

## *Direct from Bonn*

United Nations Climate Change meetings in  
Bonn, Germany, June 12 - 16, 2000

---

### Daily Reports by Floy Lilley, J.D.

---

Friday, June 16, 2000

#### **Final Day: Kyoto will not affect climate**

"Politically, three main groups need to be on board for the Protocol to implement," declared Michael Zammit Cutajar, Executive Secretary of the Convention, in the final press briefing of SB-12 just now concluded.

This response came in answer to a question by the French press about the possibility that some parties could block agreement. Depending upon whether the opposition came about from procedures or political will, the Chairman of COP is the judge of consensus. The Chairman decides if it is more likely than not that the Kyoto Protocol will be implemented. But, Cutajar acknowledged that some political forces are more equal than others are.

"It is a given that the EU and the Umbrella Group (Japan, US, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Iceland and Russian Federation) both must politically endorse implementation," Cutajar summarized. "But," he emphasized, "I want to say that the sixteen countries known as OPEC need to be taken seriously as a third political main group. The adverse economic effects upon those countries is no less important than the adverse climate change effects upon small island states."

Is the EU losing its prominent role in these meetings?

Cutajar felt that the EU position on the need for emission reductions to be primarily domestic and only supplementally offshore through mechanisms is "unchanged, but the EU has an interest in negotiating" [to keep ratification alive]. John Ashe, Chairman, Subsidiary Body on Implementation, added, "You can't have final agreement without the EU." This newer EU stance has, indeed, been seen to soften

*"Greenhouse gas emissions and the overall temperature of the globe are not expected to be appreciably different after full implementation of this Kyoto Protocol."*

their old insistence upon a rigid formula for domestic/offshore credits toward commitments.

Who is authoring the detailed handbook on how to do projects that might become the how to bible?

Harold Dovland, Chairman, Subsidiary Body on Scientific and Technological Advice, says that UNFCCC will determine who will write the handbook. The handbook should become available right after COP6 in November. Such a handbook is seen as enhancing the private sector engagement in projects. Small companies require special guidance. Large companies, like BP, are already preparing for emissions trading. They are already training their employees to think in trading terms.

"No international trading system is yet recognized by the Convention," stressed Dovland. "But," he continued, "many are lining up, making deals and getting ready for their own fast start with the Kyoto Protocol."

Cutajar added, "The Kyoto Protocol can only work with the work of the private sector. Governments may be the parties, but the private sector is the operator."

What difference is it likely to make to the grand scheme of things if a seller liability only position is adopted (as in current SO<sub>2</sub> trading) or if a seller-buyer liability prevails?

With a slip of the tongue, Dovland addressed what he called this "seller-liar liability" issue. Seller-buyer liability is a position endorsed by environmental groups. Environmental NGOs want buyer liability included so that a higher burden is placed upon both parties to deal in worthwhile, verifiable purchases. Because this emphasis will drive up transaction costs and push many purchases into the end of the implementation period, business NGOs have voiced opposition.

What has been accomplished this week?

"Mini steps forward," said Cutajar. He judged that countries had gotten closer to what they must do to build a quality GHG accounting system. The data had to have credibility. Proper recording had to be in place. Some have not noticed these mini steps.

Not ready by COP6?

Is this all staged foot-dragging or is there any substance to palpable malaise felt in the corridors on this final day of SB-12?

Is it true that some countries simply can not handle the red tape? The Russian Federation, for instance, lacks legal and administrative capacity to draft the laws and regulations required to implement the Kyoto Protocol mechanisms.

It has been noted that the Russian delegation had been completely silent until a mid-week compliance session. Then, and only then, they objected to just about everything that had been achieved over the past year. They demanded an advisory board only, not a decision-making body. "They didn't want consequences for non-compliance. They didn't even want facilitation," noted an NGO newsletter on the last day of SB-12.

Yet, it is precisely the Russians who would gain the most by the strongest compliance system. How? Russian hot air is arguably that country's most valuable commodity today. The weaker the compliance system, the lower the value. "Economic forecasts show that Russian tons of carbon could sell for as much as US\$50 or more under a strong compliance regime," an eco article stated this morning. "But with no effective compliance system the price could be less than one dollar per tonne," the author concluded.

The U.S. desire to include sinks, coal and nuclear within the CDM is viewed by environmental groups as an economically-driven desire to cheapen the price the U.S. will have to pay for certified emission reduction certificates (CERs). Such groups argue that Russia will get a higher price if strong sustainability criteria are adopted and the cheapest technological, forest and agricultural options are excluded. There is some apprehension that the industrialized world will take down all the "low hanging fruit" in the first commitment period (2008-2012).

This initial commitment period is no longer meant to accomplish an environmental difference. The Parties have gotten pragmatic. Greenhouse gas emissions and the overall temperature of the globe are not expected to be appreciably different after full implementation of this Kyoto Protocol.

Amend that.

There is no projected benefit from this first small incremental baby step - this first implementation period. The first small step of perhaps dozens more?

Will each successive period impose more stringent requirements and commitments?

Will we begin to discover that not enough of what humans do has significant impact upon climate changes?

Are efforts to fix climate in one particular utopian ideal futile?

One thing is certain. There is no final day for Climate Change meetings.

---

June 15, 2000

**Coming soon: "Kyoto Lands"**

"So boring, boring, boring," sighed the handsome delegate from the Third World country. "The Annex I parties just blah-blah-blah about absolutely nothing. We have no part in this. I made my silence speak for me today," Margaret declared as we trudged our way to the subway stop last night. The hour was near eleven o'clock. Tiredness had been earned.

We spoke of the issues during the half-hour ride "home." What did these two delegates expect of the land-use and forestry piece of this Protocol puzzle? Emily, a second delegate, sweetly volunteered that the bookkeeping would likely become a new great source of graft and corruption. "After all," she said with a twinkle, "what do YOU think will happen when, hypothetically of course, the numbers do not look so good and some computer whiz knows how to change them without anyone noticing?" "Further," she teased, "what do YOU think will happen to that park when gold is discovered under that so-called Kyoto land?"

Only a few Americans have taken notice of this land-based mischief called LULUCF (Land use, land-use change and forestry). Patrick Michaels, senior fellow in environmental studies at the Cato Institute and author of the recent book, "The Satanic Gases," is one of those few. This March, Michaels wrote on the increase in global-scare reports.

His article included, "The Gore team is banking on some type of national weather disaster this summer. They hope to call attention to global climate change and their belief that uncaring Republicans refuse to pass the Kyoto protocol on global warming. This UN document will cost the country a fortune and has the potential to relegate an amazing percentage of our land - the United Nations calls it Kyoto lands - to their watchful eyes.

**They are about to release a report [note, that report was released here in Bonn this week.] that puts just about all U.S. forested land in this category, as well as much of our farmland. That's easily half the country."**

Land-use and forestry, as an emission reduction project, would be projects that reduced or eliminated logging, prevented the conversion of a forest to agricultural

uses and prevented humans from releasing carbon dioxide from the soil, litter, and the trees themselves. The creation of national parks, wilderness areas and conservation easements that would remove land from use changes in perpetuity are actions taken to address the duration aspect of land and timber. Land use and forestry would have the goals of emission avoidance, reduction and mitigation. Such a project is located today in Bolivia. The size includes 1.5 million acres. The partners are the Bolivian government, The Nature Conservancy, American Electric Power, BP Amoco, and PacifiCorp. Funding has been \$9.6 million initially. The project life is scheduled to be 1997-2026. Estimated total carbon benefits are 7 to 14 million metric tons of carbon.

The Nature Conservancy also developed the Rio Bravo Carbon Sequestration Project in Belize and recently initiated a third project in Brazil, the Guaraquecaba Climate Action Project.

How can land use projects address the permanence issue? The Nature Conservancy last night tackled this question in a two-hour side bar titled "The Duration of Carbon Benefits from Forest-based Activities in the CDM." Co-hosted by Societe General de Surveillance, PartnerRe Agricultural Services, and EcoSecurities, this program discussed project design, liability offset, buffers, certification, ton years, and insurance.

No-till agriculture today, and the eventual abandonment of agricultural lands through in-perpetuity agreements should change the face of land. As the World Bank had written, "At the end of the commitment period a combination of reduced pressure for agricultural conversion and increased local demand for environmental amenities may result in indefinite protection of forests that would otherwise have been destroyed for ephemeral economic gains."

"Ton years" is a response to the permanence issue of land use and forestry. "Ton-year" crediting schemes were explained during the sidebar this way: Projects would receive fractional credits for each year that a ton of carbon is kept out of the atmosphere. [Just a new age way of being paid not to plant?] A conversion factor of ton year to perpetual ton will be chosen by the policy makers.

Some delegations, feeling decidedly land poor, critically attack the inclusion of land use and forestry in the CDM mechanism as the creation of entitlement. They argue that either large countries or rich countries, or both, would be allowed through this use of sinks to plant or proclaim wildlands their way around stringent and severe energy belt-tightening at home.

Sinking feelings pile on top of our tiredness. Sleep might not be enough to refresh us.

---

June 14, 2000

### **Sinks raise NGO dander**

Just why exactly don't environmental NGOs want sinks projects to be credited as a mechanism?

This and other burning questions like "What is carbon leakage?" were asked and answered yesterday at one of the two press briefings scheduled this week.

To my lead question, Robert Watson, Chairman of IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) answered forcefully that the rub resulted from the difference between science and politics.

"Scientifically," Watson stated, "the removal of carbon from the atmosphere by forests and land-use change is good for the climate. But, politically, this use of sinks might take the focus off reductions of emissions from energy production."

"Trees, also, are not a permanent sequestration of carbon," Watson continued. "Additionally, monitoring and measuring might result in undue credits or undue debits because carbon changes on the ground surface may not result in atmospheric changes."

Answering my second question within the first, Watson explained that carbon leakage occurs when deforestation is slowed in one spot, only to show up in another. Watson stressed that driving forces behind any deforestation needed to be so well understood that such an unintended consequence as pushing deforestation to a new area did not result.

Environmentalists see sinks to be loopholes. They don't want this easier path available. They are strident about it. A global coalition of environmental groups including WWF, Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth issued yesterday a press release warning that the Kyoto Protocol was "Heading for the Rocks."

"If governments don't pull the helm over, the Kyoto Protocol is heading for the rocks," said Jennifer Morgan of WWF International.

The forestry activities of Canada, Japan, Australia, USA, New Zealand, Sweden and France were said to "favour rules which would give incentives to chop down old-

growth forests and replace them with new plantations from which they can claim pollution credits."

Other voices chimed in. "The Kyoto Protocol is slowly but surely being destroyed as governments seek to open up loophole after loophole. It would allow them to avoid doing anything to reduce emissions from burning fossil fuels, which is the primary cause of climate change," warned Karla Schoeters of Climate Network Europe.

Mie Asaoka of Kiko Network added to the protesting chorus. She claimed, "Just as surely as we are seeing the world warm, and the first signs of climate disasters ahead like the floods in Mozambique and the big storms in Europe at the end of 1999, the main polluters are trying to escape putting their own house in order."

While these NGOs are certain the climate will self-destruct without their stringent climate policies, a different view was put forward by Bert Metz, Co-chair of Working Group III on Mitigation.

Metz's slide presentation at the press briefing concluded with his pronouncement that "Low Greenhouse Gases scenarios are possible WITHOUT any specific climate policy." Metz's special report on emissions scenarios utilised six computer models. The modellers assumed the driving forces of climate changes to be:

- Population (rates coming down)
- Economics (world is richer)
- Technology (most important variable)
- Land-use
- Energy (use of renewables growing)

Metz's computer-generated scenarios raised the upper end of a temperature increase projection to 1.0 degrees-5.0 degrees Celsius from the older projection of 1.0 degree-3.5 degrees Celsius by year 2100.

It is worth repeating Metz's conclusion.

"Low greenhouse gasses are possible without any specific climate policy."

No good reason here not to include the sink.

---

**June 13, 2000**

### **Only Losers Invited?**

"Only projects that would not have been economic without CDM credits should be eligible. The CDM must not become a 'top up' for projects that are already profitable, as these will proceed anyway. The idea must be to encourage projects that would not otherwise be able to proceed."

Greenpeace declares that the above is a feature that must be included in any CDM. Their briefing paper is titled *The Clean Development Mechanism: Used by renewable energy or Abused by coal & nuclear?*

The entire paper continues the groan and the howl that has been heard ever since Kyoto in 1997. As a South American nation delegate said yesterday, "The minute Kyoto said what needed to be done, the affected players began to seek ways to do it at the least cost."

Does that sound unreasonable?

How sustainable is any project, anyway, that cannot pay for itself?

Greenpeace seems to be trying to have it both ways. Their paper pridefully states that "many renewable technologies are now tried, tested and cost effective." Is cost effectiveness a virtue only when associated with wind, solar or biomass, but not when connected to coal or nuclear?

The defense of this seemingly schizophrenic position is that social engineering is more valuable than mere economic losses. "The CDM is not solely designed to reduce carbon emissions. It is also mandated to assist developing countries to achieve sustainable development."

Keep in mind that what is "sustainable development" is truly in the eye of the beholder. Greenpeace, being omniscient, knows that neither coal, nuclear, large hydro nor sinks projects can be sustainable. Thus, those technologies are to be excluded. The claim is that "only 100% emission free, 100% sustainable, will ensure the CDM's environmental integrity."

Why is Greenpeace railing against coal and nuclear? Calling them "dirty industries," Greenpeace argues that "clean coal projects lead to the locking in for long periods of time carbon-intensive capital stock and send entirely the wrong signals to the energy market regarding its investment direction. Nuclear power is similarly unsustainable because of nuclear reactor safety, waste disposal and transport concerns, and the risk

of nuclear weapons technology proliferation. It is therefore all the more worrying that the CDM could be used as a vehicle for nuclear and coal promotion."

Why is WWF railing against the same things? Jennifer Morgan, WWF's Director Climate Change Campaign, supports the position that "an environmental screening process should ensure that all CDM and JI (joint implementation) projects pass a sustainability test before being eligible for certified emissions reductions under the CDM. As a basic principle, nuclear power, large hydro and coal are non-sustainable technologies and should explicitly be excluded from the CDM. Sinks projects (carbon sequestration) should not be eligible under the CDM, as Article 12 explicitly deals only with emissions reductions."

How can it be that there is anyone in this year 2000 that thinks they know just exactly all the energy technologies that both exist and will exist? Why would any member of this incredible generation of change and astonishing discovery feel compelled to make finite lists?

Perhaps all this ranting is better understood when the basic Greenpeace and WWF positions are revisited.

Environmental NGOs like Greenpeace and WWF have never liked any Kyoto mechanism. They view all of the mechanisms (CDM, JI, trading and even the EU bubble) as loopholes. They want domestic reductions, period. They want the wrenching transformation of society that Al Gore's EARTH IN THE BALANCE demands.

This is the short list of permissible energy technologies:

- Thermal and electric solar power
- Wind power
- Small hydroelectricity
- Geothermal
- Biomass
- Wave and tidal power

The EU supports such a list and the U.S. does not.

Humanity needs all the energy it can muster from all the sources available. Each type of technology on this list has its own special application in some place, for some time and at some cost; and each has its own environmental problems. Not one on this list is a panacea. Even taken altogether, these technology options do not now make a

significant contribution to our energy supply, and their ability to do so in the future will take decades.

Additionally, renewable is not necessarily sustainable. For instance, close inspection finds wind generation so tied to large parcels of land that, in that sense, it could be classified, like coal mining, as an extractive-based activity with inherent limitations.

But, the environmental NGOs are quick to warn of the calamity that will befall us all if parties don't do it their way. "If these considerations are not taken into account, we run the serious risk of postponing the measures that, in light of the increasingly frequent climate-related disasters, are becoming ever more urgent."

Underwrite money-losing CDMs before it's too late.

---

**June 12, 2000**

### **Cashing-in on global warming**

John Palmisano is busily setting up European and Washington, DC, offices expecting to make a ton -- on tons of carbon.

Palmisano exemplifies the business entrepreneur ready to profit from hot air. If the United Nations is going to categorize carbon dioxide emissions as pollutants, then there will be those, like Palmisano, who will make markets advising energy, transportation, manufacturing and agricultural players about trading in the new commodity.

Palmisano resigned in early May from Enron to create his own company. John Palmisano & Associates now specializes in commercial and policy aspects of greenhouse gas trading, of energy efficiency and renewable energy, and of emissions trading, offsets, and bubbling in the United States. He isn't alone.

Like Palmisano, other hopeful businessmen flock around perennially-worried non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and indefatigable nation state delegates as the formal week of the Twelfth Session of the Subsidiary Bodies (SB-12) to the Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) gets underway today in Bonn, Germany.

For many, this begins their second week, not first.

An informal workweek ended Friday.

Earth Negotiations Bulletin (ENB) summed up what the mood was by the end of last week. "Some participants have expressed concern over what they feel is undue haste in these meetings to produce the basis for negotiating texts," ENB wrote. "The land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF), mechanisms and adverse effects groups," seemed especially rushed. The comment continued, " While they applaud progress, they fear that the urgency in the lead-up to the Sixth Conference of the Parties (COP-6) means negotiations may be pushed more rapidly than they are prepared for at this stage. Indeed, some delegates sense that these informal meetings have reached the limits of their mandate."

At a pace that is too rapid for some and far too slow for others, all aspects of the Kyoto Protocol are being word-smithed. The goal is to have a final document for both negotiation and acceptance by November's COP6 at The Hague. Ratification is envisioned by 2002. Fast or slow, all hands are hard at work.

Representatives from the business community, including the International Chamber of Commerce and the International Climate Change Partnership, are working hard on matters that don't begin to make any sense unless one has been following along for several seasons. They recommend that parties agree to create clear definitions on fungibility and tradability, to eschew quantitative restrictions in the mechanisms, to provide clarity on the proposed institutional controls for Clean Development Mechanisms (CDM), to create a strong and fair compliance system, and to approve mechanisms for fast-track CDM crediting.

Are you following this?

Is anyone discussing the negligible effect upon the climate that is projected even when this treaty is fully implemented?

No.

All speakers mirror roughly what the FCCC Executive Secretary, Michael Cutajar, keeps repeating. His warning goes, "The global climate system is being destabilized by the economic and demographic growth of the last two centuries. The impacts of warming are mostly negative. Climate change is a case of environmental dumping on a global scale."

Oh?

What if the impacts of warming are mostly beneficial? Much evidence makes this case. See [Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Climate Change](#) and [Greening Earth Society](#).

The scope of the hardworking attendees does not include any such possibility.

These workers see only a crisis.

These workers are here to save us.

Let the micro-management of a global planned economy commence.

Let the Palmisanos of the world profit from this massive "broken window" economic example. Then, at least somebody can have benefited from this mess.

---

### Climate Change Meetings in 2000

#### June 12, 2000

**12TH ASIA-PACIFIC AND THIRD COMMONWEALTH CONGRESS OF ENVIRONMENTAL JOURNALISTS:** This meeting will be held in Suva, Fiji from 5-9 June 2000 and will focus on climate change and small island states. For more information contact: Nina Ratulele, Secretary, Pacific Islands News Association, Level 2, Damodar Centre, 46 Gordon Street, Suva, Fiji; tel: +679-303-623; fax: +679-303-943; e-mail: pina@is.com.fj; Internet: <http://www.oneworld.org/slejf/fiji.htm>

**FIRST WORLD CONFERENCE AND EXHIBITION ON BIOMASS FOR ENERGY AND INDUSTRY:** This conference will be held in Sevilla, Spain, from 5-9 June 2000. It is being jointly organized by the European Conference on Biomass for Energy and Industry, and the Biomass Conference of the Americas. For more information contact: Angela Grassi; tel: +39-055-500-2174; fax: +39-055-57-3425; e-mail: eta.fi@etaflorence.it; Internet: <http://www.etaflorence.it/sevilla.htm>

**12TH SESSION OF THE FCCC SUBSIDIARY BODIES:** SB-12 will be held in Bonn, Germany, from 12-16 June 2000. It will be preceded by one week of informal meetings, including workshops. For more information contact: the FCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: secretariat@unfccc.de; Internet: <http://www.unfccc.int/sessions/00june/index.html>

**THE KYOTO PROTOCOL: THE END OF THE BEGINNING?** This meeting will be held from 19-20 June in London, England. It is being organized by the Royal

Institute of International Affairs (RIIA). For more information contact: Georgina Wright, RIIA, Chatham House, 10 St James's Square, London SW1Y 4LE; tel: +44-20-7957-5700; fax: +44-20-7321-2045; e-mail: [info@riia.org](mailto:info@riia.org); Internet: <http://www.riia.org> (click on "conferences")

### **INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CLIMATE CHANGE**

**COMMUNICATION:** This conference will be held from 22-24 June 2000 in Kitchener-Waterloo, Ontario, Canada. It will be hosted by Environment Canada and the University of Waterloo and is intended to support effective communication as a means of strengthening the climate change science-policy process. For more information contact: Jean Andrey, Department of Geography, University of Waterloo; tel: +1-519-888-4567 x3629; e-mail: [jandrey@fes.uwaterloo.ca](mailto:jandrey@fes.uwaterloo.ca) or contact Daniel Scott, Adaptation and Impacts Research Group, Environment Canada; tel: +1-519-888-4567 x5497; e-mail: [dj2scott@fes.uwaterloo.ca](mailto:dj2scott@fes.uwaterloo.ca); Internet: <http://geognt.uwaterloo.ca/c3confer/>

**WORLD RENEWABLE ENERGIES CONGRESS:** This meeting will be held from 1-7 July 2000 in Brighton, England. Hosted by the World Renewable Energy Network, it is being co-sponsored by several organizations, including UNESCO, UNDP and the European Economic Commission. For more information contact: A. Sayigh, 147 Hilmanton, Lower Earley, Reading RG6 4HN, UK; tel: +44-1189-611-364, fax: +44-1189-611-365; Internet: <http://www.wrenuk.co.uk/brighton/topics.html#topics>

**SECOND CIRCULAR OF THE QUADRENNIAL OZONE SYMPOSIUM - SAPPORO 2000:** This meeting will take place from 3-8 July 2000, at Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan. The meeting will focus on all aspects of ozone-related science. For more information contact: Rumén D. Bojkov, Secretary of the Ozone Commission, c/o WMO Secretariat, P.O. Box 2300, Geneva 2, Switzerland; e-mail: [bojkov\\_r@gateway.wmo.ch](mailto:bojkov_r@gateway.wmo.ch); or Toshihiro Ogawa, Director, Earth Observation Research Center, National Space Development Agency of Japan, Roppongi First Bldg. 14F, 1-9-9 Roppongi, Minato-ku, Tokyo 106-0032, Japan; e-mail: [t\\_ogawa@eorc.nasda.go.jp](mailto:t_ogawa@eorc.nasda.go.jp); Internet: <http://www.eorc.nasda.go.jp/AtmChem/O3symp/1st-announce.html>

**31ST EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE MULTILATERAL FUND UNDER THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL:** The 31st Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund under the Montreal Protocol is scheduled for 3-7 July 2000 in Geneva, Switzerland. The 32nd Meeting will be held from 4-8 December 2000 in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso. For more information contact: the Ozone Secretariat; UNEP, Nairobi, Kenya; tel: +254-2-62-1234; e-mail: [ozoneinfo@unep.org](mailto:ozoneinfo@unep.org); Internet: <http://www.unep.org/ozone/meet2000.htm>

**20TH SESSION OF THE OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP OF PARTIES TO THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL:** OEWG-20 will be held in Geneva, Switzerland, from 11-13 July 2000. For more information contact: the Ozone Secretariat; UNEP, Nairobi, Kenya; tel: +254-2-62-1234; e-mail: ozoneinfo@unep.org; Internet: <http://www.unep.ch/ozone/20oewg.htm>

**NATIONAL POLICY ASSOCIATION BREAKFAST SEMINARS ON GLOBAL WARMING:** The US National Policy Association is holding a series of breakfast seminars during 2000 in Washington, DC. The seminars aim to provide an opportunity for representatives of the business, labor, agricultural, academic, government and environmental sectors to address various policy issues relating to climate change. The remaining meeting is scheduled for 13 July. For more information contact: Kaylin Bailey, National Policy Association; tel: +1-202-884-7628; e-mail: kbailey@npa1.org

**INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CLIMATE AND HEALTH IN SMALL ISLAND STATES:** This conference will be held from 24-25 July 2000, in Nadi, Fiji, and is being organized by the Interagency Network on Climate and Human Health, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Environment Programme and the World Meteorological Organization. For more information contact: H. Ogawa, World Health Organization, Regional Office for the Western Pacific; fax: +632-521-1036 or 526-0279; e-mail: ogawah@who.org.ph; or C. Corvalán, Department of Protection of the Human Environment, World Health Organization, CH-1211, Geneva 27; tel: +41-22-791 4208; e-mail: corvalanc@who.int; Internet: [http://www.who.int/peh/climate/climate\\_and\\_health.htm](http://www.who.int/peh/climate/climate_and_health.htm)

**CONGRESS OF THE 29TH INTERNATIONAL GEOGRAPHICAL UNION COMMISSION ON CLIMATOLOGY:** This conference will take place from 9-13 August 2000 in Seoul, South Korea. The theme of the conference is "Climate Change and its Impacts." For more information contact: Hyoun-Young Lee, Department of Geography, Konkuk University, 93-1, Mojin-dong, Kwangjin-gu, Seoul, 143-701, South Korea; tel: +822-446-6756; fax: +822-446-8194; e-mail: leekwons@kkucc.konkuk.ac.kr

**FIFTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GREENHOUSE GAS CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES (GHGT-5):** This conference will take place from 13-16 August 2000 in Cairns, Northern Queensland, Australia. It will provide a forum for the discussion of recent advances in the area of greenhouse gas control technologies, including CO<sub>2</sub> capture, storage and utilization. For more information contact: Colin Paulson, CSIRO Energy Technology, PO Box 136, North Ryde, NSW 1670, Australia; tel: +61-2-9490-8790; Internet: <http://www.ieagreen.org.uk>

## **UNEP OZONE SECRETARIAT - ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

**ASSESSMENT PANEL:** This meeting will be held from 22-29 August 2000 in Abisco, Sweden. For more information contact: the Ozone Secretariat; tel: +254-2-62-1234; e-mail: [ozoneinfo@unep.org](mailto:ozoneinfo@unep.org);  
Internet: <http://www.unep.org/ozone/meet2000.htm>

## **Meetings of the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range**

**Transboundary Air Pollution:** The Working Group on Strategies and Review will meet from 30 August – 1 September 2000. The Steering Body to the Cooperative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP) will meet from 4-6 September 2000. The Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution will meet from 4-7 December 2000. All meetings will be held in Geneva, Switzerland, and convened under the UN Economic Commission for Europe. For more information contact: Information Unit, UNECE, Palais des Nations, Room 356, CH - 1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland; tel: +41-22-917-4444; fax: +41-22-917-0505; e-mail: [info.ece@unece.org](mailto:info.ece@unece.org); Internet: <http://www.unece.org/meetings/meetgen.htm>

**13TH SESSION OF THE FCCC SUBSIDIARY BODIES:** SB-13 will be held from 11-15 September 2000, in Lyon, France, and will be preceded by one week of informal meetings, including workshops. For more information contact: the UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: [secretariat@unfccc.de](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.de); Internet: <http://www.unfccc.int>

**UN ECE Committee on Sustainable Energy:** The Ad Hoc Group of Experts on Coal and Thermal Power will meet on 25 September 2000. This meeting will be followed directly by the Meeting of the Committee on Sustainable Energy, which will meet from 26-28 September. Finally, the Ad Hoc Group of Experts on Extension of European Electricity Interconnection will meet on 29 September 2000. All meetings will take place in Geneva, Switzerland, and will be convened by the UN Economic Commission for Europe. For more information contact: Information Unit, UNECE, Palais des Nations, Room 356, CH - 1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland; tel: +41-22-917-4444; fax: +41-22-917-0505; e-mail: [info.ece@unece.org](mailto:info.ece@unece.org);  
Internet: <http://www.unece.org/meetings/meetgen.htm>

**EARTH TECHNOLOGIES FORUM:** This meeting, organized by the Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy, will be held in Washington, DC, from 30 October – 1 November 2000. Both ozone and climate change issues will be discussed. For more information contact: Alliance for Responsible Atmospheric Policy; tel: +1-703-243-0344; e-mail: [alliance98@aol.com](mailto:alliance98@aol.com); Internet: <http://www.earthforum.com/>

**SIXTH CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE:** COP-6 will be held in The Hague, the Netherlands, from 13-24 November 2000. For more information contact: the UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: secretariat@unfccc.de; Internet: <http://cop6.unfccc.int/>

**SEVENTH INTERNATIONAL ENERGY FORUM:** The Government of Saudi Arabia will host the Seventh International Energy Forum, from 17-19 November 2000, in Riyadh. For more information contact: the Saudi Arabian Mission to the UN, 405 Lexington Avenue, 56th Floor, New York, N.Y. 10017, USA; tel: +1-212-697-4830; e-mail: saudiArabia@un.int

**THIRD ASIA PACIFIC CONFERENCE ON SUSTAINABLE ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES:** This conference will be held from 3-6 December 2000 in Hong Kong. For more information contact: APCSEET 2000 Secretariat, Department of Chemical Engineering, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Kowloon, Hong Kong; tel: +852-2358-7134; fax: +852-2358-0054; e-mail: apc2000@ust.hk; Internet: <http://www.ust.hk/apc2000>

**12TH MEETING OF THE PARTIES OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL:** MOP-12 is scheduled to take place in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, from 11-15 December 2000. The 32nd Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund will be held prior to this, from 4-8 December, also in Ouagadougou. For more information contact: the Ozone Secretariat; tel: +254-2-62-1234; fax: +254-2-62-3601; e-mail: ozoneinfo@unep.org; Internet: <http://www.unep.org/ozone/meet2000.htm>

---

Copyright © 2000 [Sovereignty International](#) and [Freedom.org](#). Unmodified use and redistribution permitted provided **this notice is maintained**.