective negotiations in the lead up to South Africa.

Last year, ECO headlined Tuvalu's insistence on a legal form Contact Group as 'A Bold Move in Darker Times'.

We would really love to have a headline here in Cancun saying, 'A Bold Move By All Parties in Sunnier Times'.

And delegates, if you're up for it, you can make the first bold move forward right here, right now.

– *LULUCF, continued from page 1*

ment period. To do this, Parties would need to provide information about each of the potential options on the table and how it will impact their pledges.

This analysis is urgently required for a meaningful discussion on numbers. That will achieve two crucial things: the discussion of 'numbers' will go forward with consideration of all potential options, and decisions will be made based on the likely real impacts on the climate.

Japan: No to Kyoto Under Any Circumstances

When leadership was needed most, the home country of the Kyoto Protocol made a destructive statement in the KP plenary. It rejected a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol by saying 'Japan will not inscribe its target under the KP on any conditions or under any circumstances'.

'Preferring' a single-treaty approach is one thing, but aggressively denying the future of Kyoto is quite another. The statement upset many Parties and created an unconstructive atmosphere.

This COP was supposed to be the place to rebuild trust among parties, but Japan's move not only could degrade trust but even potentially wreck the negotiations.

At a time when the world is seeking to strengthen the climate regime, Japan's hard stance, in the guise of getting the US and China to make mitigation commitments, risks leaving us with no deal at all.

A large majority of Parties have said they want a legally binding outcome. It's time they hold firm to the legally binding treaty that was so hard-won in those late nights in Kyoto. Japan should honour the basic framework that all countries agreed in Bali, which is for developed country Parties to continue their mitigation obligations under the KP, for a legally binding agreement under the LCA track to include comparable efforts for the US, and for the developing countries to undertake nationally appropriate mitigation actions that are supported by finance, technology and capacity building.

Does Japan really want to be known for the burial of the Protocol that was born in one of its beautiful cities?

| Party | Emission Reduction Pledge % 2020 | Unaccounted Logging Emissions % |
|-------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| New Zealand | -10 to -20 | +66.0 |
| Norway | -30 to -40 | +8.7 |
| Russian Fed | -15 to -25 | +5.5 |
| Australia | -5 to -15 | +4.0 |
| Japan | -25 | +3.6 |
| EU | -20 to -30 | +2.7 |
| Switzerland | -20 to -30 | +2.4 |
| Canada | -17 | +1.4 |

Notes: Figures are percentages of country-specific base years. Pledged emission reductions for 2020 (rel 1990) from FCCC/KP/AWG/2010/INF.2/Rev.1. Unaccounted logging emissions equals the difference between Party's proposed reference levels and average of historical net emissions. The estimate of average historical net emissions from Annex I forest management calculated using data from 1990-2008 (forest land remaining forest land) from Parties' 2010 inventory submissions. Any adjustments were made on consultation with Parties and technical experts. Japan has not yet indicated whether its pledges include accounting for forest management.

Cancun Personals

ANNEX 1 COUNTRY SEEKING TREATY FOR NO-STRINGS ATTACHED HOLIDAY ROMANCE IN MEXICO.

Currently struggling with a 13-year relationship, just looking for a good time in the Cancun sun.

Likes: excellent food, movies, comic books, robots and big industry.
Dislikes: commitment, cooperation, compliance, science and targets.

If interested please email:
scared_of_commitment@awg.kp

Fossil of the Day

#1 - Japan

For announcing it will not inscribe its target in a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol under any conditions or circumstances.