Standing on the precipice demands for the Cancún climate negotiations

Foreword
This summary sets out Friends of the Earth’s demands for the climate talks in Cancún, Mexico. Tackling greenhouse gas emissions to prevent dangerous climate change is one of the most pressing challenges facing humanity. A peak in global emissions by 2013 and a steep decline thereafter are necessary for a reasonable chance to secure a safe climate for all.

Rich developed countries are responsible for three quarters of emissions historically despite representing only 15 per cent of the world’s population. They have a legal and moral duty to lead the fight against climate change and to support clean growth in developing countries as well as compensate them for harmful impacts.

Last year’s climate summit in Copenhagen did not deliver a just solution to climate change. Rather it entrenched the deep divisions between developed and developing countries, as developed countries failed to fulfill their existing obligations, and continue to promote dangerous and inequitable climate policies such as carbon offsetting. These barriers and lack of political ambition must be overcome in order to make progress in Cancún.

In addition to specific demands for the Cancún climate talks, Friends of the Earth demands that governments tackle the underlying drivers of climate change such as exploitative economic models, excessive consumption and fossil fuel subsidies. Cancelling the illegitimate debts of the developing world is also critical to the people now on the front line of climate impacts.

Demands to Governments
All countries must agree:
• Emissions cuts of at least 40 per cent by 2020 on 1990 levels – without offsetting – for all developed countries under the Kyoto Protocol’s second commitment period, as a starting point ahead of a bigger discussion about the equitable distribution of the remaining global carbon budget.
• Emissions cuts from the United States equivalent to the efforts of other developed countries.
• A new financial mechanism under the authority of the UNFCCC.
• Commitments to adequately fund developing-country adaptation and mitigation from developed-country public sources.

All countries must reject:
• The use of forests in carbon trading.
• Existing carbon offset schemes and the establishment of new carbon offsetting and trading mechanisms.
• Any role for the World Bank in controlling climate finance.
THE NEGOTIATIONS LEADING UP TO CANCÚN
At the Bali climate talks in 2007 all countries agreed to a two year process under two separate negotiating tracks – the Kyoto track and the Convention track. Negotiations under these two tracks were due to be finalized in Copenhagen in December 2009. The Copenhagen talks, however, produced only the controversial, non-binding Copenhagen Accord, championed by the United States.

- The Copenhagen Accord is a weak and ineffectual agreement and must not form the basis of any decisions in the Cancun talks.
- It fails to impose legally binding emissions reduction commitments on developed countries.
- Its voluntary pledge system would put the world on track for at least a 4 degrees temperature increase. It pledges a totally inadequate target of $100 billion a year for climate action with the majority of the finance to be delivered by the private sector, through carbon markets or the World Bank.

THE KYOTO TRACK
Friends of the Earth demands that setting adequate targets under the Kyoto track is the overriding priority in the international climate talks. The latest climate science shows these reductions must be at least 40 per cent by 2020 on 1990 levels – without offsetting – for any acceptable chance of avoiding catastrophic climate impacts.

The Kyoto track requires developed countries who are signatories to the UNFCCC’s Kyoto Protocol (excluding the United States) to agree their legally-binding post-2012 targets under a second commitment period.

Developed countries are reluctant to set themselves reduction targets consistent with what the science demands. Worse still, they are threatening to abandon their commitments under the Kyoto track, to appease the US desire to set only voluntary targets and drop the existing legally-binding penalty system. But the United States agreed in 2007, under the Convention track, to match the efforts of other developed countries. It is vital to hold the EU, Japan, Canada, Australia, Russia and other developed countries to their legal obligations.

Many governments are already calling for another year of climate talks before a deal to tackle climate change can be reached. A second commitment period of the Kyoto protocol, however, can be agreed already in Cancún. Failure to set adequate second commitment period targets under the Kyoto track would severely weaken the international climate regime and sideline the principle of “historical responsibility” enshrined in the UNFCCC.

THE CONVENTION TRACK
Negotiations under the Convention track are guided by the Bali Action Plan, which seeks to “enable the full, effective and sustained implementation of the Convention through long-term cooperative action, now, up to and beyond 2012”.

The Bali Action Plan requires emissions reduction commitments from all developed countries (including the United States), mitigation actions from developing countries (supported and enabled by finance and technology), policies to address deforestation, enhanced action on adaptation, and enhanced action on mobilising finance and technology cooperation.

Friends of the Earth has prioritised its campaigning under this track on four cross-cutting issues: climate finance, offsetting, forests, and human rights.

Climate finance
A new financial mechanism must be established under the authority of the UNFCCC to support and enable developing countries in tackling climate change.

Developed countries owe developing countries a climate debt because of their historic contribution to causing climate change. The compensation for climate impacts in poor countries is a straightforward obligation. Additionally, as all countries will now be required to take decisive action on climate change, expecting poorer countries to avoid fossil fuel growth requires additional compensation from the rich world, to fund the “incremental costs” – as agreed under the UNFCCC.

Scale and source
Research published by the UN’s department of Economic and Social Affairs estimates developing countries will require between US$500 billion and US$600 billion annually for mitigation and adaptation, far more than the US$100 billion promised in the Copenhagen Accord. It also asserts that it will be necessary for most of this finance to come from public-sector sources.

The UNFCCC and Bali Action Plan require developed countries to deliver new and additional finance and technology. Most developed countries, however, continue to evade these obligations, and are instead attempting to count private financial flows – through offsetting – as meeting their own emissions reductions commitments despite emissions cuts and additional public finance being distinct obligations.

Attempts to justify the expansion of offsetting through new sectoral crediting and trading proposals, to fund developing country action, must be scrapped from negotiations.

Developed countries must instead tackle their own domestic emissions through public investment and direct regulation, and must use progressive taxation and innovative sources such as currency transaction taxes to raise the financial flows needed to meet their additional international finance obligations.

Governance and delivery
The needs assessment, governance and allocation of climate finance should be democratic, transparent and fully accountable to the UNFCCC.

Most developed countries, however, are positioning the World Bank to assume a controlling role
for climate finance. This is despite the clear conflicts of interest with the World Bank and its poor environmental and social track record.

Climate finance policies and programmes must enable effective public scrutiny. Funds should be allocated according to equitable and rights-based criteria and should respect people’s sovereignty with due regard to vulnerable people. Funds should prioritise local technologies and knowledge and promote the local control, use and management of energy, forests and water. Workers involved in carbon-intensive industries must be supported through a just transition to sustainable and decent employment.

**Offsetting**

Friends of the Earth demands offsetting is scrapped. Offseting is profoundly unjust, fundamentally flawed and cannot be reformed.

It creates carbon lock-in in developed countries, delaying the action that is urgently needed. Offsetting is widely discredited for failing to guarantee additional emissions reductions and it has well-documented damaging impacts on communities. Offsetting transfers the responsibility for reducing emissions from rich developed countries to poorer developing countries, and further over consumes the remaining global carbon budget.

Instead of offsetting, developed countries should be making domestic emissions cuts of at least 40 per cent by 2020 on 1990 levels as well as providing additional resources to developing countries – as per their obligations under the Convention. Failure to do so is not consistent with climate science and will not achieve an effective or just solution to the climate crisis.

**Forests**

To prevent dangerous climate change, conserve biodiversity and safeguard the sustainable use of forests, any agreement on forests must be designed to stop deforestation and degradation, not simply reduce or defer emissions.

**Safeguards**

Forest agreements must explicitly recognise and enforce the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, including territorial and customary rights.

More than 1 billion people, including 60 million Indigenous Peoples are dependent on forests for their livelihoods, food and medicines.

Any agreement to stop deforestation must recognise that plantations are not forests and must implement policies that explicitly safeguard against plantation expansion.

Reduced emissions from deforestation and degradation (REDD) mechanisms should not be used to fund the replacement of forests with plantations.

**Forest funding**

Forest funding mechanisms must not be based on the trading of forest carbon, but form part of the broader climate finance architecture, alongside the funding of other mitigation and adaptation activities.

Offset REDD proposals risk creating a land grab that would leave millions of people worse off, while allowing countries with high carbon intensity to continue consuming more than their fair share of carbon at an unsustainable rate. Such mechanisms discourage developed countries from moving away from carbon intensive infrastructure, risking our ability to avoid dangerous climate tipping points. This could directly cause the world’s last remaining forests to die back from even small increases in global temperatures.

There are cost-efficient non-market ways to help prevent deforestation including bans and moratoria, measures against illegal logging and effective local community solutions. Tackling the drivers and underlying causes of deforestation is paramount. These drivers include agrofuels, soy production, excessive meat and paper consumption, industrial logging and destructive practices in mining, oil and gas.

**Human rights**

The effects of and responses to climate change are having a negative impact on the human rights of people across the world. To protect individuals and communities vulnerable to climate change now and in the future, human rights protections must be integrated into all aspects of climate agreements.

Mitigation of and adaptation to climate change has to take place in a way that respects, protects and promotes human rights.

To enable them to be part of the solution to climate change, individuals and communities must have access to information about policy responses to climate change as well as full, early, equal and effective participation and access to justice.

All aspects of the international climate agreements should be consistent with human rights safeguards in existing legal instruments, including those for Indigenous Peoples, women, children and young people and displaced persons.

**DEMANDS TO GOVERNMENTS**

All countries must agree:

- Emissions cuts of at least 40 per cent by 2020 on 1990 levels – without offsetting – for all developed countries under the Kyoto Protocol’s second commitment period ahead of further research on the fair allocation of the global carbon budget.
- Emissions cuts from the United States equivalent to the efforts of other developed countries.
- A new financial mechanism under the authority of the UNFCCC.
- Commitments to adequately fund developing-country adaptation and mitigation from developed-country public sources.

All countries must reject:

- The use of forests in carbon trading.
- Existing carbon offset schemes including the establishment of new carbon offsetting and trading mechanisms.
- Any role for the World Bank in controlling climate finance.
A PATHWAY FROM MEXICO TO SOUTH AFRICA

This architecture would provide a list of initial outcomes for Cancun and a pathway towards a clear goal in South Africa.

In Cancun, Parties must:

1. Implement article 3.9 of the Kyoto Protocol by adopting a second 5 year commitment period to the Kyoto Protocol with QELRC’s requiring at least a 40% reduction in carbon emissions at the domestic level by Annex 1 parties.

Subsequent to this:

2. Adopt a coordinated package of COP decisions under the LCA track, which will co-exist with the Kyoto Protocol, to enhance implementation of the Convention in accordance with the Bali Action plan. In particular, the package must include:

   a) An overarching decision containing a shared vision and long term global goals on mitigation, adaptation, technology and finance in accordance with the principles of common but differentiated responsibilities, equity and international human rights obligations and a procedure for review of implementation of the Convention;
   b) A framework decision ensuring that the United States has comparable mitigation commitments to KP Parties and effective procedures for reporting and compliance;
   c) A framework decision for enabling and supporting nationally appropriate mitigation actions by developing countries in the context of sustainable development through the provision of technology, financing and capacity building, in a measurable, reportable and verifiable manner;
   d) A framework decision for the protection of forests that does not allow forests to be included in carbon markets or used as offsets and explicitly excludes plantations. The agreement must include protection of the rights of indigenous and forest-dwelling communities, with appropriate mechanisms to ensure this;
   e) A framework decision for the creation of a work programme on adaptation, and the creation of appropriate mechanisms including a new subsidiary body on adaptation, a mechanism for loss and damage, a mechanism dealing with displacement and migration as a result of climate change and an adaptation fund under the Convention;
   f) A framework decision for the creation of technology action plans, a new subsidiary body on technology, and a technology fund;
   g) A framework decision operationalising an effective financial mechanism under the authority of the COP including an executive board, secretariat, trustees, technical panels and appropriate funds with no role for the World Bank.

The details of the agreed approaches and mechanisms should be further elaborated by the Parties for agreement at COP 17.
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