

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 AWG-KP and AWG-LCA in Accra in August 2008. ECO website: <http://www.climatetwork.org/eco>

The Saudi REDD policy: Make the polluters pay!

Can we believe our ears? Did we really hear such positive things at the REDD Workshop on Friday? Was that really Saudi Arabia saying that REDD has two benefits -- reducing emissions and maintaining a key carbon sink – and suggesting that it be funded by a levy on logging and timber industries, which are among of the causes of deforestation emissions?

Of course, the Saudi delegation didn't go as far as to extend the "polluter pays" principle to the oil industry as well, but their statement was happily just one of many surprisingly positive developments in Friday's REDD workshop. In fact, by the time CAN International offered its intervention at the end of the workshop, we found ourselves already in agreement with the statements that had been made by many Parties. Phrases like "REDD must be in addition to deep Annex I cuts" and "respect for the rights of indigenous peoples" could be heard echoing among many of the Parties.

ECO was pleased with the specificity of the presentations, and would like to applaud the Parties' broad participation in the workshop. There was real back-and-forth discussion, with questions that contributed clarification, not just rhetoric. As noted by the chair, there were genuine commonalities among proposals that may well form the basis of a consensus.

The day began with the G-77 and China breaking a logjam by agreeing to support the inclusion of the whole range of forest activities proposed by their various members: conservation and stabilization of large existing forests, reducing deforestation emissions, sustainable forest management, enhancing carbon stocks, and afforestation /reforestation. These had previously been seen as competing alternatives within G-77 and China, but now a new atmosphere of mutual support has emerged.

In the same vein, the questions of methodology (with the conspicuous ex-

ception of forest degradation) are now agreed to be resolvable, although not yet resolved. The traditional "market versus fund" debate has become more nuanced with the emergence of new funding approaches, such as those variously called "market-linked," "non-offset market", or "blended".

The U.S. had little to say, as usual. Norway, on the other hand, got a big round of well-deserved applause for its Bali commitment of \$ 2.6 billion for REDD over the next five years.

However, while the pieces of the puzzle have been identified – the forest activities to be supported and the funding alternatives to support them- there is, as yet, no agreement on how to fit the puzzle together. That's the next, very big, step that delegates have to take. Although the Chair announced that there will be no more official REDD meetings here in Accra, ECO urges Parties to continue the discussion amongst themselves, and with civil society – particularly forest dependent peoples.

Sectoral Intercourse

A little ray of sunlight may have peeked through the clouds during the opening day of the LCA workshop on sectoral approaches. Presentations on Wednesday focused mainly on how sectoral approaches can be used to elaborate mitigation actions by developing countries under the Bali Action Plan. Both developed and developing countries began to enumerate the same

ideas in the same language.

Wednesday's productive conversation was helped by clearer presentations than parties have made before. The EU tabled initial proposals to focus on key industrial heavily-emitting sectors in developing countries, and to use a combination of carbon markets and technology and financial assistance to support developing country actions. South Korea offered a similar ap-

proach. And Japan has dropped two unproductive ideas replacing national targets for Annex I countries with sectoral goals, and imposing uniform sectoral targets worldwide. (ECO reminds parties that Annex I targets must be science-driven, not limited to bottom-up assessments of what is "feasible.") What remains of the Japanese proposal on (cont'd on page 2)

Good Role Models: South Korea Joins South Africa to Lead Emerging Economies in Action on Climate Change

In a breath of fresh air, South Korea joined South Africa Friday in leading emerging economies in action on climate change. South Korea's Climate Change Ambassador Rae-Kwon Chung announced that next year South Korea will come forward with its own emissions reduction target through 2020. South Korea and South Africa deserve praise for demonstrating that non-Annex I countries can take on meaningful mitigation measures to help avert dangerous climate change consistent with their common but differentiated responsibilities. We are still waiting for similar indications of commitment from many Annex I Parties.

(SECTORS cont'd from page 1) developing countries bore substantial resemblance to the EU's and South Korea's. The three proposals differ in emphasis on the carbon markets versus other forms of technological and financial assistance.

China opened the door to further discussing these kinds of sectoral approaches for its heavy industry sectors, with strong emphasis on the need for technology transfer and financial assistance to help carry out domestic emission reduction policies. India, though emphasizing the potential complexity of sectoral approaches, left that door open. Algeria and others kept a sharp focus on the key questions who will pay and who will provide technology, and by what means.

Some rays of sunshine were evident Thursday as well, including South Korea's announcement that it will unveil a national target next year.

All in all, a good basis for real engagement between developed and developing countries on key elements of the Copenhagen package.

But the clouds started closing in as Thursday's discussion proceeded. Negotiators reverted to old habits of legalism and proceduralism, offering fine distinctions about what parts of the sectoral discussion may take place in the AWG LCA versus the AWG KP. Even in these darker speeches, however, countries were careful to leave room to continue the constructive sectoral approaches conversation started the day before.

ECO reminds negotiators of the need to focus on the big picture; what must emerge from the two AWGs by Copenhagen is a package agreement that will avoid dangerous climate change. The longer some parties persist in drawing insurmountable walls between the two processes, the harder it will be to build that package. Necessarily, the two processes overlap and intertwine, and that's where the deal is to be found. Let's get on with it and let the sun come out.

Japan's Bottom-Up Bottoms Out At Three Percent

As noted in the related article, Japan, in the AWG-LCA workshop, indicated that the bottom-up sectoral approach would not replace national emission reduction targets for developed countries. However, at its side event on the same issue, Japan insisted that the bottom-up sectoral approach "is useful in setting ambitious and feasible national reduction targets for developed countries." Yet, by Japan's own calculations, applying a sectoral

approach in the energy-related sector would achieve a reduction in CO2 emissions by 2020 of only three percent from 1990 levels (13 percent from 2005), far off from its Kyoto target.

ECO reminds the Parties that an ambitious emissions reduction target in 2020 must be in the range of 25 of 40 percent below 1990 levels. Clearly, the sectoral bottom-up approach is not helpful in this regard. Moreover,

there are several studies concluding that Japan has significant reduction potentials. If the Parties' views on the sectoral approach are going to continue to develop and merge, further clarification by Japan is needed. The first thing Japan should do is to announce ambitious science-based targets. That is the right way to address the principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities."