

## Environmental NGO Delegation Report - AGBM 8

Steven Guilbeault, Greenpeace and Quebec Coalition on Climate Change

As the last negotiation session, AGBM 8 should have been the forum where we could have determined the position of most of the players. In fact, the U.S. and Japan both came forward with their respective target, stabilisation by 2010 for the former and an obscure 5% for the latter. The U.S. proposal was met by a least than welcoming feeling where as the Japanese's received a bit more attention, mainly from trying to understand what it would mean for various Annex 1 countries.

To our dismay, Canada still has not made it's position known on one of the most substantive issue of these negotiations, Qerlos. This situation, and all the frenzy happening back home at the time of the AGBM, made it both difficult and delicate for the delegation since we are the only OECD country without a clear target. The statement by Prime Minister Chrétien that Canada would be "greener" than the Americans was at the first welcome, but then just added to the confusion since what that means still has not been defined.

### Loopholes

AGBM enable us to better understand some of the potential dangers (loopholes) of the protocol such as<sup>1</sup>:

- 1) "Super heated air" could represent a 10 to 15% increase over 1990 levels;
- 2) International Aviation/Marine Fuels, if not included, could represent a 5 to 10% increase;
- 3) The New Zealand approach could mean an 8% increase in allowable emissions;
- 4) The 3 other gases, HFC, PFC and SF6 could add 5 to 10% to industrialized countries emissions by 2010.

Although the issue of "Super heated air" seems to have been ruled out, the 3 other issues will be at the very heart of COP 3 and Canada should make it's position clear on those issues.

International Aviation/Marine Fuels should be included in the protocol, the emissions from those sectors can be easily accounted for and there are no reasons why they should be left out.

Canada should stop supporting the New Zealand "Net" approach for a number of different reasons. First, there is a internal debate inside Canada on the methodology use to monitor sinks. Second, there are still many uncertainties about carbon sequestration and what guaranties do we have that a tree planted to off set emissions won't be cut or burn down resulting in a "net" emission in the atmosphere? Third, Canada should also stop trying to hide behind definitions such managed forest vs unmanaged forest as excuse to increase our emissions.

---

<sup>1</sup>These estimates are for U.S.A., the European Union and Japan based on 1990 levels up to the year 2010.