

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT DELEGATION TO COP 17 IN DURBAN

SUMMARY

MONDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2011

Accreditation of the EP Delegation - Members and staff

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2011

► **Briefing** by Mr Artur Runge-Metzger, Director of International and Climate Strategy, DG CLIMA, **European Commission**
EC meeting room, EU Pavilion

State of play of negotiations

1. India has proposed 3 items to be included in the agenda: Equity, property rights, fair trade. These suggestions are now debated. A definitive agenda has not been fixed all needs to be voted, so South Africa has solved this putting the items on a provisional agenda avoiding hindering the negotiation process.

2. LCA (Long term Cooperative Action under the Convention) track deals with Cancun agreement and its implementation. There is a new document which summarises all what has been reached until now: adaptation technology has been a success, whereas common accounting rules are still an open question, monitoring reporting and verification are still a problem and more progress need to be done on verification.

3. On the Kyoto Protocol (KP) side there have been very good discussion and the big question is now on how to solve the gap between Dec 2012 and Dec 2013 and lawyers are looking for creative solutions. We need to avoid that the 30% falls off the table.

If we were to move from 20 to 30%, EU proposes to have a new Art in the KP which foresee to amend KP. Concerning the "new" KP it should have an 8 years commitment period with a 2 tracks approach. A new review period should be foreseen (in 2015 after publication of the IPCC report).

4. On the Roadmap (RM). On legally binding commitment, there are several views and the discussions focus at the moment with China, India and Brazil, trying to understand what they are willing to do while they are all throwing the ball (and blame) in each other's field. India seems to be the one to be more willing to come on board with the EU. Yesterday they were news concerning the willingness of China for signing up to legally binding agreements after 2020, but in fact nothing has changed to its real political line which is difficult to evaluate.

5. On the process

South Africa negotiation process (Indaba) has many negotiators and official senior negotiations are ongoing. Wednesday there is the opening of high level segment with more than 50 ministers.

Q & A

Q Jorgenssen and De Brun on the 2nd commitment period, on who will join, how will it be connected to the Roadmap and which is its strength?

Q Eickhout on the role of China: what is EU anticipating and ready to give in, so that China is on board and could be followed by India. Where are we with CCS and CDM?

A Artur Runge-Metzger: on who will be the 2nd commitment period: it's an open question. Concerning environment equity, this is not solved. The link to the roadmap: Many developing countries see KP as an icon.

* On non legally binding commitment: EU can sign here in Durban, but the real problem is the ratification. The question is how in the actual scenario could this happen, when EU alone needs to have 27 ratifications to be done in the next 10 months. We should go for provisional applications (not possible), or go for an implementable paper to be adopted by Saturday: it is more important how we formulate this than what.

* On China: nothing has changed in its position until now.

* On CCS: problem is liability.

► **Meeting with the French Environment and Energy Management Agency (ADEME), M. François Moisan Research and Strategy Executive Director, Ms Dominique Campana Director of International Affairs and M Jean-Pierre Tabet Climate Change Adviser**
European Parliament meeting room, EU Pavilion

There has been an exchange of views on climate change policy in the European and international context, with a presentation on ADEME activities within the French energy and climate package; on the financing of the development of green technologies supported by the French future investment programme; on the energy efficiency EU directive and climate change as a solution to EU energy security and sustainable development and on energy efficiency as a vector and driver for technological innovation.

Among the questions asked, there were the ones of *Mr Seeber* and of *Mrs Pilar dal Castillo* on nuclear and on subsidies for fuels for cars, of *Mrs Carvalho* on new processes on new energy efficiency industry and on cities.

The outcome of the discussion showed that the Energy Management Agency (ADEME) goes forward with its programme which is not linked to the government line. On nuclear they said that as France is in pre-electoral stage, they are now looking at the Roadmap and at 2050 for future investments. On the other hand, if one considers short-medium term, it has to be looked at 2020 where nuclear will still playing a strong role, even if there are strong feelings that it is necessary to decrease its percentage (now over 80% of French energy is nuclear

► **Meeting with delegation of Fairtrade farmers**
Rock Ash Meeting Room, ICC building, Ground Level

The present fair-trade farmers were

- **Adam Tampuri**, cashew farmer from Ghana and chairman of the Fairtrade certified SPO cashew producer group called Gbankuliso Cashew farmers Association, currently elected President of the country network in Ghana (Fairtrade Africa-West Africa Network.)
- **Carlos Eugenio Vargas**, from Costa Rica, representative of the network of Fairtrade producers in Latin America and the Caribbean, he works with banana farmers
- **A Representative of fair-trade farmers**

Basically they have said that they support being part of CO2 reduction but that they don't want agriculture to be linked to CO2 mitigation.

Q & A

Q: Carvalho on CDM and sugar and sustainability criteria. Do you agree with sustainable criteria?

A: *Representative of fair-trade farmers (UK):* We don't have a footprint ourselves, but we already do consider it and support being part of CO2 reduction but we don't want agriculture to be linked to CO2 mitigation.

Vargas: On sugar: as regards to sustainability, fair-trade has sustainability standards in every product.

Q. *Rosbach:* Could you find something to replace your production? For instance, what could you grow instead of bananas?

A. *Tampuri:* We are unable to quantify the percentage of product's destructions, but pest and insects are increasing with climate change. We can and want to be part of green economy as our carbon cycle is low.

Vargas: we try to support organic agriculture when possible and we have also forestry project, but this is not always possible (for example sugar cane production requests strong temperature differences between day and night, so we cannot grow sugar cane, etc). We can have a gradual evolution, but sometimes changes are happening so quickly, that it is difficult to adapt.

Q. *Del Castillo* asks on how technologies, their transfer are applied as regards as to cc?

Q. *Seeber:* is there any difference between fair trade farmers and traditional farming. How are farmers helped to adapt to cc?

A. *Tampuri:* What can technology do? We can use different models and predict cc, so this can be done. Technology would help and if we could afford to buy new tractors we could have less CO2 emissions compared to use of old tractors. Fair-trades are allowed to plant around water and use it (against traditional farming).

Vargas: in case of coffee and some other productions we try to do more efficient energy. But we have problems of funding projects. But of course we want fair access when it comes to technology.

► **Meeting and meeting with Head of *EEAS Delegation to South Africa*, Mr Van De Geer**
European Commission meeting room, EU Pavilion

Mr Van De Geer, EU Ambassador of EU Delegation gave a overview and in looking of SA (he was a former Diplomat for the NL). 50% of the 30% exporters in EU are trading manufactured goods and now they are heavily suffering from EU crises. The EU Roadmap is in general welcomed.

Q & A

Q *Ulvskog* asks about China

A SA has close relation to China, but more to the continent. On cc China is less reluctant than US to fight, but is not keen on too stringent measures.

Q *Seeber*: Which is the energy type SA is focussing on?

A If SA doesn't take measures, by 2018 they will have a energy gap (a deficit of 7.000 MWatt until 2018), and so there are 2 major breaks: lack of skill labour and lack of energy. SA wants to continue to use coal, will look at wind and other energies, but in fact do look at nuclear to fill the gap.

There is a need to create 10 mio jobs in the next 10 years, but this will not happen.

Q *Carvalho, Hassi* on SA and China and cc

A At the moment there are many problems, namely as corruption (whites, many parliamentarian are in jail) and differences in salaries are still enormous. Zuma as President seems to be responsible.

Concerning emission, we need to have a 2nd commitment period without conditions, but this would not be OK. The reluctance of developing or emerging countries is not that they don't want to do anything, but that they cannot switch in 2 or 3 years. SA should develop its green energy (there are many EU companies involved in this, even if on a commercial basis only).

► **Briefing by Öko Institute**

European Commission meeting room, EU Pavilion

It has been a very good briefing!

On the State of play of process: We have received a new negotiation text, which is different to Cancun, where we did not have any to start with.

1. One of the key areas is Finance and green climate fund decided in Cancun. Here the discussion is to adopt this governing instrument (establishing the board of c fund or decide the rules between cc and fund).

* Another key issue is the *Capitalisation of the fund*, which is problematic in this moment for EU.

* Long term finance (decided in Copenhagen), as it will stop in 2012. So far there is only the general pledge on 100 bio. \$, but no other clarification - US: refused to discuss long-term finance, EU is at least "reluctant".

* Standing committee of the Fund: Standing Committee on Finance. Unclear status, supervisory body or more?

2. Mitigation of Annex 1 and non Annex 1 countries

How to disclose the gap between them; there are two parties looking at it, one in a more aggregate way, another in a more detailed way looking to the countries.

There is also a gap on transparency and information. There are no dates from emerging countries on emissions. This has to change.

On common accounting progresses need to be done.

3. Legal form of agreement of LCA. This is the most difficult point and all options are open at the moment.

Q & A

Q Del Castillo asks on the possibility to find an agreement compared to previous COPs and asks if the cleavages between countries are to big.

A looking at outside scenario we note that at this moment the situation does not look very good as:

1. Canada will not commit to a 2nd commitment period
2. China said to commit to a legal binding under certain conditions
3. US said they did not see the Chinese proposal

Q *Jordan Cizelj*: What are the US ready to discuss?

Q *Carvalho on CDM*

A There are negotiations going on, but issue is not so controversial as in the past,...

On market mechanism there seem to be an option possible for the 2nd commitment period.

Q *Seeber asks* on megatons gap. Is the UN the right place to solve this?

A This year it is very amazing to see that China has its own pavilion and to see how things move and change. Through discussions and negotiations many things have been achieved, like for instance in the maritime sector.

► **Meeting with Parliamentarians of Japan**
European Commission meeting room, EU Pavilion

1. *Mr. Shoichi KONDO*, House of Representatives (Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ)),

Director of the Standing Committee on Environment, of the Special Committee on Postal Reform and of the Deliberative Council on the Constitution

2. *Mr. Takashi ESAKI*, House of Councillors, (Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ)) Member of the Committee on General Affairs, of the Committee on Budget, of the Special Committee on Consumer Affairs, of the Research Committee on Society of Cooperative Way of Life and Regional Vitalization (The Democratic Party of Japan) and Assistant to the Secretary General of the Democratic Party of Japan, Deputy Secretary General of the Democratic Party and the Shin-Ryokufukai in the House of Councillors

3. *Dr. Shinichi YOKOYAMA*, Member, House of Councillors, (New Komeito) Member of the Committee on Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Committee on Audit, Special Committee on Okinawa and Northern Problems, Director of the Research Committee on Society of Cooperative Way of Life and Regional Vitalization

Mr. Shoichi KONDO: Negotiations might be difficult, as we cannot join to new KP if other big emitters (US+ China) don't want to join.

Leinen: the 2 open questions are the 2nd commitment period and solidarity as regards as to Climate Fund for developing countries

Q & A

Q *Seeber* asks on Japan's position not to join 2nd commitment period of "new" Kyoto and on the role in your country of nuclear as regards as tackling cc.

A We never declared that we are not willing to join 2nd commitment period. But the fact is that the KP does not include big emitters like China and US, so this has to be solved first. We have to look at the general framework and as regards as outcome of COP-17 we are ready to provide help to those countries which are willing to use our technologies.

The most important point is that all countries do their part and we want to be involved in the fight against cc reducing the emissions.

On nuclear: we have to review our energy plan after our nuclear accident, but personally I believe that we have to move away from nuclear generation as early as possible and reduce its dependency from nuclear.

There are still many people who are and have been evacuated and nobody knows when they could come back (in 12-20 or more years).

► **Meeting** with *Achim Steiner*, Executive Director, **United Nations Environment Programme**
European Parliament meeting room, EU Pavilion

Achim Steiner presented the international process stressing that it is not a waste of time as there has never been so much action to fight against cc as in the last 3 years. Without being naïf optimists, and being also frustrated, we should recognize that a lot has been achieved and we have just a bit more to go.

The approaches on cc are different among major actors, the dream of a transatlantic pact on cc should be dropped and the fact that we have reached 20% goal, but not implemented the agenda of renewables and more efficient energy, why look at 30%? So the question is how to accelerate and to do what needs to be done first. Talking about 1,5° is not right neither necessary, at the moment.

We should think on how and what to do in this negative economic scenario.

On the state of negotiations: Durban will not be the place where there will be a big successful conference, but at least it confirms Cancun and Copenhagen decisions, namely the Green Fund.

On K and its future: EU is defending the fact that Carbon has a price today, and that this has to be taken into account. It is clear that the agenda on cc is not as coherent as it used to be, with emerging and developing countries, emitters etc. There are new alignments, new alliances.

China is oscillating between commitment and domestic solutions.

On REDD: even if complex and ambitious it is a big success that it is on the cc agenda. It is important especially for Africa. Carbon finance is very important – if forests become economically viable, they are saved!

On the Montreal Protocol and reduction of HCFC: the issue of black carbon that kill lots of people every year (nr to check). So all these things should be considered, as together they contribute heavily to CO2 reduction.

Rio is the real summit in the world which is the key to sustainability and equity.

Q & A

Q *Jorgenssen* asks on China as apparently there are other interpretations (Commission) saying that China has not moved.

A 2°C should not be abandoned and should be maintained at the moment.

On China: China is doing things, and has increased common transports, has moved quickly to Euro 6, this needs to be recognized.

On cc negotiations, SA has just announced a new green fund; Brazil has the highest rate of success in the fight against deforestation in the last 3 years, so the approach should be to look what has been done and not to judge too much and think how to accelerate the process. China will do more, but doesn't want to commit internationally.

► **European Parliament and Commission side event "Climate Action in Cities"**
Brussels Room, Durban Exhibition Centre (DEC)

Main Participants:

1. Commissioner Hedegaard,
2. M. Jos Delbeke, Director-General European Commission DG Climate Action
3. Mr. Karl-Heinz Florenz, Member of the European Parliament

Subject of the event: The significance of urban development for the transition to a low-carbon and climate resilient society. Initiatives in the EU and beyond, the interdependency of pioneer cities and international cooperation and policy networks will be highlighted.

Guiding Questions for the Panel:

1. Which are the drivers of urban mitigation and adaptation action?
2. What are the benefits of trans-national networks to incentivise climate action?
3. Which standards and tools can help to stimulate local actions?
4. How could the Durban conference be helpful to cities worldwide?

a.) European and International Cooperation Among Cities, Mr. Ilmar Reepalu , Mayor of Malmö, Committee of the Regions & Covenant of Mayors

He presents the heating and cooling model which has been realised in Malmo, with energy generated from waste and recycling; with transports working by biogas, creation of green roofs to collect rain water.

b.) Financing and Technical Assistance for Urban Action, Mr. Christopher Knowles, Head of Climate Change and Environment Division, European Investment Bank

He presented three financing project

* ELENA - European Local Energy Assistance for SME and municipalities for developments of transports, lightings etc. Added value is the reproduction of best practice. Actually 15 approved project

* JESSICA - Joint European Support of Sustainable Investment in City Areas

At present there have been investments for 1,65 billion of structural funds in 11 MS

* EEF- European Energy Efficiency fund, which is innovative financing for EE projects

c.) African Low Carbon Cities, Ms. Roseanne Diab, Executive Officer, Academy of Science of South Africa

A study can be downloaded from www.assaf.org.za

Recommendations of the study are: ensure a shift towards a green economy; emphasize co-benefits; ensure partnership approach; promote low carbon consumption: land use planning; have leadership; give attention to transport sector; ensure a strong mitigation effort in industrial sector; same on built environment; maximise local opportunities in the low carbon transition process; encourage innovation through a partnership approach. All this means to have more opportunities than burdens.

d.) Mitigation and Adaptation in Chinese Cities, Mr. Jiahua PAN, Director for Sustainability and Urban Development, China Academy of Social Sciences

e.) Standards for reporting local and urban actions for climate action, Mr. Yunus Arikan Manager, Cities Climate Center, ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability.

► **Briefing by Ms Hedegaard, Commissioner for Climate Action**
EC meeting room, EU Pavilion

Hedegaard: during the first week, the EU has managed to assure a good start and most countries have been very supportive, especially having noticed that the EU is not using 2nd commitment period for too ambitious targets. **Roadmap** is very welcomed.

Where are we with the Roadmap? Difficult to say, but we have to start acting now.

Other key point of the negotiations is the **legally binding commitment**. For China is a no-go and US are very tough on this. So this will be the most difficult point.

Tomorrow the Pres of COP will start with 52 ministers.

Q & A

Q *Jorgenssen*: it seems that Polish presidency is not respecting EU line on cc and is rather blocking.

A we should speak with one voice, but we don't have a position!

Q *Eickhout* insists on China. What could be possible to do in order to have a better deal?

A when asked, Chinese said that nothing new has come up. They don't give real signals. They don't want to repeat the Copenhagen situation where they got all the blame. India is difficult. They are vague, saying that they could go into something but then they put loads of conditions and they are very firm on not starting before 2015.

Another problem is the Polish Presidency as the Polish point of view is slightly less "committed" than the rest of the EU.

It is important to put the pressure on the right ones and push the roadmap, which seems to be accepted well. If we are too rigid, we loose everything. Targets have to be put down and guidelines have to be accepted (=roadmap) to avoid the risk to loose everything!

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2011

► **Briefing by Polish Presidency (PP) after EU Coordination meeting** *Krakow Room, EU Pavilion*

PP: A single legally binding agreement is our preference, but we have noticed that KP is not a tool for a cc reduction, but also an opportunity which offers many possibilities and the whole architecture of the process should be kept intact

There is substantial progress on the adaptation and on the national adaptation plan.

The general picture shows that Green Fund is very important but there is no agreement on the budgetary Fund.

From the beginning we had many meetings with major economy (China, US etc) but they were not very positive.

Today is a strategic day and we want to work more closely with SA Presidency and that we have to work more closely with LLDCs and AOSIS as allies.

Florenz: AAUs could break the deal. (**AAU = Assigned amount unit (AAU)** A Kyoto Protocol unit equal to 1 metric tonne of CO2 equivalent. Each Annex I Party issues AAUs up to the level of its assigned amount, established pursuant to Article 3, paragraphs 7 and 8, of the Kyoto Protocol. Assigned amount units may be exchanged through emissions trading.) The problem is the number of excessive allocated certificates

PP: On a global level, this is not important. AAUs are only important for the EU. First we need to get consensus around Roadmap and then go to 2nd commitment

Concerning 2nd commitment:

- NZ and Australia: don't come unless other join
- China, US: no
- EU, CH, Norway: OK
- AAUs are important only for EU.

Proposal by P Presidency should come today or tomorrow. PPresidency is not defending its national line, it is not the only EU country to have surplus of AAU, and in EU there are different views and divisions on 2nd commitment period, so it is not the PP to be blamed. Debate on climate fund and money is still ongoing


The corner stones in the Roadmap are: 2015 to get adoption and 2021 as timeline for implementation and to have all major economy on board.

***In substance** the Kyoto 2 could be less ambitious than the climate package adopted by the EU. This means that it would even worse if the AAUs would be on board. So we have to be careful on KP. PP seems to be weak and not representing EU line. On Roadmap: if it says that nothing needs to be done before 2020n then is it useless to have it. Maybe US should be left aside, and we should go on without US.*

Florenz underlined that the Roadmap should have been discussed before starting COP negotiations. If PP is bad, there is EU Commission.

► **WG 2: International aviation, maritime transport and emissions trading**
Meeting with International Emissions Trading Association
Bingo (Orange River) Room, ICC Conference Venue

Participants: Jenny Peetermans, Henry Derwent, Simone Ruiz, Alexander Sarac (DLA Piper), Christine Fedigan (GDF Suez), Andreas Arvanitakis (Point Carbon), Luc Larmuseau (DNV), Karl Upston-Hooper (Greenstream), Tim Baines (Norton Rose), Giovanni Bertolino (Enel), Sandra Parthie (Alstom), Russel Mills (Dow Chemicals), Rosanna Fusco (Eni), Dorothy Denis (Orbeo), Jose Luis Pastor (Endesa).

Background: The central feature of the  Kyoto Protocol (66 kB) is its requirement that countries limit or reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. By setting such targets, emission reductions took on economic value. To help countries meet their emission targets, and to encourage the private sector and developing countries to contribute to emission reduction efforts, negotiators of the Protocol included three market-based mechanisms - Emissions Trading, the Clean Development Mechanism and Joint Implementation.

The **CDM** allows emission-reduction projects in developing countries to earn certified emission reduction (CER) credits, each equivalent to one tonne of CO2. These CERs can be

traded and sold, and used by industrialized countries to meet a part of their emission reduction targets under the Kyoto Protocol.

The mechanism stimulates sustainable development and emission reductions, while giving industrialized countries some flexibility in how they meet their emission reduction limitation targets. The CDM is the main source of income for the UNFCCC Adaptation Fund, which was established to finance adaptation projects and programmes in developing country Parties to the Kyoto Protocol that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change. The Adaptation Fund is financed by a 2% levy on CERs issued by the CDM

A & Q

Q The question asked was if CDM are delivering what they are supposed to deliver, namely clean technology for development. So, as they are criticised, investors could step out.

A CDM as such have the objective to help countries meet their emission targets, and to encourage the private sector and developing countries to contribute to emission reduction efforts, **therefore Industry is ready to give projects, but not for free!**

Florenz: What proposes Industry to the politicians in order to convince them to keep CDM? Why are Banks so much involved? This must be solved, as Banks should not be involved more than necessary.

A "Incentivation of the private sector" is the name of the game, which means if you do something, then there must be a revenue. That's how it came to the CDM, which is the only instrument for developing countries to get clean technology. And banks have a role to play and they have to make this exercise profitable, otherwise nobody would do it. And as today, money is not given directly to the countries anymore, this system is the right one.

Q We are not questioning the CDM, but we would like to improve the rules. How can we have sustainable development if we do not have at the same time poverty eradication. That is why we need to have the system working better. This means political goals and interests for business have the two main objectives to be achieved.

Conclusions: Ok for banks to be involved, as long as they stick to their role and they do not act as traders.

► WG 2: International aviation, maritime transport and emissions trading

Meeting with the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO)

Ms Jane Hupe, Head of the Environment Unit in ICAO's Air Transport Bureau and the Secretary of ICAO's Committee on Aviation Environmental Protection.

European Parliament meeting room, EU Pavilion

191 states agree on a framework. ICAO helps to facilitate (trainings, focal points). ICAO tries to build bridges. EU ETS can perhaps be linked and a global agreement might be the best. But it is not easy. Currently, blame on ICAO. So why is there not yet an agreement on a global level? ICAO has not an official position on ETS. Much has to be done in terms of monitoring and assistance.

A problem for ICAO is the democratisation of transport as a constantly growing number of people fly and this at prices which are cheaper than ever. There is no other way than assuring transport will be more sustainable. ICAO is willing to be "facilitator", and **a solution needs to be found.**

Q *Seeber* which are your estimates on CO2 reductions considering the growth of the sectors, the need of benefits of the company etc etc.

A The answer is **sustainable transport**.

► **European Parliament Side event: "Climate financing: from 'fast start' to 2020 and beyond"**

Warsaw Room, DEC

Speakers:

- **Nicholas Stern**, *Chairman of the Grantham Institute on Climate Change and the Environment, LSE and IG Patel Professor of Economics & Government*
- **Artur Runge-Metzger**, *Director of International and Climate Strategy, DG Climate Action, European Commission*
- **Farrukh Iqbal Khan**, *Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Pakistan to the United Nations*
- **Joan McNaughton**, *Senior Vice-President, Environmental Policies and Global Advocacy, Alstom*
- **Wendel Trio**, *Director, Climate Action Network Europe*
- **Jo Leinen MEP**

The side event focuses on climate finance and in particular new and additional resources and innovative sources of finance.

Stefan Agne, European Commission: climate finance is a key issue in the negotiations, as all actions needed cost money and therefore should be involved accordingly to its possibility in doing efforts.

The focus is on the architecture of the green Fund, on the standing committee, and on how to find money.

Farrukh Iqbal Khan, UN: *Long term finance solutions*:

1. *What have we agreed on in Cancun? Resources should be additional, scaled up, predictable and adequate. We need to be clear on these words. What is additional? And scale up it means to growth, but how much? When? And predictability?*
2. *We might have to create a legitimate process and a intergovernmental sanction process*
3. *and the need to have a commitment on both sides....;*

Joan McNaughton, Alstom

It will come to a stage where the carbon will have a price and enterprises and companies will have to cope with this.

Investment in the energy sector until 2050 will require 276 of trillions dollars and 100bn dollars until 2020.

ETS has been used also by some gambling bankers and this does not help.

Often a good project with a new technology cannot be financed, as banks want to be sure of return of investment, therefore the risk of investment should be considered.

Wendel Trio, Director, Climate Action Network Europe: the 100 bn Euros for the climate fund need to be public money. In this scenario, it will be difficult to get the money committed in Cancun, so innovative sources have to be found.

International shipping and aviation have not been tackled yet, but this issue should be considered as a levy for mitigation.

Q & A

Q Hassi: on transport and maritime sector

A It is **essential to include transport and maritime sector in the ETS**. Here in the negotiations we try since years to include these sectors, but without success as countries do not want on the basis of a common differentiated responsibility.

Q Seeber: It is important to know what to do with the money and the real problem is who manages the Fund.

***Stern: came late and gave a presentation on climate finance. The rationale for recommendation we made on 100 bn. which was a compromise sum between negotiators, who were mostly finance ministers or finance experts.

The main principles agreed on were: something new and innovative; something that focuses on the problem (taxing CO2); investment flows should deal with investments risk and need to reduce the risk and, more, we wanted to have incentives for the rich countries to give the money and something that could be scaled up.

► **Briefing by Mr Artur Runge-Metzger, Director of International and Climate Strategy, DG CLIMA, European Commission**
EC meeting room, EU Pavilion

State of play of negotiations

- Negotiations are ongoing at working level, about new version of text – many open questions, In the text there are no compromises yet. Most progress on Cancun Agreements.
- On the side of **KP** there are still open questions at technical level.
- Text is not good enough for **EU**, as principles are not included and the EU model is considered as the strictest one.

Bilateral talks: ministers of EU are very active:

- There is the **Russian** proposal to amend the Convention making it easier to move from non-Annex I to Annex I and to push to a vote if there is not consensus.

- **Kazachstan** wants to be Annex I, but has bad reduction target and would only produce more “hot air.
- **AAUs** are pushing for ratification.
- **NZ and Australia** want do things within a legal frame. They would prefer a declaration route, meaning not necessarily a legally-binding agreement on KP, but only a political decision.
- **Brazil, China and SA** are on the weakest possible option. **SA** would rather have a declaration (Declaration – which does not require consensus as a decision does). EU wants a decision.

► **Meeting with Parliamentarians of Mexico**
Wild Teak Meeting Room, ICC Building, Ground Floor

Were present:

María del Pilar Torre Canales, Deputy by the New Alliance Party (PANAL), former advisor for the Ecologist Green Party (PVEM), member of the Communications, Foreign Affairs and Health Commissions and of the Special Commission of Climate Change at the Chamber of Deputies.

Ignacio Pichardo Lechuga, President of GLOBE Mexico and President of the Cuetzamala Basin System Commission at the Chamber of Deputies by the Revolutionary Institutional Party (PRI), Member of the Environment and Natural Resources Commission and Water Resources Commission.

Ignacio Pichardo Lechuga*, explains that Mexico proposed to host the Green fund. Here we have to start working regionally, locally and **every single country has to be responsible for its backyard and here there are several new elements which have been approved in Mexico, namely the national strategy and the approval yesterday at the Senate of a national law on climate change and a package of definition concerning REDD, deforestation, environmental services

Q & A

Q on how Mexico sees EU

A we consider that EU until now has been pushing forward and now EU is not so strong as previously as it seems that it concentrates to the ends

Q Florenz: what is your position on the Roadmap? In Cancun you have had a “bridge-building” role between US and EU, what now?

A In Cancun we were not ready to go into commitment, now our leverage has decreased, as last year being the Presidency we were stronger. Now we certainly support K and 2nd commitment, but we have less leverage.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2011

► **Briefing by Polish Presidency after EU Coordination meeting**
Krakow Room, EU Pavilion (PL Environment Minister, Mr Korolec)

PP: The purpose is to have a **legally binding agreement in essence** and we are open to 2nd commitment period provided some conditions are met. There seems to be room for an outcome.

Concerning **AAUs**: this has never been mentioned during the negotiations, this is a point which is sensitive in this room only. On AAUs the real issue is how you spend the income coming from the AAU. As Poland we make many efforts to reduce CO2 and we did this 6 times more than required (-30%), then we agreed on climate package and being in a transition way we are trying to do this in the best possible way.

In so difficult negotiation as this one you need to have credibility and be ready to face a possible failure. Every day we meet ministers and we are negotiating seriously.

Legally binding agreement in essence means that not only EU has commitments but also other countries: this is our hope, but it seems not to be realistic.

There cannot be an agreement which is weaker than what we already have. KP is not finished, just the 1st commitment period. Many things have been agreed on (for in stance technology etc), but without commitment it will be difficult to realise them. At the European Council this situation has to be discussed. It is difficult to foresee an outcome.

The key points of the roadmap which would fulfil the achievement are clearly dates and time to fulfil the process. Some parties are reluctant to 2nd commitment period as some questions are still open as well as in the Roadmap. So EU is discussing many scenario.

Seeber: *It is clear that there will not be a legally binding agreement, neither a 2nd commitment, so why not focus on Cancun and bring some concreteness in that agreement. As EU, if we look at our 2020 strategy, we need to show what we are doing and convince then the others. We should first try to do at home, and then speak to the other.*

PP: Negotiators are actually very smart and sometimes they are playing with us.

► **WG 1: Agriculture, LULUCF, REDD+**

Meeting focussed on REDD+ with Ms Tauli Corpuz (indigenous people), Mr Parker (Global Canopy Programme) and Dr. Yemi Katerere (Head of **UN-REDD** Programme Secretariat)
European Parliament meeting room, EU Pavilion

BACKGROUND: LULUCF: THE 'NO LOOPHOLES' ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY PACKAGE FOR MINISTERS

From the Ecosystems Climate Alliance: www.ecosystemsclimate.org

Closing LULUCF loopholes

The Forestry and Land Use sector (LULUCF) is responsible for at least 30% of global emissions and has huge emission reduction potential. Loopholes in coverage across land and forests of developed countries currently undermine emissions reduction and the integrity of targets. Ministers, here are your options on the table to contribute to ambitious emissions reductions with LULUCF.

More comprehensive accounting

Our key demand is that all significant sinks and sources of emissions are mandatorily accounted for in the land use sector. This should include at least 'forest management' and

'wetland drainage and rewetting'. Each accounts for about half a billion tons of emissions in developed countries each year. You should also agree on a SBSTA work program to assist parties to move as soon as possible to full land-based accounting. Wetland drainage and rewetting allows great emissions reductions with relatively little effort.

Forest Management – close the loophole

Day to day logging activities and conversion of natural forests to plantations (all called forest management) are currently voluntary for accounting, leading to a failure to account for many emissions. Only land use change involving forests is currently mandatory for accounting (Article 3.3). Four new options are proposed by which to account for forest management. The key principle in determining which option to choose must be that it compares emissions to an historical baseline and incentivizes reductions below this level, given that in the Kyoto Protocol we are attempting to reduce emissions from 1990 levels.

There is only one option on the table that has no loopholes, has environmental integrity and is consistent with accounting in other sectors – Option 3 (*net-net accounting relative to the first commitment period*). So, this shouldn't take long to decide. Projected reference levels should be refused. They just inflate emissions in the baseline and therefore only reduce emissions on paper, not in the atmosphere. Choosing projected reference levels would make the LULUCF sector outrageous compared to other sectors; becoming the notorious rotten apple in the KP basket.

Close the bio energy loophole: bio energy emissions should be accounted for in LULUCF and / or the energy sector, as burning wood and other biomass is emissive; currently bio energy is rarely accounted for anywhere, because emissions from forests and croplands are not usually accounted for.

Other matters relevant to accounting for forest management

Natural disturbance definition: This relates to wildfire, insect and disease infestations and extreme weather events. Ensure the definition is restricted to non-anthropogenic events that are extreme and infrequent.

Harvested wood products: This is about trying to claim credits for wood even when it moves beyond the boundaries of forest management into other sectors, and would further skew accounts to overstate removals. Retain the rule that requires instant oxidation for all harvested wood products.

Forest definitions: The current definition of 'forest' adopted for use in LULUCF fails to differentiate between natural forests and plantations. It contributes to failure to account for emissions. The best way to solve this is to adopt the subsidiary forest categories of the FAO and to activate the decision that SBSTA explore a biome based definition of forest (Decision 11/CP.7 Land use, land-use change and forestry).

'Flexible land use': This proposal would undermine the existing rules under Article 3.3 for deforestation, afforestation and reforestation so as to evade accounting for substantial emissions and must be rejected.

Imposing a cap on credits / debits: A cap is an attempt to limit the worst excesses of A1 loopholes on emissions, but it doesn't solve the problem and it limits incentives for real emissions reduction. A cap on debits is an outrageous proposition as it would limit a party's obligation to account for emissions.

Q & A

Q Florenz: what are you doing practically? Which are the criteria and definition for funding?

A We work with the various countries, helping them to do biodiversity assessment and helping them to realise project. A major key point of our work is to look at “multiple benefit”, not only about carbon reduction, but also on the maintaining of biodiversity.

As ONG they basically act like lobbyists, having a role of researchers and disseminating information.

► **WG 2: International aviation, maritime transport and emissions trading**

Meeting with CDM Watch

EC meeting room, EU Pavilion

Civil servant of UK government, chair of CDM Watch.: On HFC we ensure that methodology is best applied. It is important to realise that CDM are an important instrument to get information about what happens in the sector and what goes on as it gives a good insight and early signals.

Concerning additionality: the question is not yet entirely solved: Gas recovery is probably no additional as it is profitable, which is worrying for us. On oil recovery this would not pass, because no additionality.

CDM might die – not necessarily because it is politically decided, but because of a lack of investment.

► **Meeting with representatives of the Chinese Delegation**

Zhou Dadi, founding director of the Beijing Energy Efficiency Center (BECon) and director of China's Energy Research Institute

Liu Yanhua, director and doctoral supervisor of geography at the Academy, former vice-minister of the Ministry of Science and Technology (2001-2009).

Chinese Delegation Pavilion

Position of China: Background

1. Facts

Cancún agreement pledge: “China will endeavour to lower its carbon dioxide emissions per unit of GDP by 40-45% by 2020 compared to the 2005 level, increase the share of non fossil fuels in primary energy consumption to around 15% by 2020 and increase forest coverage by 40 million hectares and forest stock volume by 1.3 billion cubic meters by 2020 from the 2005 levels.” (28 January 2010). China’s new Five –year plan (12 FYP, 2011-2015) includes the following targets:

- Emissions intensity: Decrease its carbon dioxide emissions per unit of GDP -17% from 2011 to 2015
- Non fossil fuel target : Increase the share of non fossil fuels in primary energy consumption from 8.3% in 2010 to 11.4% in 2015
- Energy intensity – Decrease energy consumption per GDP by -16% from 2011 to 2015
- Recent energy and emissions data and China's new 12th Five year indicate that **China is set to not only meet its Cancun Agreement emissions intensity pledge, but is likely to go beyond it.** However, at the same time, largely due to faster than expected economic growth, emissions in 2020 are likely to be higher than previous estimates (Climate Analytics et al. 2011).
- **China has been successful in rapidly reducing its energy intensity.** China reported that energy consumption per GDP decreased by more than 19% over the period 2006 to 2010, coming in just under the domestic target of 20% (range 18% to 27% depending on the data source).
- **China has been successful in introducing renewable energy and other non-fossil energy sources.** The share of non fossil energy sources has increased to 8.3% in 2010. China revised its expectations for wind energy upwards: the new target for wind is 70 gigawatts of additional installation by 2015. The domestic target to increase the share of non-fossil fuels in primary energy consumption to 11.4% in 2015 is consistent with the international pledge to increase it to 15% in 2020.
- These targets constitute a major effort and, for most model calculations, the non fossil target leads to emissions dropping by around 580 to 800 Mt CO₂ (or 6-8%) below business as usual in 2020. (Climate Analytics et al. 2011)
- According to the analysis by the climate action tracker (Climate Analytics 2011) **China's forestry target in the international pledge is of limited influence on national total emissions. The new Five Year Plan does include implementing additional national actions that could reduce emissions further.**

2. Positions

Despite evidence of considerable action undertaken at home (energy efficiency targets in the 11th Five Year Plan, expansion the use of renewable energies, e-mobility, etc.), **China has fundamentally declined to accept legally binding targets and is putting the onus on developed countries to assist with clean technology.**

China is a major player in the CDM; it is by far the largest supplier in terms of reduction credits (CERs), which, however, predominantly stem from the HFC23 destruction. Interest in implementing emissions trading as a domestic policy tool is also growing in China. In July 2010, the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC) announced that China will establish domestic carbon trading programmes in selected provinces and/or sectors during the 12th Five Year Plan from 2011 to 2015 to help to meet its 2020 carbon intensity target. Such efforts are, however, self-imposed and are strictly separated from ongoing international negotiations.

Economic costs and energy security concerns are likely to keep China heavily reliant on coal. According to the IEA's World Energy Outlook 2010, China puts into operation one coal fired power plant (1 GW) every 10 days on average up to 2035 in the Current Policies Scenario. Apart from their significant local environmental impacts, the rise in Chinese greenhouse gas emissions threatens to undermine EU reductions.

EU-Chinese cooperation on Near Zero Emissions Coal initiative (NZEC) seeks to address this issue. The Chinese Ministry of Science and Technology is preparing an adaptation plan, which will set out options for China to deal with climate change. The EC is assisting with the development of similar plans at provincial level.

3. Position of negotiation groups

G-77 & China

G-77 & China are coordinating common negotiating positions among 130 developing countries. The G-77 positions are presented by the country serving as the chair for each specific negotiation issue. However, as there are a wide range of interests on climate change within the G-77, from AOSIS to OPEC, sub-groups of developing countries (e.g. African Group, AOSIS, LDC, etc.) will also state their positions alongside the G-77 position, or independently if there is no consensus among G-77 members. Despite difficulties in coordinating common positions on many details, G-77 members share basic views:

- Under the AWG-KP, G-77 wants to avoid a gap between commitment periods and is arguing for a second commitment period from 2013 to 2018, with 1990 as a single base year;
- The current mitigation pledges of Annex I countries are considered insufficient and they call upon all Annex I countries to show leadership through ambitious reduction commitments;
- Regardless of considerable differences in the level of development among the group which often results in conflicting positions, G-77 regularly reiterates the UNFCCC principle of common but differentiated responsibility and warns that re-classification of countries or differentiation amongst developing countries will impede the process of negotiations.

In preparation for Cancún, G-77 has indicated its willingness to accept a comprehensive set of decisions provided that: (1) they are based on the principles of the UNFCCC and in concordance with the Bali Action plan, covering all its elements, (2) a balance between AWG-KP and AWG-LCA is ensured, and (3) the overall objective of a comprehensive, ambitious and legally binding outcome is not compromised.

Q & A

Q *Leinen*: What is your position towards 2nd commitment period? Which would be an acceptable compromise for you?

A We are fully aware that EU Commission took the lead for a long time and many of your countries have done a lot. Now EU is less strong and we would like to see more collaboration. Nowadays there are two big powers (US and EU), whereby US has a different position. And there are so many different positions, look at Russia, Canada and all this makes confusion. Developed countries have to take the lead and we should do all our best. We are trying to do our best, but maybe we have not communicated in a good way what we have done until now. Our population is huge but we cannot follow the same path as the developed countries. Nevertheless we want to be in the picture. It is true that we could do more. We really support the EU to take the lead.

Q on roadmap, levy on shipping, why are China's ambitious so low, which are the legally binding commitments that China is ready to accept?

A Well, I am not representing the ministers of China. On roadmap, a legally binding system could be developed for the future to start this process. From Chinese side we can support developed countries to start the scheme. But all this depends from all countries, not only from China.

A new, full legally-binding agreement can be developed for the future to start, as a way of a new process, and China is ready to enter the 2nd commitment of the KP under 5 conditions:

1. only in 2020
2. if K parties fulfil their prior commitments
3. if they enter into further additional commitments
4. If industry countries provide financial support through climate funding
5. If industry countries provide technological support.

The extension of Kyoto most important and the Green Climate Fund should be established.

Q Strategically, when do you think to jump in the game? We have only 48 hrs.

A We have to find a way to identify targets and actions first and we have to think first what we need to do now, before thinking of what to do in the future. We have to have a stepwise approach. Domestically we have already legal commitments. Even the roadmap would be difficult for us, unless we would have enough time. Considering the differences in all countries, it is difficult to apply to same standards. In the future we can solve all these problems, **now we need something very practical (even for the Roadmap, which at the moment is not totally clear) and not something which is theoretically correct. So let's start the process!**

► **Meeting with Parliamentarians of the Pan-African Parliament and South Africa**
EC meeting room, EU Pavilion

Jerry Dimotana Thibedi, Chairman of the pan African Parliament Committee on Agriculture, Rural Economy, Environment and Natural Resources

Climate protection is a task, but also an opportunity. It will bring us jobs! Africa is speaking with one voice on climate change. It is the reality of history and the reality of the moment.

Q & A

Q *Leinen*: what do you expect from EU?

A We need to get time and assistance, and, from our side, we also need to act. We are willing to do whatever is possible. Cooperation and partnership should continue. We need funding. Talking about money is cheap but put it on the table is expensive.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2011

► **Briefing by Ms Mackowiak-Pandera** after EU Coordination meeting
Poznan Room, EU Pavilion

The SA Presidency presented a paper which could be the scenario for reaching an outcome: A process to close LCA track and to establish discussing general agreement. A legal outcome is still an issue which is not solved and which is crucial for EU. There is no support for entering a 2nd commitment period without legally binding agreement on the Roadmap. KP2 seems not possible, but perhaps there could be a decision on the Roadmap.

EU agreed with AOSIS and LDCs to ask other countries to come on board.

China, India and US are still not on board.

On financial issue: there is no agreement among EU countries to commit on funding.

On transfer of technology the pillar of Cancun , can be solved.

China wants 2nd commitment period without commitments and the Roadmap only without legally binding commitments.

Red line for EU is to have a process leading to something with commitment for major economies with indications on how this process will be and with concrete dates in the roadmap with 2020 limit for entering into force. EU is in favour of legally binding 2nd commitment period. US will play a crucial role in the process.

Q & A

Q Within the EU some would like to go to K with conditions and some without conditions. So what is the EU representing?

A The adoption of a Roadmap leading to the ratification of KP in one year would be possible. Ratification would depend on the conditions of commitments. At the moment all efforts are focussed to have a Durban outcome.

Q Where are we AAUs? Can EU accept that US and China don't accept legally binding commitments until 2020?

A We are in a bad situation, as accepting that EU with a few countries are ready to accept legally binding commitment would be not enough to reach the 2°C target. Developing countries are asking EU to help them. There will be later decision in the Council on what to do next, which strategy to adopt in future.

Q We want that the PP is efficient, effective and clear in the negotiations.

► **Briefing by Ms Hedegaard, Commissioner for Climate Action**
EC meeting room, EU Pavilion

Hedegaard: we had a very good meeting with OASIS, African countries and LDC. We need to effectively stop cc, and these countries agree to have a legally binding commitment. Also Brazil agrees to have a legally binding commitment after 2020, and the same said SA, which means that half of the basis here has moved, and that now we need to have on board the other half.

Experts are now continuing to negotiate on the 2nd commitment period and on the RM.

Q & A

Q Jorgenssen: how could EU accept a RM with commitments after 2020?

A US is moving in our direction, China asked for 2017, we say 2015. We, as EU, want this review to add on with targets.

Q Eickhout: 2015 is a very crucial year, but many countries have problem with it, so how can we have 2015 agreed on? On KP: AAUs is not solved yet. How can we use Brazil and other to put pressure on other countries?

A On timeline: Timetable is not key point and we cannot have this as a topic. We need to find a solution which does not put at risk what we are doing domestically. We don't know what we are doing in the end.

Q Arsenis: What will be the legal status of the 2nd commitment period ?

A On the 2nd commitment period: we could ratify here in Durban, but this we cannot do, as we need to know the content. We need strong wording and it is not enough to ratify a weak statement which says that we now start a process to have something in 2020. Then it is better for EU to say no.

Q Hassi: What is happening on financing, or are we only speaking on roadmap?

A The Green Fund is still on the table. DE, DK and UK announced to put some sums, so it will be operational. So we got a good impression of G27.

Leinen: we really hope that there will be an outcome tomorrow, otherwise it will be very bad for Africa.

► **Meeting with Irish Environment Minister Phil Hogan**

European Commission meeting room, EU Pavilion

Hogan: On the future Irish Presidency: among our priorities are Blueprint of water and Biodiversity.

On COP-17: the EU agenda is quite strong, progress has been done, ok to go for a 2nd commitment period and towards a RM. Brazil is giving good signals, but other countries want only voluntary agreements, so negotiations are difficult. From my perspective, France said that progress have been done in Agriculture. But better to have no agreement than bad agreement.

Q & A

A The Forestry and Land Use sector (LULUCF) is a very technical issue and it is very difficult to find an agreement at international level. There is a consensus on agriculture and progress on LULUCF and on climate fund but if the agreement is not good, better not to have one.

If we can have some progress made in some key areas and have a positive outcome here, then we could do some changes in Doha, next year.

EU has an overall mandate, it is open on a 2nd commitment period and on the RM, so we are sticking to it, and we have support from other countries. We don't want a process that starts only in 2020.

The big difference between Cancun and Durban, is that EU is the only one has put a proposal on the table and all others are reacting to it. The other thing is that here there is no plan B.

► **WG 2: International aviation, maritime transport and emissions trading**

Meeting with IMO (International Maritime Organization)

European Commission meeting room, EU Pavilion

IMO Secretary-General, Mr. Efthimios E. Mitropoulos; Mr JO Espinoza, Director of IMO's Marine Environment Division (MED) and Eivind S. Vagslid, Deputy Director/Head of MED's Air Pollution and Climate Change Section, will be present for the IMO.

IMO will meet the targets by 2013 and therefore has done its job.

Q. Which are the market based measures which you are working on?

A. We are left with a emission trade scheme and the other is a tax contribution as a levy. We have put in place a model which responds to requests in case of accident, for instance oil spill of a tanker.

All ships over the world have to be treated in the same way, and rules have to apply to everyone, despite the flag: therefore remove the reference to the Annex. There is consensus on that within IMO.

► ***Bilateral meeting with an US Congressional staff delegation***
European Parliament meeting room, EU Pavilion

For us it is very difficult to support an agreement here. US was asked what is the right position as

1st it seemed OK for US to support roadmap and to have binding targets if everybody agrees and then

2nd ok for process but not for binding targets.

Well, the confusion is probably due to semantics, as ok for the process, which eventually could lead to legally binding targets. On Roadmap – which is proposed by EU and which is formal – we agree as long as it is a generic roadmap.

We want now to put in place actions, to increase energy efficiency and reduce CO2 emissions.

The 9 officials of the delegation stressed that USA are putting in place actions domestically have bilateral agreements with other countries. They did not answer what they would do in case that China would agree on an agreement in Durban, saying that first they should know on what they will finally agree on.

Position of US on green fund: they can agree on if it is done by the private sector (which basically means that they are against from a governmental point of view).

The US officials asked why EU is so keen on "legally binding" as for US once a political agreement is signed, it is legally binding! There must be a difference in cultural and political understanding.

► ***Meeting with Brazilian Parliamentarians (One of the best meetings)***
Pod Mahogany Meeting room, ICC building, Ground floor

Congressman **Alfredo Sirkis**, Green Party MP, representing the state of Rio de Janeiro, chairman of the Rio + 20 sub commission of the Commission of Foreign Affairs and National Defence and the vice chairman of the joint Congress Climate Change Commission and member of the Brazilian delegations to the Montreal, Bali and Copenhagen Climate Change UN Conferences.

Sirkis: Kyoto will be substituted by something that is temporary, we have to re-design the scheme, we have to re-discuss transparency and responsibilities. I think that we will have a smaller agreement to keep K alive until 2015. But we will have to change our mentality and everybody has to make efforts for mitigation and re-assess everything in 2015.

And according financing, the bill has to be paid according to each one's historic responsibility;

Brazil reacted in a negative way to EU position on aviation as resources should have been put in Green fund. We have other ways to act, such as international taxation, CDM, private sector, why this aviation mechanism. It is important to have real information and that things are counted in the right way.

We have to tackle the problem on the consumption level. Obviously it is difficult when US doesn't believe in cc. We need unified indicators as at the moment there is a big confusion understanding which country is doing what as each one take as basis of departure different dates and data: Europe reduces on base 1990, Brazil 2005, US 2005, other countries use 1992 or 2000, China uses carbon intensity of the GDP: this causes enormous confusion which jeopardizes the efforts.

We have to have a new taxation system that incorporates Carbon economy and sustainability (a revolution in the system). We need to go towards a new model. We have to "marry" ecology and economy – this is the topic of Rio+20 – this is the larger picture, going further than "just" climate change. We need a simple approach. Taking into account negative environmental influences and the carbon input of every operation. That could be a new indicator. And more, we could start to give an economic value to ecosystem services, and have not only a world carbon tax, but also a reform on national/ regional taxation systems. Substitute forms of taxation that do not take into account sustainability criteria.

Amarylli Gersony

EPP MEMBERS TO THE COP-17 DELEGATION

Full Members:

1. Mr. Seeber (ENVI co-ordinator)
2. Mrs. Del Castillo (ITRE co-ordinator)
3. Mr. Florenz (ENVI rapporteur, Vice Chairman of the EP Delegation)
4. Mrs. Gardini (ENVI vice-co-ordinator)

Additional Members

1. Mrs. Carvalho (ITRE)
2. Mrs. Jordan Cizelj (ITRE-rapporteur)