

Part I

Speeches by NGOs during the Ministerial Segment on 8, 9, 10 December 1997

THREE STATEMENTS
BY
BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY NGOs

**The U.S. Business Council for Sustainable Energy
European Business Council for a Sustainable Energy Future
International Cogeneration Alliance
International Association of Public Transport**

*Intervention by Michael Marvin
Executive Director
U.S. Business Council for Sustainable Energy*

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates,

Thank you for the opportunity to address you. My name is Michael Marvin, I am the Executive Director of the U.S. Business Council for Sustainable Energy. I speak to you today on behalf of organizations spanning five continents representing sustainable energy businesses involved with the implementation process for the Framework Convention on Climate Change. I appreciate the opportunity to present our views on the climate change negotiations and express our strong support for finalizing a meaningful protocol at a constructive and fruitful meeting of this Conference of Parties.

The U.S. Business Council for Sustainable Energy (BCSE), European Business Council for a Sustainable Energy Future (e 5), International Cogeneration Alliance and International Association of Public Transport represent businesses from more than 70 countries across five continents. These organizations and businesses have agreed on common policy recommendations for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Our business organizations believe that early and firm action is necessary and feasible to limit climate change. There are many technologies available today that are cost effective and whose greater use will yield positive outcomes for the economy and the environment. It is our opinion that solutions to the climate change challenge are not technologically constrained but institutionally constrained. Overcoming this requires continuing changes in economic and regulatory frameworks.

Reasonable targets and early timetables are necessary preconditions for stimulating investments in efficient technologies. This process should be accompanied by identifying and eliminating institutional barriers to clean energy development, production and use.

The businesses that are our members suggest the following elements should form the basis for a legally binding international agreement:

- Establish near-term targets for controlling greenhouse gas emissions with a benchmark for Annex I countries for the first commitment period – as early as the year 2005 – and a reduction by 2010. We all now know with

confidence that appropriate steps to respond to climate change – based upon the efficient and clean use of energy – will lead to long-term, world-wide economic growth. An early and meaningful reduction target for Annex-I countries will help convince developing countries that a less carbon-intensive economy is viable.

- Set a firm commitment for completion of an agreement on meaningful participation of non-Annex I countries, including a limit on growth of greenhouse gas emissions by the largest-emitting Non-Annex I countries. This commitment should enter into force no later than the time that Annex I countries have met their commitments of the first commitment period.
- Encourage introduction of domestic market-based mechanisms to implement treaty or protocol obligations.
- Create real, verifiable and lasting emissions reductions, allow joint implementation with credit for energy-related projects and emissions trading among Parties to the protocol. Additionally, programs should be encouraged which facilitate the transfer of highly efficient technologies for non-Annex I countries.
- Postpone resolution of sinks until COP 4 when we have a more complete understanding of their role and effect within the larger framework.
- Do not allow borrowing from future emissions budgets.
- Voluntary commitments, while helpful, do not in and of themselves provide business with a proper framework for technological innovation.
- Encourage the elimination of subsidies and tax advantages for carbon-intensive energy sources, and limit or reduce emissions of greenhouse gases from the use of aviation and marine bunker fuels.
- Approve appropriate mechanisms to address cases of non-compliance at the First Meeting of the Parties of a Kyoto Protocol.

Our members believe that the scientific understanding of climate change, while never complete, is sufficient to take action to control greenhouse gas emissions. It is reasonable for early action to be taken to address the threat of a changing climate. While there are differences on some issues, those who speak through this intervention have put aside those differences for the common good of taking clear, substantive steps to address this major economic and environmental threat.

Thank you for the opportunity to share a business perspective on these negotiations. We wish you success in your challenge of meeting global environmental and economic needs. Our organizations look forward to the opportunity for continuing participation in these negotiations, and hope that we can be of service to this body.

Statement by Egil Myklebust, Chief Executive of Norsk Hydro, Norway

On behalf of international business present in Kyoto

On behalf of international business, I welcome this opportunity to offer our input to these important negotiations.

Business and industry, in all their diversity, have a range of views on climate change. In that, we are no different from governments.

Yet all the business organizations represented here in Kyoto regard the issues at stake with great seriousness. We have taken part in climate change meetings since 1991, when governments first took up the issue. We know that business will continue to be part of the solution at Kyoto and beyond.

The challenge of climate change requires prudent, timely and global action over the long term.

Whatever agreements are reached here, business will be closely involved in making them work. Our role in meeting the demands of an expanding global economy is crucial in three respects: as generators of capital investments, as producers of goods and services, and as providers of employment.

More than that: business develops much of the technology essential to improved environmental performance. Thus, any agreement reached here must promote innovation in technology. It must also help business to make rational long-term decisions.

So industry has a key role to play after Kyoto. We invite governments to bear the following considerations in mind:

Governments must regard business as their partner. They should encourage the use of voluntary initiatives and negotiated agreements in order to limit greenhouse gas emissions. Voluntary initiatives do not exclude governments. On the contrary, they encourage real dialogue and partnership between government and industry. Many companies have already demonstrated the value of voluntary measures. They offer flexibility and encourage innovation. They achieve cost-effective solutions.

Substantial differences exist between national economies. National policies with global objectives should, therefore, reflect differences in economic and social structures. They should take account of competing social, environmental and economic priorities. Investment cycles of 20 years or more are required by many industries. Policies should therefore avoid costly and premature retirement of capital.

Energy is crucial for economic development. All forms of energy, existing and emerging, must be mobilized to meet projected growth in demand

throughout the 21st century. Efforts should focus on minimizing their impact on the environment. We should encourage climate-friendly technology.

The reduction of greenhouse gas emissions will depend on technology. Major capital investments are required, both for the development of technology and for its commercial dissemination. Governments should encourage and support these investments. At the same time, the dissemination of existing technologies in developing countries offers great potential for reducing emissions significantly. Consequently, technology partnerships should be encouraged as an integral part of foreign direct investment.

Foreign direct investments by the private sector are rising much faster than official development assistance. Private financial flows will stimulate technology cooperation. Initiatives such as emissions trading and joint implementation should also be developed. They offer real possibilities for significant emissions abatement at reduced costs.

Our objective is to ensure that the activities of business and industry benefit the environment, the economy, and society as a whole. This is our commitment in Kyoto. Thank you for the opportunity to make this clear.

Statement to the COP 3 by TSUJI Yoshifumi, Vice-Chairman, Keidanren

(Chairman, Nissan Motor Co., Ltd.)

Kyoto, 9 December 1997

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates and participants of COP 3,

I feel honoured and privileged to speak on behalf of the International Chamber of Commerce, the World Business Council for Sustainable Development and the Japan Federation of Economic Organizations, or Keidanren for short, on how we are addressing the climate change issue.

In recent years, tackling environmental issues has been one of the major concerns of Keidanren which has represented Japanese industry since it was founded in 1946. The Keidanren Global Environment Charter entered into force in 1991. In June this year, the Keidanren Voluntary Action Plan on the Environment, which covers 37 industrial sectors of this country, was released after two years of work.

We are convinced that the worldwide spread of voluntary efforts by industries is one of the most effective means of mitigating global warming. It was that belief that we sought the cooperation of the ICC and WBCSD. The result was the International Conference of Voluntary Business Initiatives for Mitigating Climate Change which was held last week in Kyoto with the participation of business and industry organizations from ten countries and four continents.

The International Conference adopted a Joint Statement, copies of which have been attached to my written statement. Now I would like to go over the main points confirmed by the Joint Statement.

First, industries can make essential contributions to international measures decided in Kyoto to mitigate climate change by developing, commercializing and diffusing relevant technologies. Second, business and industry, while they act in a manner befitting regional, economic and social conditions around them, will respond actively to the climate change issue, for example by developing energy saving technology and waste heat recovery, and by promoting renewable energy and the safe use of nuclear power. Third, voluntary action comes in various forms. There are action programmes formulated by individual corporations, those by industrial sectors, those by the entire industry and even those which will be part of the national programme. Fourth, voluntary actions are most effective if they are undertaken within a general framework developed by governments that allows industry to contribute technological, managerial and entrepreneurial expertise to the fullest extent. However governmental measures should not discourage

voluntary and flexible approaches and should not distort trade patterns or inter-industry competitiveness.

I have just related the main points of the Joint Statement. I believe that our business conference last week, has served to highlight the value of voluntary efforts within industry. We are determined to continue to work with the ICC, WBCSD and other business and industry organizations to press ahead with voluntary action programmes.

Industry's voluntary action plans are by no means free and easy-going. They demand concrete measures and constant efforts for improvement. They also require transparency, periodic reporting and review. Therefore, we would like to express our strong hope that COP 3 recognizes voluntary actions as an effective policy option for implementing the goals set out in Kyoto.

I wish to conclude my speech by wishing that COP 3, which is attracting worldwide attention, agrees on realistic and equitable goals for reduction of greenhouse gases as the first step on the long road to the solution of the problems of climate change.

Thank you for listening.

ICC, KEIDANREN AND WBCSD

Joint Statement

3 December 1997

I. *Climate Change: Industry voluntary initiatives*

Voluntary actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions are being implemented throughout the world. With the necessary flexibility, adaptable to all sectors and regions, they can achieve results more effectively than rigid unilateral regulations. The complexity of the climate change issue requires a full range of responses and doesn't lend itself to simple, prescribed solutions.

In particular, the business community plays a unique and positive role in addressing the challenge of potential climate change through efficient use of natural resources and energy, the creation of economic growth, the development and dissemination of innovative technology and international technology partnerships. With further promotion and wider participation by all sectors of business and industry, such activities could contribute significantly to mitigating climate change. These industry activities contribute to the realization of sustainable development, which allows the present generation to meet its needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own.

Many sectors of society, including the business community, are already engaged in cooperatively taking cost-effective actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions based on the scientific knowledge reported in the Second Assessment report of IPCC which is thought to be the most reliable information at this time even though there still remains uncertainty. As the effect and benefit of mitigating measures will be felt over time, these actions are taken with a long-term perspective.

II. *Voluntary approaches*

Implementation of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change affects business operations, employees, customers, shareholders and the governments that depend on business for so many societal needs. Many of the tasks of implementing future decisions of governments and responding to subsequent changes in consumption patterns fall to business. In particular, business plays an integral role in the development, commercialization and dissemination of technologies, and in applying its broader experience and technical and managerial expertise to environmental challenges.

Voluntary initiatives are actions undertaken, by business and industry to achieve specific goals designed to make progress towards “best practice” appropriate to the different characteristics of each regional, economic and social setting. Voluntary actions take various forms and could involve business sector commitments and negotiated agreements in which governments are partners. Transparency, periodic reporting and review can also be incorporated in voluntary initiatives.

Companies are therefore taking positive and responsible actions through voluntary programmes to address climate change issues. Voluntary programmes should outline actions to be taken so that results can be measured and demonstrated. These initiatives can also contribute to the development of innovative technologies and other options for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Governments should be encouraged to incorporate voluntary initiatives in their national climate change policies.

Voluntary actions are most effective if they are undertaken within a general framework developed by governments that allows industry to contribute technological, managerial and entrepreneurial expertise to the fullest extent. Governmental measures (e.g. regulations, economic instruments) should not discourage voluntary and flexible approaches and should not distort trade patterns or inter-industry competitiveness.

III. Examples of effective voluntary actions

Voluntary actions encourage the utilization and dissemination of existing effective technology and contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Effective actions which have been entered into and could be pursued in the future include:

- (i) the utilization and dissemination of highly efficient energy conversion technology such as clean coal technology, cogeneration and waste heat recovery;
- (ii) the efficient utilization of the full range of primary energy sources including renewable forms of energy. It is noted that nuclear power today contributes in many places to cutting GHG emissions, and can, in appropriate circumstances, also contribute in the future;
- (iii) the provision of energy efficient end-use products and services, such as the “Green Lights” programme in the United States.

The range of different types of voluntary actions includes: specific company programmes such as the “Climate Wise” programme in the United States; sectoral voluntary actions such as CEFIC’s energy efficiency commitments; different types of voluntary agreements among companies or

between companies, business associations and governments such as the Keidanren's "Voluntary Action Plan on the Environment", BDI's "Declaration on Global Warming Prevention", Australia's "Greenhouse Challenge"; and nation-wide covenants such as those in force in the Netherlands.

Within the Convention itself, the pilot phase of Activities Implemented Jointly and Joint Implementation programmes are examples of policy frameworks that can create incentives for voluntary programmes of mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions in all regions of the world.

Training and education, especially in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, are essential for the smooth promotion of international technology transfers. They can also be improved through voluntary initiatives.

IV. Recommendations

For voluntary actions to achieve their full potential, it is essential that government, business and the public cooperate, and that policies and measures under international consideration be designed to promote cost-effective, voluntary actions.

It is recommended that the COP (Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change) recognize voluntary actions as an effective policy option for implementing the goals set out in Kyoto.

The following organizations also endorse the Keidanren, ICC, WBCSD Joint Statement to the 3rd Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.

Toyoda, Shoichiro

Chairman

Keidanren (Japan Federation of Economic Organizations)

Helmut Maucher

President, ICC

Björn Stigson

President, WBCSD

Klaus Kohlhase

Acting Chairman of the Ad Hoc EJAC Working Group on Climate Change

John Foote

Chairman of Task Force on Sustainable Development, Business Council of Australia

Ken Gregory

Centre for Business and the Environment

Paul N. Cicio

IFIEC, World President

Dr. Marshall Gysi

Managing Director FIDIC

Z. Iyszkiewicz

Secretary General, UNICE

R.W. Knapp

*Chief Executive
World Coal Institute*

STATEMENTS
BY
ENVIRONMENTAL NGOs

Statement of Climate Action Network to the Third Conference of the Parties

Mr. Chairman,

My name is Jennifer Morgan. I am representing the Climate Action Network, the largest coalition ever formed on an environmental issue, reflective of the concerns of hundreds of millions of people.

The world is watching. As thousands of us sit here in Kyoto, millions of people are waiting to hear what you decide for their future. This is the most important environmental agreement we have ever undertaken. They are watching to see if you move beyond the unfulfilled promises you made in Rio in desperate hope that their children and grandchildren will be spared the devastating impacts of global warming.

This is why we are here. We have the scientific evidence that proves that we are changing the climate. We have the technology that provides the solution to this problem. What we need is leadership from you.

The problem is that these negotiations, for the past 5 years have been detached from that reality. For five years we have listened to interventions from countries explaining why they should do less and why others should do more. For five years we have watched the fossil fuel industry manipulate and damage these negotiations as carbon dioxide continues to be pumped into the atmosphere. We all have been held hostage by these special interests. Let us be clear – the lobbying of companies such as Exxon, Texaco and Mobil must not keep you from acting responsibly and moving forward.

Note that all of these companies are from the United States. The world's largest polluter has the world's most obstructive interests spending millions of dollars to keep you from doing what they, in their heart and soul know is right.

The United States has adopted the rhetoric of these fossil interests, pointing fingers at countries that emit 1/20th of its own emissions. Meanwhile, via multilateral and bilateral aid agencies the U.S. is funnelling billions of taxpayer dollars toward fossil fuel projects in the developing countries – ensuring that their emissions skyrocket in the future.

Listening to the voice of these special interests has prevented you from acting on what the science demands, and what the public expects. The vast majority of the public of the world is demanding a commitment by their leaders to prevent dangerous climate change. Who are these people? They include scientists, doctors, business leaders, economists, religious leaders, mayors, and environmentalists in your countries. There is a clear mandate for you to adapt a protocol that includes:

- A significant legally binding reduction commitment to bring emissions below 1990 levels.
- The year 2005 in that commitment.
- Closure of all loopholes, namely:
 - All six major greenhouse gases must be included now, not next year at COP 4;
 - No superheated or hot air trading;
 - No sinks;
 - Air and marine fuels.

In other words, the reductions must be real.

The protocol's structure must ensure that these commitments are credible and verifiable including:

A regularly scheduled review of the adequacy of commitments.

A compliance system that gives meaning to the words legally binding and ensures that the commitments are enforceable.

Ministers, we have all travelled to Kyoto to begin to address the problem of global warming. We cannot let the fossil fuel lobby continue to manipulate this process. This is especially true in my own country. As a woman from the United States of America, I cannot accept this. I cannot accept that the world's largest polluter propose a target that, in essence, allows for an increase of emissions. I cannot accept that they refuse to take responsibility for their actions which have immense impacts on others around the world. I cannot accept that the burden of acting is being shifted to my children and grandchildren.

There is a moral imperative to act. There is nothing to be afraid of. This is the moment for you to reject the tactics of the fossil fuel lobby and answer to the demands of the atmosphere. It will be the final arbiter. It is not a silent partner in this negotiation.

If you know something is right, respond. The world is watching.

STATEMENT BY CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. Chairman,

My name is Gurmit Singh from MALAYSIA and CAN Southeast Asia. I speak to you for the CAN group of environmental NGOs, especially those from the South. We wish to thank you for this opportunity to address the Ministers gathered at such a critical stage of the finalization of a legally binding GHG reduction Protocol for Annex I parties.

In the limited time available to us, we would like to stress the following points:

1. Climate protection must be the over-riding consideration in these final days of the fulfilment of the Berlin Mandate.
2. Political will must be demonstrated in a positive manner, not to undermine the fundamental objectives of the UNFCCC.
3. The majority of the developing countries will be the worst victims of climate change but the least able to cope because of their limited resources.
4. The insinuation that developing nations are out to freeload on the commitments of Annex I nations must be forcefully put aside as a smear campaign waged by powerful lobbies in the North.
5. There is ample evidence that Southern nations have taken action to start curbing their GHG emissions but it is against the basic principles of the Convention to ask them to assume legal limitations even before the Annex I nations have taken on such commitments and demonstrated their serious compliance. On the other hand, it is the very Annex I nations who have failed to even stabilize emissions that are putting pressures on the South.
6. The Kyoto Protocol for Annex I countries must have reduction targets in the order of 10 per cent or more over the 1990 GHG emission levels to be achieved by the year 2005. These must be free of all loopholes like "hot or superheated air", sinks, etc.
7. The Berlin Mandate must be fulfilled here and now in Kyoto, not transformed into another Mandate that postpones further into the future concrete action on GHG reductions, a course of action that the IPCC considers irresponsible.
8. The speeches from PM Hashimoto and Vice President Gore at the launching of this segment have failed to provide the much sought leadership. We are forced to look elsewhere.

The war of words that has raged for so long in the negotiations and recently in the mass media must end. But peace can only come through the signing of a strong Kyoto Protocol, that finally puts some teeth in the Convention.

We would be extremely disappointed if you, the Ministers gathered in Kyoto, fail in this long overdue mission. We will not let the World and your constituents forget this global failure. Let the world judge you and hold you accountable! Thank you.

Statement by Michelle Valentine on behalf of the "Climate Train"

Tuesday, 9 December 1997

Thank you. Mr. Chairman,

I am privileged to be able to speak to you on behalf of the Climate Train.

We are a group of 36 scientists, environmental activists, government delegates and students from 14 countries who have come to this conference by train and boat. We have travelled more than 14,000 kilometres across Europe, Siberia, China and the sea, with stops for meetings in Berlin, Warsaw, Moscow, Novosibirsk and Beijing.

Our journey gave us a unique opportunity to interact with people from many regions and countries to discuss common concerns and problems. We learnt from NGOs and scientists about the regional effects of climate change. We found communities who are already suffering from climate change, who are fearful for their future. In Siberia people are witnessing their forests burning because of drought, and our colleagues calculate they may all be destroyed in only a few decades.

In China there is much concern about the increased frequency of catastrophic flooding of low-lying coastal areas, and the massive disruption of their agricultural systems. Visiting these places and hearing from local people directly about their concerns made us face the realities of climate change.

Travelling by train and boat produced only one eighth of the global warming impact of a similar journey by airplane. Of all modes of transport, air travel is the most dangerous to the climate because greenhouse gas emissions from aircraft directly affect the most sensitive parts of the atmosphere and these effects are long-lasting. The recent dramatic increase in air travel is totally unsustainable and we ask the COP to tackle this problem of reducing emissions from aircraft in future meetings.

Arriving at COP 3, we found a very limited and discouraging process. The confrontational tone of the present negotiations cannot resolve what is a common, global problem. None of the greenhouse gas reductions the COP is considering adequately reflect the gravity of the problems that changes in our climate will bring. We need first to take note of what the planet can bear then work out what levels of CO₂ and other greenhouse gases can be emitted rather than relying on weak proposals put forward by those too heavily influenced by the economic or industrial lobbies.

During our journey we discussed many new and innovative ways of tackling the problems such as renewable energies, energy efficiency, new types of housing, development of good public transport systems and encouraging

overland travel by dismantling bureaucratic barriers. Many of these straightforward practical answers deserve much more serious consideration by policymakers.

But more than this, we all need to be prepared to fundamentally change our lifestyles so that we can meet the responsibility of caring for our planet. Many of us are already doing this and therefore we do not need the large quota of emissions which you want to give us. Policy makers should base their judgement on what is a 'realistic' change of lifestyle not on their own experience as diplomats but on public opinion and good examples.

Whatever decision the COP takes, the result will affect the future of billions of people and the earth itself. We need a new approach of co-operation that can deliver a collaborative and long term global solution based on equity.

One very positive action that we could all implement now is to make the Climate Convention itself more sustainable by reducing the need to travel to future meetings. This could be achieved by increased use of video conferencing and the internet and more regional conferences.

Finally, we would like to invite you all to experience some real changes in the weather by joining our Climate Ship to COP 4 in Buenos Aires.

Thank you Mr. Chairman for the opportunity to make our statement, and also to everybody who helped organize the "Climate Train" especially Scientists for Global Responsibility and ASEED (=action for solidarity, equality environment and development).

THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL
FOR
LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL
INITIATIVES
ON BEHALF OF
LOCAL AUTHORITIES
AND
MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT
AND
NAGOYA DECLARATION

**STATEMENT TO THE PLENARY OF THE HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENT
OF THE THIRD CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE UNFCCC**

**by TAKEHISHA MATSUBARA
MAYOR OF NAGOYA, JAPAN**

**ON BEHALF OF THE
INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR
LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL INITIATIVES (ICLEI)**

8 December 1997

Mr. President, Distinguished Delegates,

I am the Mayor of the City of Nagoya, Japan. I am here to communicate to you that local governments firmly believe that we can play a crucial role in global climate protection and that we are highly motivated to do so to our best ability.

Our city, Nagoya, is a member of the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives, ICLEI, and we are a participant in the international Cities for Climate Protection Campaign. I am representing ICLEI on this occasion.

The 2.2 million people of Nagoya are part of the global community. Together with other urban communities around the world they account for almost 50 per cent of the people of the earth. Through COP 3, I sincerely hope that this enormous urban village will be united for the prevention of climate change.

ICLEI is the international environmental agency of over 250 of the local governments that make up this urban global village. Its mission is to build and serve a worldwide movement of local governments to achieve measurable improvements in the global environment.

Cities for Climate Protection is an ICLEI campaign that aims to fight global climate change by mobilizing local governments to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions. Presently, over 200 cities are in the campaign. These represent over 100 million people and account for 5–6 per cent of total global CO₂ emissions.

Local governments have accompanied this Convention process since the beginning. ICLEI presented the Helsinki Declaration in Rio when the Framework Convention on Climate Change was born. Last week, a delegation of 15 elected local officials came here to COP 3 following the 4th Cities

for Climate Protection World Summit hosted by my City and Aichi Prefecture. They presented to COP 3 a report on CO₂ emissions reductions that campaign cities are achieving. In addition, the delegation presented the Nagoya Declaration.

The Nagoya declaration calls on COP 3 to set an initial reduction target for Annex 1 countries, relative to 1990 levels, for the year 2005, with the ultimate target of 20 per cent for the year 2010. Most of the CCP cities that have set targets for themselves have chosen 20 per cent or better, and many are now on paths to achieve their targets.

If Premiers, Prime Ministers, and Presidents could be mayors for one week in cities that are successfully reducing greenhouse-gas emissions, the Parties would realize that aggressive reduction targets are realistic. To date, cities in the campaign have reduced at least 42 million tonnes of CO₂ since 1990, and in doing so have derived a wide range of economic, social, and environmental benefits, like cleaner air.

Local governments believe that an early legally-binding target around the year 2005 is crucial as a political signal from national governments that they are making a serious effort to combat climate change. Without an early legally-binding target, it will become harder for local elected officials to maintain their voluntary political commitment to aggressive emissions reductions over the long term.

Please be assured, as you go into the final negotiations of the Kyoto outcome, that local governments will work with you to implement aggressive emissions reductions strategies. In the Nagoya Declaration local governments have pledged to give full support to their national governments to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions. We look forward to the post-Kyoto process and the contribution that we may make as partners in implementation of climate protection.

In the end, it is cities that may suffer the most adverse effects of climate change. And it is cities that have the most to gain by reducing emissions. As urban economies become more efficient, cities will become a nicer place to live in.

Thank you very much.

FINAL NAGOYA DECLARATION

Nagoya, 28 November 1997

PREAMBLE

WE, THE REPRESENTATIVES of 145 local government organisations from 29 nations around the world,

PARTICIPATING in the Cities for Climate Protection (CCP) World Summit, the 4th Local Government Leaders' Summit on Climate Change, sponsored by the City of Nagoya, Aichi Prefecture, Japan, and the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) and held in Nagoya, Japan, November 26–28, 1997;

AFFIRMING the important role that the CCP – a global campaign whose members include 201 local governments worldwide representing approximately 100 million people and accounting for almost 5 per cent of global carbon dioxide emissions campaign is playing in assisting national governments to implement the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC);

REFLECTING the conclusion of the IPCC Assessment Report that stabilization of the global climate may require reductions in greenhouse gas reductions by more than 50 per cent;

SHARING grave concern about the threat of climate change to cities and to life on the planet, and determined to undertake initiatives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions with the on-going support of ICLEI, who represents our common voice in the United Nations and the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the FCCC and its Subsidiary Bodies,

DO HEREBY PRESENT this Declaration to the Third Meeting of the COP to the FCCC taking place in Kyoto, Japan, December 1–10, 1997.

1.0 A GLOBAL EFFORT BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

1.1 Cities and urban areas are especially at risk from the potential effects, both direct and indirect, of climate change. Coastal cities are threatened by sea level rise, as well as more intense storms, especially in extra-tropical regions. Public health is also at great risk. As seasonal temperatures rise, especially in the summer, many residents of our cities will be threatened by heat-related illness, respiratory disease, and various infectious diseases caused by the spread of insect and rodent vectors.

Ground-level ozone pollution is a serious problem in many of our cities, and its formation is also sensitive to elevated temperature.

- 1.2 Local governments in most parts of the world are responsible for land use, waste management, trees and parks, transportation infrastructure, building and construction codes, energy utilities, and public education. They can employ these powers to significantly reduce energy use and greenhouse gas emissions.
- 1.3 Local governments, in response to the threat of climate change, have taken early action to reduce local emissions of greenhouse gases. Among the participants in the Cities for Climate Protection campaign, 39 local governments have committed themselves to carbon dioxide reductions in the range of 15–30 per cent.
- 1.4 Among participants in the Cities for Climate Protection, 34 local governments have completed all five milestones required, including implementation of a Local Action Plan that aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. These milestones are:
 1. An energy and emissions baseline inventory for municipal operations and the wider community,
 2. Estimation of an energy and emissions forecast for the target year 2010 or 2015,
 3. Establishment of a greenhouse gas emissions reduction target,
 4. Development of and obtaining local council approval for the Local Action Plan,
 5. Implementation of policies and measures.

Collectively, 62 local governments reported to ICLEI in a recent survey that they have reduced their cumulative emissions by 42 million tonnes during the period 1990 – 1996.

- 1.5 Many local governments that have committed to reducing their emissions by at least 20 per cent by the year 2005 or 2010 are now on trajectories to achieve their targets by investing in energy efficiency and transportation projects that reduce local energy use, as well as waste management policies that reduce methane emissions.
- 1.6 In cooperation with the private sector and NGOs, local governments are aggressively implementing strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. They are enjoying multiple benefits from their initiatives that outweigh and often offset the financial costs of such measures. Such benefits include: lower costs of municipal operations, local job creation, better air quality and improvements in public health, reductions in traffic congestion, better urban livability.

1.7 Inspired by the multiple benefits that local governments in developed nations are enjoying as they successfully implement greenhouse gas emissions reduction strategies, local governments in developing nations have also begun to initiate actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, even though their national governments are not obligated under the Framework Convention on Climate Change to reduce such emissions.

Provided adequate financial resources and appropriate technologies are available, developing country cities are desirous of pursuing sustainable development strategies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Local governments in developing nations believe that when strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions address social problems and improve the standard of living locally, they are indeed worth pursuing.

2.0 COMMUNIQUE TO COP 3

WE, the participants in the CCP, as well as other ICLEI members, are convinced from our concrete experiences that: climate change is the most serious long-term environmental threat to cities and their residents, as well as to global security;

cities can meet significant greenhouse gas reduction targets; cities derive multiple benefits from greenhouse gas reductions that frequently exceed the financial costs;

legally binding national commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, if the agreed upon targets and timetables are ambitious, will significantly enhance and amplify local initiatives.

On the other hand, weak national commitments risk undermining local government initiatives; local governments in developing nations are enthusiastic about contributing to climate protection strategies, given the multiple benefits to be enjoyed, provided adequate finances and technical assistance are made available.

THEREFORE, WE CALL ON THE PARTIES TO THE UNFCCC TO:

- 2.1 Adopt a protocol that specifies legally binding targets and timetables for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
- 2.2 Set an initial reduction target for Annex 1 countries, relative to 1990 levels, for the year 2005, with the ultimate target of 20 per cent for the year 2010. Only such an ambitious and early target will demonstrate that national governments are making a serious effort to combat climate change and its impacts.

- 2.3 Urge national governments, through direct consultation with national and local organisations and municipalities, to establish processes and economic instruments which will enable the development and implementation of Local Action Plans to meet greenhouse gas reduction targets.
- 2.4 Persuade international agencies and development banks to grant developing country cities access to financial resources directly from the financial mechanisms associated with the UNFCCC and aid agencies such as the World Bank and regional development banks.
- 2.5 Recognize the benefit of a partnership approach between all spheres of government, the private sector and NGOs in undertaking climate protection measures.
- 2.6 Draw on the experience and expertise of local governments in implementing greenhouse gas reduction strategies by inviting local government officials to participate, through their international associations, ICLEI and IULA, on a non-voting basis in all meetings of the Conference of the Parties and its Subsidiary Bodies, alongside representatives of other international governmental organizations.

3.0 LOCAL GOVERNMENT PLEDGE

WE, the representatives of local governments worldwide, are convinced that local governments are an effective vehicle to help achieve national greenhouse gas reduction goals and that close partnerships with our national governments will enhance our collective efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions;

THEREFORE, WE pledge to make maximum efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions at the local level, to embrace the goals of global sustainability and Local Agenda 21, and to extend our full support to our national governments and to ICLEI's CCP campaign, which will seek to:

- 3.1 Promote the significant reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from municipal and other public operations, including buildings, facilities, landfills, waste treatment, and water pumping stations through the use of renewables, energy efficiency, co-generation, district energy and recycling.
- 3.2 Promote the significant reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from community-wide activities, including transportation, housing, and commerce locally.

- 3.3 Promote the significant expansion of the supply and consumption of renewable energy worldwide at the municipal level.
- 3.4 Promote local educational initiatives and organisations to enhance public understanding of climate change, thereby improving acceptance of national government measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- 3.5 Recruit by the year 2000 local governments to the CCP campaign that together with existing CCP participants account for 10 per cent of the world's carbon dioxide emissions.
- 3.6 Significantly expand the CCP campaign in developing countries.

GLOBAL
LEGISLATORS
ORGANIZATION
FOR A BALANCED ENVIRONMENT
(GLOBE)
ON BEHALF
OF PARLIAMENTARIANS
AND
GLOBAL PARLAMENTARY
DECLARATION
ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Speech by Tom Spencer, MEP, President of GLOBE International to the Conference of Parties

Tuesday, 9 December 1997

I speak this morning not as a negotiator but as a parliamentarian. As the President of an organization of environmentally-committed parliamentarians from 54 countries. We want to see a tight protocol with minimum leakage, but we also insist on looking beyond Kyoto. Our work begins when yours ends. We have to pass the laws and vote the budgets that give reality to your formulas. Above all we have to explain climate disruption to the electorates of the planet...

The key challenge of climate change is not scientific or technological. As John Prescott said yesterday, the challenge is political, and I would add, it is intellectual, institutional, and ethical.

After a week of debate about important details, I suggest that the time is right for a statement of even more important principle,

After years of debate, about "efficiency" I suggest that your efforts cannot be brought to success without a statement about "equity".

The "sense of the Senate" resolution made the fair political point that they could not ratify a treaty, that was not seen to be fair by the American people. A treaty, they said, would have to include meaningful participation by developing countries. I say to my friends in Congress that you cannot ask for that participation on the basis of efficiency alone, You must specify that the nature of that involvement will be equitable.

In life "the right thing to do is the right thing to do". It is occasionally true in diplomacy that an ethically just answer is also the only available way out of an impasse.

So, let the Conference of Parties resolve *"to agree to negotiate a legally binding "Equity Protocol" establishing the principle that the apportionment of global emission entitlements be deliberately converged to a point of equal per capita shares at a date to be agreed."*

This Mr. Chairman is known as the Contraction and Convergence analysis. It offers a framework for an answer. It offers an envelope of equity within which we can trade and barter our way to collective sanity in the coming decades.

I invite the Government of Japan, and the European Union to propose such a text. I invite the United States, which rightly takes its stand on the basis of a "global solution to a global problem" to draw the logical conclusion of its own approach, and to propose such a text.

And in response:

May I invite the Africa Group whose statement in August led the way to respond to such a text.

May I invite the AOSIS states whose very survival depends on our collective success to back such a proposal.

May I invite the Governments of China and India to seize this opportunity of an Equity Protocol that would entrench in our process the principle they have always fought for.

Mr. Chairman, as parliamentarians we have to stand on platforms around the planet and explain to electors: why the monsoon is late, the rivers are dry, or the floods are rising;

to explain why the forest is burning, the cattle are dying, or in some countries why there is

Surf in the High Street

to explain above all that these are not Acts of God, but Acts of Man.

I appeal to the negotiators here to give us a Treaty we can be proud of and the promise of a just future to this debate.

GLOBAL LEGISLATORS ORGANIZATION FOR A BALANCED ENVIRONMENT – GLOBE

GLOBE PARLIAMENTARY DECLARATION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

7 December 1997

- Having regard to the GLOBE positions elaborated at the GLOBE International General Assembly May 1997; the GLOBE Japan symposium in August 1997; the GLOBE Bonn Symposium “Targeting Kyoto and Beyond” in October 1997; the GLOBE Symposium on climate change held in Kyoto on 8 December make the following declaration:
- Having regard to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Mandate adopted at the COP meeting in Berlin;
- Recalling the conclusions of the IPCC that the “balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on climate”; and deeply concerned that the majority of the Annex 1 countries will not meet the target set in 1992 of stabilizing their emissions by the year 2000 at 1990 level;
- Reaffirming its belief in the need to fulfil the Berlin Mandate by a legally-binding Kyoto Protocol;
- Recognizing the threats of climate change to biological diversity, the spread of infectious diseases with the rise of global temperature, and the paucity of comprehensive studies on the effects of climate change on biological diversity;
- Accepting the conclusions of studies, including those by the World Resources Institute, the US Department of Energy “Five-Labs”, report and the IPCC second assessment report, that greenhouse gas emissions abatement can have net economic benefits of up to 1 per cent of GDP, and are substantially higher in reality if the prevention of future economic costs related to extreme weather damage are included in the calculations;
- Believing therefore, that the whole planet and its population stand to gain, both environmentally and economically, from substantial emissions reduction commitments being agreed at Kyoto and, by extension the negotiations at Kyoto should provide direction for the enhancement of human health and security;
- Recognizing that emissions of the countries in transition have been dramatically reduced since 1990, GLOBE affirms that this represents an over-achievement in terms of abatement commitments for Annex 1 countries and thus represents a substantial credit in favour of those

countries which must be banked in their favour, and allows them to be excluded from any additional commitments (including the 15 per cent EU proposal) for A1 countries to 2010 that may be agreed in Kyoto;

- Aware that more stringent limits will need to be agreed to continuously, not least in the energy generation and transportation sectors, and in the household and workplace;
- Strongly believing that new limits, however stringent, cannot succeed in terms unless they form part of a comprehensive global agreement involving discipline on all parties;
- Convinced that any such agreement will have to be reached on the basis of equity expressed as a negotiated convergence to equal per capita emissions entitlements globally, with pro rata reductions thereafter;
- Welcoming, therefore, the commitment of the Africa Group at the AGBM 7 meeting in Bonn to the principle of Convergence and Contraction;

Therefore,

1. GLOBE calls for all post-Rio climate change commitments to be formally enshrined in a long-term legally-binding framework on climate change covering at least the years 2000 to 2100;

That these commitments shall include the establishment of an absolute maximum limit on Greenhouse Gas (GHG) concentrations of not more than 550 ppmv CO₂ equivalent, a designated date by which “emissions standstill” will be reached on an equitable basis and a common “rollback” commitment thereafter;

That these commitments shall be implemented in accordance with a basic emissions limit set at a level for each country consistent with GHG concentrations of 350 ppmv CO₂ equivalent (the Green Box), a global reserve bank of emissions rights that shall not exceed 200 Giga tonnes for the duration of the MEA (the Blue Box) and penalties for actual emissions which exceed the Green and the Blue Box allocations for each country (the Red Box);

That the rules and procedures necessary for the applications of these principles in accordance with the mandate to be adopted at Kyoto shall be agreed by 31 December 1999.

2. GLOBE calls on all participants at Kyoto to address the linkages between the Conventions on Biological Diversity and Climate Change. This would include carrying out comprehensive international research on the effects of climate change on biological diversity, implementing conser-

vation plans and creating protected areas connected by corridors to allow for species migration,

3. GLOBE calls for the individual countries represented in Kyoto to adopt, immediately and additionally, voluntary agreements aimed at the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, such as those indicated in the so called "Kyoto basket".

STATEMENT
BY THE
WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
AND THE KYOTO APPEAL

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Programme Unit 111 – Justice, Peace and Creation

STATEMENT TO THE HIGH LEVEL SEGMENT OF THE THIRD SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES (COP 3) TO THE UN FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Kyoto, 9 December 1997

Mr. President, Distinguished Delegates, Observers,

We recognize that the COP 3 negotiations are at a difficult point. We make this statement on behalf of the World Council of Churches with a combination of humility and prayer, wanting to assist the process and yet needing to speak the truth as we discern it.

For us in the World Council of Churches, the core of the COP 3 agenda is justice.

Justice means being held responsible for one's actions.

The rich of the world, through promotion of the current economic model, have been and continue to be responsible for the vast majority of emissions causing human-produced climate change but seem unwilling to honestly acknowledge that responsibility and translate it into action. It is ironic that countries which exult in their domestic legal principles feel themselves above the law when it comes to their international obligations on climate change.

Justice means being held accountable for promises you make.

The rich of the world have broken their Rio promise to stabilize emissions by 2000 at 1990 levels and yet seem to exhibit no embarrassment at their failure.

Justice means being held responsible for the suffering you cause to others.

Small island states, millions of environmental refugees, and future generations will suffer as a result of the callous exploitation of the Earth's resources by the rich.

Justice means being held accountable for abuse of power.

Human societies, particularly in the over-developed countries, are damaging the environment through climate change with little respect for the inherent worth of other species which we believe to be loved by God as are we.

Justice means an equitable sharing of the Earth's resources.

Millions of people lack the necessities for a decent quality of life. It is the height of arrogance to propose that restrictive commitments be placed on the poor to make up for the delinquencies of the rich. Over-consumption of the rich and poverty of the poor must both be eliminated to ensure quality of life for all.

Justice demands truth.

Destructive misinformation campaigns are being used by groups with powerful economic self-interest with the intention of preventing meaningful action on climate change.

Justice requires honesty.

The world is not so easily divided into the rich North and the poor South as we used to think. There are a few wealthy and powerful countries and elites within the category referred to as developing countries who sometimes misuse this classification of nations to disguise their economic self-interest.

God's justice is strict but it is not cruel. We are all here in Kyoto as brothers and sisters equal before God within the community of creation – a creation which we all want to be healthy and thriving for future generations. In affirmation of the goodness of creation (Genesis 1:25), God beckons us to respect all forms of life. In what we do at COP 3, we must not betray life.

Confidence-building measures are needed so that together we can reduce the threat of climate change:

- Industrialized countries must demonstrate, in the near future, real and significant reductions in domestic greenhouse gas emissions which many studies have shown to be possible with a considerable net benefit to their economies.
- Though developing countries should not be subject to formal emission limitation commitments yet, many of them are pursuing measures and can continue their efforts to become more energy-efficient and to limit greenhouse gas emissions.
- The sharing of finance and technological resources is needed but it is also very important to exchange experiences from both South and North including those of indigenous cultures, women's organizations and others which can offer lessons and tools for learning to live in a socially just, equitable and ecologically sustainable manner.

In these remaining days of COP 3, let us shift our energies away from trying to figure out how to attain the minimum and channel them instead toward creative risk-taking options for accomplishing the maximum. Thank you.

Notes

- 1) At COP 3, the World Council of Churches (WCC) was represented by a delegation consisting of:
 - Lic. Elias Crisostomo Abramides, Ecumenical Patriarchate, Argentina
 - Ms. Nafisa Goga D'Souza, India
 - Dr. David G. Hallman, Canada (Head of Delegation)
 - Mr. Prawate Khid-Arn, Christian Conference of Asia, Hong Kong
 - Dr. Karin Léxen, Christian Council of Sweden, Sweden
 - Dr. Alfredo Salibian, Consejo Latinoamericano de Iglesias, Argentina
 - ev. Tsutom Shoji, National Council of Churches in Japan, Japan
 - Rev. Bill Somplatsky-Jarman, National Council of Churches of Christ, United States of America
 - Dr . Larisa Skuratovskaya , Russia
- 2) The World Council of Churches (WCC) has been involved in the climate change issue for ten years. To encourage governments of industrialized countries to accept their responsibility in the lead-up to COP 3, the WCC co-ordinated a petition campaign through the churches in 23 industrialized countries which called on those governments to meet the stabilization commitment of Rio, adopt a binding international agreement for further reductions post-2000, and engage citizen participation more forcefully in finding solutions.
- 3) The "Kyoto Appeal" presented at the Dec. 7th Inter Religious Gathering on Climate Change (including Buddhists, Christians, Shintos and New Religions) contains prayers for COP 3 and calls on leaders to support the AOSIS protocol.

KYOTO APPEAL OF THE INTER-RELIGIOUS GATHERING ON PREVENTION OF CLIMATE CHANGE

We, Person of Religion, have assembled of Kyoto Catholic Kawaramachi Church, and have transcended religious differences in order together to hold "Inter-Religious Gathering on Prevention of Climate Change". Our Purpose is to pray for the successful conclusion of the Third Conference of Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP 3) which is being held from December 1 to 10, 1997 at the Kyoto International Conference Hall. Not only Person of Religion but also citizens and overseas participants to the COP 3 have joined this gathering here at this church.

Human beings from the beginning of existence to this date, have benefited from nature and have deprived various other creatures of their lives. Therefore, it is humankind's common task to respect with appreciation all life including nature. In recent years, however, we have selfishly destroyed nature to accommodate our needs; neglecting the weak and other forms of life by placing priority on the economic interests. We have been indifferent to the reality that, the more materially abundant life we pursue, the more sacrifice other people and other life forms have to make. We, Person of Religion, sorrowfully reflect on our past that we have taken the same position as others and have remained silent to this reality.

Today, we are facing the unprecedented crisis of our global environment as a result of climate change and global warming. The main cause of this is the greenhouse gases such as CO₂ emissions to the atmosphere as well as deforestation, the main contributors of which are the "advanced" Nations including Japan. Experts warn us that significant reduction of greenhouse gas emissions need to be made, or else grave consequences because of climate change are in the offing. It is the responsibility of we who live today to leave a good environment to the next generation.

We, therefore, request to the all leaders of the participant countries of the COP 3 as well as to the people around the world:

The leaders of the nations must not only pursue the interest of their industries but should hold a global perspective thus giving hope to the future of Earth. To this end, they must strive to agree starting 2005 to curb all emissions into the atmosphere of greenhouse gases such as CO₂ emissions to the level proposed by the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) and supported by the international NGOs, that is 20 per cent of the 1990 level by the year 2005. Furthermore, people around the globe should monitor this to ensure these commitments are fulfilled and endeavour to simplify their own lifestyles.

We, Person of Religion, have gathered here today in the City of Religion to sound to the world the alarm of the crisis of global environment. At the same time, with other people of religions around the world, we pray that a resolution which would ensure the future of Earth will be passed at the COP 3.

7 December 1997

Participants,

“Inter-Religious Gathering on Prevention of Climate Change”

TWO STATEMENTS
ON BEHALF
OF
TRADE UNIONS

International Confederation of Free Trade Unions Climate Change and Jobs:

Towards a Strategy for Sustainable Employment

Trade Union Statement to the Kyoto Conference (1–10 December 1997)

Ministers in Kyoto face the dilemma of making commitments that meet the imperative of action to slow down and arrest global warming but do not compromise the economic development needed to reduce poverty and unemployment. There is a grave danger of environmental and employment policies pointing in contradictory directions. Yet in the debates about what should be the global programme on climate change, there is very little discussion of a sustainable employment strategy.

My presentation on behalf of the trade unions in the 137 countries that are members of the ICFTU and the written statement we have circulated, focus on how a sustainable employment policy can help to build a credible international effort to reduce and arrest climate change.

Trade unions are concerned that few policy-makers have considered the impact on workers and workplaces of meeting the challenges identified by the Assessment Reports of the IPCC. Working people around the world could well find themselves bearing a disproportionate share of the direct and indirect costs of either dislocation as a result of failure to arrest global warming or of large scale changes in employment structures as a result of action to reduce emissions.

Lack of research means we do not know enough about the effects on employment patterns and communities of continued climate change or of policies to counteract global warming. Precious time needed to plan for change is being lost.

Furthermore the underlying problem of the social and economic consequences of environmental policy is being ignored, thus leading to divergent views about what needs to be done and what is politically feasible.

As the vast majority of greenhouse gas emissions come from the manufacturing industry, energy production and supply, as well as from transportation and construction sectors in industrialized nations, workers in these sectors are most at risk from proposals to reduce emissions. One of the few studies available, estimates over 340,000 US job losses in six energy intensive industries for meeting commitments agreed upon in the Berlin mandate. Total job losses could be in a range between 900,000 and 1.6 million jobs. While new jobs in "green" industries will be created, such as energy saving in buildings, it is unclear where and how many and therefore what training and adjustment measures are needed.

Whatever targets are decided, trade unions intend to ensure that employment transition issues are dealt with in an international context. Resistance to high targets will come from those sectors in both industrial and developing countries which will suffer most and, given crisis levels of global unemployment, may be opposed by workers unless strong and equitable employment transition measures are linked to target-setting. Proposals to soften the effect of targets on companies through such mechanisms as “tradable permits”, could result in the dangerously divisive effect of closures of industries in one country to allow an increase in emissions in another.

Developing countries must be encouraged to participate in emissions reductions because firstly, their emissions are rising fast and will soon reach significant levels. And secondly, once locked into a high emissions development pattern, it becomes increasingly costly to break out of it.

As prime contributors to global warming, *industrial* countries have a responsibility to take the lead, both by cutting emissions and by providing financial and technical assistance. However it is vital to the development of a strong response from industrialized countries that the global dimensions of the challenge are fully recognized from the outset, by a recognition from developing countries that they too will need to join in the setting of binding targets even if they have differentiated goals and timetables.

Our over-riding concern is to ensure that action to prevent environmental degradation is consistent with the goals of full employment and the eradication of poverty. This will not be achieved by relying on market mechanisms or by suppressing workers legitimate concerns about their jobs. It *will* require careful planning by governments, employers, and trade unions in all countries and by the UN.

The ICFTU therefore urges COP 3 to initiate large-scale detailed studies of the employment implications of the decisions you adopt. The ILO should be asked to establish a tripartite team to work on sustainable employment programmes to be part of climate change programmes.

The ICFTU, and the International Trade Secretariats like the ICEM who are also represented here, will continue to press for an international climate change strategy that is equitable to workers and their communities. The disruptive and costly effects of both climate change and measures to combat it can be reduced significantly if trade unions are involved, through such tools as the workplace eco-audit. We will also work to influence public policy by collaborating with other sectors in society. We appreciate this opportunity to present our ideas to the Third Conference of the Parties in Kyoto, Japan and look forward to working with you in the future.

**International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mine
and General Workers' Unions
to the Third Conference of the Parties to the
Framework Convention on Climate Change**

Kyoto, 9 December 1997

Address by Kenneth S. Zinn

Honourable Mr. President, distinguished ministers, delegates, ladies and gentlemen,

My name is Kenneth Zinn and I am here today representing the International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mine and General workers Unions, known as the ICEM.

The ICEM is a global labour federation consisting of 450 affiliated unions representing 20 million workers in 114 countries on all five continents employed in the energy, chemicals, mining, pulp and paper, rubber, cement, glass, ceramics, and environmental services industries. I am proud to be here with affiliates of ours from Australia, South Africa, the United States and Canada.

We are the men and women who bring you the world's energy that makes our economies run. Our members are the ones who work deep under the ground digging out coal, often, as the recent mine disaster in Russia showed once again, at great risk to their lives. They are the ones who are exposed to carcinogenic substances in the world's chemical plants and oil refineries. They are the ones on the front lines of radiation exposure in the world's uranium mines and nuclear power plants. They are the ones working at the natural gas wells and pipelines and in the electric power generating stations. They are the people who get up every day, work hard and play by the rules, pay the taxes that fund the governments who are represented here and, in those countries that allow people the right to vote, they are the citizens who elect you, the governments.

Simply put, without the sacrifice and hard work of our members and workers like them, society as we know it would grind to a halt. Yet, despite this fact, these negotiations have given almost no consideration to their fate and to the fate of their families and communities who depend on these jobs for their very survival.

The ICEM cares deeply about maintaining a healthy and safe environment for the people of today and the children who will inherit our world. The fact that we work in dangerous industries makes us doubly sensitive to matters of environmental safety. We accept that human activities may be causing a gradual warming of the earth's climate, and believe that leaders of today

should confront this problem and not leave it for the next generation to solve.

With that said, however, it is very clear that these negotiations have failed by creating a negotiating framework that divides instead of unites the world's governments in collective action. Instead of a protocol that promotes the common good, we are debating a protocol where some will be winners and others will be losers.

The negotiations have failed to take the most basic first step – the identification of a global atmospheric greenhouse gas concentration target. If we do not know what our global target is, how is it possible to determine the appropriate course of action to take in terms of emission reductions and timetables and each country's equitable share in meeting that target? Some would have us go down a certain road without knowing our destination, and this seems particularly foolhardy given the stakes to the environment and the world's economy.

A protocol that commits certain nations to cuts in emissions without actually stopping global warming is a failed protocol. It is a scientific fact that the world cannot stop global warming if this protocol excludes countries that are today responsible for some 40 per cent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions and will be responsible for more than half of the world's emissions in just 20 short years. We could literally shut down the economies of North America, Europe, Japan, Australia and New Zealand tomorrow and the problem of global warming would still be with us.

If the parties sign a protocol that binds some countries to reduce emissions but not others, you will raise energy costs in some countries but not others, encourage the export of capital and jobs and pollution, and in the process, simply transfer greenhouse gas emissions from one part of the world to another.

We reject creating one more incentive for multinational corporations to move production from one part of the world to another. The result will be little net change in global greenhouse gas emissions but tremendous economic disruption. In fact, the problem may be exacerbated if more energy-efficient operations are shut down in countries with reduction obligations and less energy-efficient operations are opened elsewhere. Global warming is a global problem and thus necessitates a global solution.

We accept the position by the developing country governments that they have overriding concerns to alleviate poverty, hunger and disease. We are committed to that same cause and our sense of global solidarity and economic justice demands that we stand with the poor and working people of those countries who are struggling to do just that.

But by the same token, the industrialized country governments must also worry about economic development in their countries, and we equally stand with the poor and working people of those countries who are struggling for jobs, growth and justice. We believe this protocol must look out for the interests of poor and working people in all countries. The workers and the poor – north and south – are the ones who will bear the brunt of any climate changes that result from global warming and we will bear the brunt of any economic policies adopted to deal with global warming. We seek climate solutions consistent with the objectives of Chapter 29.2 of Agenda 21: “The overall objective is poverty alleviation and full and sustainable employment, which contribute to safe, clean and healthy environments.”

Just a few days ago, the G-8 countries held a summit in Kobe here in Japan to talk about the jobs crisis. World unemployment is at crisis levels. There are 36 million people unemployed in the OECD countries alone. Thus the notion that this protocol may throw more people out of work – again, for little or no environmental gain – is totally unacceptable.

For those who say the world can make very rapid changes in production and transportation to reduce emissions without economic disruption and job losses, we remain ready to work with you. However, most evidence points to the contrary. One need only look at the double-digit unemployment rates and the shattered lives of workers and their families in the coalfields of the United Kingdom, and to the closed factories of eastern Germany to know there is a severe human cost to making these changes in a short period of time.

A study just released by the International Labour organization shows that 1.5 million coal miners alone will lose their jobs by 2010 should the governments assembled here agree to simply stabilize Annex I emissions at 1990 levels. For every coal miner who loses his job, there are at least four to five other workers who will also lose their jobs. And that’s just the tip of the iceberg. If the lowest cost fuels are removed from the energy mix, industries that are highly energy-intensive will suffer as will individual energy consumers.

As the ILO study shows, the job losses will occur in both developed and developing countries even if this protocol binds only Annex I countries to emissions reductions. Coal miners in South Africa and Colombia will also suffer, as will oil workers in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Venezuela, Mexico, Nigeria and many other countries as well. In our global market place, the impact of what is done by industrialized countries will flow through to many developing nations.

We have a duty not to gamble with our members’ livelihoods and we make no apologies for defending our members’ jobs.

The answers to this problem are time, technology, and social justice frameworks that protect the most vulnerable in our societies. And these are the answers for both developed and developing countries. In the industrialized nations, time must be given to allow for the gradual turnover of capital stock, ensuring that any new capital stock is as environmentally-friendly as possible. In those countries where capital stock is now turning over or is being built for the first time, it should be incumbent on all nations to similarly ensure that the new stock emits fewer greenhouse gasses. This means, in part, that through joint implementation or other means, state-of-the-art technology must be provided to countries that are newly developing or are in transition. These responsibilities fall on governments from both developed and developing countries, on private industry, and on the international financial institutions to provide the resources to allow this to happen:

Time must be given to the developing countries to grow – but to grow smartly and humanely. This protocol is as much an economic instrument, as it is an environmental instrument. As such, we must insist that social justice concerns be included, just as we would insist for any international economic treaty.

It is not sufficient for any of our economies to grow if the people at the bottom don't get the benefit from it.

We must take note that some of the governments who today are demanding the right to grow unfettered are also ones that disallow any freedom of association for workers to join trade unions in their countries. "Development" without labour rights means development for some but not the many and we reject such a framework. This is as true for the industrialized countries as it is for the developing countries.

The government delegates here have an awesome responsibility. Your responsibility is both to the earth and to the people who inhabit it. We in the trade union movement will do our part but we must be allowed a seat at the table. We must be part of a social partnership with industry, government, and other affected parties.

It is essential that the world's governments get this right, and ensure that any new protocol actually accomplishes the goals of the Framework Convention without harming those people the world round who can least afford it.

Thank you.

OTHERS

INTERNATIONAL YOUTH
AND STUDENT MOVEMENT
FOR THE
UNITED NATIONS (ISMUN)

Statement by the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations (ISMUN)

Hirofumi Goto (Kyoto University)

Mr. President, Distinguished guests, Honourable delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is my pleasure to address you on behalf of the International Youth and Student Movement for the United Nations (ISMUN) and its global constituency of young people from all continents.

Young people and youth NGOs have taken the lead in many countries in the search for the new consumption and production patterns which are required to avert the disastrous consequences of climate change. Yet little progress has been made because of the failure of the richest and most powerful countries to act in the interest of present and future generations.

The time since Rio has been a time of broken promises. Commitments were made to limit greenhouse gas emissions, but instead the opposite has taken place. Promises were made for new and additional resources for sustainable development, but instead we have experienced new and additional cuts.

Some 85 per cent of today's youth live in the developing countries. They will be the first to suffer from the approaching disasters caused by climate change

The United Nations Charter recognizes the equal rights of nations large and small. We thus find it appalling that some countries who demand maximum security for themselves, even to the extent of accumulating nuclear weapons, insist on continuing to pollute the atmosphere at the risk of climate change that will obliterate the very existence of a number of small island states and lead to the destruction of the habitat of many developing countries.

The single greatest threat to the global climate and survival of mankind would be the use of nuclear weapons leading to a nuclear winter. Therefore we reiterate the call for a convention on the abolition of nuclear weapons to be concluded by the year 2000.

There is no doubt where the responsibility lies for centuries of greenhouse gas emissions. And there is no way that the luxury emissions of the few can be equalled with the survival emissions of the many. We strongly reject attempts to shift the burden for resolving the problems caused by industrialized countries to the poor in the developing world.

This is not the time for compromises that fall below the minimum required to avert catastrophe. If some countries chose to opt out of the imperatives

of mankind it must not prevent the rest of the world from reaching a principled agreement with the necessary cuts in emissions from the industrialized countries. We are convinced that pressure from the peoples of the world may finally convince the recalcitrant country to join.

The question of climate change is fundamentally an issue of building a more just and equitable world. Without a fundamental change of course there is little hope to prevent further erosion of the global environment which is spurred by greed and shortsighted business interests. Ways and means must be found to realize the right to development for all.

For developing countries to follow with realistic measures they need full access to new and sustainable technologies. The threat of climate change represents a great challenge to generate the new and additional resources required for sustainable development. The possibilities for an early introduction of global taxes and fees to support sustainable development for all must be fully explored.

To accomplish the great tasks for global cooperation in the new millennium we need strong and democratic international institutions. In a world of chaos we need the democratic internationalism symbolized by the United Nations more than ever.

We feel that the global public debate on climate change has just started. It must now be vigorously pursued in all parts of the world to generate public support for the sometimes hard and difficult measures that are called for to safeguard our common heritage, the atmosphere. It is our belief that young people and youth NGOs could play a crucial role in this process.

Thank you.

