It’s a Matter of Principle

At the time of writing, the stage seems set for another marathon session into the wee hours. There is no real point to go into the cut and thrust of the negotiations at present (of those few details which we can find out), since they will undoubtedly be completely out of date by the time delegates turn up at La Rural in the morning.

The small group of countries huddled with Ambassador Estrada, selected through some evolving, mysterious and utterly opaque process, has reconvened. It is set to conclude by midnight, but nobody believes in that deadline any more. The process in this COP has been strange, to say the least.

It is heartening to see the new-found resolve of the EU and other OECD countries, the African group, AOSIS, the LDC group, and an increasing number of large G77&China countries willing to pitch in and prevent the US, the Saudis and their fossil fuel industry pals from taking over this COP. The stakes in the details of the negotiated text are not that high, but there are principles at stake. Vital principles.

There is the moral, political and legal obligation on all Parties to move forward towards fulfilling the objectives of the Convention under Article 2, in accordance with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, and the principle of equity.

This means starting the process of building on the basis of the Kyoto Protocol to broaden and deepen the mitigation regime. This is not a “code” for binding emissions obligations for developing country Parties, as the US has been suggesting. It is a straightforward means for saying that OECD countries need to discuss deeper emissions targets for the second and subsequent commitment periods. It is a straightforward way of saying that urgent means must be found to assist large Southern emitters to get their economies on a decarbonisation track while strengthening their ability to meet their legitimate development goals. There is no doubt that it must be done, and equally no doubt that it must be done fairly.

It also means fulfilling the obligation of all the Parties to move forward as swiftly as possible to build an adaptation framework which meets the needs of AOSIS and the LDC group.

This is not charity but a legal obligation of all countries that have ratified the Convention, as well as a moral and political obligation to those most vulnerable to the rapidly increasing impacts of climate change.

It is unfortunate that it has taken almost two weeks to get down to the basics of why we are all here. Nevertheless, ECO encourages all Parties who have the interests of their people and future generations at heart to press on and push forward to get SOME progress on both adaptation and mitigation here. It’s a matter of principle.

Stop Press: The US and Saudi Arabia are sabotaging chances of reaching an agreement on an adaptation package, and obstructing any meaningful discussion in the context of the Seminars by attempting to block talks on a future framework.

If these efforts are successful, developing countries most vulnerable to climate change will be further marginalised.

Ministers Stress Need to Reduce Emissions

The Ministerial Roundtable on the UNFCCC’s achievements was a sobering exercise with regard to the large countries participating in the event.

Needless to say, the US speech was full of bad rhetoric. Only Japan reminded us that “global emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG) must begin a downward trend in the near future if we are to realise the ultimate objective of the UNFCCC.” China and India as a key message complained about the lack of Kyoto Protocol ratification by the US, “responsible for 40 percent of OECD climate emissions,” thereby reducing the effectiveness of the Protocol and climate protection generally, as emissions of Kyoto Parties are “on an upward path.”

Forward looking China acknowledged that sustainable development and poverty eradication policies must be “compatible with environmental protection” such as climate policies. It also reiterated its recent major efforts to overcome dirty coal usage by linking clean air requirements with energy efficiency and renewable energy.

The Dutch Minister on behalf of the EU said stepping over the EU’s suggested threshold of 2°C will “result in almost irreversible damage.”

This was a prelude to the very heartening intervention of Kiribati. On behalf of AOSIS, they reminded that the world needs to see future significant reductions by all Parties, if the sheer survival of small island nations and their people are to be guaranteed. They called
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 Invite You To A “Post 2012 Discussion/Coffee Morning”

When: Sometime in 2005 (not to be confirmed)
Where: An Exxon Mobil petrol station somewhere in Nebraska (not to be notified nearer the time)

AGENDA
9.00am: Coffee
9.30am: More coffee
10.00am: Chit-chat (NOT about the weather)
11.00am: Keynote address by Don Pearlman: “Buying Governments: Hiding the Money Trail”
Useful and timely advice on the top 10 governments for sale and how to get the best value for your oil dollars whilst appearing to keep your hands clean
11.30am: Coffee
11.45am: Breakout groups
Group 1 (In the Tiger on the Run Shop): Should we pay mega-rich oil producing countries to stop producing oil?
Group 2 (In the Car Wash, or phone booth if wet): Is the coffee any good or should we move the meeting to Starbucks?
Group 3 (In the Manager’s Office): Should the USA be allowed to pollute freely with no consequences?
12.00pm: Feedback to plenary from Group 2
12.05pm: Plenary discussion about the coffee thing (conclusions of Groups 1 and 3 will be “Yes, of course” and “Yes because Exxon-Mobil says so” respectively, so no further discussion on these points will be necessary).
12.15pm: ENDS

Due to the sensitive nature of the agenda items, Parties who succeed in guessing the date and finding the venue will be required to sign an agreement pledging not to discuss or reveal the contents or conclusions of the meeting to any other UN fora, the media, friends, family or the man who runs the corner shop. Parties judged to be out of compliance will be required to forfeit their firstborn children (with the exception of the conclusions of Groups 1 and 3 which may be publicly agreed with but not criticised).

Cash-for-Disinformation Campaign at COP10?

ECO is informed that a number of “experts” and “journalists” whose institutions are affiliated with Exxon-Mobil’s cash-for-disinformation campaign are present at COP10. Thus, it may not be a coincidence that COP10 has witnessed an unprecedented number of acts of sabotage in the form of fake publications (including ECO), defaced posters, and attacks on NGO activities and representatives.

Last Tuesday, some delegates may have been baffled by a fake “ECO” circulated at the convention hall. ECO, which regards this copycat act as a sign of its effectiveness, is appalled to note the futile efforts of those who react to intelligent discourse with such pranks. Surely, anyone who wishes to make a point should have the courage to, at the very least, be open, transparent and accountable.
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– Ministers Stress, from front page –
on the US to “take actions to reduce emissions, not just the growth of emissions.”
German Minister Trittin reendorsed the indispensable advantage of multilateral agreements over bilateral lobbying by the US. He reiterated the scientific evidence that in order “to stay below 2°C, the world must reduce emissions by 50 percent by 2050.” He added that Germany is committed to reduce its GHG emissions “by 40 percent by 2020 below 1990 levels if the EU accepts a 30 percent GHG reduction target.” He then strongly took on the US saying “no one can justify this high per capita emission.”
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