

VAKATSEITE

against

Compiled by Azza Taalab

PREFACE

The success of the Kyoto Conference on climate change, and the adoption there of a protocol that will shape climate change policy for the next 20 years, is in no small measure due to the activities of the media and of non-governmental organizations. While government negotiators and ministers were at the core of the agreement on the Kyoto Protocol, it was those other actors who provided the political platform. The spotlight that they brought to bear on the climate change issue, and on the event itself, made Kyoto an appointment that could not be missed and created the pressure for a significant outcome.

If fully implemented, the Kyoto Protocol will indeed have a significant environmental impact, reducing the level of greenhouse gas emissions from industrialized countries by some five per cent below a 1990 baseline. When compared with projections of emission levels in 2010 in the absence of measures to fulfil the Kyoto commitments, this represents a reduction of nearly 30 per cent below “business as usual”. This is the true environmental measure of the Kyoto outcome.

It is equally clear, however, that the environment ministers gathered in Kyoto succeeded in negotiating one of the most important economic agreements to have been concluded under the United Nations banner for several years. A real reduction of 30 per cent in emissions of gases from mainly industrial sources will have a strong economic impact. In sectors such as energy and transport, the commitments agreed in Kyoto will drive a new wave of technological innovation and bring forward to the market technologies which have until now appeared futuristic. Consumers will also have to be induced to reexamine the way in which they use, and often waste, scarce resources in these areas of their daily lives. These factors are sufficient to justify labelling the Kyoto Protocol an economic instrument.

In addition, the Protocol enables the establishment of market-based mechanisms for developed countries to achieve emission reductions “offshore” at least cost. These mechanisms – joint implementation, the “clean development mechanism” and emissions trading - will create new markets and new ways of doing business.

In both ways, therefore, the Kyoto Protocol will mark the evolution of the global economy and global markets in the 21st century. In its implementa-

tion, the media and the non-governmental organizations – in particular the business sector - will be called upon to play a full part. They must scrutinize the elaboration of the “small print”, the necessary rules and procedures that will determine the mechanisms for accounting and accountability, vital for the credibility of the Protocol. Their contributions to the discussion will help governments strike the right balance between ease and rigour in establishing these mechanisms. The business sector, industrial and financial, will be called upon to deliver results and to choose mechanisms and measures for doing so that make economic sense, within parameters set by governments.

This timely publication, compiled by one who was closely involved with the participation of non-governmental organizations in the climate change process, serves not only as a reminder of past achievements but as a call to future action – action which must start with support for the signature, ratification and entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol.

Michael Zammit Cutajar

Executive Secretary, UNFCCC

FOREWORD

The most profound global threat which humanity is facing is the prospect of human economic activities creating a dangerous “greenhouse effect” of global warming, with consequences for the earth’s entire ecosystem and for the way of life of rich and poor societies alike.

Those consequences – rises in sea level, depleted agriculture, reduced water flows, increased health hazards, more turbulent weather, social strains – all suggest that both developed and developing countries have good reason to worry about global warming.

Recent increases in temperature and changes in climate variability in various parts of the world are suspected by many scientists to be the first signals of such global climate change.

The stakes are high on all sides. We can not allow further damage to the systems that support human life to become irreversible knowing that the cost of implementing adaptive measures in future will be prohibitive.

In this regard, the Kyoto Protocol to the Climate Change Convention goes beyond mere calls for action and through legally binding commitments promises to arrest and then reverse the upward surge in emissions that started in the industrialized countries 150 years ago.

Now it is for policymakers in all countries to refine and launch the win-win solutions available to them. Abandoning counterproductive incentives and subsidies, removing barriers to market efficiency, and promoting investments in energy efficiency can limit emissions while benefiting the economy.

Further scientific research into the causes and effects of climate change must be a priority investment. Economics has much to offer by analyzing win-win policies, market mechanisms, and other solutions. The Kyoto Protocol is the first instance where governments have agreed to use economic instruments to implement the Protocol. Development of these instruments will give the stake-holders opportunities for a better choice in achieving efficiencies.

One of the most important tasks facing policymakers will be to engage the energies of the business, industry, local governments and the civil society. Industry leaders must adjust their investment and marketing strategies and

develop more energy-efficient vehicles, consumer goods, and production processes. At the local government and community level, the Protocol should be seen as a harbinger of increased pressure to make urban transport system, public buildings, and town planning more energy efficient and environmentally friendly. Most importantly, individual households must contribute to emissions reduction through their powers of consumer choice and their personal lifestyle decisions.

For its part, the United Nations Environment Programme is fully committed to strengthening its support of the IPCC and its contribution to Convention-related activities, including public information services. Only by working together in this way can the international community effectively address the global challenge of climate change.

Klaus Töpfer

Executive Director

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

INDEX

AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
BDI	Federation of German Industries
BCSE	Business Council For Sustainable Energy
CAN	Climate Action Network
COP 1	First session of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Climate Change
COP 2	Second session of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Climate Change
COP 3	Third session of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Climate Change
COP 4	Fourth session of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Climate Change
COGEN	International Cogeneration Alliance
CCP	Cities for Climate Protection
ECO	Newsletter issued by Climate Action Network
EEI	Edison Electric Institute
ENB	Earth Negotiations Bulletin
e 5	European Business Council For a Sustainable Energy Future
EWEA	European Wind Energy Association
FOE	Friends of the Earth
FIELD	Foundation for International Environmental Law and Development
GAKKOS	Global Network Class
GCC	Global Climate Coalition
VIII	

GCI	Global Commons Institute
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHGs	Greenhouse gases
GLOBE	Global Legislators Organization For a Balanced Environment
IUPT/UIPT	International Association of Public Transport
ICC	International Chamber of Commerce
ICEM	International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mine and General Workers Unions
ICFTU	International Confederation of Free Trade Unions
ICLEI	International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives
ICSU	International Council of Scientific Unions
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ISMUN	International Student and Youth Movement of the United Nations
IULA	International Union of Local Authorities
Keidanren	Japan Federation of Economic Organizations
LGO	Local Government Organization
NARUC	National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
SAR	Second Assessment Report
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNICE	Union of Industrial and Employer's Confederations of Europe
WCC	World Council of Churches
WBCSD	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
WWF	World Wide Fund
VERTIC	Verification Technology Information Center

* * *

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Preface by Michael Zammit Cutajar	IV
2. Foreword by Klaus Töpfer	VI
3. Index	VIII
4. Synopsis by Azza Taalab	XIII
5. Part I: Speeches by NGOs	1
6. Part II: Press releases by NGOs	53
7. Acknowledgements	201
8. Photos	202

SYNOPSIS

“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.”

Tom Spencer of GLOBE, 9 December 1997, Kyoto

Introduction

The purpose of this book-cum-Compilation is to put on record the invaluable contribution, dedication and commitment of the non-governmental actors (NGOs) who have been, and are currently participating in the negotiations on climate change. After expounding briefly the greenhouse effect and its critical role in climate change, the book identifies the different NGO constituencies most active in the UNFCCC process and their positions on the Kyoto Protocol, which was negotiated and adopted by the Third Conference of the Parties (COP 3) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) held from 1 to 11 December 1997 in Kyoto, Japan, and finally their role in the implementation of the Convention on Climate Change.

At the outset, a few words must be said on the “immensity” of the COP 3 event. For COP 3 was by far the biggest meeting ever organized by the Convention secretariat with some 10000 participants of all kinds: 2273 Government delegates, with massive numbers from the media and NGO world: 3712 media representatives and 3663 NGO representatives, in addition to 79 from the intergovernmental world. As a sign of our modern and virtual reality, COP 3 set the stage for the biggest live broadcast ever on the Internet.

COP 3 was also marked by its “high political profile” culminating in the ministerial segment, which was held from 8 to 10 December and which was addressed by Mr. Ruytaro Hashimoto, Prime Minister of Japan, Mr. José Maria Figueres Olsen, President of Costa Rica, Mr. Kinza Clodumar, Presi-

dent of Nauru, Mr. Albert Gore, Jr., Vice-President of the United States of America and President of the Senate and Mr. Maurice Strong, representative of the Secretary General of the United Nations. COP 3 was attended by more than 80 Ministers and Deputy Ministers.

This introductory chapter is based on information gleaned from the compilation. The latter will consist of two Parts: Part I is a compilation of accredited NGO statements whose list of speakers was approved by the bureau of COP 3 during the Ministerial segment of the meeting held from 8 to 10 December. Part II is a selection of press releases issued by accredited NGO players on the major issues under the Kyoto Protocol adopted one day after the official closing day, on 11 December.

Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change

In their daily activities, humans are increasing emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG) and thus their concentrations in the atmosphere are going up. As these concentrations increase, the temperature of the Earth rises. This is known as the greenhouse effect. It leads to changes in the patterns of precipitation and to sea level rise. And as temperatures, precipitation and sea level change, there is reason to worry about the adverse effects on ecological and socio-economic systems, and on human health.

The scientific assessment of the greenhouse effect and its impact on human societies has been spearheaded by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)¹). Published in 1996, its second assessment report (SAR) is the most comprehensive and scientifically authoritative account of humankind's understanding of climate change, the potential effects on humans and the natural environment, the technology currently available to reduce human activities adversely affecting the climate, and the socio-economic implications of those measures to be taken to mitigate these changes.

The SAR concluded that "there is a discernible human influence on the Earth's climate system" and that action was needed immediately. Reducing GHG emissions can no longer be avoided as the temperature of the earth is expected to rise between 1.0 to 3.5 C over the next century; a rate of change that has not been experienced at any time during the past 10,000 years.

¹) The IPCC was established in 1988 by both UNEP and WMO, and is made up of 2000 scientific and technical experts. It published two assessment reports on the science of climate change in 1990 and in 1996.

Furthermore, recent evidence shows that the temperature has gone up all over the globe. Precipitation patterns have changed and in some parts of the world especially in Africa, it has become drier. In a warmer world, forest species could change and the rate of extinction of birds, animals and plants could be already 50 to 100 times the natural extinction rate.²⁾

In a warming world, sea level rise is also expected to rise by 50 centimeters over the next century. It could be as high as 1 metre, or as low as 15 centimeters. But once the process is set in motion, it cannot be slowed down in anything less than a few millennia. A sea level rise of 1 metre will displace tens of millions of people in low lying deltaic areas of Bangladesh and China for example, and wipe out whole cultures in small island states.³⁾

The bottom line is that all countries need to act now to address this threat of climate change. Industrialized countries need to produce and consume energy cleanly and more efficiently, while developing countries need to modify their pattern of development towards cleaner energy production and use, and lessen their dependence on fossil fuels (oil, coal and gas).

Signposts: The Convention on Climate Change, the Berlin Mandate and Kyoto Protocol

Against this backdrop, the international community first signed and ratified the Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 1992 to address this issue. The ultimate aim of the Convention is to “achieve... stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.”⁴⁾

However, at the first session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 1) held in 1995, Berlin, Parties to the Convention decided to go further and strengthen the commitments of the industrialized countries beyond the year 2000 so as to approach the aim of the Convention.⁵⁾ They thus agreed on establishing an open-ended Ad-hoc group of Parties to initiate this process called the Ad Hoc Group on the Berlin Mandate (AGBM), which finished its work in 1997 and adopted the results of its work at COP 3.

COP 3 saw the arduous negotiation and adoption of the Kyoto Protocol⁶⁾, aimed at reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) beyond the

²⁾ For further information, refer to “*Climate Change and Wildlife*” – A summary of an international workshop by Birdlife International and WWF, Boulder, Colorado, September 1997.

³⁾ Robert Watson – “*The heat is on*” in *Our Planet*, Volume 9, no. 3, 1997.

⁴⁾ See Article 2 of the UNFCCC.

⁵⁾ The Berlin Mandate is contained in FCCC/CP/1995/7/Add.1, decision 1/CP.1

⁶⁾ Text of Kyoto Protocol is in document FCCC/CP/1997/L.7/Add.1.

year 2000 by the industrialized countries. The protocol establishes different and legally binding reduction targets for individual countries in the industrialized world (Annex I)⁷⁾ in view of the differences in their economic and national situations over five year “budget periods” starting from 2008 to 2012.

The United States agreed to an average reduction of 7 percent below 1990 levels in the first budget period, from 2008–1012. Member countries from the European Union are to jointly meet a target of 8 percent reductions from 1990 levels in the same period. Japan’s reduction target is 6 percent. The agreement calls for reductions in emissions of six greenhouse gases: carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆).

Other industrialized countries in Annex I such as Russia and Ukraine ended up with more lenient targets, which brings the average target down to just over 5 percent below 1990 levels for all industrialized countries. Some other countries from Annex I such as Australia and Iceland were even allowed to increase their GHG emissions during the same period – much to the objection and uproar of the environmental NGO constituency, as opposed to the satisfaction of a few NGOs from the business and industry constituency.

Three NGO constituencies in the UNFCCC process... or more?

Since 1992, it has been the practice under the UNFCCC to deal with two NGO constituencies: environmental NGOs, and business and industry NGOs. It was during the first Conference of the Parties held in Berlin, in 1995, that the UNFCCC process began to deal with a third constituency; that of local authorities and municipal government. It is to be noted that this current categorization is not totally accurate as it does not fully reflect the reality of the diversity of views and interests existing within the NGO constituency.

A. Environmental NGOs

The environmental NGO constituency coordinated by Climate Action Network⁸⁾ comprises large international NGOs such as the World Wide Fund

⁷⁾ Annex I Parties include the 24 industrialized countries of the OECD including the European Union and 11 countries with economies in transition. 6 Parties were added to Annex I at COP 3 which are Croatia, the Czech Republic, Liechtenstein, Monaco, Slovenia and Slovakia.

⁸⁾ Climate Action Network is a network of NGOs who share a common concern for the problem of climate change and wish to cooperate in the development and implementation of strategies to combat it. It has regional and national focal points in Africa, South Asia, South East Asia, Central and Eastern Europe, and Latin America, Canada, France, Russia, the UK, and the US.

(WWF), Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth International, KIKO FORUM⁹⁾, academia, (the scientific and technological community in the language of Agenda 21) such as the Verification Technology Information Center (VERTIC), Foundation for International Environmental Law and Development (FIELD), the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU), the Wuppertal Institute for Climate, Environment and Energy, Union of Concerned Scientists, to name but a few.

It also includes youth NGOs such as the International Youth & Student Movement of the United Nations (ISMUN); religious groups such as the World Council of Churches (WCC); Trade Unions such as the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), and last but not least, the parliamentarians represented by the Global Legislators Organization For a Balanced Environment (GLOBE). The positions of GLOBE and the WCC will be outlined separately in view of the importance and extent of outreach of their campaigns to address climate change and protect the planet.

The environmental NGO constituency in its entirety, acknowledges the science of climate change based on the conclusions reached by the IPCC in its Second Assessment Report (SAR) that “there is a discernible human influence on the Earth’s climate system”. It reiterates that the cost of early action to reduce GHG emissions is by far lower than the cost of inaction in view of the serious impacts of climate change on human settlements, human health, ecosystems, biodiversity, and agricultural systems, if action were delayed.

Led by the World Council of Churches, environmental NGOs stress the ethical dimension, that is, the moral commitment of humankind to act in favour of the poor and vulnerable countries such as the Small Island States and for the protection of the Earth’s climate.

B. Business and Industry NGOs

The business and industry NGOs is another constituency, which is coordinated by the International Chamber of Commerce¹⁰⁾, a diverse group which includes companies, electric utilities, manufacturing industry including fos-

⁹⁾ KIKO FORUM was set up only for COP 3 so as to coordinate the contribution of Japanese environmental NGOs to the UNFCCC process as well as fund the participation of a number of developing country NGOs in COP 3. It disbanded after COP 3.

¹⁰⁾ The ICC has been set up since 1919 as the prime channel of communication between the business community and international governmental bodies. It draws on the experience and insight of its 5000 member companies and the ICC national committees in more than 130 countries.

sil fuels, and trade associations. It includes three groups: the moderate ICC-led NGO business and industry group such as the Federation of German Industries (BDI), the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD), and the Japan Federation of Economic Organizations (Keidanren); the “hard core” fossil fuel group led by the Global Climate Coalition, and the “Clean energy” group such as the US and European Business Council for Sustainable Energy, and the International Cogeneration Alliance (COGEN).

It is to be noted that the business and industry constituency is by no means a uniform group, as it represents different interests and views. At the beginning, the ICC managed to coordinate a consensus view which it formally presented to the UNFCCC process.

However, in early 1997, the business and industry ranks broke, giving rise to a separate group – the “Clean Energy” group mentioned above, joined most recently by the International Association of Public Transport (UIPT), in addition to the Insurance Industry Initiative, and the European Wind Energy Association.

This group acknowledges the scientific understanding of climate change which, while incomplete, is sufficient for early action to control GHG emissions so as to address the threat of climate change. This would also give an early signal to the market which would enable it to create a demand for renewable energy and energy efficiency, stressing the economic and competitive advantage in doing so.

The moderate ICC-led constituency does not reject either the science pointing to global warming nor does it over-emphasize the cost of reducing emissions. However, it underlines its role as a central part of the solution to climate change, the need for prudent, timely and global action over the long-term to address this global challenge, and calls for increased investment in climate-friendly technology.

On the other hand, the “hard core” fossil fuel group led by the Global Climate Coalition (GCC), differs from the moderate ICC-led business and industry NGO group by strongly stressing the economic cost of reductions of GHG emissions, arguing that the science of climate change is far too inconclusive and that any legally binding agreement on GHG reductions without equally obligating developing countries would cause loss of jobs in the US and loss of competitiveness due to relocation of industries to the developing world. In the lead up to COP 3, it funded a US\$ 13 million campaign in the US¹¹⁾ against any legally binding agreement aimed at reducing emissions of GHGs by industrialized countries only.

¹¹⁾ See the campaign’s web site at <http://www.climatefacts.org/other/index.html> & the GCC’s web site at <http://www.worldcorpcom/dc-online/gcc/>.

C. Local Authorities and Municipal Government

Coordinated by the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI), local authorities and municipal government are considered too a non-governmental entity in the UNFCCC process, though they are not in the strict sense of the word. Understandably, local authorities led by ICLEI and the International Union of Local Authorities (IULA) are asking for a different status; to be accorded a "Local Government Organization (LGO)" status in the UNFCCC as well as in other UN entities.

ICLEI is the environmental agency of over 250 local governments from all over the world whose mission is to build and serve an international movement of local governments aimed at attaining improvements in the global environment. In 1993, ICLEI launched a Climate Change campaign (CCP) to fight climate change. To date, 240 cities have joined this campaign representing 100 million people and accounting for 5–6 per cent of total global CO₂ emissions.

This constituency representing local government acknowledges the conclusions reached by the IPCC and stresses the economic and other benefits resulting from GHG reductions based on the achievements of its CCP campaign in major cities of the world.¹²⁾

They were also of the view that an early legally binding target around the year 2005 was crucial as a political signal from national governments that they are making a serious effort to combat climate change. For without it local elected officials would find it hard to maintain their voluntary political commitment to aggressive emissions reductions over the long term.

The positions of the key NGO constituencies on the Kyoto Protocol

This section deals with the different positions of the key NGO constituencies on the various issues under the Kyoto Protocol negotiated and agreed upon by Parties attending COP 3. These issues were also reported on and debated in two newsletters issued by NGOs during the Conference—"ECO" issued by the environmental NGO constituency and the Earth Negotiations Bulletin (ENB) issued by the International Institute for Sustainable Development.

The issues to be discussed are as follows: the reduction "targets" of greenhouse gas emissions within a specific "timetable"; means of reaching the tar-

¹²⁾ *Local Government Implementation of Climate Protection*, Report to the United Nations by ICLEI, December 1997, released at COP 3.

gets agreed upon within a specific timeframe, and procedural issues such as compliance and review of commitments.

1. Targets and Timetables

Environmental NGOs as a whole – with slight differences – called for significant legally binding targets by industrialized countries to reduce the emissions of CO₂ and all the other greenhouse gases, i.e. a 20 per cent reduction of CO₂ emissions over 1990 levels by 2005 by Annex I countries (AOSIS protocol)¹³) as a first step towards the stabilization of atmospheric concentrations. They called for a separate reduction targets for methane and nitrous oxide by the year 2005 and a legally binding commitment to phase out the long-lived “F” gases which are HFCs, PFCs and SF₆.

The final version of the Kyoto protocol agreed to differentiated targets for all Annex I countries. Furthermore, it bundles all 6 gases in a “basket” and sets a different optional baseline i.e. 1995 for the 3 “F” gases – contrary to the gas-by-gas approach espoused by most environmental NGOs.

In view of the potency and longevity of the “F” gases in the atmosphere, the environmental NGOs will continue to “lobby” for their eventual phase out at the next round of negotiations scheduled in November 98 in Argentina.

“Sinks” and the “net” approach are considered by most, if not all environmental NGOs including KIKO FORUM, WCC and GLOBE, as a major “loophole” in the Protocol. Sinks are storehouses of CO₂ on Earth, most notably forests. The forests absorb CO₂ from the air as they grow and help slow the build up of this gas in the atmosphere.

Hotly debated and criticized, “ECO” – the environmental NGO newsletter – warned against the inclusion of sinks in the Protocol in view of the scientific uncertainty surrounding the quantification of CO₂ uptake by “sinks” such as forests.

It is to be pointed out here that the issue of “sinks” was closely associated with the “net” approach; the latter refers to deducting from the GHG reduction targets the amount of CO₂ absorbed by sinks such as “forests” or even oceans.

Environmental NGOs were also of the view that methodologies are insufficient for comparing “sink performance” among Parties. They further argued that sinks could be used as a ploy for dodging a Party’s responsibility in reducing GHG emissions at home by avoiding reforms in the use of fossil fuels. They could also create a dangerous incentive by encouraging countries to clear old natural forests and plant new forests for the mere sake of

¹³) The AOSIS protocol is contained in document A/AC. 237/L.23.

carbon credit. Another reason for concern for a number of environmental NGOs is the ways by which to distinguish between “anthropogenic” or “man-made” emissions and “natural” emissions.

The “net” approach to “sinks” has been criticized on the grounds that it reduces considerably the emission targets for a number of Parties. For example, the US Administration has announced¹⁴⁾ that its own obligation of seven percent with sinks equals a four percent reduction of GHGs without them.

Debate over this issue has not as yet been finalized, as sinks have already been included in the Kyoto Protocol (Article 3, para. 3), much to the consternation of the majority of environmental NGOs and the “Clean Energy” lobby led by the International Cogeneration Alliance. This issue will be revisited later on when the role of NGOs is discussed.

The picture is somewhat less clear with the ICC-led business and industry NGO constituency. With regard to targets and timetables, and the issue of sinks and the „net“ approach in the estimation of the “target”, some industry groups within the ICC did not object to legally binding targets as reflected in the statements delivered on behalf of the constituency – targets and timetables were accepted but without any figures given and no real discussion of the sinks issue.

Others mainly from the “hard core” fossil fuel group led by the Global Climate Coalition (GCC) expressed their stance against targets and timeframes without developing countries, while declaring their support for joint implementation and emissions trading without any real discussion of the issue of sinks and the net approach.

In a widely attended symposium on the mitigation of climate change held alongside COP 3, a report by both the ICC and WBCSD comprising 34 case studies entitled “Business and Climate Change” was released.¹⁵⁾ It highlights efforts made in some of their industries aimed at reducing GHG emissions and at saving energy.

On the other hand, towards the end of the negotiations in Kyoto, the “Clean energy” group represented mainly by COGEN and e 5, called upon the European Union to respect its original commitment of 15 per cent unilaterally over 1990 levels by 2010, in lieu of the 8 per cent reduction target set out in the Protocol. They argued that by doing so, European economies and businesses would lead the world into a more efficient industrial age and so get ahead of others in international competition.

¹⁴⁾ “*Global Climate*” by Hermann Ott of the Wuppertal Institute for Climate, Environment and Energy, Yearbook of International Environmental Law, vol 8, 1997

¹⁵⁾ “*Business and Climate Change*”, A report by the ICC and WBCSD, Kyoto, 1997.

They further argued that other benefits would result from these reductions such as improved energy efficiency in production supply and use, increased industrial competitiveness, and reduced energy bills. The development and application of clean renewable energy, buildings efficiency technologies, modern transportation, and cogeneration systems would also be accelerated.

Their view is summed up in the following words by Michael Brown, President of COGEN "We share the views of research groups, the WorldWatch Institute, economists and others who all say that there are policies and technologies which can dramatically reduce carbon emissions while strengthening the global economy and creating millions of jobs. This is the prize within Europe's reach."

At the Fourth Cities for Climate Protection World Summit held in Nagoya on 30 November 1997, ICLEI called upon COP 3 to adopt a 20 per cent CO₂ reduction target by 2010 with an interim target by 2005. ICLEI argued that the benefits of GHG reduction far outweighed the costs of reduction measures. They reported that 62 of their members participating in the CCP campaign have committed themselves to CO₂ reductions ranging from 15 to 30 percent, and actually succeeded in achieving actual reductions of GHGs that exceeded 42 million tons a year.

Other benefits that accrued from such reductions entailed better local air quality, financial savings, local job creation and economic development, reduced traffic congestion, and overall improvement in living conditions in urban areas. Furthermore, it is to be noted that ICLEI did not raise the issue of sinks.

The voice of the Parliamentarians represented by GLOBE rose in support of early and decisive action, and against the inclusion of sinks in the Protocol. They differed from the majority of environmental NGOs, the WCC and ICLEI on the issue of targets and timetables by calling for an "Equity Protocol" based on concentrations of 350 ppmv CO₂ equivalent, which establishes the principle that the apportionment of global emission entitlement be deliberately converged to a point of equal per capita shares at a date to be agreed upon by Parties.

This is based on the contraction and convergence analysis developed by the Global Commons Institute (GCI) and adapted by GLOBE. In this framework, all parties (both developed and developing countries) need to be obligated. The timeframe covered is from 2000 to 2100. Modalities of this Equity Protocol would have to be worked out by 31 December 1999.

For its part, the World Council of Churches called for the adoption of a 20 per cent reduction of all six gases by the year 2005, stressing the ethical

dimension to act responsibly towards the most vulnerable such as the Small Island States; as sea level rise in these countries could seriously threaten their very survival. Furthermore, they highlighted the net economic benefits to the industrialized world, which would result from reducing GHG emissions.

Before turning to the next issue in the Protocol, the position of Trade Unions must be outlined. Trade Unions represented by ICFTU and the International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mine and General Workers Unions (ICEM) at COP 3 were reticent about high targets of emissions reductions. Exact timeframes to achieve such targets were not discussed, nor were the issue of “sinks” dealt with. However, they voiced their concern over the need to adopt strong and equitable employment transition measures to be linked to setting targets. Furthermore, they called upon COP 3 to initiate detailed studies of the implications of the COP’s decisions on employment, in collaboration with the International Labour Organization (ILO).

2. Means of reaching the targets

(i) Emissions Trading¹⁶⁾

At the outset, some countries placed top priority on reaching an agreement regarding certain economic instruments which would provide “flexibility” in attaining the reduction targets. The US announced this concept at COP 2 held in Geneva, July 1996. The European Union received it with caution, while developing countries opposed it.¹⁷⁾

In spite of the vehement attacks by both the developing countries and the environmental NGO constituency, the basic principle of emissions trading survived in the final text of the Kyoto Protocol among Annex B¹⁸⁾ of the Protocol only.

Environmental NGOs led by CAN, Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth, and WWF issued press release after press release in which they called for the exclusion of emissions trading from the legally binding agreement, decrying it as another “loophole”. They expressed their concern that this could be used as a “cop out” by industrialized nations in reaching their reduction target even if the text of the Kyoto Protocol states that “such trading shall be supplemental to domestic actions”. Currently, there is no cap on the amount of emissions to be traded.

¹⁶⁾ Article 16 bis and 3.10 & 3.11 of the Kyoto Protocol.

¹⁷⁾ “Global Climate” by Hermann Ott of the Wuppertal Institute for Climate, Environment and Energy, Yearbook of International Environmental Law, vol 8, 1997.

¹⁸⁾ Annex B in the Protocol lists Annex I Parties and their respective emission limitation and reduction commitments

Like environmental NGOs, the WCC was also against “emissions trading” for the same reasons mentioned above arguing that its modalities and guidelines should be first worked out before any trading is undertaken.

For its part, GLOBE’s position is not entirely against emissions trading; they are reticent to a large extent to the way it is being dealt with in the Kyoto framework. GLOBE would favour trading as a way of blending economic efficiency and equity in the Equity Protocol proposed by them, as targets required under the latter scenario would be extremely strict (ranging from 50 to 60 per cent reductions within decades). In such a case, some trading would be inevitable to assist in the transitional phase, without really being a significant loophole.

Russia is one example that illustrates the concern voiced by environmental NGOs. Today, Russia’s emissions of CO₂ are some 30 per cent below 1990 levels. It is expected that until 2008, such emissions will not rise to their 1990 levels, due to Russia’s current economic disruption. In this case, Russia has a reservoir of “hot air” credits which it can sell cheaply (or expensively for that matter!) to any other Party obligated under the Protocol to meet part of its reduction target. Therein lies the problem – to be used by some countries to opt for the “offshore” solution in meeting their emissions reduction targets.¹⁹⁾

With regard to the position of the business and industry NGO constituency led by the ICC, WBCSD, Keidanren, UNICE, and others, it is summed up as follows: “Initiatives such as emissions trading and joint implementation should also be developed. They offer real possibilities for significant emissions abatement at reduced costs”.

There are several assumptions that need to be highlighted here. Selling carbon credits will not necessarily be cheap. Nor is it certain that countries with carbon credits will be willing to sell at any price to those countries in need. It remains to be seen too whether countries with legally binding targets would prefer to invest abroad in buying credits, instead of trying to achieve the targets by investing at home.

For its part, the “Clean Energy” group expressed its qualified support for emissions trading by stressing that credit should only be given to energy-related projects and emissions trading should be done among Parties to the Protocol.

ICLEI, on the other hand, was silent on the issues of emissions trading and joint implementation. This may be explained by the fact that its CCP cam-

¹⁹⁾ “*Global Climate*” by Hermann Ott of the Wuppertal Institute for Climate, Environment and Energy, Yearbook of International Environmental Law, vol 8, 1997.

campaign is actually reducing emissions locally without the use of either emissions trading or joint implementation.

Trade Unions oppose emissions trading like most of the environmental NGOs, but not necessarily for the same reasons. They argued that “tradeable permits” could lead to closure of industries in one country to allow an increase in emissions in another country. They further argued that this could entail loss of jobs and capital because of increased investment in developing countries which would endanger the competitive advantage of some industrialized countries. They voiced their concern over the kind of training and adjustment measures needed when “green or clean energy jobs” are created. In addition, they were of the view that the socio-economic impacts of climate change policy on workers have not been adequately addressed.

(ii) Joint Implementation and the Clean Development Mechanism²⁰⁾

Joint implementation (JI) has emerged as one of the major controversies since the adoption of the Convention on Climate Change. Some Annex I countries have sought to obtain credits towards their emissions targets for abatement activities undertaken in developing countries (non Annex I countries).²¹⁾ This would enable Annex I countries to meet their emissions targets in the most cost effective manner and could lead to substantial transfers of financial resources and technology to developing countries.

This concept, however, has provoked objections from the majority of both developing countries and environmental NGOs, who argue that it is inequitable and difficult to administer. As a result of these concerns, COP 1 expanded the concept and authorized a pilot phase of activities implemented jointly between Annex I and non Annex I Parties until the year 2000; a period during which Annex I Parties would not receive credits towards their existing commitments.²²⁾

During COP 3, environmental NGOs led by CAN, Greenpeace, FOE, Ozone Action and WWF voiced their concern over joint implementation especially between developing and industrialized countries. The thorny questions raised were: how could credits be allocated; what were the means to ensure that JI benefits both donors and recipients and; how would JI projects get approved and what were the methods used to review the projects’ progress and outcomes.²³⁾

²⁰⁾ Articles 6 & 12 of the Kyoto Protocol.

²¹⁾ See Article 4.2 (a) and (d) of the UNFCCC.

²²⁾ “*International Relations and Global Climate Change*”, PIK Report no. 21, edited by Detlef Sprinz and Urs Luterbacher, Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, July 1996

²³⁾ Briefing paper by VERTIC, November 97, Kyoto

GLOBE advocated the idea of an "Equity Protocol" with no specific mention of either joint implementation or the Clean Development Mechanism. While Trade Unions expressed their support for joint implementation, which is seen as a means of transferring climate-friendly technology to developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

The ICC-coordinated business and industry NGO constituency also expressed their full support for Joint Implementation programmes as they are seen as policy frameworks which can create incentives for voluntary programmes for the mitigation of GHGs in all regions of the world; thereby creating jobs, investment opportunities, and increasing competition. "...the promises of emissions trading and JI must be developed at COP 4 scheduled from 2 to 13 November 1998 in Buenos Aires. Competition on open markets will stimulate industrial activities that are part of the solution to climate change. There will be new job-creating business opportunities in such areas as waste management and energy efficiency."

They further expressed their support for the need to encourage technology partnerships as an integral part of foreign direct investment (FDI) based on the great potential of technology in reducing GHG emissions. They argued that this would offer real possibilities for significant emissions abatement at reduced costs.

On this issue, the "Clean Energy" NGO group was in agreement with the rest of the Business and Industry constituency through their support of JI, though with a slight difference-stressing that credits should be restricted to energy-related projects at the beginning and declaring its support for JI programs which facilitate the transfer of highly efficient technologies to developing countries.

This issue is still unresolved for the time being, as it will be further elaborated and is expected to be hotly debated during the course of 1998 when there will be attempts at working out verifiable guidelines for JI projects to be examined by the UNFCCC subsidiary bodies meeting from 2 to 12 June 1998, in Bonn. Such guidelines would then be submitted to COP 4 for a possible decision.

The Clean Development Mechanism needs to be made operational. Based on an idea by Brazil, the purpose of this mechanism is to assist developing countries in achieving sustainable development and in contributing to the ultimate objective of the Convention, and to assist Parties included in Annex I in reaching their reduction targets. In short, it is aimed at financing JI projects in developing countries by developed countries against certified emission reductions under the authority of the COP and the supervision of an executive board.

Its proceeds would also cover the administrative costs as well as assist vulnerable countries to the effects of climate change in meeting the cost of adaptation. Here again, further work by the UNFCCC bodies is needed to elaborate the mechanism's operational modalities and guidelines for COP 4.

It is noteworthy to mention here that the various NGO constituencies did not raise much objection to this issue- perhaps because it is still to be fully developed – with one exception voiced by Tata Energy Research Institute, which views that the new mechanism may divert public funds away from the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The concept of the Clean Development Mechanism awaits further elaboration during the course of 1998, and possibly until the first meeting of the Parties to the Protocol.

(iii) Developing countries' commitments

At the outset, both the text of the Convention on Climate Change and the Berlin Mandate need to be recalled. The Convention²⁴⁾ specifies that developed countries included in Annex I should *take the lead* in modifying longer-term trends in anthropogenic emissions... and return the level of their GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000.

Furthermore, Parties meeting in their first Conference in Berlin, in 1995, agreed by adopting the Berlin Mandate to begin a process to strengthen commitments of developed country Parties included in Annex I beyond the year 2000 with no new commitments for developing country Parties not included in Annex I, but only a reaffirmation of existing commitments to continue to advance the implementation of Article 4.1 of the Convention to achieve sustainable development.

In the negotiations leading to the Kyoto Conference, some countries²⁵⁾ favoured a "voluntary opt in" for GHG reduction commitments by developing countries in the Kyoto Protocol. The majority of developing country Parties led by the Group of 77/China opposed their inclusion in the Protocol arguing that developed country Parties should first fulfil their responsibilities, act on their promises, and abide by their emissions reduction commitments before they can be included.

A furore was raised during the negotiations in Kyoto and more precisely on 5 December, by the majority of developing countries as well as by the environmental NGOs over a draft decision tabled by New Zealand dealing with developing countries' commitments whose text read "Agrees that there

²⁴⁾ See text of the UNFCCC, Article 4.2 (a) and 4.2 (b).

²⁵⁾ FCCC/AGBM/1997/7.

should be further legally binding commitments for **all** Parties beyond 2014.” This is in spite of the fact that the decision made the legally binding commitments to be undertaken by developing countries (Non-Annex I countries) contingent on the implementation of commitments by developed countries (Annex I countries).

This issue was hotly debated in ECO²⁶), the voice of the majority of the environmental NGO constituency joined by the WCC. The New Zealand draft decision was outrightly dismissed until Annex I Parties fulfil their commitments especially after their failure to live up to their commitments on financial resources and technology transfer. The parliamentarians represented by GLOBE concurred too that developing countries be excluded, but only for the time being: that is, until developed countries have acted on their commitments. It was generally thought that this New Zealand attempt may have derailed the initial idea of “a voluntary opt in” for commitments by developing countries.

For their part, Trade Unions reiterated that in order to develop a strong response from developed countries, developing countries need to recognize from the outset that they are to be obligated even if they have differentiated targets and timeframes in view of the global nature of the climate change threat.

The “Clean Energy” NGO constituency represented by the BCSE, e 5 & COGEN called for a firm commitment for meaningful participation of developing countries including a limit on the growth of GHG emissions by the largest emitter from developing countries. This commitment is to enter into force no later than the time that Annex I countries have met their commitments that is by the year 2012.

The ICC-led business and industry NGO constituency supported too the inclusion of legally binding commitments by developing country Parties. They argued that developing countries should be involved in measures to limit the growth in GHG emissions “as quickly as possible” due to their rapid economic expansion with increasing energy demand, and reliance on fossil fuels which will outstrip that of developed countries in the next century.

While the “hard core” fossil fuel group led by the Global Climate Coalition was adamant on including developing countries in the deal at the same time as developed countries due to fear of job losses mainly in the US, and fear of loss of competitiveness caused by the relocation of industries to the developing world.

²⁶) ECO issues from 30 November to 9 December 97 issued during COP 3.

3. Procedural issues – Compliance and review²⁷⁾

The majority, if not all environmental NGOs including the Climate Action Network, Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, Ozone Action, the Sierra Club, and WWF to name but a few joined by GLOBE and the WCC, have called for a strong compliance mechanism to check whether Parties are meeting their targets or not.

This compliance procedure shall be approved by the first meeting of the Parties to the Protocol including an indicative list of consequences, taking into account the cause, type, degree and frequency of non-compliance. Any procedures and mechanisms entailing binding consequences shall be adopted by an amendment to the Protocol. Some environmental NGOs were of the view that initiating an amendment to the Protocol may weaken its effectiveness to some extent.

The ICC- led business and industry did not voice its opinion on compliance or review focusing its call on accepting voluntary initiatives launched by industry as being the most effective way to reduce GHG emissions.

On the other hand, the “Clean Energy” group led by the European and the US Business Council for Sustainable Energy, COGEN, and UIPT called for an appropriate compliance mechanism to address cases of non-compliance at the first Meeting of the Parties to the Protocol (MOP 1).

With regard to the issue of review, environmental NGOs called for the inclusion in the Protocol of a review every three years. This would create an incentive for Parties to meet their targets and implement their commitments. The final version of the Protocol, includes a vague wording on such a review which would be “periodic”, without specifying a specific number of years—much to the consternation of environmental NGOs.

It is noteworthy to mention that the business and industry NGO constituency as a whole did not raise this issue, maybe because of its focused attention on voluntary initiatives. On the other hand, the “Clean energy” group was not all that much in favour of voluntary commitments which, in their view, do not provide a proper framework for technological innovation for business.

²⁷⁾ Articles 17 & 8 of the Kyoto Protocol on compliance and review.

The role of NGOs in the UNFCCC process

“While ratification by governments is obviously essential for the results of COP 3 to take effect, it will be for non-governmental actors, and in particular for business, to deliver the investments, the programmes and the other actions that will lead to the limitation and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions...”

Michael Zammit Cutajar,
Executive Secretary of the UNFCCC

These words pronounced by Michael Zammit Cutajar in his Opening speech, delivered on 1 December 1997 at COP 3, highlight the indispensable role played and to be played by the non-governmental community in the international climate change policy debate.

Against this backdrop, it is of paramount importance to place the first part of this book-cum-compilation in its proper context. Statements and press releases are not important per se; they are important because of their impact, and influence on the process and on public opinion by clarifying – or for that matter – by obscuring the various issues under discussion.

The following paragraphs will now attempt to show how NGOs can impact the process and public opinion. Formally, accredited NGOs²⁸⁾ under the UNFCCC process are allowed to deliver statements, limited to one or two per constituency, before the plenary of the meetings of the Conference of the Parties and the sessions of the UNFCCC subsidiary bodies. During COP 3, the representatives of a few accredited NGOs delivered their statements in which they stated their positions and gave their recommendations to the process of the negotiations.

NGOs fulfil a number of functions in the climate change negotiations; they play an advisory function. By way of example, an increasing number of Governments have recognized this advisory role by including selected NGO representatives in their official delegations at UNFCCC meetings. The Alliance of Small Island States, Australia, Canada, Germany, and the United States – to name but a few – have all included, on more than one occasion, a representative from the non-governmental community (either from the business and industry NGOs or the environmental NGOs), on their official delegation.

²⁸⁾ An NGO becomes accredited to the UNFCCC by fulfilling two requirements: NGOs should provide evidence of their non-profit status, and information on their activities which are relevant to Climate Change. It is the Conference of the Parties that approves the final accreditation status of NGOs. See Article 7.6 of the Convention on Climate Change.

NGOs provide policy recommendations too on the issue of climate change as exemplified in the statements delivered to the plenary of COP 3. The ICC-led business and industry NGO constituency went further than a mere statement by submitting its recommendations to COP 3 which resulted from an International Conference on Voluntary Business Initiatives for Mitigating Climate Change, which was held alongside COP 3.

The role of business and industry is crucial in the implementation of the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol in three respects: as generators of capital investments in cleaner technology – such as the development of a low emission engine that is economically viable in the automobile industry and renewable energies; as producers of goods and services through adopting voluntary and/or other initiatives for the development of new products and production processes that use less raw material and energy; and as providers of employment in cleaner industries.

This is attested by the actual energy savings realized in several industries in Germany and Japan through their voluntary initiatives.²⁹⁾ Attitudes are evolving too even in the fossil fuel group. Recently, the Chairman of British Petroleum announced BP's increased investment in solar energy as well as research in low carbon technology. Texaco, Shell and GM have also realized the need for change and that it is time to move away from the confrontational practices of the past to develop new approaches.³⁰⁾

On a more formal level, ICLEI on behalf of local governments, held the Fourth Local Government Leaders' Summit on Climate Change in Nagoya, Japan, on 30 November 97. This Summit was attended by representatives of 145 local government organizations from 29 nations from all over the world. The Nagoya Declaration was formally submitted by the Mayor of Nagoya to COP 3 on 8 December in addition to the statement to the Conference. Through this declaration, local governments pledged full support to their national governments in their efforts to reduce GHG emissions stressing the contribution that the former can make as partners in the implementation of climate protection policies.

The paramount role played by local authorities represented by ICLEI is based on the responsibilities and services they render in the daily lives of every citizen. In most parts of the world local authorities are responsible for land use, waste management, trees and parks, transportation infrastructure,

²⁹⁾ Christopher Flavin and Seth Dunn *"Rising Sun and Gathering Winds – Policies to Stabilize the Climate and Strengthen Economies"*, Worldwatch paper 138, November 1997.

³⁰⁾ John Browne, BP Chairman, Speech *"Climate After Kyoto – the Business Response"*, Royal Institute of International Affairs, 6 February 1998, London & *"World Resources Institute and General Motors Open Dialogue on Global Climate"* – News release of 12 January 1998 at <http://www.wri.org/press>.

municipal buildings, building and construction codes, energy utilities, and public education. Thus, local authorities can help implement the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol by acting at the local level.

In addition, accredited NGOs can lobby their national delegations in the corridors of the Conference venue or by officially requesting meetings with their national delegations. During COP 3, the environmental NGO group in particular Réseau Action Climat/France, requested a meeting with H.E. Dominique Voynet, the French Minister of the Environment so as to voice their concerns over a number of issues under negotiation, especially over the issue of sinks and the net approach in estimating the reduction target.

It is worth noting that the French Minister actually recognized in her speech delivered at COP 3 the invaluable contribution of NGOs in the process by announcing the change in France's position vis-à-vis the net approach which it no longer supported because it listened to the voice of its NGOs. The influence of NGOs is clearly demonstrated here though it is not always that explicit and easy to assess.

NGOs play a political role too; Tom Spencer, on behalf of GLOBE representing 300 parliamentarians³¹), summed up their political role in a Parliamentary Symposium on Climate Change held on 7 December, by declaring that "...When you negotiators have finished. You need us to vote the laws and pass the budgets which give reality to your formulas..." Set in this context, GLOBE does, and will play a major role in disseminating the Kyoto Protocol as well as advise other parliamentarians especially their US colleagues that it makes economic, political, and ethical sense to ratify the Kyoto Protocol in spite of its inadequacies.

Mustering public support for the Kyoto Protocol is a major political task fulfilled by all NGO constituencies. 1998 will be crucial; the members of GLOBE, for example, will be discussing, throughout this year, the various issues in the Protocol that still remain unresolved in preparation for the next round of negotiations scheduled in November 1998.

The strategy adopted by ICLEI on behalf of local authorities and by most of the international and national environmental NGOs is to muster public support as a basis for their action aimed at influencing decision-makers first at the domestic level and then at the global level. A strategy that can pressure national governments to act on their commitments agreed upon in the Convention and in the Kyoto Protocol.

³¹) GLOBE has offices in Europe, Central and Eastern Europe, Japan and the US. For further information, its website is at <http://www.globeint.org/>

Providing information – a powerful tool in bringing about any change in the behaviour of both decision-makers and the public is an additional task fulfilled by all NGO constituencies. Environmental NGOs including Birdlife International, Greenpeace, World Watch Institute, and WWF for example, prepare and publish public education material in addition to press releases and backgrounders which raise the awareness of both the public and the delegates on climate change and its impact on human societies.

In the same vein, and in the lead up to COP 3, the World Council of Churches launched a campaign to increase public support for the reduction of GHG emissions. To this end, the WCC coordinated a petition campaign through the churches in twenty three industrialized countries. It called on their governments to meet the stabilization target set out in the UNFCCC, adopt a legally binding agreement for further reductions beyond the year 2000, and engage citizen participation more forcefully in finding solutions to the global threat of climate change.

During COP 3, the WCC coordinated an inter-religious gathering on climate change which included Buddhists, Christians, Shintos and New religions to pray for the outcome of COP 3 and submitted officially the Kyoto Appeal to the Conference in which it called on the Conference's Ministers to support the AOSIS protocol proposal.

Furthermore, one can not omit mentioning the impressive mobilization undertaken by the environmental NGO constituency led by KIKO FORUM within Japan itself, and in Kyoto in particular, aimed at raising public awareness on issues related to climate change in the form of concerts, a post-card campaign, peaceful marches, symposia, visual displays, and street theatres. Nor is it an exaggeration to mention the abundant, and excellent media coverage in well reputed dailies and specialized journals on COP 3 throughout the world – which has helped in raising public awareness of the issue – thanks to the NGOs who provided the information and stories to the media specialists.

After having reviewed the diversity in the positions of the non-governmental organizations and their role, it is to be underlined that the implementation of the Convention on Climate Change as well as that of the Kyoto Protocol can not be effected without their indispensable contribution, work and involvement as their strength is derived from their roots that lie in business, local government, parliaments, trade unions, and in environmental and citizens' groups.

By the same token, the significance of the Kyoto protocol for economic development in the world at large is to be underlined. The Protocol is not only a first step towards combatting climate change, it is also a first step

towards rethinking the way humankind uses natural resources (and fuels in particular) to propel the global economy. Again, that rethinking can not be done by some 2000 civil servants in a negotiating room, it has to involve all stakeholders from the non-governmental community.

As Jacques Santer put it:

“The European Union [or the World] needs NGOs to become itself. Dare I say NGOs also need Europe to accomplish their project and accomplish it as a world-wide design? Our global world can not remain a forum or an integrated market which delivers opportunities to the strongest and smartest at the risk of leaving our planet uninhabitable. It is also necessary to have strong actors, political and economic, who are motivated by a universal willingness to serve, and not only by a concern for power.”³²⁾

Kyoto is now behind us ... Buenos Aires is the next step where specific loopholes such as emissions trading, joint implementation, sinks, and developing country commitments will need to be addressed and closed; and NGOs will be busy working away to achieve this goal.

Azza Taalab

* * *

³²⁾ *“The European Union Needs NGOs”* by Jacques Santer, President of the European Commission, Civicus web site at <http://www.civicus.org/oct97.htm>