

Climate: A Matter of Survival, a Question of Justice

by Joseph Purugganan

Photo by Mel De Vera/LRC

The search for just solutions to the climate crisis is one of the most pressing global challenges today. Governments have converged once again, this time in the resort-town of Cancun, Mexico, for another round of talks aimed at reaching a consensus on how to save our endangered planet.

The imperative is to come up with a global deal on climate change anchored on four building blocks- the stabilization of greenhouse gas emissions (mitigation), developing measures to allow countries to adapt to the impacts of climate change (adaptation), climate financing and technology transfer.

There is no denying the need for and the urgency of arriving at a global consensus on climate change. Scientists have been warning us of the climate tipping point beyond which we face an irreparable global catastrophe.¹

Needless to say, for many poor countries like the Philippines and for the poorest and most vulnerable communities within these countries, climate change is a matter of survival. The fact that the voices of these poor communities have been muted and their messages and demands ignored in the climate talks also drive home the point that the long term solutions to the climate crisis lie beyond the UN-mandated negotiations.





CLIMATE...from page 1

In this issue of Focus Policy Review we examine the critical issues underpinning the debates on climate policy. We review the basic information about climate change and how global institutions and governments have tried to respond to the issue. We zero in on the Philippine context and examine what is at stake for our country and its most vulnerable communities, and articulate peoples' urgent demands for solutions anchored on the principle of climate justice.



http://www.pinoygigs.com/blog/2009/09/revive-your-bayanihanspirit-extend-your-help-to-ondoy-victims/#more-273

What's at stake for the Philippines?

The Philippines has been described as a climate hazard hotspot and a country highly vulnerable to the negative effects of climate change.² In 2009, the country experienced 25 disasters, topping the list of countries in terms of disaster occurrence that year ahead of China and the United States.³

Climate has always been a factor influencing development in the Philippines. Government's own assessments point to increasing risks and pressures from weather-related events on the economy over the years⁴. The government estimates that disasters-mostly weather-related such as typhoons, floods and droughts-have cost the country around 20 billion pesos in damages annually since 1990.⁵

The Philippines is a classic case of a low emitter contributing very little to the problem of climate change yet high on the list of countries vulnerable to climate change and in dire need of additional resources that would allow it to adapt to the adverse impacts The predicament of the Philippines is the classic case of being a low emitter contributing very little to the problem of climate change–with emissions of less than 1% of global green house gas emission (GHG) levels–yet, high on the list of countries vulnerable to climate change and in dire need of additional resources that would allow it to adapt to the adverse impacts.

Philippine response

The Philippines has in many respects been ahead of most countries in trying to frame both an institutional and policy response to the problem of climate change. An interagency committee on climate change (IACC) was established as early as 1991 to coordinate various climate change related activities, propose policies and prepare Philippine positions to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) negotiations.

Since then the Philippine government has moved to institutionalize climate in official policy by establishing high-level institutions and mechanisms such as the Presidential Task Force on Climate Change (PTFCC) established in 2007 and more recently (2009), the Philippine Climate Change Act, a law which aims to mainstream climate change in government policy formulations and establish the framework strategy and program on climate change. It likewise established the Philippine Climate Change Commission (PCCC), which now stands as the sole policy-making body of the government tasked to coordinate, monitor and evaluate the programs and action plans relating to climate change.⁶





With the creation of the Philippine Climate Change Commission, the government hopes to address long standing concerns over the overlapping and sometimes competing functions of the different national agencies working on climate change. The key for the PCCC is to be able to steer the agencies into one direction, recognizing various competencies and harmonizing roles and functions. In its early stages however, the PCCC already encountered problems in coordinating the functions of the agencies.



Multiple climate hazard map of Southeast Asia from Climate Change Vulnerability Mapping for Southeast Asia by Arief Anshory Yusuf and Herminia Francisco. Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia, IDRC, SIDA, and CIDA. January 2009

At the 15th Conference of Parties (COP-15) of the UNFCCC in Copenhagen, for example, we witnessed this lack of coordination when the PCCC vice-chairman expressed the Philippines' supposed willingness to associate with the Copenhagen Accord without the consent and approval of the other agencies and prior to any public consultation on the matter. This mistake was corrected later on with a formal letter addressed to the UNFCCC Secretariat. This incident however is indicative of the challenges that still face the Philippines when it comes to defining a cohesive response to climate change.

The Philippines adopts a multi-pronged strategy to address climate change. It strives to push for a balanced approach to climate change action with equal emphasis on mitigation and adaptation. There is recognition of the enormous need to adapt to the negative effects of climate change, especially in light of the disaster-prone character of the country, yet there is also a strong political desire to make a positive contribution to the global effort to stabilize GHG emission levels.

The National Framework Strategy on Climate Change (NFSCC) came out in April 2010. The goal of the Philippines, as defined in the NFSCC, is to build the adaptive capacity of communities and increase the resilience of natural ecosystems to climate change, and optimize mitigation opportunities towards sustainable development.⁷

Furthermore, the national framework calls for a synergy of adaptation and mitigation in recognition of the mutually beneficial relationship between the two pillars. Adaptation however is defined as the anchor The approach of the strategy. Philippines is to undertake mitigation measures such as energy efficiency and conservation, renewable energy development, sustainable transport and even Reducing Emission from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) in the context of adaptation.8 R

- 1 Climate tipping point may arrive without warning, says top forecaster. News report from Science Daily. http://www. sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/02/100209191445.htm. accessed 3 December 2010
- 2 Arief Anshory Yusuf & Herminia Francisco, Climate Change Vulnerability Mapping for Southeast Asia, , Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA), January 2009.
- **3** Femke Vos, Jose Rodriguez Regina Below and D. Guha-Sapir Annual Disaster Statistical Review 2009: The numbers and trends.
- 4 New Risks and Pressures (from the PTFCC website http:// www.doe.gov.ph/cc/nrp.htm accessed August 12 2010)
- 5 Jose Ramon T. Villarin, Ma. Antonia Y. Loyzaga, Antonio G.M. La Viña, et al., "In the Eye of the Perfect Storm: What the Philippines should do about Climate Change, Working Paper," July 2008, 59, http://www.observatory.ph/SCJ_doc. pdf (accessed June 29, 2009) as cited in Focus Report on CDM in the Philippines
- 6 Philippine Climate Change Act of 2009.
- 7 National Framework Strategy on Climate Change 2010.
- 8 WRI 2007 as cited in National Framework Strategy on Climate Change. 2010.



Climate 101: Understanding the Basics of Climate Change By Carmina

By Carmina Flores-Obanil

As typhoons, floods, droughts grew more severe all over the world climate change has emerged not only as a buzzword but an issue that merits and demands both immediate and concerted action. Scientific evidence points to the fact that climate change is happening, and that "global warming" has accelerated, caused largely by the increased greenhouse gas emissions from cars, power plants, and other manmade sources. In 2007, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) came out with a statement "that the global average net effect of human activities since 1750 has been one of warming" and that it is attributable primarily to the increase in three key heat-trapping gases in the atmosphere: carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide, which are classified as greenhouse gases.

What is climate change; its causes?

Climate change has been defined as any change in global temperatures and precipitation over time due to natural variability or to human activity.

Climate change usually occurs when the total amount of the sun's energy absorbed by the earth's atmosphere and surface changes or when the amount of heat from the earth's surface and atmosphere that goes to space over an extended period of time also changes. Humans can cause climate change by releasing greenhouse gases (through combustion of fossil fuels which release carbon dioxide) and aerosols into the atmosphere, by changing land surfaces (through deforestation), etc. Natural and human factors that cause climate change are called 'climate forcings' since they 'force' or push the climate to shift to new values.

For thousands of years, earth's temperature and the balance of heat-trapping greenhouse gases have remained just right for humans, animals and plants to survive. The problem at this point is keeping that balance. As people burn fossil fuels to heat our homes, run our cars, produce electricity, and manufacture all sorts of products, the greenhouse gases that go to the atmosphere also



Illustration of the greenhouse effect (courtesy of the Marian Koshland Science Museum of the National Academy of Sciences). Visible sunlight passes through the atmosphere without being absorbed. Some of the sunlight striking the earth • is absorbed and converted to heat, which warms the surface. The surface • emits heat to the atmosphere, where some of it • is absorbed by greenhouse gases and • re-emitted toward the surface; some of the heat is not trapped by greenhouse gases and • re-emitted toward the surface; some of the amount of heat that gets absorbed before escaping to space, thus enhancing the greenhouse effect and amplifying the warming of the earth.

http://www.pewclimate.org/global-warming-basics/facts_figures/climate_science_basics/ghe.cfm; accessed on 2010 December 5



≝ GLOBAL SOUTH



Global surface temperature, based on surface air temperature measurements at meteorological stations and on sea surface temperature measurements from ships and satellites, shows a temperature increase of 1.4°F (0.78°C) since the beginning of the 20th century, with about 1.1°F (0.61°C) of the increase occurring in the past 30 years. Data courtesy of NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies.⁴

increase, which in turn also amplify the warming capability of the natural greenhouse effect.

What is the greenhouse effect?

The greenhouse effect is a natural phenomenon which helps regulate earth's temperature.

Heat-trapping or greenhouse gases like water vapor, carbon dioxide, etc. 'trap' heat in the lower atmosphere and re-radiates some of this heat downward to the earth. Without a natural greenhouse effect, the temperature of the Earth would be about zero degrees F (-18°C) instead of its present 57°F (14°C). Human activities, however, primarily burning fossil fuels and changing land cover patterns, are increasing the concentrations of some of these greenhouse gases, in effect also increasing the natural greenhouse effect.

Climate change real, so should solutions

Apart from a few climate skeptics, who question the assertions on climate change and its causes, there is broad consensus within the international scientific community that the world is indeed getting warmer. While the increase in temperature was not constant, but consisted of warming and cooling cycles at intervals of several decades, the long term trend is one of global warming.

This is the reason why alpine glaciers have been retreating, sea levels have risen, and climatic zones are shifting. Based on scientific studies conducted, "the 10 warmest years in global meteorological history have all occurred in the past 15 years and the 20th century has been the warmest globally in the last 600 years."¹ The effects of global warming are already being felt through severe weather conditions, rising sea levels, more frequent and prolonged droughts and occurrences of El Niño and La Niña phenomena. In extreme circumstances, sea-level rise could completely submerge some small island states which could then trigger abandonment and significant "off-island migration," at great economic and social costs.²

As a global response to climate change, 154 countries signed the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCC) in 1992 and agreed to stabilize the amount of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. A more concrete commitment was made by 160 countries³, including the most industrialized ones in December 1997 in Kyoto, Japan under the Kyoto Protocol. Since then, the parties to the UNFCCC and the Kyoto protocol have met to firm up commitments and thresh out the details of a legally binding global agreement to address climate change.

3 As of November 2009, 187 countries have ratified the Kyoto Protocol



^{1 &}quot;New Climate Change Fact Sheet, "http://www.thegreatwarming.com/ pdf/ClimateChangeFactSheet.pdf

² Leatherman, 1997; Nicholls and Mimura, 1998 as cited in "Small Island States," Chapter 17 of: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). 2001. Climate Change 2001: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Cambridge University Press. Accessed at http:// www.climate.org/resources/climate-impacts/smallislands.html. Last visited 5 January 2011.

^{4 &}quot;Understanding and Responding to Climate Change : Highlights of National Academies Report, 2008 edition," http://dels-old.nas.edu/ dels/rpt_briefs/climate_change_2008_final.pdf

SOUTH

More Useful Terminologies

Weather The specific conditions of the atmosphere at a particular place and time, measured in terms of variables that include temperature, precipitation, cloudiness, humidity, air pressure and wind.

Weather Forecast A prediction about the specific atmospheric conditions expected for a location in the short-term future (hours to days).

Climate The long-term average of conditions in the atmosphere, ocean, and ice sheets and sea ice described by statistics, such as means and extremes.

Climate Forecast A prediction about average or extreme climate conditions for a region in the long-term future (seasons to decades).

Climate Variability Natural changes in climate that fall within the normal range of extremes for a particular region, as measured by temperature, precipitation, and frequency of events. Drivers of climate variability include the El Niño Southern Oscillation and other phenomena.

Climate Change A significant and persistent change in the mean state of the climate or its variability. Climate change occurs in response to changes in some aspect of Earth's environment: these include regular changes in Earth's orbit about the sun, re-arrangement of continents through plate tectonic motions, or anthropogenic modification of the atmosphere.

Global Warming The observed increase in average temperature near the Earth's surface and in the lowest layer of the atmosphere. In common usage, "global warming" often refers to the warming that has occurred as a result of increased emissions of greenhouse gases from human activities. Global warming is a type of climate change; it can also lead to other changes in climate conditions, such as changes in precipitation patterns.

Climate System The matter, energy, and processes involved in interactions among Earth's atmosphere, hydrosphere, cryosphere, lithosphere, biosphere, and Earth-Sun interactions.

Likely, Very Likely, Extremely Likely, Virtually Certain These terms are used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to indicate how probable it is that a predicted outcome will occur in the climate system, according to expert judgment. A result that is deemed "likely" to occur has a greater than 66% probability of occurring. A "very likely" result has a greater than 90% probability. "Extremely likely" means greater than 95% probability, and "virtually certain" means greater than 99% probability.

Mitigation Human interventions to reduce the sources of greenhouse gases or enhance the sinks that remove them from the atmosphere.

Vulnerability The degree to which physical, biological, and socio-economic systems are susceptible to and unable to cope with adverse impacts of climate change.²

Adaptation Initiatives and measures to reduce the vulnerability of natural and human systems against actual or expected climate change effects.³

Fossil fuels Energy sources such as petroleum, coal, or natural gas, which are derived from living matter that existed during a previous geologic time period.

Feedback The process through which a system is controlled, changed, or modulated in response to its own output. Positive feedback results in amplification of the system output; negative feedback reduces the output of a system.

Carbon Cycle Circulation of carbon atoms through the Earth systems as a result of photosynthetic conversion of carbon dioxide into complex organic compounds by plants, which are consumed by other organisms, and return of the carbon to the atmosphere as carbon dioxide as a result of respiration, decay of organisms, and combustion of fossil fuels

References and Excerpts from:

- "Global Warming Frequently Asked Questions" National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Climatic Data Center http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/globalwarming.html
- "Climate Literacy: The Essential Principles of Climate Science," http://climate.noaa.gov/index.jsp?pg=/education/ edu_index.jsp&edu=literacy; accessed 2010 December 7 Temperature Trends in the Lower Atmosphere: Steps for Understanding and Reconciling Differences. Thomas R. Karl, Susan J. Hassol, Christopher D. Miller, and William L. Murray, editors, 2006. A Report by the Climate Change Science Program and the Subcommittee on Global Change Research, Washington, DC.; accessed 2010 December 7



SOUTH



Global Responses, Global Confusion?

Although the intellectual origins of the current climate consensus date back to the 1960's, the birth of the main institutions specifically dedicated to dealing with climate change can be traced to the United Nations Earth Summit, held in Rio de Janeiro in June 1992. The Rio Summit produced a consensus among the 172 governments regarding the formation of an international climate change treaty, which would eventually become the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). As expressly stated in its text, the ultimate purpose of the Convention was to *"to achieve… stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system,"*¹ even as the treaty itself did not specify emission limits or enforcement mechanisms for those limits. Rather, these would be subsequently negotiated in annual *Conferences of Parties* (COP).

One other significant theme elaborated by the UNFCCC was its division of its participating parties into Annex I (Industrialized Countries), Annex II (OECD Countries), and Developing Countries— a classification pushed forward to ensure that all countries of the treaty would share *"common but differentiated responsibilities."* As it was believed, at the time of the UNFCCC's formation, that *"the largest share of historical and current global emissions of greenhouse gases has originated in developed countries, that per capita emissions in developing countries are still relatively low"*², it would likewise be

Annex I and II countries which would shoulder the burden of reducing the emissions which they historically had issued the vast majority of. Others have summarized this dimension of the UNFCCC as the *polluter pays principle* the idea that the party responsible for pollution (historical emissions), should be responsible for redressing the harm (global warming) done to the environment.

How the UNFCCC would actually enforce the reductions of emissions among its parties, how much emis-

continued on page 8





GLOBAL...from page 7

sions would be reduced, would take several more years of negotiation, until the third COP was held in Kyoto in December 1997. Ratified by 187 countries³, the Kyoto Protocol set up the foundation pillars that would determine international climate change policy in the years to come. Not only was the amount of emission reductions specified for Annex I countries to be a 5.2% decrease from the 1991 level; for the first time, several enforcement mechanisms were laid out on paper, including what would eventually become known as Kyoto's flex*ibility mechanisms*. Beyond national regulatory devices for decreasing four specified GHG's⁴, the Kyoto Protocol introduced measures known as Emissions Trading, Joint Implementation, and the Clean Development Mechanism in the aim of making it cheaper for national governments and polluting companies to meet their respective emission reduction targets. A market in carbon and GHG's was constructed as a result of the agreement in order to "help stimulate green investment and help Parties meet their emission targets in a cost-effective way."5

Despite the role of key American personalities (ex. Al Gore) in paving the way for Kyoto's flexibility mechanisms, and despite widespread acceptance of the Protocol in other regions of the globe, it is interesting that some of the most pronounced dissent against Kyoto has occurred in the United States, where it was derided by the Bush administration as an *"unrealistic and ever-tightening straitjacket."*⁶ Consequently, the same administration announced, in February 2002, a

domestic climate change plan setting a *"greenhouse gas intensity"* (the ratio of GHG's to GDP) reduction target for the United States of 18% by 2012.⁷

This contrasts significantly with the climate mitigation trajectory set by the European Union. Whereas the US eventually withdrew support for Kyoto, the EU heightened its enthusiasm for the Protocol's mechanisms— to the point of the Union's crafting of its own continent-wide climate scheme. Through the EU Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS), the world's largest carbon trading market to date, as much as 11,500 installations in the EU member states have been subjected to the Kyoto Protocol's stipulations, generating a emissions-reduction model that has since been emulated by other trading systems throughout the world.

Other country groupings have had equally striking responses to the Protocol. Retorting, for instance, to attempts of industrialized countries to shift increasing responsibility for addressing climate change to the developing world- China and India especially-, the coalition of the Group of 77 (G77) and China have continually reiterated the UNFCCC principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities", pushing for heightened initiative and accountability of developed country parties in cleaning up the problem they have been historically responsible for creating. Likewise, given the poverty burdens still shouldered by the same nations, calls for an increased incorporation of sustainable development issues, strengthened involvement of the UN system in supporting national adaptation, and South-South cooperation have repeatedly been sounded.



COP 16 photo by Jon Golinski/UNFCCC (http://unfccc.int/2860.php. Accessed 4 December 2010)





The Philippine government has called for "deep and early cuts" in the emissions of developed countries, access to climate finance for adaptation and relevant forms of technology transfer

Given, moreover, the disproportionate climate change risks to be and now being experienced by island nations, there can be little surprise that the members of the Association of Small Island States (AOSIS) have always been found among those lobbying for stronger climate mitigation policies as well as among critics of any perceived complacency in the current consensus. In its Declaration on Climate Change in 2009, for example, the member states of AOSIS reported being "profoundly disappointed by the lack of apparent ambition within the international climate negotiations to protect SIDS and other particularly vulnerable countries."8 This has also been mirrored in AOSIS' stance to limit global temperature rise to 1.5 degrees, as opposed to the currently-agreed 2 degrees Celsius, in order to better contain anticipated climate risks in the world's most vulnerable countries.

How does the Philippines figure in all this? As can be expected from a country with a carbon footprint of less than 0.3% of the globe's total emissions, yet which has been identified as one of the nations most vulnerable to climate change⁹, several Filipino personalities have been at the forefront of those pushing for a more just climate change consensus. One person that comes to mind is Bernaditas de Castro Muller— former lead coordinator of the G77 plus China— who has been a key negotiator in the G77's thrust to have industrialized nations repay their *"climate debt"* to developing countries.

Official rhetoric of the Philippine government has called for *"deep and early cuts"* in the emissions of developed countries, access to climate finance for adaptation,

and relevant forms of technology transfer. Nonetheless, some particular positions of Philippine delegations to international climate talks have elicited sharp criticism from civil society and other government bureaus. Such was the case around the positioning of the Philippines in relation to the proposed Copenhagen Accord in COP 15, where through the direction of then Presidential Adviser on Climate Change Heherzon Alvarez, the Philippines had signalled to the UNFCCC secretariat its intention to associate itself with the Copenhagen Accord only to back track later citing the need for more consultations at the national level before any formal position on the Accord is taken. As the Copenhagen Accord has been blasted by various climate advocates and developing country negotiators as insufficient, exclusive, and drafted in a non-transparent manner- the product, it is claimed, of a climate summit "held to ransom"¹⁰— it is to be expected that the Philippine delegation's show of support for the Accord has similarly drawn flak from local critics and activists.

Whatever else may be said about the present landscape of global climate change policies, it is clear that that landscape is far from uncontested or even settled. How it will alter in the upcoming COP's will depend, in part, on the balance of power of the parties involved, and their ability to have their interests incorporated into new climate-based institutions and agreements. **R** J. Cruz

- 3 As of November 2009
- 4 The GHG's being: Carbon Dioxide, Methane, Nitrous Oxide, and Sulphur Hexaflouride
- 5 http://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol/items/2830.php. Last visited 6 January 2011.
- 6 http://edition.cnn.com/2003/TECH/science/12/01/us.kyoto. reut/. Last visited 6 January 2011.
- 7 http://www.pewclimate.org/policy_center/analyses/response_ bushpolicy.cfm. Last visited 6 January 2011.
- 8 http://www.sidsnet.org/aosis/documents/AOSIS%20 Summit%20Declaration%20Sept%2021%20FINAL.pdf. Last visited 6 January 2011.
- 9 http://www.climatemediapartnership.org/reporting/stories/ philippines-eighth-most-vulnerable-to-climate-change/. Last visited 6 January 2011.
- 10 http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/8423831.stm. Last visited 6 January 2011.



http://unfccc.int/essential_background/convention/background/ items/1353.php. Last visited 6 January 2011.

² http://unfccc.int/essential_background/convention/background/ items/1350.php. Last visited 6 January 2011.

SOUTH

A Tale of Two Accords¹



PEOPLE 'S AGREEMENT "The Cochabamba Accord"

Logo of the World Peoples Conference on Climate Change and Mother Earth's Rights. captured from http://www.climate-justice-now. org/category/events/cochabamba/.Last visited 15 December 2010

The Peoples Agreement is the main outcome of the World People's Conference on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth held on April 22, 2010 in Cochabamba Bolivia. The Cochabamba Accord as it later came to be known articulates a perspective on the root causes of climate change and puts forward concrete demands on how to address the problem based on the principle of climate justice. The World People's Conference was participated in by around 35,000 representing 147 countries participated in that event, including government figures, international organizations, and social movements from around the world.



COPENHAGEN ACCORD

Logo of COP-15 Copenhagen Summit. Captured from http://blogs.ei.columbia.edu/tag/copenhagen-2009/. Last visited 15 December 2010

The Copenhagen Accord was the deal brokered by the United States during the final moments of the 15th Conference of Parties (COP-15) in December 2009 in Copenhagen, Denmark.

Worked out by only a small group of around 26 countries, the accord was not adopted formally but was merely noted by the UNFCCC. Since then close to 140 countries have expressed their intention to be associated with the Accord

Recent documents released by Wikileaks revealed however the different tactics used by the United States to gain support for the Accord including spying and the use of threats and promises of aid.

Limit for Average Global Temperature Increase

Limit global temperature increase during the present century to 1^e C in order to reduce the effects of climate change. For this, it is proposed that the world return to greenhouse gas concentrations of 300ppm.

Limit the increase in temperature to 2° C, and, following an evaluation in 2015, see if it is possible to reach the goal of 1.5 $^{\circ}$ C.

Greenhouse Gas Reductions

50% reduction based on 1990 levels for the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol (2013-2017), excluding carbon markets or other types of compensation.Demands that the United States ratify the Kyoto Protocol. Puts forth that all developed countries must make comparable reductions: for example, the US cannot reduce by 3% and the EU by 30%. Rejects attemps to annul the Kyoto Protocol. Does not set an aggregate goal for all developed countries. Proposes voluntary reductions commitments by developed countries, which means that they must only state what they plan to do.Does not establish criteria for comparable reductions among developed countries.Does not state that reductions should occur under the framework of the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol.According to the European Comission, voluntary commitments allocated thus far under the Copenhagen Accord represent real reductions of just 2% based on 1990 levels.

Climate Debt

Developed countries have a climate debt toward developing countries, Mother Earth, and future generations.

This climate debt consists of: returning the atmospheric space that has been occupied by the greenhouse gas emissions of developed countries, thereby affecting other countries; a debt to Mother Earth that should be honored through the recognition and implementiation of a Universal Declaration on the Rights of Mother Earth at the United Nations; a debt to climate change migrants; a debt with regard to adaptation and development consisting of the costs developing countries must incurr to respond to the grave impacts of climate change. No mention of climate debt.

Financing

Financing should be set aside for climate change in an amount greater than that which developed countries currently budget for defense, war, and security spending.Financing should should reach 6% of GDP for the developed countries historically responsible for climate change, should come from public funds not linked to carbon market mechanisms, and be in addition to Official Development Assistance. Approximately 30 billion US dollars for the period 2010-2012, which represents 0.005% of the annual GDP of developed countries. Mobilize 100 billion US dollars by 2020 to attend to the needs of developing countries, which amounts to 0.05% of GDP. Approximately 50% of this financing would come from the carbon market.

¹ Comparison between the Cochabamba Peoples Agreement and the Copenhagen Accord. http://pwccc.wordpress.com/2010/06/16/ comparision-of-the-people%C2%B4s-agreement-and-the-copenhagen-accord/. Accessed 13 December 2010





Technology Transfer

Creation of a Multilateral and Multidisciplinary Mechanism that guarantees technology transfer for climate change that is free of intellectual property rights.

Proposes a Technology Mechanism, but it is unclear whether this will simply be a showcase of available technologies. No mention of the need for changes to regimes of intellectual property rights.

0		
Carbon Mark	iets	
Rejects the carbon market and other forms of dealing with climate change based on the market.	Promotes the use of carbon markets and proposes the creation of new market mechanisms.	
Forests		
Rejects market mechanisms for the reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation.Proposes the creation of a mechanism that, unlike REDD+ or ++, respects the sovereignty of States, guarantees the rights of indigenous peoples and communities that live in forests, and is not based on carbon market mechanisms.	Proposes incentives for actions related to REDD based on the carbon market.	
Food and Agric	ulture	
To confront the climate crisis, we must bring about a profound shift toward the sustainable models of agricultural production used by indigenous and farming communities, and other models and ecological practices that contribute to solving the problem of climate change and guaranteeing food soveriegnty.	No mention of food and agriculture.	
Reclassification of	Countries	
Rejects the reclassification of developing countries according to their vul- nerability. Respect for and application of Article 4.8 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).	Promotes the reclassification of developing countries accord ing to climate change, giving preferential treatment according to vulnerability.	
Climate Migra	ants	
Protection and recognition of the rights and needs of those forced to migrate due to climate change. Highlights the need to raise this issue in negotiations.	No mention of migration caused by climate change.	
Justice and Fulfillment of Intern	ational Commitments	
Proposes the adoption of legally binding mechanisms to guarantee compli- ance with international treaties, as well as the creation of a Climate and Environmental Justice Tribunal.	Does not propose any mechanism for remedying compliance with international commitments by developed countries.	
Referendum on Clim	ate Change	
Proposes a World Referendum on Climate Change so that the people can decide on this issue, one that is of vital importance to the future of humanity and Mother Earth.	No mention of a mechanism for consulting populations.	
Indigenous Pe	oples	
Recognition and revalorization of indigenous roots of all humanity and full respect for the rights of indigenous peoples.	No mention of indigenous peoples.	
Rights of Mothe	r Earth	
Proposes to discuss and approve in the United Nations a Declaration on the Rights of Mother Earth to reestablish harmony with nature. In an inter- dependent system, it is impossible to recognize rights for only the human side of that system. The only way to defend human rights is to also recognize the rights of Mother Earth. These rights include the Earth's right to life, the right to regenerate its biocapacity, the right to maintain its integrity, and the right of all	No mention of the rights of Mother Earth.	

Structural Causes

Proposes to analyze and modify the structural causes of climate change. Affirms that these have to do with the capitalist system that is centered on the maximization of profit and the exploitation and commodification of nature.

No mention of the structural causes of climate change.



to a clean environment.

False Solutions to Climate Change: A Brief Round-up

By Jerik Cruz and Mary Ann Manahan

The Kyoto Protocol is a legally-binding agreement ratified by 187 countries, which set targets for the 38 industrialized countries including the European community for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by an average of five percent against 1990 levels over the five-year period 2008-2012.

Several mechanisms however were incorporated in the Kyoto Protocol with the aim of supposedly rendering the task of reducing global emissions more flexible, efficient, and cost-effective. Nonetheless, evidence amassed by critical research on some of these mechanisms suggests that, *in reality*, they remain ineffective against, or worse, are *actively exacerbating* climate change.

These instruments are part of what climate activists have increasingly called *"false solutions"* to climate change. Some of the more prominent ones among them will be outlined briefly in what follows:

Emissions Trading. Emissions trading stems from the premise that emissions reductions are the same across countries and that therefore emissions reductions are without any social, political and historical context. Using this framework, India for instance can make reductions to make up for the emissions of a highly developed industrial country like Britain. Under this, a reduction of a certain amount for Carbon Dioxide in a highly industrialized factory in the UK can be made equivalent, for example, to reductions made in a less technology-intensive plant in, say, India. As such, pre-agreed amounts of emissions to be reduced are thereby transformed into *emission rights*, which can be bought and sold internationally.

Under this arrangement, once a central authority has set a limit on the amount of pollutants a factory in the United Kingdom can emit, said factory can continue emitting CO2 at the same level it had previously, as long as it purchases emission rights from the Indian plant. This means that it is the plant in India that will cut its dirty gas emissions to cover the emission from the UK, which can continue polluting the atmosphere at the same level as before. In exchange for cash (or its equivalent), the Indian plant will reduce its emissions by the amount of emission rights which it sold to the UK factory, so that in the end, global emissions are, in *theory*, still reduced by the set amount on the whole. The added bonus, according to the underlying theory, is that the final allocation of property rights will be an *economically efficient* one where everyone ends up better off than before.



Hoodwinked in the Houthouse: False Solutions to Climate Change. Cover design Amber Stauss for the report published by Rising Tide North America and Carbon Trade Watch.





For all such theoretical wrangling, however, field research on how the emissions trading system actually works demonstrates that the arrangement is systemically flawed. For one thing, technical difficulties remain in measuring and computing how much emissions are actually being reduced in specific sites. Likewise, political pressure exerted by industrial lobbies in the developed world has resulted in the provision of superfluous emission rights. leading to more lax reductions. Both of these contribute to an overall surplus of pollution permits within emission trading schemes, and a ballooning of the limits originally set by central authorities. Windfall profits likewise accrue to those who sell these superfluous rights, and whatever sense of "historical responsibility" first pledged by Annex I countries is altogether forgotten. In the US State of California for example, the State government's emissions trading program (2012-2020) calls for the creation and distribution of 2.67 billion allowances (equivalent to 2.67 billion tons of carbon dioxide).¹ Depending on the prevailing price of carbon, these allowances or permits can be worth around US\$ 50 billion.²

Carbon Offsets. Carbon offsets such as the Clean Development Mechanism (see article on CDM projects in the Philippines) use the same "logic" of emissions trading, though rendered even more abstract. Instead of purchasing pollution rights to retain the same level of emissions, with carbon offsets, companies, governments and other institutions may opt to invest in or finance purported "emissions-savings projects." For example, the UK factory may finance a hydroelectric power project in India to "displace" current or proposed investments in dirtier, more emission-heavy energy. The "carbon savings" thus generated by the project are then inventoried in favor of the UK factory, which can use them as "carbon credits" to cover its excess emissions.

Some of the same failings of emissions trading manifest throughout the carbon offset schemes propounded by the Kyoto Protocol. For one thing, impossible measurement and calculation difficulties present themselves in estimating how much *"emissions savings"* are actually being generated in such projects, leading some critics to maintain that the *"carbon credits"* so made are a purely imaginary commodity. Huge conflicts-of-interest are also inherent from the way in which such offset arrangements are also structured, as regulators of the scheme, such as governments or government units and private firms, are oftentimes those who also stand to benefit from the cash flows brought about by carbon offset projects. Meanwhile, numerous cases have been documented where offset projects have been directly responsible for dispossessing local communities from their lands. While handing revenues to some of the dirtiest industries in the global south, offsets have precipitated unjust takeovers of community resources in the name of *"clean development"*, a trend described by critical commentators as *"carbon colonialism."* ³

Carbon Capture and Sequestration. More recently, technology-based solutions or "techno-fixes" such as Carbon Capture and Sequestration (CCS) technologies have been gathering greater popularity among engineers and policymakers. In contrast with standard *"flexible mechanisms"*, CCS is an emission reductions instrument based on capturing Carbon Dioxide directly from point sources such as fossil fuel power plants and factories, thereafter storing it to prevent its leakage into the atmosphere. According to an IPCC special report, with the proper application of CCS technologies, a conventional power plant's CO2 emissions could be reduced by as much as 80-90%⁴.

However, many limitations persist with the applicability of CCS at the present time. For all the expectations it created, various proponents of CCS themselves acknowledge that its technologies are unlikely to be broadly applicable until 2030. It is not only that precise and secure methods for determining how much carbon to store underground should be developed, but also how to determine failure and other technical issues have yet to be sorted out. Making CCS a viable climate solution, as US-based grassroots climate network Rising Tide North America points out, would involve *"extraordinary and highly*" controversial" investments in infrastructure, on the order of "thousands of miles of pipelines and hundreds of untested underground storage sites."5 In any case, decades more would be needed to construct such a vast infrastructural apparatus, to say nothing of the threat of carbon leakage and the socio-environmental hazards such sites pose.

Finally, in line with criticisms made of emissions trading and carbon offsets, focusing excessively on CCS detracts politicians and decision-makers from the historical and political dimensions of climate change; the interests influencing climate change policies, as well as the broader structural transformations needed in order to counter the ecological and social contradictions of industrial society become summarily forgotten. CCS presumes

> continued on page 14





FALSE...from page 13

that the problems of *"business-as-usual"* can somehow be sanitized by means of technology, even as all indicators show that it is the *"business-as-usual"* attitude that must be transformed if the global climate is to remain stable.

REDD. Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (REDD) is a mechanism in the climate negotiations that intends to "create a financial value for the carbon stored in forests, offering incentives for developing countries to reduce emissions from forested lands and invest in low-carbon paths to sustainable development."⁶ Simply put, additional money is poured in to support reforestation in developing countries. According to the United Nations, about 20 percent of carbon emissions can be contributed to forest use. But it is claimed that REDD+, on the other hand, goes beyond forest degradation and deforestation and includes the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks.

A highly controversial measure, REDD is seen by its proponents as an opportunity for reforestation but has been opposed by many indigenous peoples and other rural communities because such initiatives can advance land grabbing. It is criticized for providing incentives to large landholders to apply a "You-pay-or-I-cut" approach to every hectare of forest land that they succeed in wresting from indigenous peoples and landless farmers" (IPC, 2008). The controversy also extends to other issues. One is its failure to address forests as living organism and source of biodiversity, as reflected, partly, by the broad definition of forests which include plantations such as jathropa, palm oil and other cash crops. There are also concerns raised over issues of benefit sharing among the indigenous peoples, forest management, and issues of land ownership and tenure.



Photo from http://www.redd-monitor.org/2010/09/08/ indigenous-environmental-network-and-friends-of-the-earthnigeria-denounce-shell-redd-project/#more-5621. Last visited 15 December 2010

Agrofuels. Agrofuels is a term first coined by Latin American social movements to depict the liquid fuels derived from food and oil crops produced in large-scale plantations Agrofuels are being promoted as a clean, alternative source of energy, and as such, many countries have made rapid moves to change legislation, mandatory targets, policies, and provide financial support. Agrofuels, which come in two forms—bioethanol and biodiesel— are blended with petrol and diesel primarily for transportation. For instance, the feedstock program in the Philippines for bioethanol is being sourced from sugarcane, sweet sorghum and cassava. Biodiesel on the other hand, is sourced from jathropa and coconut. Agrofuels are oftentimes interchanged with biofuels which are traditional materials such as wood used for cooking and heating.

Developing countries have tried to capitalize on the growing demand for agrofuels by instituting policies to support the industry. In the Philippines, the Biofuel Act of 2006 serves as the main legislation that defines and guides the program of the government on biofuel production. Currently, the Philippine Agricultural Development and Commercial Corporation (PADCC), an attached agency of the Department of Agriculture, is engaged in investment matching for biofuel production. Recently, the Department of Agrarian Reform conducted a study and consultation to "Simplify Investor-Friendly Land Use Conversion Policies and Guidelines for Biofuel Production" in Negros Island's agrarian reform communities. Both public and private investors alike are targeting lands that are labelled "marginal lands" and "wastelands", although they have been under communal or traditional customary use for generations, and are crucial for the livelihoods of smallholders, rural women, pastoralists, and indigenous peoples. Some lands targeted had previously been earmarked for agrarian reform and/or public and forest lands. The new commercial interests asserted over these lands can potentially undermine the redistribution process in the country. R

- 5 http://www.risingtidenorthamerica.org/special/fsbooklet.pdf
- 6 http://www.un-redd.org/AboutREDD/tabid/582/Default.aspx



¹ Designing the allocation process for California's Greenhouse Gas Emissions Trading Program: The multi-billion dollar question. Summary report by Next 10. December 2010. http://www.next10. org/next10/pdf/trading/Next_10_Summary_Report.pdf. last accessed 5 January 2011.

² ibid

³ http://www.greenleft.org.au/node/25266

⁴ http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/special-reports/srccs/srccs_wholereport.pdf

Philippine CDM Projects contributing to, not addressing, climate change*

There's a lot of math; there's a lot of science, but the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) is also simply about what makes and doesn't make sense. The CDM is a product of an international agreement, known as the Kyoto Protocol, signed by 38 industrialized countries with the aim of reducing "greenhouse gas emissions by an average of five percent below the 1990 levels" in the period 2008 – 2012; the reduction ranges from one to 10 percent. This would be done through CDM projects "in developing countries that supposedly reduce the equivalent greenhouse gas emissions that they would emit domestically."

CDM implementers, such as in the Philippines, claim that the bottom line is carbon dioxide reduction which they say is achieved at the end of the day, neglecting the harmful, polluting effects of landfill and the methane gas produced here on environment and people. The reality on the ground is telling a different story from what is claimed by these CDM promoters.

The book "The Clean Development Mechanism: Costly Dirty Money-making Schemes," written by Herbert Docena (2010), shows that in the Philippines, some of the very practices that need to be stopped are continued and contribute further to environmental degradation and climate change. Worst, they are in violation of Philippine law, specifically the Solid Waste Management Act. According to this special report, as of June 2009 there were 32 CDM projects registered in the Philippines while 45 were still being registered¹; 28 out of 32 projects involve methane production through landfills. These projects capture methane gas from the tons of waste products dumped in the landfills, while in others materials are burned directly to produce energy. Docena's report highlighted the three major CDM projects of such kind in the Philippines found in Montalban (Rizal province), Quezon City and Clark in Pampanga. The project implementers, mainly partnerships between the local governments and private firms, claim credits for generating electricity from methane generated in landfills. "Methane is a greenhouse gas 72 times more powerful over a 20 year period and 25 times more powerful over a 100 year period than carbon dioxide in its impact on climate. But it is generated only when organic materials are disposed in large volumes, concentrated and compacted in landfills and forced to decompose without oxygen as is the case with the prevailing unsustainable waste management practice," explained Docena in the CDM special report published by Focus on the Global South-Philippines.

The report argues that in fact production of the harmful substance methane would not be necessary if the local government units are following and implementing the Solid Waste Management Act of 2001 (Republic Act 9003), which requires them to segregate wastes, subject the organic wastes to composting and reduce the wastes being dumped into landfills. If the law is being implemented, only negligible amounts of methane would be produced. But local governments and private firms implementing might not agree with this, as their bread and butter CDM projects would be affected.

In Montalban, the communities living near and within the vicinity of the landfills have complained about the destruction of their vegetation and the harmful effects of the landfills on their health, but to naught, it would seem. In 2007, the Montalban landfill received "as much as 4000 tons of solid waste from Metro Manila daily. An adjacent 19 hectares of land would [now] be cleared and turned into a landfill to receive even more garbage." The Montalban project has claimed that it could capture as much as 50 percent emissions of methane and burning it as well. But the current landfill is estimated to be producing 63 million litres of lecheates, which is sufficient to fill over 28 Olympic-size swimming pools with most of it expected to end up in the Marikina River," Docena argued.

> continued on page 16



List of CDM Projects developed by or linked to companies cited for pollution violation by the government

Name of CDM Project	Company with Pollution Violation Citation	Claimed 'Reductions' as % Total
Montalban Landfill Methane Recovery and Power Generation Project	Rio-Tuba Nickel Mining Corp. +	49.4%
First Farmers Holding Corporation (FFHC) Bagasse Cogeneration Plant	First Farmers Holdings Corporation	7.0%
Wastewater treatment using a Thermophilic Anaerobic Digestor at an ethanol plant in the Philippines	Absolut Distillery	5.6%
Amigo Farm Methane Recovery and Electricity Generation Project	Amigo Agro- Industrial Development Corporation *	0.5%
Anaerobic digestion swine Wastewater treatment with on-site power bundled project (ADSW RP1005)	Cathay Farms Development Inc	0.4%
Anaerobic digestion swine Wastewater treatment with on-site power bundled project (ADSW RP1002)	Filbrid Livestock Agricultural Corporation	0.4%
Superior Hog Farms Methane Recovery	Superior Hog Farm, Inc.	0.2%
Gaya Lim Farm Inc. Methane Recovery	Gaya Lim Farm, Inc.	0.2%
Emission reductions through partial substitution of fossil fuel with alternative fuels in three cement plants of Holcim Philippines Inc.	Holcim Philippines Inc.	Undergoing registration

+ subsidiary of parent company developing CDM project

* Amigo Agro-Industrial Development Corporation is not listed as directly involved in the CDM but signed an agreement with EcoSecurities to develop the project (Det Norske Veritas, "Validation Report: Amigo Farm Methane Recovery and Electricity Generation Project," 2008, http://cdm.unfccc.int/UserManagement/ FileStorage/R3MSQ2EFP8UCJ5ZXDBOVNIY1H0AGK6

Source: Docena, Herbert. "The Clean Development Mechanism Projects in the Philippines: Costly dirty Money Making Schemes." June 2010; Focus on the Global South

PHILIPPINE...from page 15

The reason that the people's complaints may be falling on deaf ears is the money factor. Over the next 10 years the CDM projects in Montalban, Quezon City and Clark alone can get as much as P4.4 to 13.6 billion from the CDM funds. The amount however glosses over the fact that "the energy produced by landfill gas, which could be considered 'renewable' only if waste was considered unlimited unavoidable. and would still be far less than the energy that would be saved if recycling were practiced." In the case of the landfill projects, the wastes are used to "power more greenhouse gas emitting activities, raising questions about net emissions down the line." These landfill gas projects thrive on increasing the demand for waste, including organic wastes which make methane production viable. Instead of promoting segregation and recycling therefore, the projects "perpetuate unsustainable waste disposal practices that actually contribute more to greenhouse gas emissions."

The CDM special report cites how the Clark project design document has underscored the need for an "assured waste supply for substantiating a developer's business decision to invest in methane capture or landfill gasto-energy project."

The CDM which was set up to address greenhouse gas emissions and curb climate change, it seems, has now become a busi-





ness decision with income and profit as bottom line. **R** C.V. Militante

- * This is a write-up based entirely on the special report "The Clean Development Mechanism Projects in the Philippines: Costly dirty Money Making Schemes" by Herbert Docena, published in June 2010 by Focus on the Global South Philippines. All quotes, explanations, statistics came from said book.
- 1 According to the CDM registry of the UNFCC, as of December 2010, 43 CDM projects have already been registered in the Philippines. The complete list of registered projects in the Philippines can be accessed at http://cdm.unfcc.int/ Projects/projsearch.html

2005 Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the Philippines by Gas







≝ GLOBAL SOUTH

The Cancun Outcome Breakthrough or Breakdown?

The battle for interpretation on the outcome of the recently concluded global climate talks in Cancun is underway.

The 16th Conference of Parties (COP16) under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) ended two weeks of negotiations last December 10, 2010 in Cancun Mexico producing a package collectively dubbed the "Cancun Agreements".

According to proponents, Cancun delivered a "balanced package" that effectively restores faith in the multilateral process¹. The package includes the following elements:

- Industrialised country targets are officially recognised under the multilateral process and these countries are to develop low-carbon development plans and strategies and assess how best to meet them, including through market mechanisms, and to report their inventories annually.
- Developing country actions to reduce emissions are officially recognised under the multilateral process. A registry is to be set up to record and match developing country mitigation actions to finance and technology support from by industrialised countries. Developing countries are to publish progress reports every two years.
- Parties meeting under the Kyoto Protocol agree to continue negotiations with the aim of completing their work and ensuring there is no gap between the first and second commitment periods of the treaty.
- The Kyoto Protocol's Clean Development Mechanisms has been strengthened to drive more major investments and technology into environmentally sound and sustainable emission reduction projects in the developing world.
- Parties launched a set of initiatives and institutions to protect the vulnerable from climate change and to deploy the money and technology that developing countries need to plan and build their own sustainable futures.
- A total of \$30 billion in fast start finance from industrialised countries to support climate action in the developing world up to 2012 and the intention to raise \$100 billion in long-term funds by 2020 is included in the decisions.
- In the field of climate finance, a process to design a Green Climate Fund under the Conference of the Parties, with a board with equal representation from developed and developing countries, is established.
- A new Cancún Adaptation Framework is established to allow better planning and implementation of adaptation projects in developing countries through increased financial and techni-



Cartoon by Cuban cartoonist for Granma Pedro Mendez Suarez; captured from www.mrzine.org

cal support, including a clear process for continuing work on loss and damage.

- Governments agree to boost action to curb emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries with technological and financial support.
- Parties have established a technology mechanism with a Technology Executive Committee and Climate Technology Centre and Network to increase technology cooperation to support action on adaptation and mitigation.

Critical Voices

The Bolivian government which represents today one of the most critical voices in the global climate talks has stated its dismay over the outcome in Cancun. Bolivia decried the adoption of the Cancun package calling it "a hollow and false victory that was imposed without consensus and its cost will be measured in human lives."²

Bolivia asserts that the ultimate yardstick of success of a climate agreement is whether or not the agreement will effectively reduce emissions to prevent runaway climate change. According to Bolivia, the "Cancun text clearly fails (this critical measure), as it could allow global temperatures to increase by more than 4 degrees, a level disastrous for humanity."³ Analyses of the impact of voluntary pledges under the Copenhagen Accord, which are also reflected in the





Cancun package, show that they are inadequate to achieve the goal of holding the increase in global temperatures within 2 degrees Celsius,⁴ and could lead us to a global temperature pathway of between 3-4 degrees Celsius.⁵

Bolivia highlighted the lack of any new offers on both emissions reduction and financing, viewing the package instead as a backtracking on already existing commitments. A point made clear by Bolivia's UN ambassador Pablo Solon, Cancun "does not represent a step forward, it is a step backwards", because the non-binding commitments made to reduce emissions by around 15 percent by 2020 simply cannot stabilize temperature at the "level which is sustainable for human life and the life of the planet."⁶

On the process, Bolivia decried the effort to exclude its proposal on the negotiating text which incorporates proposals made on behalf of over 35,000 social movements and organizations from 140 countries who participated in the World People's Conference on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth held in Cochabamba in April 2010.

The Bolivian submission sought for just solutions to the climate crisis, pointing to the systemic causes of climate change and asserting and advancing further the principles of historical responsibility and the notion of climate debt. The Bolivian proposal, which later came to be known as Cochabamba Accord, was initially included in the negotiating text in the period leading up to COP16 but was unceremoniously dropped in the Cancun text. (See Tale of Two Accords for details on the Cochabamba Accord)

Several NGOs and movement have also expressed disappointment over the outcome. International peasant's group La Via Campesina denounced the Cancun package while groups like Friends of the Earth International called the package "wholly inadequate" and "a slap in the face of those who already suffer from climate change. But in the end all of us will be affected by the lack of ambition and political will of a small group of countries."⁷

Philippine position

Climate commissioner and head of the Philippine delegation in Cancun, Lucille Sering expressed support for the Cancun package calling it "a stepping stone towards further progress."⁸

Speaking on the new Green Climate Fund, Sering noted the progress made in terms of putting in place a "responsive governance mechanism" which will "ensure a balanced allocation for adaptation and mitigation."⁹

Multilateralism=US

Those who welcome the Cancun package are almost unanimous in trumpeting the agreement as a triumph of multilateralism. Despite the dissenting view of Bolivia, proponents assert that after the failure in Copenhagen, Cancun represents a return to the multilateral track, breaking the "inertia of mistrust" that was prevalent prior to COP- 16.

By multilateralism proponents actually mean an agreement that has the United States on board. The United States has been pushing for a "modest package" that is anchored on the elements of the Copenhagen Accord, including an "agreement by all the world's major economies to implement their mitigation actions and targets in an internationally transparent manner, and that also paved the way for new institutions and support for climate finance, technology, adaptation, and REDD."¹⁰ The Cancun package mirrors the position of the US.

What now, where to?

With almost universal support for the Cancun package, the next big step would now be the COP-17 in South Africa next year which people hope could produce a legally binding agreement that would translate the commitments and pledges into concrete actions. In the meantime, governments would have to further consolidate their position on the key outcomes contained in the Cancun package as everyone gears up for the succeeding round of global climate negotiations. For the climate justice movement, the challenge is to continue the building and consolidation of grassroots movements, heighten the pressure on governments to accede to the peoples urgent demands, and intensify the campaign for climate justice.

J. Purugganan

- 5 Joeri Rogelj et al. Analysis of the Copenhagen Accord pledges and its global climatic impacts- a snapshot of dissonant ambitions. Environmental Research Letters. IOP Publishing. September 2010. http://iopscience.iop. org/1748-9326/5/3/034013/fulltext. Last visited 5 January 2011.
- 6 As cited in 'Climate capitalism' won at Cancun everyone else loses by Patrick Bond. 13 December 2010. http://links.org.au/node/2041. Last visited 13 December 2010.
- 7 Nnnimmo Bassey, chair of Friends of the Earth International as quoted in the CJN report "Cancun Package merely prevents collapse and leaves the Kyoto Protocol in life support. 11 December 2010. http://www.climate-justice-now. org/ancun-package-merely-prevents-collapse-and-leaves-kyoto-protocolon-life-support/. Last visited 5 January 2011.
- 8 Moving Beyond Cancun's Breakthrough. Article by Imelda V. Abano. BusinessMirror. 12 December 2010

10 Statement of the United States at COP-16, 9December 2010, Cancun, Mexico. http://www.state.gov/g/oes/rls/other/2010/152621.htm Last accessed 14 December 2010



¹ UN Climate Change Conference in Cancún delivers balanced package of decisions, restores faith in multilateral process press release issued by the UNFCCC Secretariat. 11 December. Accessed at http://unfccc.int/ files/press/news_room/press_releases_and_advisories/application/pdf/ pr_20101211_cop16_closing.pdf. December 13 2010

² Bolivia Decries the Adoption of Copenhagen Accord II without Consensus. Press release issued by the Plurinational State of Bolivia. 11 December 2010. Accessed at http://boliviaun.net/cms/?p=1943#more-1943. Last visited 13 December 2010

³ ibid

⁴ Adding up the Numbers: Mitigation Pledges under the Copenhagen Accord. Pew Center on Global Climate Change. http://www.pewclimate.org/docUploads/copenhagen-accord-adding-up-mitigation-pledges.pdf. Last visited 5 January 2011.

⁹ Ibid

Katarungan sa Usaping Klima

Ang mga paninindigan para sa climate justice ay nakaangkla sa ilang batayang prinsipyo at paniniwala:

Pagbabago sa sistema - paniniwala na nakaugat ang problema ng pagbabago sa klima sa umiiral na sistema ng pag-unlad na siyang nagtulak ng matinding pagkasira ng kalikasan at ng walang humpay na pagkakamal ng tubo at kayamanan. Ayon sa pandaigdigang kilusang Climate Justice Now! "Hindi natin mapipigilan ang climate change kung hindi natin babaguhin ang umiiral neo-liberal at "corporate-based" na ekonomiya na syang hadlang sa pagtatatag ng mas sustenableng mga lipunan. Kailangan nating pigilan ang "corporate globalization1

Historical Responsibility - Ang problema kaugnay ng paginit ng ating mundo o global warming, na syang sanhi ng climate change, ay hindi nangyari sa isang kisapmata. Ito ay resulta ng daang taong pagbubuga ng maduming usok sa ating kalangitan. Kinilala sa ilalim ng pandaigdigang kasunduan sa Climate Change (UNFCCC) na ang "pinakamalaking kontribusyon sa emisyon sa kasaysayan at sa kasalukuyan ay mula sa maunlad na mga bansa; na ang emisyon kada tao sa papaunlad at mahihirap na mga bansa ay nananatiling mababa at ang kanilang ambag sa emisyon ay tataas pa sa pagtugon nila sa kanilang mga pangangailangan na umunlad." Dapat kilalanin na ang mayayamang mga bansa na syang mas malaki ang kontribusyon sa problema ang dapat mangunga sa paresolba sa problema at paglapat ng lunas sa mga epektong dulot nito.

Climate Debt - ay isang obligasyon na panagutan at bayaran ang pagkasira sa kalikasan na dinulot ng walang pakundangang emsiyon ng masasamang usok sa kalangitan. Ang pangunahing may kagagawan ng pagbubugang ito ay ang mga mayayamang mga bansa , kung saan 20% lamang ng kabuuang populasyon ng mundo ang nakatira, ngunit syang sanhi ng 75% ng kabuaang emisyong naitala sa kasaysayan.²

- b. Development Debt ang mga mahihirap na bansa ay may karapatang umunlad. Dapat na kilalanin din na kakailanganin ng mga bansang ito na tahakin ang isang antas ng industrialisasyon para tugunan ang sarili nyang mga pangangailangan at maitaguyod ang kanyang kasarinlan sa paraang likas kaya. Para magawa ito, kakailanganin ang suportang pampinansya at akses sa angkop na teknolohiya.
- c. Adaptation Debt ang mga negatibong epekto ng pagbabago sa klima tulad ng pagkasira at pagkawala ng mga pinagkukunan ng tubig, tagtuyot, malawakang pagbaha, at pagbaba ng produksyon, ay malaki ang implikasyon sa buhay at kabuhayan ng mga mamamayan. Dapat panagutan ang mga negatibong epektong ito sa pamamagitan ng paglalaan ng sapat na pondo at suporta upang maka-akses ng angkop na teknolohiya.
- d. Migration Debt Milyong milyong mga tao ang napipilitang lisanin ang kanilang mga lupain at komunidad dahil sa epekto ng pagbabago sa klima. Sila ang tinatawag na mga climate migrants. Bilang kabayaran sa migration debt na ito, kailangang repasuhin ng mga mayayamang mga bansa ang kanilang mahigpit na polisiya sa migrasyon at kilalanin ang mga karapatan ng mga migrante.

False Solutions - pagtutol sa mga binabanderang "solusyon" na nakatuntong sa mga "market-based" na mekanismo na nagbubukas pa ng oportunidad sa mga korporasyon na kumita at makinabang sa problema sa pagbabago sa klima. Ilan sa mga ito ay ang mga mungkahing mekanismo tulad ng REDD, ang mga carbon-offsets, agrofuels, at mga high-tech na solusyon tulad ng carbon sequestration and capture (CCS). ℝ

Ang Climate Debt ay sumasaklaw sa:

a. Emissions Debt - pagkakautang na batay sa labis labis na emisyon mula sa mayayamang mga bansa naaayon sa konsepto ng makatarungang hatian sa paggamit ng atmospera. 2 Halaw sa Final Conclusion s of the Working Group on Climate Debt at the World Peoples' Conference on Climate Change and Mother Earth's Rights. Accessed at http://pwccc.wordpress.com/category/ working-groups/08-climate-debt/. Last visited 15 December 2010. Isinalin sa Filipino ni J. Purugganan. 14 December 2010.



EDITORIAL TEAM

Jenina Joy Chavez Joseph Purugganan Mary Ann Manahan Carmina B. Flores-Obanil Clarissa V. Militante

Issue Editor: Joseph Purugganan Masthead design & lay-out: Amy T. Tejada This is a publication of Focus on the Global South Philippines with offices at #19 Maginhawa Street, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines. Phone: 355-25-78 Email: cvmilitante@focusweb.org Website: www.focusweb.org

It is the publisher's policy that the public may use contents of this publication, provided that it be given the rightful acknowledgement and/or attribution.

Halaw sa Radical New Agenda Needed to Achieve Climate Justice: Poznan Statement from the Climate Justice Now! Alliance. 12 December 2008. Isinalin sa Filipino mula sa Ingles ni J. Purugganan. 14 December 2010)