

2001 Genoa Compliance Report

The Environment

Overall Issue Assessment

| Initiative / Country | Britain | Canada | France | Germany | Italy | Japan | Russia | US | Total |
|----------------------|---------|--------|--------|---------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| <i>COP6</i> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>GEF</i> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 0 | -0.13 |
| <i>Energy</i> | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| <i>Johannesburg</i> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>POPs</i> | 0 | +1 | 0 | +1 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0 | +0.13 |
| <i>OECD</i> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | +0.17 | +0.34 | +0.17 | +0.34 | +0.17 | 0 | 0 | +0.17 | +0.17 |

Individual Commitment Compliance Breakdown

Commitment 1:

“Attempt to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through the Sixth Conference of the Parties in Bonn (COP6) and other relevant fora”

Assessment:

| Country | Non-Compliance | Work in Progress | Full Compliance |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Britain | | 0 | |
| Canada | | 0 | |
| France | | 0 | |
| Germany | | 0 | |
| Italy | | 0 | |
| Japan | | 0 | |
| Russia | | 0 | |
| United States | | 0 | |
| Overall | | 0 | |

Compliance Breakdown:

High-level ministers and officials gathered at Bonn, Germany from July 16 – 27 2001 to see if they could reach a consensus as to the best way to minimize the negative effects of climate change. The Conference was especially important due to announcement by

the United States in the months preceding the Conference that they would not be ratifying the Kyoto Protocol.

The agreement reached at Bonn represents an important step towards making it easier for national governments to ratify the Kyoto Protocol. In order to reach this consensus, many concessions were made, particularly in the issues of carbon sinks and credits. As such, while Bonn was a success in formulating a framework for the implementation of Kyoto, many environmental organizations criticized the Conference and claimed that the concessions weaken the effectiveness of the Kyoto Protocol.

While the parties at Bonn failed to establish a legally binding agreement to ensure compliance to the emission reduction targets, progress was made in the area of adaptation funds. Although there was no binding agreement on financing, the European Union, Canada, Iceland, Japan and New Zealand all promised to contribute, as of 2005, approximately \$400 million (US) to a fund to ensure compliance with Kyoto.

All G8 member-states receive a grade of 0 on this commitment for while they all participated in the COP6 Conference; negotiations still have a long way to go before any concrete agreement on climate change can be reached. At Bonn, many core issues were not finalized and were postponed to the next conference of the parties, COP 7, which took place in Marrakech, Morocco.

Commitment 2:

“Will give money to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) so that it may continue to support environmental protection on a global scale and foster good practices to promote efficient energy use and the development of renewable energy sources in the development world”

Assessment:

| Country | Non-Compliance | Work in Progress | Full Compliance |
|----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Britain | | 0 | |
| Canada | | 0 | |
| France | | 0 | |
| Germany | | 0 | |
| Italy | | 0 | |
| Japan | | 0 | |
| Russia | -1 | | |
| United States | | 0 | |
| Overall | | | -0.13 |

Compliance Breakdown:

In the months following the G8 Summit at Genoa, the GEF financing committee has met four times: October 11 - 12, December 3 - 4, February 27 - 28, as well as May 13 and

14. All G7 member states participated in the Summit, sending at least three officials to each. Russia does not participate; therefore, they receive a compliance score of –1 since they have not taken any initiative to comply with this commitment. The other countries receive a score of 0, since the GEF funding dilemma has not yet been resolved – the meetings are an on-going process.

Upon the closing of the May meeting, the committee issued a statement claiming that officials had “made significant progress on all the issues on its agenda, including arrears, the final replenishment document, policy recommendations, and the GEF-3 replenishment amount.” The committee will be recommending to the World Bank Board of Executive Directors that the total commitment of new resources for the GEF-3 be in the neighbourhood of \$2 billion (US). However, even given this large amount, some donors did not believe \$2 billion to be a sufficient level of funding given the fact that the GEF mandate had been expanded, especially in the issue areas of persistent organic pollutants and land degradation.

Commitment 3:

“Hold a G8 Energy Minister conference”

Assessment:

| Country | Non-Compliance | Work in Progress | Full Compliance |
|----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Britain | | | +1 |
| Canada | | | +1 |
| France | | | +1 |
| Germany | | | +1 |
| Italy | | | +1 |
| Japan | | | +1 |
| Russia | | | +1 |
| United States | | | +1 |
| Overall | | | 1.0 |

Compliance Breakdown:

The G8 Energy Minister’s Meeting was held from May 2 – 3, 2002 in Detroit. Leaders from the US, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom and Russia met to finalize recommendations for G8 member countries on energy security, sustainability and alternative fuel technologies. They also promised to explore new sources of energy as demand grows around the world.

In addition, the Energy Ministers agreed that oil price stability could be achieved if all countries established "clear and transparent" investment rules. These rules would allow oil companies to have confidence to develop untapped resources and reduce dependence on traditional sources now subject to disruption.

Since the Energy Minister's meeting was held as promised, each of the G8 members receive a compliance score of +1.

Commitment 4:

“Work with civil society and developing countries to make the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg a success”

| Country | Non-Compliance | Work in Progress | Full Compliance |
|----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Britain | | 0 | |
| Canada | | 0 | |
| France | | 0 | |
| Germany | | 0 | |
| Italy | | 0 | |
| Japan | | 0 | |
| Russia | | 0 | |
| United States | | 0 | |
| Overall | | 0 | |

Compliance Breakdown:

There are two parts to this commitment: one, that the G8 member states will work with civil society and NGOs to resolve sustainable development issues; and, two, that they will work to ensure Johannesburg is a success. The Johannesburg Summit will take place in South Africa from 26 August to 4 September 2002.

The purpose of the World Summit on Sustainable Development Summit is to restore momentum to sustainable development initiatives. This is a challenging task since environmental issues have been overshadowed by the traumatic events of September 11th. Johannesburg will attempt to produce action orientated (rather than diplomatically vague) commitments. Representatives will focus on five areas: water and sanitation, energy, agricultural productivity, biodiversity and eco-system management, and health.

Regarding the first aspect of the commitment, civil society and NGOs have been included in every aspect of the preparation for this Summit because Johannesburg is meant to be a forum for “multi-stakeholder dialogue”. The priority placed on the inclusion of civil society and NGOs into international deliberations is evident by the emphasis placed on non-state members attending the Summit. The registration process for non-state actors is simple and straightforward, and all logistical information is available on the website. However, no participant list is available on the web, so it is not yet clear how many NGOs and how diverse the civil society participation will be. Moreover, information relating to which states will be participating in the Summit is not available either. As such, for the first component of the commitment, member states receive a score of zero, for while effort has been made to include NGOs and civil society in the Summit process, the results of these attempts is not yet known.

Since compliance with the second aspect of the commitment cannot be evaluated at this

time, as the Summit has not taken place yet, G8 members receive another score of zero.

Therefore, all states will receive a compliance score of zero, since progress has been made to ensure that Johannesburg will be a success and that civil society will be included in the discussions. However, the effectiveness of each G8 member can only be evaluated upon conclusion of the Summit.

Commitment 5:

“Promote early entry into force of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants”

| Country | Non-Compliance | Work in Progress | Full Compliance |
|----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Britain | | 0 | |
| Canada | | | +1 |
| France | | 0 | |
| Germany | | | +1 |
| Italy | | 0 | |
| Japan | -1 | | |
| Russia | | 0 | |
| United States | | 0 | |
| Overall | | | +0.13 |

Compliance Breakdown:

Unfortunately, not much has been accomplished in promoting the early entry into force of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants. While Britain, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Russia and the United States have all signed the Convention, only Canada and Germany have ratified it. Japan has not yet signed on.

Therefore, Britain, France, Italy, Russia and the United States all receive a compliance score of 0 since they are all still in the process of ratifying the Convention. Canada and Germany receive a score of +1 since they have both signed and ratified. Japan receives a score of -1, since they have not taken any initiative to promote the Stockholm Convention.

Dates of Signature and Ratification

| Country | Date of Signature | Date of Ratification |
|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Canada | May 23, 2001 | May 23, 2001 |
| France | May 23, 2001 | |
| Germany | May 23, 2001 | April 25, 2002 |
| Italy | May 23, 2001 | |
| Russia | May 22, 2002 | |
| United Kingdom | December 11, 2001 | |
| United States | May 23, 2001 | |

Commitment 6:

“Work with the OECD to produce a recommendation that fulfills the Okinawa mandate”

| Country | Non-Compliance | Work in Progress | Full Compliance |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Britain | | 0 | |
| Canada | | 0 | |
| France | | 0 | |
| Germany | | 0 | |
| Italy | | 0 | |
| Japan | | 0 | |
| Russia | | 0 | |
| United States | | 0 | |
| Overall | | 0 | |

Compliance Breakdown:

The “Okinawa Mandate” refers to the commitment made by the G8 to work with the OECD in developing a plan to create “common environmental guidelines” for export credit agencies.

In a press statement issued on 4 December 2001, the OECD Secretary-General declared, “*Much progress has been made to date, and I foresee discussions continuing towards further improvements. The current proposal of common approaches, after fifteen months of negotiation, has also taken into account consultations with civil society organizations. The implementation of this proposal by most members from January 2002 will mean that all major exporting countries of the OECD will now be applying environmental review mechanisms. This results in the first common “greening” of export credits and should be seen as a major accomplishment. This proposal in an important first step, I believe the countries of the OECD will, through ongoing negotiations and review, improve the level playing field for export credits and the environment.*”

According to the same press statement, the key elements of the proposal that have been negotiated to date are:

- Screening of all projects with a repayment term of 2 years or more
- Classification of projects in one of three categories, according to their potential effect on the environment, in order to indicate the extent of the information required for the subsequent environmental review
- Review of projects, including scrutiny of Environmental Impact Assessment in sensitive sectors and locations, in order for Members to evaluate whether to cover or decline official support and, if support is to be provided, the extent of any mitigated requirements.
- Benchmarking of projects against international standards such as those contained in the guidelines of the World Bank Group

- Exchange and disclosure of information with relevant stakeholders and with other Members
- Reporting and monitoring and a review no later than the end of 2003

Therefore, G8 member states receive a compliance score of zero, for while there is not a full consensus to implement the common approaches as an OECD Recommendation; nevertheless, progress has been made in implementing common environmental guidelines.

REFERENCES

COP6

European Christian Environmental Network, *Report on COP6 Part II: Bonn Climate Change Coalition*, available on-line at <http://www.ecen.org/cop6bonn.htm>

United Nations, *The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*, available on-line at <http://unfccc.int/cop6-2/infopart/finlop65.pdf>

GEF

GEF Replenishment Funding Statement, *Statement on the Replenishment Meeting*, May 14, 2002, Document number: GEF/R.3/CRP.6 available on-line at http://www.gefweb.org/Replenishment/Reple_Documents/R.3.CRP.6.pdf

Energy

G8 Energy Ministers, *Co-Chairs Statement*, available on-line at <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/g7/energy/energy0702.html>

Johannesburg

United Nations, *Johannesburg Summit 2002 Website*, available on-line at <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/index.html>

Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants available on-line at <http://www.chem.unep.ch/sc/documents/signature/signstatus.htm>

OECD

OECD, *Statement from the OECD Global Forum on International Investment*, February 7 – 8, 2002, available on-line at <http://www.oecd.org/pdf/M00025000/M00025577.pdf>