

ECEN Working Group on Climate Change

Report of COP 15, 7-19 December 2009, Copenhagen, Denmark

Marijke van Duin, facilitator ECEN WG on Climate Change, Amsterdam, NL

1. General – Outcome - Analysis

COP 15 was a long awaited and intensely prepared conference. It was supposed to deliver a binding agreement for international climate policy for the post-2012 period, as a follow up and/or adapted continuation of the Kyoto Protocol. The preparatory conferences however gradually took away hope that such a deal could be reached. Instead, the focus shifted to reaching a political agreement, as a first step towards a legally binding treaty. In the end, neither of these outcomes has become reality. The so-called Copenhagen Accord, presented as THE outcome of COP 15, is in fact a text put together by some 28 states, as the result of stressful negotiations led by US President Barack Obama.

The Copenhagen Accord is open for subscription by states until 31 January 2010. Those who subscribe are supposed to register their voluntary goals for emission reduction. Industrialised countries agreed to provide USD 30 billion over the period 2010-2012, as ‘fast start funding’ for adaptation, emissions reductions, research and capacity building in developing countries, including prevention of deforestation. This amount will mount to USD 100 bn per annum by 2020. A new fund, the Copenhagen Green Climate Fund would have to channel these funds. Only (developing) states that sign up to the Accord can share in the funds.

The official outcome of COP 15 is that the COP takes note of the Copenhagen Accord, and decides to continue its negotiations in future meetings as outstanding issues have not reached agreement. Future meetings include SB 31 May-11 June 2010 in Bonn, and COP 16, 29 Nov - 10 Dec 2010 in Mexico. (In 2011 COP 17 will be in South Africa).

However, given the fact that the promised funds are only available to subscribers of the Copenhagen Accord, and given the fact that the text of the Accord mentions many issues that are also in the two official UN-track texts still under negotiation (KP and LCA), the Accord is a potential threat to the current UN negotiations on climate change. Therefore it is to be hoped that the UNFCCC Secretariat will manage to streamline the Copenhagen Accord back into the official UN process in the course of 2010.

In the mean time the UNFCCC Secretariat has declared that the deadline for subscription to the Copenhagen Accord will not be as stringent as previously said.

The way the Copenhagen Accord was put together caused a lot of frustration and anger. No wonder: for the first time in history some 120 Heads of State gathered to talk about climate change - but they did so just for 24 hours. That is of course far from enough to deliver a text as a result of a transparent, democratic process.

The almost two weeks of conferencing leading up to the historic get-together by Heads of State were marked by chaos and emotions shifting from hope to despair and vice versa. In the second week of the conference, with many ministers arriving, a severe deadlock became apparent due to the Chinese and American positions. China being unwilling to put its emission reductions under international scrutiny, the USA was unwilling to commit to any emission reduction. Given this situation and the fact that 50% of the world's CO₂ emissions come from these nations, their leaders faced huge expectations in order to save COP 15. In fact Obama immediately turned to the Chinese upon arrival, and gave a clear warning in his speech to the Plenary.

That Friday 18 December all negotiations took place behind closed doors. Only later it became clear that the USA and China, after finding some common ground (compromising on domestic MRV for China), had called in other nation(s) (blocks) to their deliberations, notably India, Brazil and South Africa, and later on EU president Sweden, some large EU members states as well as several developing nations. Many press conferences were cancelled that day, no-one really knew what was going on as

closed deliberations went on and several drafts of the 'Copenhagen Accord' were floating around. The Closing Plenary was postponed and adjourned for several times, while the hall was filled with tired delegates not knowing what was going on (there are 192 Parties...). Finally, at 3.30 a.m. on Saturday 19 December, the Closing Plenary re-opened with Chair Rasmussen presenting the Copenhagen Accord and asking the delegations to adopt it after a reading break of 60 minutes. Many delegates were furious, with Tuvalu stating its future was not 'for sale', Venezuela and Cuba pointing out that they refused to abandon the democratic, transparent UN process to go along with a text they had not been a part of, etc. The Chair was clearly overwhelmed by such anger and adjourned the Plenary again. Later on at a press conference it became clear that during the following hours UN SG Ban Ki Moon had to use all his diplomatic skills to avoid a total melt-down of the conference. He convinced several states not to totally boycott the Copenhagen Accord. At 10.30 a.m. the Closing Plenary continued, and as a compromise the COP agreed to 'take note' of the Copenhagen Accord. At the same time it decided to continue its own official two-track negotiations. But many delegates immediately wondered what the status of the Copenhagen Accord was vis-à-vis the official UN texts; whether the UNFCCC secretariat should or should not deal with the practical and logistical outcomes of the Copenhagen Accord etc. So there was much confusion. During the Closing Plenary some countries and country-blocks stated their support for the Copenhagen Accord, a.o. the African Union and the European Union. But at the same time China, notably involved in the making of the Accord, left the door open to not associate with it. And later on I learned that many African countries wondered what to do - the Accord already created a split within the African community, in spite of the endorsement of the African Union. (Of course their dilemma is whether to subscribe the Accord abandoning the democratic UN process in order to get access to the promised money, or to stay true to the slow but democratic process and perhaps miss the 'financial boat').

In retrospect, the acts of president Obama seemed to be inspired by the situation 'back home'. At the time of COP 15 the US House of Representatives had already adopted a climate bill, but the Senate had (has) not. Perhaps in order to convince the Senate, Obama wanted to make a point in Copenhagen. Getting China on board is indeed a prerequisite for any climate policy the US Senate may want to consider. And at a press conference during COP 15 Senator Kerry (D) said the Senate will pass the climate bill in 2010.

Unfortunately right now the outlook is not very positive, as the long-term Democratic Senate seat in Massachusetts was recently lost to a Republican, thus destroying the necessary Democratic majority in the Senate. Also the recent weapon transaction between the USA and Taiwan could have a negative impact on USA-China relations and affect their early climate cooperation.

The European position has been rather weak throughout COP 15. Already beforehand its bid was made: 20% reduction by 2020 with an option to 30% if there would be broad international commitment. The EU played only a secondary role in the negotiations for the Copenhagen Accord. But behind closed doors a fierce battle was (and is) going on between EU, USA, Japan and other industrialised countries about the partition of the pledged adaptation funds (30 bn \$ until 2012 up to 100 bn \$ in 2020). As far as I know decisions on this matter have not yet been taken. Interestingly enough EU mentioned these amounts in euros, and has tried to keep it that way throughout much of the second week. But under pressure of the USA it went back to US dollars.

In the mean time the EU has formalised its support for the Copenhagen Accord, see press release below.

2. Copenhagen – Bella Centre - KlimaForum - Demonstrations

COP 15 was unprecedented in terms of high level participation, numbers of participants and security measures. The city of Copenhagen saw daily demonstrations, a growing number of police and armed police forces, helicopters in the air etc. In all the atmosphere was pretty grim. We heard and read that numerous protesters were arrested, even hundreds of them on 12 December, the day of the large demonstration (see below). On other days protesters tried to rally the Bella Centre, the official conference centre. This led authorities to close down the metro stop at Bella Centre, thus forcing many conference participants to walk to the Centre through rain and snow.

The grim atmosphere worsened throughout the conference, also because the number of participants (over 45,000 accreditations) vastly surpassed the capacity of the Bella Centre (15,000). As a result there were long queues, sometimes standing as long as 8 hours(!) outside the centre in rain, snow and wind. Even worse was that as of Tuesday 15 December - the start of the high-level segment - NGO-access was restricted to only 20% of all accredited NGO-participants. Fortunately many of the WCC-delegates, including myself, could still get in. But this situation ended the final day, Friday 18 December, when only one of us could still enter the centre. This lucky person, the International Director of DanChurchAid Christian Friis Bach, delivered the WCC speech at the Plenary (see WCC report for text).

Needless to say there was a lot of frustration among NGOs, who issued a very angry joint letter to the UNFCCC-secretariat. Rumours had it this scenario had been pre-meditated by some leading Parties, in order to have an excuse to get rid of the NGOs the final day. In any case, it was a precedent for the UN to abandon its long-standing commitment to participatory transparency. It is to be hoped that in Mexico full NGO participation is ensured again.

Parallel to the COP there were other conferences going on. Near the city centre the Klima Forum was located, or "The Peoples' Summit", where many lectures, films, presentations etc. were held. Some interesting events I witnessed were:

1. Debate with Green leaders from four continents, among whom Wangari Maathai, Kenya, Christine Milne, Australia, José Bové, France, Elizabeth May, Canada and Marina Silva, Brazil. Bové: We need to change WTO rules, we need an international court under the UN for environmental issues, comparable to the International Criminal Court. The EP adopted a resolution on the recent FAO meeting, saying that no solution on local or international level can be found without adaption of the rules on agricultural subsidies (650 MEPs voted for). This is the beginning of a process on what people want and what farmers need, to be concluded in 2014. We need mobilisation to put pressure on EC and national governments. The European target of 10% biofuels in 2020 leads to massive deforestation for palm oil plantations, esp. in Indonesia. We need a very strong civil movement on peace and non-violence, basic democracy, ecology and social equity. The Greens will stand with such a civil movement. Hopefully the Global Green Charter will evolve in a global green movement.

At the same time the Green European parties have not yet reached consensus on 350 ppm., but they do agree on maximum 2C temperature rise...

2. Film by Oxfam 'Victims of CC' about 4 women in Uganda, Bangladesh, UK (London) and Brazil. The Ugandese woman lives in a poor rural village and tells how difficult it is to survive, as she has to go further and further to find some food; her situation is heartbreaking. The cause: disrupted weather patterns leading to drought. Disrupted weather patterns occur also in Brazil and Bangladesh and can lead there to extensive flooding. People do not know anymore when to sow or plant crops and are threatened in their livelihoods. The woman in London gave up a job as journalist and now teaches 6 and 7-years old about CC; she makes the educational material herself.

3. Film 'Meat the Truth' about the meat industry and its effects on climate change. Very interesting and confronting. The setting is similar as 'An Inconvenient Truth' with Dutch politician Marianne Thieme as presenter. According to the FAO livestock farming plus everything around it (such as transport), is responsible for 18 % of global GHG emissions. The message is: stop eating meat!

Centrally located in Copenhagen was also the nerve centre of numerous protesters. Especially the big protest march on Saturday 12 December was memorable. Estimates have it that up to 100,000 persons took part in this event. The march started at the Parliament Square, after several subgroups had gathered nearby. One of those subgroups was the Ecumenical group, which counted many hundreds of people and was one of the largest protesters' groups. The group contained church people of many countries, including participants of the COP itself, and carried very distinctive card boards, made thanks to the creativity and industry of the Danish ecumenical secretariat! Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams spoke to the group beforehand in a fiery manner, giving us all the energy to march the full 7 km to the Bella Centre. Luckily the weather was good that day!

3. Ecumenical participation

Ecumenical presence and participation at this COP was unprecedented in numbers as far as I know. There were over 300 registered participants, from WCC, Christian Aid, Dan Church Aid, Bred for All, Brot für die Welt, Fin Church Aid, Diakonia, EED, Norwegian Church Aid, Christian World Service, ECEN (Peter Pavlovic and myself), ACT, Indian partners of EED, Aprovech, Church of Sweden, ICCO, Oilwatch, Centre for Science and Environment India, Institute for Essential Services Reform. So mostly from developing agencies and their partners. It was very exciting to work together in such a large group and be so visible: many of these organisations had their own booth in the large exhibition area of the Bella Centre, and some organised or took part in a side event. Also the ecumenical campaign 'Countdown to Copenhagen' did not go unnoticed, with many young people handing out leaflets and wearing special T-shirts.

The Countdown to Copenhagen Campaign culminated in a special event on the morning of Sunday 13 December. Outside the City Hall, on a large podium, a programme was presented with young people from all over the world, telling their stories about how climate change affected their daily lives. Then on stage came the famous Archbishop-emeritus Desmond Tutu from South Africa with a strong speech, delivering the over 512,000 signatures from all over the world to UNFCCC secretary executive Yvo de Boer. The latter thanked the ecumenical movement for its support of the UNFCCC processes throughout the years. The event was completed by a blistering performance by a Danish pop group.

After the Countdown presentation on Sunday 13 December the ecumenical worship service took place in the city cathedral at 2 p.m., for many the most forceful and moving event of all. The service, attended by Danish Queen Margrethe II and many church VIPs, was broadcasted live on Danish television and Eurovision. With a very strong, simple and clear sermon by Archbishop Rowan Williams and great complementary lectures and beautiful (African) choir music, it was indeed a service to remember. The sermon focussed on 'fear', as the main obstacle for change. With his words Archbishop Williams urged all to embrace love rather than fear in dealing with climate change.

Immediately after the service, at 3 p.m. sharp, the church bells started to ring 350 times – the final round of the Countdown Campaign. Later on we heard that thousands of congregations and RC parishes all over the world, had joined in the bell ringing.

After the service an ecumenical VIP dinner took place – see for more information the WCC CC update nr. 49 (and COP 15 report).

On Monday morning 14 December the WCC had its side event, together with Caritas Internationalis. The event was very well attended. (For a report see the WCC report of COP 15).

Later on that day a joint ecumenical strategy meeting took place, in order to prepare for the High Level Segment. This meeting was attended by some 70 persons. In small groups several subjects were discussed, also with a view to future ecumenical witness and campaigning. Later on in the week there were a few smaller briefings, just for the WCC group.

On Tuesday 15 December church leaders at Copenhagen released a Message to the COP 15 negotiators 'Do not be afraid! Act now!'. And on Friday 18 December the statement by the WCC to the plenary of the High-Level Segment of COP 15 - "A sign of hope for the future for people of good will" was presented by Christiaan Friis Bach (see for texts the WCC report).

Also The Interfaith Declaration on Climate Change was endorsed by the WCC and available on the website <http://www.interfaithdeclaration.org/>

After COP 15 the Central Committee of CEC in responding to outcomes of the Summit invited CEC member churches, church communities at grassroots level and individual Christians "to continue the efforts which are already visible in many places in Europe in reducing our ecological footprint, limiting energy consumption and in our efforts for climate justice. God's creation needs to be protected, cultivated and sustained for future generations. In following this aim the CEC is committed to intensify its work in this area." The CEC statement can be found at:

[http://www.ceceurope.org/index.php?id=53&tx_ttnews\[tt_news\]=176&tx_ttnews\[backPid\]=17&cHash=4e6b65f353](http://www.ceceurope.org/index.php?id=53&tx_ttnews[tt_news]=176&tx_ttnews[backPid]=17&cHash=4e6b65f353)

4. Side events and press briefings

There were many very interesting state-of-the-art presentations and discussions by top institutions, NGOs, politicians and business people. A selection-in-short:

1. Countdown to Copenhagen side event with a.o. Naomi Klein. The main global debate is between two basic visions: 'business as usual' in which the past is the past and there is no space for thinking about history. This leads to pricing common goods such as forests and the atmosphere (EU/USA). The other basic principle is that of climate debt, which should lead to the earth's repair. A movement to collect repair payments has already started. This is a much fairer position for the global South, and is supported by the ecumenical movement.

Interesting in this respect is the position of Latin American presidents, esp. Chavez (Venezuela) and Morales (Bolivia). They blame capitalism for causing CC and state that the neo-liberal market based economy is not rational (e.g. think of vegetables imported from Indonesia to Kenya, which indeed happens as one WCC delegate informed us...).

2. Tearfund on building climate resilience for the most vulnerable. Tearfund focuses on the most vulnerable women and children. Apparently a big discussion is going on inside many agencies in how far the CC programme is actually 'normal aid'? But data show that CC really has a devastating effect on projects, esp. through weather anomalies. Again, weather patterns disrupt normal crop cycles and threaten livelihoods (see above).

3. WCC / Caritas Internationalis see WCC report.

4. The ICRI (International Coral Reef Initiative) presented the latest data: already 20% of global reefs are lost; their survival depends on mitigation of temperature rise. If GHG emissions go beyond 350 ppm, the outlook is grim. Corals are very important for food chains on which also humans depend. For coastal areas they form an important barrier protection from the sea. So SIDS face a double threat.

5. Inuit use their traditional expertise for CC research; they work together with modern high tech equipped researchers. Data show a big decline in the thickness of sea ice and the area covered with it. Also new meteorological expertise is combined with traditional weather forecasting – the latter getting more and more difficult. They did their own appeal to COP 15 to act now, via the Inuit Circumpolar Council. A warning: growing (eco..) tourism has a big impact on Inuit culture and the environment.

6. Bellona (Norway) – European Commission: research on ocean wave energy is underway. Some small installations already deliver to the grid, test sites are in Norway and Ireland. Other research focuses on salt-freshwater energy winning, notably Reversed Electro Dialysis (RED). Worldwide 75 companies and 12 research institutes from 7 EU Member States are involved. At the moment RED competes with wind energy, so is getting commercially interesting. There will be a pilot project in the Netherlands.

7. ESA (European Space Agency): ESA supports EU Member States in their CC programmes. States decide, ESA implements their CC programmes with now some 20 satellites. These programmes have been added in 1995 to the normal function of satellites, which is measurements for weather forecast. CC is not (yet?) first priority. Currently measurements include global CO₂ amounts in atmosphere and in oceans. The ESA CC Initiative is in cooperation with other space agencies, a.o. NASA. It will reprocess and calibrate its archive, and put the right analysis to the observation data on sea ice, sea level, surface temperatures, ocean colour, glaciers and ice caps, land cover, fire disturbances, cloud properties, ozone, aerosol properties and GHGs. The next 20 years there will be long term global systematic Earth Observations, so that scientific climate models and observations can be confronted. During the last 10,000 years humanity has lived in a situation where earth's temperature has not varied more than 1 degree C. Now projections are that the snow in the Alps will disappear around 2050. Sea ice volume (thickness) is measured from submarines. The data are very unsettling: the ice is rapidly melting from below. The ice cap is much more fragile than appears from above. Sea ice will disappear around 2050/60 in the summer. Sea level rise is already happening. Also temperature projections are up. Three years after temperature extremes occur in Europe the effects are measured in the vegetation. Eco systems are beginning to lose resilience. River flooding is increasing. In Spain aridification is apparent.

A new interactive project will start: 'Eye on Earth', in which the public can submit local data a.o. via

Google Earth.

8. Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP). This initiative is working with the corporate world and a number of governments to keep track of and register corporate GHG emissions. In 2003 only 235 companies took part; in 2009 more than 2500. There are 3 scopes: 1. the own burning of fossil fuels; 2. electricity bought by the company; 3. everything else, e.g. travel. The Project works ahead of and in anticipation of future regulation. Also TNCs are working with the Project; they aim for a global scheme (carbon market) rather than national regulations. The USA will need approx. 2 years to phase in a carbon market. The biggest challenge is capacity building for MRV in SMEs, esp. in developing countries.

9. CAN Europe analysis of proposed targets by Annex 1 Parties - loopholes

EU 30% reduction by 2020 unconditionally is sufficient; 20% is not. USA and Australia are not at all sufficient. Norway 30-40% reduction is sufficient; Russian Federation very inadequate. Negotiations include the contribution of the land-use sector, mainly forests, and the role of emissions trading. Here are big loopholes that can undermine reduction targets. Under the Kyoto Protocol, the land-use sector is not directly included in the emissions reduction targets of industrialized countries. Put simply: if a country's forest absorb more CO₂ from the atmosphere compared to historical levels, countries can account for this towards their emissions reduction targets, and this contribution is limited by a so-called cap on emissions "credits" from the forestry sector.

Currently in the negotiations, countries are proposing new "reference levels", against which sequestrations and emissions from the forest sector would be accounted for post-2012.

Almost universally, industrialized countries have proposed reference levels significantly lower than historical levels of sequestrations from the forest sector. As an example: the reference levels proposed by Sweden, Austria and Finland would allow emissions worth circa 20 percent of their total emissions in 1990 levels to go unaccounted for. This would overwhelm the environmental effect of their emissions reduction target, and represent an unfair advantage compared to some other countries. For the EU as a whole, this loophole could be as large as 15 percentage points of their currently proposed emissions reduction target. For industrialized countries, this loophole represents circa 5 percent of their emissions in 1990, or a very significant portion of their current proposed aggregate target of 13-19 percent below 1990 levels.

10. CEPS (Centre for European Policy Studies) on flexible mechanisms beyond 2012: CDM should balance environmental integrity, incentives and the strength of international institutions. The problem of overlap issues leading to offsetting, needs to be further discussed. From an investors perspective CDM is a powerful tool, but with conditions: it needs to be a global mechanism that allows global sectoral involvement. CDM can respond quickly to technical (r)evolution and can flourish in longer term markets. Development will take approx. 10 years.

JI (joint implementation) operates on a smaller scale with approx 200 projects under guidance of the JIAC = JI Advisory Committee. JI is most promising on the long term. Host country and recipient country have bilateral agreement; some will join Annex 1 in the future, so JI is a temporary option.

11. Inforce / WECEF on CDM: It should be more simple, more easily accessible e.g. via microcredit. Focus on household and community projects.

12. The Climate Group works with the Network of Regional Governments (subnational governments) on CC, building partnerships between developing regions and Annex 1 regions (e.g. Wales/UK – Mbali/Uganda), in collaboration with UNDP. The aim is to build constituencies amongst citizens in both areas. In Mbali this has resulted in growing awareness and pressure on politicians to set up a CC policy plan. See nrg4sd.org

13. European Youth Forum on intergenerational equity. Since COP 14 in Poznan youth have their own voice in the UNFCCC COPs. Survey in 124 countries shows that the majority of youth thinks the greatest global threat is CC (73%). 61% thinks solutions need to come from politicians. Also the majority thinks developed countries should clean up their own mess, before asking developing countries anything. 90% think that companies worldwide should take greater responsibility for CC. Youth are trying to build a global voice, a.o. via the UN. Suggested and already used tools: social media (networks etc.); infrastructure development; education online.

14. Climate Justice Fast by AYCC (Australian Youth Climate Coalition): since December 6 a group of young people has been fasting to put pressure on the negotiations. They take only water, some salt and vitamins B1. The young spokeswoman says she already lost over 25% of her body weight - more than

15 kg. She looks thin and pale and her voice is weak (it is the second week). She says CC can only stop by ending overconsumption, the use of fossil fuels and deforestation. The group will end their fast once the conference is over. Shocking.

15. European Commission on REDD: a new project started in the summer of 2009 with universities and research centres in 7 countries. The project sites are in Peru, Indonesia, Cameroon, Vietnam. REDD is complicated because it involves livelihoods, and situations differ from region to region. The project explores a framework of 'four eyes': incentives, identity, information, institutions. Identity = belonging, social networks, sense of community etc. REDD-benefits need to be 'translated' into something local people understand, such as water quality and quantity. Community-based forest management is needed. REDD needs to consider all land uses: AFOLU (agriculture, forestry, other land use) and measures need to be truly additional and resilient.

16. Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), 'REDD in the real world'. The international debate focuses on the global architecture of REDD. Some 40+ countries are developing national REDD strategies via World Bank a.o. The main question is: who owns the forest, and who pays? Challenges are high level commitment and MRV. A broad policy reform and simpler policies using global funds via carbon markets and incentives are needed, leading to 'PES': paying for environmental services. The presentation is followed by debate: should we indeed start pricing forests? What is next: tundras, mountains? It is dishonoring to the earth.

17. Also in another side event on REDD (of which I witnessed about 15 minutes), people from the Amazon and neighbouring countries cried out about what is happening to their forests. Indigenous peoples feel profoundly mistreated in this issue and hate the way the industrialised world is talking about their land and handles it – everything is only about money. And in a press conference on REDD it was clearly stated that the main problems for grassroot groups are 1) the rights of indigenous people are not guaranteed and 2) as long as plantations are considered forests, there is a real danger that centuries-old forests will be replaced by 40-years lasting plantations (e.g. for biofuels). The ordinary people, depending on the forests, are overpowered as governments will most likely sell out the rights of their indigenous peoples. (N.B. according to Ugandan law, everyone is indigenous...). Unfortunately many countries for which REDD can be attractive have bad governance and much corruption. This discussion touches upon the core debate: should we repair the earth's damage acknowledging our climate debt, or should we price everything and go on with BAU (business as usual)?

Web Resources

UNFCCC process

http://unfccc.int/meetings/cop_15/items/5257.php

Countdown to Copenhagen

<http://www.countdowntocopenhagen.org/>

Forum on Religion and Ecology

<http://fore.research.yale.edu/>

Interfaith Declaration

<http://www.interfaithdeclaration.org/>

Ethical discussion (secular)

<http://rockethics.psu.edu/>

<http://climateethics.org/>

<http://www.boell.de/>

<http://www.inecc.net/>

Climate Action

<http://www.climatenetwork.org/>

<http://www.climnet.org/>

Policy Analysis

www.climateanalytics.org
<http://www.germanwatch.org/>
<http://www.ceps.be/>

Research

<http://www.cifor.cgiar.org/>
<http://www.icriforum.org/>
<http://www.esa.int/esaCP/index.html>

Local Authorities / regional organisations

<http://www.iclei.org/>
<http://www.nrg4sd.org/>
<http://www.inuitcircumpolar.com/index.php?ID=1&Lang=En>

EU / OECD

http://ec.europa.eu/climateaction/index_en.htm
<http://www.oecd.org>

REDD

<http://www.foei.org/en/publications/pdfs/redd-myths-exec>
Accra Caucus Statement on REDD for COP 14
http://www.recoftc.org/site/fileadmin/docs/Themes/Climate_change/ACFCC_StatementCOP14.pdf
<http://www.redd-alert.eu>

Business Community/ Emission Trading

<http://www.bvek.de/>
<http://www.ieta.org/ieta/www/pages/index.php>
<http://www.ren-alliance.org/>
<http://www.bellona.org/>
<https://www.cdproject.net/en-US/Pages/HomePage.aspx>
<http://www.theclimategroup.org/>

Calendar

Dates and locations of UNFCCC meetings are posted on its website.

Glossary

AFOLU	agriculture, forestry, other land use (in REDD debate)
AR4	Fourth Assessment Report by IPCC
AWG-KP	Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol
AWG-LCA	Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention
CAN	Climate Action Network
CC	Climate Change
CEC	Conference of European Churches
CJI	Climate Justice Initiative
COP	Conference of the Parties (to the UNFCCC)
CSC	Church and Society Commission (of CEC)
EC	European Commission
ECEN	European Christian Environmental Network
EP	European Parliament

EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation (of the UN)
GDR	Greenhouse Development Rights
ICLEI	International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives
IFI	International Financial Institution
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
JI	Joint Implementation
JIAC	JI Advisory Committee
KP	Kyoto Protocol
LDCs	Least-Developed Countries
Med	Mediterranean
MEP	Member of European Parliament
MRV	Monitoring, Reporting and Verification
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
R&D	Research and Development
RE	Renewable Energy
RED	Reversed Electro Dialysis
REDD (+)	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation in Developing Countries
SB	Subsidiary Bodies (to the UNFCCC)
SG	Secretary General
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
TAR	Third Assessment Report by IPCC
TNC	Trans-National Corporation
TT	Technology Transfer
WB	World Bank
WCC	World Council of Churches
WECF	Women in Europe for a Common Future
WFO	World Food Organisation
WG	Working Group
UN	United Nations
UNDP	UN Development Programme
UNDESA	UN Department of Social and Economic Affairs
UNEP	UN Environment Programme
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change

Climate change: European Union notifies EU emission reduction targets following Copenhagen Accord

The European Union has today formalised its support for the Copenhagen Accord on climate change and presented its commitments for emission reduction targets. In a joint letter with the Spanish Presidency of the Council, the European Commission has formally notified the EU's willingness to be associated with the Accord and submitted for information the EU's established greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets for 2020. These consist of a unilateral commitment to reduce the EU's overall emissions by 20% of 1990 levels and a conditional offer to increase this cut to 30% provided that other major emitters agree to take on their fair share of a global reduction effort. Under the Accord, notifications are to be submitted by 31 January 2010.

Commission President José Manuel Barroso said: "The EU is determined to move ahead rapidly with implementing the Copenhagen Accord in order to make progress towards the agreement that we need to hold global warming below 2°C. The Accord provides a basis on which to build this future agreement and I therefore urge all countries to associate themselves with it and notify ambitious emission targets or actions for inclusion as we are doing."

European Environment Commissioner Stavros Dimas said: "Swift action is needed to make operational key elements of the Accord such as fast-start financing for developing countries, the fight against deforestation and the development and transfer of low carbon technologies."

Copenhagen Accord

The Copenhagen Accord was the main outcome of the UN climate change conference held in Copenhagen from 7 to 19 December 2009. The 2-1/2 page accord was negotiated on the final day of the conference by the leaders of some 28 developed and developing countries and the European Commission. These countries account for over 80% of global greenhouse gas emissions. The Conference then took note of the Copenhagen accord. The secretariat of the UN climate change convention invited Parties to declare by 31 January whether they wish to be associated with the Copenhagen Accord. The Accord sets the same date for developed countries to submit their emission reduction targets, and for developing countries to submit their emissions mitigation actions.

EU notification

In the letter from the Commission and the Presidency of the Council, the EU reconfirms its commitment to a negotiating process to achieve the strategic objective of limiting the increase in global average temperature to below 2°C above the pre-industrial level. The Copenhagen Accord recognises the scientific view that global warming should be kept below 2°C in order to prevent dangerous climate change, but it does not include any global emission reduction targets for respecting this limit.

The letter restates the EU's position that keeping below 2°C requires global emissions to peak by 2020 at the latest, to be reduced to at least 50% below 1990 levels by 2050 and to continue to decline thereafter. To this end, and in line with the findings of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), developed countries as a group should reduce their emissions by 25-40% below 1990 levels by 2020 and developing countries should achieve a substantial deviation below the currently predicted emissions growth rate, in the order of 15-30% by 2020, the letter continues.

It underlines the full commitment of the EU and the Member States to continue negotiations with a view to agreeing as soon as possible, within the UN framework, a legally binding international agreement for the period starting 1 January 2013, when the Kyoto Protocol's first commitment period expires.

EU emission targets

The letter states that the EU is committed to an independent economy-wide emissions reduction target of 20% by 2020, compared with 1990 levels, and that this cut could be increased to 30% under the conditions agreed by the European Council. These conditions are that, as part of a global and comprehensive agreement for the period beyond 2012, other developed countries commit themselves to comparable emission reductions and developing countries contribute adequately according to their responsibilities and respective capabilities.

Next steps

Heads of State and Government will assess the post-Copenhagen situation at the Informal European Council on 11 February.

The next round of UN negotiations will take place for two weeks in May-June.