



CCDF



Bangladeshi CSO climate networks' comments on CoP 18 Doha Climate Conference outcome

Doha Climate Gate Way for Inaction and Climate Injustic

1. Background

Seven Bangladeshi CSO climate networks Bangladesh Poribesh Andolon (BAPA), Bangladesh Indigenous People Network on Climate Change and Bio Diversity (BIPNetCCBD), Climate Change Development Forum (CCDF), Climate Finance Governance Network (CFGN), Campaign for Sustainable Rural Livelihood (CSRL), Equity and Justice Working Group (EquityBD) and Network on Climate Change Bangladesh (NCCB) have been doing mobilization jointly since 2011. These are with actualization and aims to reflect Bangladeshi concern in global level and to assist government in providing common public view. Like past the alliance have had organized pre Doha two seminar, one press conference and one rally in Dhaka during November. In Doha during 26th November to 7th December the alliance also organized one seminar in CoP premise on climate migrant's rights; two press conferences for giving opinions on going negotiation process and also run a stall in Qatar National Convention Centre, the official premise of Cop 18. All information regarding those events has got wider attention including in national and foreign media. Information regarding all events is available in www.equitybd.org, can also available in websites of other networks.

UNFCCC Cop 18 Outcome finally declared on early hours of 9th December, termed as Doha Climate Gate Way. The group considers these as outcome for more inaction and injustice to mother earth and especially putting climate vulnerable countries (CVC) in between life and death. Here the group placing its reflection on

major issues and especially on role of Bangladesh official delegation.

2. Second Commitment Period as Life Support to KP

Kyoto Protocol (KP) came in to force in 2005 without USA, with a target of 5.2% emission cut for this period and scheduled to expire on 31st December 2012. At Doha the most important expectation was to extend it to a legal form for 5 years, then to review and decide, before Durban Platform (ADP) comes in operation in 2020. It was the demand from developing countries. But due to insistence from EU, the final outcome lead to an eight year second commitment period of the Kyoto protocol to come into effect in January 2013. This Second Commitment Period adopted by 35 developed countries (whose total emissions amount to only 15% of the global total) without any enhancement in ambitions. It is not co related to scientific forecast, which 40 to 45 % is cut from the 1990 level. US have kept his right to withdraw if they fell later. Russia, Canada, Japan and New Zeland declared that they are not going for second commitment period.

On the negotiation process, Australia has included its full bipartisan supported target range of 5-15 per cent reductions on 2000 levels by 2020 into the Kyoto Protocol, while several studies indicates that Australia's fair share in a world limiting climate change to safer levels is a 25 per cent reduction by 2020.

Non Kyoto developed countries also need to demonstrate that they are genuine about their

responsibilities by adopting strict quantified emission reduction commitments, comparable in effort and transparency with Kyoto Parties.

3. Developed Country's Mitigation Inaction

Despite the policies in all major economies, collective actions has not reached levels that address the gap between the action being taken and what is needed to limit climate change to safer levels.

It is the failure of leadership and ambition of industrialized countries like the United States, Canada and Australia in making the deep cuts to emissions necessary which is hampering and sometimes actively obstructing progress. European Union (EU) also proved to be a big disappointment with continuously refusing to review its mitigation target. EU claimed that they had already achieved 18% of its promised 20% emission reduction targets, and will be doing nothing till 2020.

While the [Bali roadmap in 2007](#) adopted the scientific projections of 25 to 40 percent emission cuts by industrialized countries on 1990 levels by 2020 for a 50 percent chance of not exceeding 2 degrees of warming.

But the offers from developed countries only aggregate up to 18% reduction as compared to the IPCC (International Panel of Climate Change) projected 40% reduction on 1990 baseline by 2020. Therefore, the Conference of Parties (CoP) had a task to enhance the ambition of developed countries to higher ranges of their targets. It completely failed on this task. In the final outcome CoP urged developed country parties to increase the ambition of their quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets, with a view to reducing their aggregate anthropogenic GHG (Green House Gas) emissions to a level consistent with the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report, and decided to establish a work program under the SBSTA (Subsidiary Body for Science for Technological Assessment.) to commence in 2013 and end in 2014, to continue clarifying the targets.

4. Adaptation, NAP and Annual Adaptation Forum

The CoP-18 had mandated to close the AWG-LCA in this session resolving the unsolved issues. In Doha the developed countries refused to talk saying that there was nothing left in the AWG- LCA discussions on adaptation. While the AWG-LCA has reaffirmed that

adaptation must be addressed with the same priority as mitigation and that appropriate institutional arrangements are required to enhance adaptation action and support and therefore the meeting decides to continue their work to enhance action on adaptation under the Convention, as provided for in the Cancun Adaptation Framework and relevant decisions. Under the Agreed outcome pursuant to the Bali Action Plan, the CoP also requested the Adaptation Committee to consider the establishment of an annual adaptation forum, to be held in conjunction with the sessions of the CoP to maintain a high profile for adaptation under the Convention and to raise awareness and ambition with regard to adaptation actions and to facilitate enhanced coherence of adaptation actions.

One of the major progresses of CoP-18 is to come in an agreement to prepare the National Adaptation Plan (NAPs) for the least developed countries (LDCs) and other interested developing countries in response to their national needs and circumstances. The CoP also decided to provide funding for the preparation of the national adaptation plan process from the Least Developed Countries Fund, to meet the agreed full cost, as appropriate through the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

5. Loss and Damage, the International Compensatory Mechanism

Loss and damage is a relatively new issue in the UNFCCC negotiations but it has progressed, which raised expectations of achieving some tangible outcome at COP 18. The expected deliverables of COP 18 on loss and damage are: (a) finalization of work programme and comprehensive response to loss and damage; (b) establishment of a mechanism to assess diverse risks and approaches; (c) consider the concept of a "Multi-Window Mechanism" put forward by AOSIS (Association of Small Island States) as a basis for future negotiations. Multi-Window Mechanism consists of three inter-dependent components, namely insurance, rehabilitation/ compensatory payments, and risk management.

Finally on Loss and Damage (which is situation beyond adaptation) parties decided to establish institutional arrangements, such as an international mechanism to address loss and damage and associated impacts of climate change by CoP 19.

6. Long Term Climate Finance, Ignorance to Historical Responsibilities

Industrialized (Annex 1) countries committed through the Copenhagen accord to provide USD 30 billion to as Fast Start Finance (FSF) for the period of 2010-2012 and thereafter, to mobilize USD 100 billion per year by 2020 as long term finance (2013-2020) for climate vulnerable people of developing countries. But in Doha except key polluter USA other annex 1 countries announced to provide around one tenth of the demand from developing countries to mobilize at least USD 60 billion until 2015 as interim arrangement. but CoP18 just urged to annex 1 country to scale up their commitment all together, and to reach 100 billion USD from 2020 for both adaptation and mitigation. It is the clear deviation from the commitment made by annex 1 countries and reflection of negligence of the historically responsible polluter countries those failed to consider the incurring immense loss and damages of the climate vulnerable communities.

Moreover, violating principles of climate finance annex 1 countries calculated past assistances as well as ODA under the FSF applying deceptive accounting, released only around 25 per cent of FSF for adaptation (policy brief, iied, Dec, 2012). Though CoP initiated to review the financial mechanism but sooner establishment of an independent international watchdog body inclusion of experts and CSOs to examine the compliance of climate finance including Green Climate Funds with effective safeguards is only solution.

7. Market Based Mechanism is Bleak

Kyoto protocol (KP) paved the process to establish market based emission reduction mechanisms (ERM) through the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), Joint Implementation (JI) and Emission Trading Scheme (ETS) in both industrialized (annex 1) and developing (annex 2) countries. However, the entire emission reduction architecture has gradually been dependent on the CDM which is the main source of income for the UNFCCC Adaptation Fund, imposed 2 per cent levy to rise from \$300 to \$600 million over the 2008-2012 periods. But whole CDM has been more questionable due to fraudulence practices and non-transparency in process. On other hand, due to huge financial crunch in Euro Zone price of carbon has been reduced from approx 30 Euro/CER to below 1 Euro/CER. Consequently, that has caused to pile up of huge unused credits, but other developed countries are

not willing to purchase those accumulated credits and in this context, to mobilize the reliable funding for Adaptation Fund and ensuring greater ambition the market based slow ERM should be replaced by the new mechanisms.

8. Technology Transfer and IPR and Ignorance

Transfer of the demand-driven, cost-effective and community-friendly technology for mitigation in the developing countries was mandated first in the KP and this issue has been pronounced in last several CoPs including Bali Action Plan. Accordingly, Durban Platform (ADP) ensured to establish Climate Technology Center and Network (CTCN) to look into tech development and its transfer; and Technical Executive Committee (TEC) to take decision on financial aspects of tech development and transfer. However, last CoP18 decided to provide advice and support to developing country in the form of capacity-building to conduct assessments of new and emerging technologies, elaborating the role of the CTCN to identify currently available climate friendly technologies for mitigation and adaptation; and further elaborate the linkages between the technology transfer and the financial mechanism of the Convention, taking into consideration the recommendations of the Board of the Green Climate Fund. But this decision will not ensure the universal access of developing countries to green and clean technology; rather in response to demand from developing countries to extend IPR beyond 2013 the industrialized countries refused to accept it and suggested to discuss it in the so called 'appropriate platform' of WIPO and the WTO.

9. Agriculture and Mitigation, Debacle Avoided So Far

Umbrella group (mostly non EU developed countries except USA), Uruguay and South Africa including WB, FAO, CGIR pushed for mitigation in agriculture in CoP18. Key objective was to provide overwhelming clearance to giant agribusiness companies and conglomerates of the developed countries to their 'climate business' through sells of 'tailored technologies' to reduce negligible emission in agriculture. This approach was placed to divert focus on the liability of gigantic polluters to reduce emission at source point to mitigation in developing countries. However, due to strong obstacles of developing countries on mitigation in agriculture at Doha meeting other unresolved issues including agriculture, aviation and maritime emission have been pushed to discuss in

the next CoP, and LDCs including Bangladesh should keep continue to resist against such a black hand through evidence.

10. Developed countries final nail on Equity and CBDR principles

In fact developed countries opposition led by US, there are no inclusion of Equity and CBDR (Common but differentiated responsibilities) principles in Doha Climate Gateway (DCG). In fact which was the main principles of KP (Kyoto Protocol), where developed countries has accepted the historical responsibility and there by to take differentiated responsibilities to take bigger cut in mitigation and bigger financing in future. KP provided binding reduction commitments for industrialized countries and the EU listed in the Annex

1, while it encouraged developing countries to take actions for mitigation, without making it obligatory for them. In Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) which will determine new framework of negotiation which will come in force in 2020, failed to include equity and CBDR. US insisted that, “If equity was in, US was out”. At CoP 18 developing countries tried but failed to bring all in a consensus. Final decision has adopted that the work of ADP as mentioned “shall be guided by the principles of the convention”. The developing countries has also tried to reference of RIO + 20 outcome document “the future we want”, where

equity and CBDR has mentioned. However it was opposed by the developed countries led by US saying that RIO + 20 is a political decision and UNFCCC is a

treaty, which makes it inappropriate to refer to a political decision.

11. New Polarization in Grouping and Rationale for National Climate Commission

In fact this time also Group 77 + China has hardly been able to play a challenging role, same as by LDC group led by Gambia. We have observed new polarization led by Philippines delegation as title “Like Minded Developing Country Group (LMDC)”; it is because of positioning and mobilization of Philippines delegation. LMDC has also included countries from South Asia namely, India, Pakistan, Srilanka except Bangladesh. Bangladesh is chairman of Climate Vulnerable Forum (CVF), which in fact has given opportunity to mobilize other climate vulnerable countries, which was long time demand from Bangladeshi civil society groups. We have also observed an urge among some Bangladesh delegation members to take active role for such mobilization. It should be mentioned that Philippine government has formed a s “National Climate Commission” and appointing Climate Commissioners and adopting new legislation on adaptation, mitigation and finance, the commission is responsible for climate negotiation, as well as implementation of climate action plan as a supra body reportable to state, coordinating all ministries. We are reiterating our demand; to form a National Climate Commission who will formulate a transparent and rule based delegation and which also a Coordinated National Platform to formulate policy in this regard taking inclusive consideration of all possible stakeholders.

Our Networks:

Bangladesh Poribesh Andolon (BAPA), Bangladesh Indigenous People Network on Climate Change and Bio Diversity (BIPNetCCBD), Climate Change Development Forum (CCDF), Climate Finance Governance Network (CFGN), Campaign for Sustainable Rural Livelihood (CSRL), Equity and Justice Working Group (EquityBD) and Network on Climate Change Bangladesh (NCCB)

Communication

Rezaul Karim Chowdhury, Equitybd, E-mail: reza@coastbd.org, Cell: 01711529792
Zakir Hosan Khan, CFGN, E-mail: zhkhan@ti-bangladesh.org, Cell: 01713065546
Mizanur Rahman Bojoy, NCCB, E-mail: BijoyRahmanBD@gmail.com, Cell: 01718703327
For details click here: www.equitybd.org