Q: IF ALL ENERGY COULD BE FREE, AVAILABLE TO ALL CORNERS OF THE GLOBE AND PRODUCE ONLY POTABLE WATER AS A BY-PRODUCT WOULD THAT ENERGY BE ACCEPTABLE TO THE UNITED NATIONS AND TO THE THOUSANDS OF NGOS?

A: NO. THERE ARE STILL TOO MANY PEOPLE AND WHO KNOWS WHAT MISCHIEF PEOPLE WOULD CREATE IF THEY HAD UNLIMITED ENERGY.

Plus, it must be mentioned, such a scenario would not require the creation of a thick layer of global bureaucrats around the globe counting, monitoring, approving, certifying, auditing and documenting emissions changes and land use changes.

Sentiments on this concluding day of COP5 range from Michael Jefferson's "moved aggressively forward" to Lennie Berstein's "these two weeks have raised the hurdles to COP6 even higher."

Most of us know we will meet again. Most of us sport a bright tulip on our accreditation card that hangs from our neck chain. We will thematically tiptoe through the tulips to The Hague in Netherlands come 13-24 November 2000.

Before then? For many hard-core wordsmiths it will be back to Dakar, Nairobi, Manila, Bonn and other hot air hot spots before COP6.

Does everyone willkommen the UN with open arms into their cities?
Not everyone.

In Bonn, ALI's Copy Service manager reacts with disgust and hostility at the very mention of anything related to the UN. He described their presence and operations as "an octopus."

The UN "crowded out all the hotel rooms. They bribed their way through normal bidding processes," he complained. "And they show up with armed forces, so what are you going to do?" he spat out.

The stored grievances seem to go years back to other confrontations with the UN in still other cities. Sarajevo was the site where he says fleets of cars were brought in by the UN to be handed out individually as favours to local bureaucrats.

He had first hand knowledge of a bidding process where a company able to do the same projected work for 1/13th of the cost ($1million) in 1/13th of the time (3 months) lost out to the entrenched UN good old boy. Tales of graft and corruption surround UN activities, but they are rarely mentioned in the presence of this huge host.

Q: WHAT IS THE MOST INTRIGUING UPCOMING WORK?

A: A DEFINITION OF 'DANGEROUS.'

An IPCC synthesis report is due out in 2001 that should define 'dangerous.'

The objective of the Convention on Climate Change is "stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system."[Art.2.]

Included in definitions [Art.1] is that 'adverse effects of climate change' means "...deleterious effects on...resilience or productivity of natural and managed ecosystems..."

There exists substantial evidence of beneficial effects of any increased levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. Much evidence is catalogued at http://www.co2science.org.
Resilience and productivity are enhanced by higher concentrations of CO2, not lessened.

Carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere have been ten to twenty times higher than today's 360ppm level.

Could a lower level of 240ppm be more dangerous?

Who is to say?

And, how is any concentration really related to global temperature?

The relationship appears to be more correlation than causation. After all, most of the 0.5 degree Celsius increase that has occurred in the past one hundred years took place before there were increases in carbon dioxide concentrations, not after.

Ken Gregory and Lennie Berstein are two Working Group lead authors on IPCC reports who would appreciate some industry groups being in on the peer review process that will determine the definition of 'dangerous.'

The Hadley Center had projected future temperature rise to be three degrees. Their new assessment reduces that projection to just two degrees Celsius. Lennie Berstein does not see a one to two degree scenario as dangerous.

Meanwhile, all the Parties and all the burgeoning ranks of opportunists rally around the old 1992 clarion call of the sky is falling. No one waits upon facts.

In the face of no evidence, some groups are finding it hard to force technology to fix problems that are still speculative.

As this conference concluded, an automobile manufacturer described the dilemma faced. General Motors noted that American consumers didn't take well to technology forced by the nanny state.

As an example, GM has already made available such politically correct products as electric cars and vehicles that use alternative fuels. People, voting with their hard-earned money, soundly rejected both 'improvements in technology'. GM stressed that technology can not be introduced prematurely. The supporting infrastructure was missing for electric cars or alternative fuels. It has not been so easy to change consumer choices.

Vice President Gore tells Americans that we must undertake a wrenching transformation of our society.
Perhaps thoughtful, productive Americans can show Mr. Gore that we have a vision that is way beyond his myopic sustainability one.

November 4, 1999 -- by Floy Lilley, J.D.

Q: WILL THE U.S. IMPOSE CARBON AND ENERGY TAXES?

A: "WE DON'T HAVE TO BE MASOCHISTIC IN ORDER TO BE COURAGEOUS ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE."

Will Roger Ballentine of the White House rue the day he answered directly to a question about taxes? Without blinking, he said Wednesday morning that no carbon tax or energy taxes are anticipated.

Is the operative word 'anticipated'?

That important question and its more important answer took place during a useful dialog between a half-dozen members of the U.S. delegation and some business and industry representatives yesterday. It was made more important because there grows a glimmer of recognition that the higher 'eco' and energy taxes being imposed in the EU just may make the EU less competitive. The EU's insistence on higher taxes is met with as much favor as their insistence on caps. Neither position is joined by most business. Business as a whole is opposed to caps and other limitations on the mechanisms to be used to lower emissions.

Even though UN diplomats insist that there is no unsettled science in the climate change debate, rarely does a day conclude that someone hasn't brought something unsettling up. Yesterday was no exception.

Bob Watson of the IPCC had earlier painted a dire scientific picture that does not in the whole seem supported by evidence.

It was mentioned that there is a fresh report on the impact of aerosol sulfates run in a new model that delivers different results from those Watson fears.

Several participants voiced that "No, we still can not say that the science is settled," and "Natural variability still accounts for the wide range of climate changes."

Tom Vant joined this brave chorus saying, "Before Watson's pronouncement today there was no evidence whatsoever on human inducement of El Nino. Yet, I can bet you that Canadian ministers are going to quote him and the things he's said. That's why we need more current science. All that is happening now is still based on old 1992 reports that we were given in Kyoto."

We are all interested to see what the first draft of the Third Assessment Report of the IPCC will say. It will be leaked any day now. But, Bob Watson chairs the IPCC. Is his scary rhetoric a forecast of that
Many have growing skepticism about an issue other than the speculative science. It is skepticism about the octopus called UNEP. UNEP (United Nations Environment Program) and its international linkages like biodiversity and desertification were initially kept out of climate change discussions. Now FCCC Secretary Cutajar promotes UNEP at every podium. Klaus Topfer, UNEP's Executive Director, is everywhere. UNEP's tentacles are reaching into every area. Where will it end?

**Q: WHAT IS AMERICA DOING TO SUPPORT CLIMATE CHANGE OBJECTIVES?**

**A: QUITE A LOT, CONSIDERING U.S. SENATORS HAVE NOT RATIFIED THE TREATY.**

The industry representative who asked this question had to feel a bit like a straight man playing directly into the five men sitting before him.

Roger Ballentine, Jeff Seabright, and David Gardiner of the White House, along with Dan Reicher of DOE, and David Doniger of EPA fielded questions for an hour Wednesday morning.

They stressed that in the USA, domestic action means action at the private, the local, the state and the federal level. And, action is indeed occurring at each level.

Some highlights are:

- 500 local officials have just formed an organization to fight global warming.
- Large states like California and New Jersey have made big commitments and taken large steps to reduce emissions.
- Large corporations like DuPont, Motorola, United Technologies, and Intel are making their own commitments and reducing large amounts of GHGs.
- The federal government is the largest emitter. An Executive Order calls for emission reductions in the 500,000 federal buildings. Those buildings currently spend $8 billion every year on energy. They need to be retrofitted. Their use of energy will be cut by 35% by 2010. That is 2% of all of the energy used in the U.S.
- The 2001 budget includes $6 Billion to combat climate change.
- Tax credits are to be given for wind and biomass production.
- Research and development funds are increased.
● The electricity industry is being restructured. Illinois alone will spend $250 million on clean energy.

● New efficiency standards for room air conditioners and refrigerators are in place.

● Gas technologies and bio-energy use is encouraged.

● 5% of U.S. electricity will be derived from wind generation by 2020.

In the face of so many unanswered questions like science and costs and legal issues, the activities reflected on all levels are truly enormous. But, the USA delegates say they are just in the first phase of priming the pump. They claim that by 2004-2005 enough information should be available to determine what our domestic program will look like by 2008 when we enter our first commitment timeframe. The delegates in the room were not going to pre-judge what will be needed for 2008.

That reserved position might be the first constructive use of the precautionary principle yet displayed.

The delegates sounded a bit rehearsed when they prompted that the U.S. must sustain and accelerate economic growth. They sounded like a focus group when they claimed that it was a myth that economic growth required increased emissions. They sounded like Clinton when they assured all that it was a myth that implementation of the Kyoto Protocol requires economic harm. Echoes of the familiar song 'It will be good for the environment and good for the economy' rang in the paneled room.

However, in closing they struck a solid and respected chord. They acknowledged that industry and business leaders could make the difference if the U.S. and the EU were to become stalemated over caps and restrictions on the use of mechanisms.

They wound up, saying, "Caps don't work. Don't try to limit the power of the market."

Hear! Hear! Yes!

Let's do hear it for the power of the market.

---

November 3, 1999 -- by Floy Lilley, J.D.

Q: WHAT DOES THE FUTURE LOOK LIKE?

A: "HAPPY DAYS IN ECONOMIC ANALYSIS ARE COMING."

"Happy days in economic analysis are coming," proclaimed John Palmisano of Enron last night. John is most concerned about implicit grandfathering language and the sentiment that says someone deserves to
get money. He feels that every loophole will be revealed in the complicated world of mechanisms. Climate change should generate as much full employment for economists as it will for lawyers.

An event took a look at those Mechanisms. It was titled "Where we are; Where we need to go." The U.S. Business Council for Sustainable Energy and the European Business Council for a Sustainable Energy Future brought together an impressive panel. Some of their sentiments on mechanisms are reflected here:

**Chow Kok Lee (Malaysia)**

- On pilot CDMs, he says the process is already there in [12.10] for pilot projects once the first meeting of the parties is called after the Protocol is implemented.

- On projects, Chow said that sinks and nuclear are both on the table. They are options for the parties to negotiate. It is complex. Baselines must be credible and baselines need technical work by experts.

- On 'capacity building', Chow opined, "Some meetings on capacity building are more sales talk than capacity building."

**Jeff Miotke (U.S.)**

- On attitude, Miotke says 99% of the parties are ready to get down to business.

- On obstacles, he calls caps an issue and noted that six meetings between now and COP6 will keep everybody very busy on the details of registry, monitoring, reporting, verification, and share-of-the-proceeds.

- On timing, he stressed that compliance issues and mechanism issues must be solved simultaneously, not separately.

- On proper projects, he thinks sinks should be included in CDMs. And nuclear? "Don't have the instrument spell out how a nation meets its target," Miotke stated, loosening the anti-nuclear stance that has been heard from most U.S. delegates.

- On specifics, he thinks research and development needs clear price signals so that unknown costs don't scare them away. "Capacity building is a larger concept than just building capacity to participate in the mechanisms," Miotke concluded.

**Eduardo Sanhueza Flores (Chile)**

- "We want to be part from the beginning of the very big transformation that the world is facing." Flores stressed that many Latin American countries are calling for something like pilot CDMs and early action.
just to entice those who are willing to be part of solutions. Businesses will have to risk.

**Dr. Jos Delbeke (EU)**

- On COP5, Delbeke said, "We are close to real negotiations now." The EU is actively preparing for implementation of the Kyoto Protocol after COP6. It forecasts real and measurable benefits.

- On specifics, he felt that mechanisms and compliance must be clear so ratification of the Kyoto Protocol happens right after COP6.

- On caps, he acknowledged they are a hard issue. He called caps part domestic-level policy and part recognition that 'hot air' must be addressed so that the economics are sounder.

- On transition, the EU desires a smooth transition between AIJ projects that qualify later as CDM and JI because this is learning by doing. That is also known as 'fake it until you make it.'

- On action within the EU bubble, he said all were phasing out coal subsidies to the extent that subsidies were down 50% in past ten years. Clean coal would be ok, but the EU does not have the technology.

- On proper projects, the EU joined in to say that nuclear was "not a good idea for CDMs."

The last word was one of those classic last words.

Eduardo Dopaza (FUNDESA) stated with an audible sigh, "Working on JI has been like trying to sell a hot dog without the sausage. There were no credits." "Where we are and Where we need to go" ended with "Where's the beef?" Not a bad question to ask, especially if you might just be being conned.

---

**November 2, 1999** -- by Floy Lilley, J.D.

**Q : WHAT IS THE BIG ISSUE? WHEN WILL IT BE BROUGHT UP?**

**A : THE ISSUE IS WHAT "SUSTAINABLE" INCLUDES.**

"This is THE issue," says the UK.

Will "sustainable" allow for only renewables?
What about gas?
What about clean coal?
What about nuclear?
What energy resources a "sustainable" project can include will be a core issue of COP6 at the Hague next November.

It deserves strong attention now at COP5.

Many brochures, white papers and presentations are highlighting the factual position that we humans face if we strive to be "sustainable" and, naturally, strive to better our lots also.

One brochure tackling this issue is by the Center for the Study of American Business. William H. Lash III, author of "A Current View of the Kyoto Climate Change Treaty" concludes, "Currently, solar and wind power account for less than 3 percent of all electric power generated. The technology needed to reach the requirements of the Kyoto timetable simply is not available." [CSAB, August 1999].

In a different policy study, "Are Economic growth and a Sustainable Environment Compatible?", author Kenneth W. Chilton says about sustainability, "Economic growth is not only compatible with a sustainable environment; it is a prerequisite." [CSAB, September 1999].

Delegates and ministers of governments hover over the phrase. They know that "sustainable" is subject to interpretation.

Chile expressed that any "sustainable development" definition "must be made within each country because it is a matter of national sovereignty."

The Swiss on "sustainable development" concurred that "the concerned government should decide." They then stressed, "BUT this is a multi-lateral environmental agreement." They cautioned against negative spillover into other treaties. An example they gave is that HFCs under the Montreal Protocol are to be abated; under Kyoto, they sometimes replace CO2. A second example given was that some sink projects under JI might have negative effects upon biodiversity. These spillover effects were to highlight the need for some specific agreement among nations as to what could be "sustainable."

Sudan offered that "sustainable development" means "consumption of energy that emits or that does not emit. Therefore, avoidance of emissions is needed [to be counted] because we have no emissions to reduce."

Klaus Kohlhase (UNICE) uses the phrase in speech and writings as if he has a solid grasp of what is meant. One of Klaus' papers included: "Development, application and improvement of a wide range of technologies make significant contributions to reducing greenhouse gas emissions an implementation of sustainable development. As private sector involvement surpasses overseas development assistance, developing countries will benefit from establishment of sustainable development." But, what energy can this include? What does Klaus think it means?

Environmental groups offer narrower definitions. Their daily newspaper, ECO, 30 Oct, front page stated,
"The CDM must prioritize renewable energy technologies: that means it must exclude nuclear power, large hydro, and clean coal technologies."

A few others are straightforward, also. The EU said brusquely within the past few days that nuclear "is not sustainable. It is OK on emissions, but it is not sustainable." Melinda Kimble with the U.S. delegation had said the same thing in Buenos Aires last year. Is "sustainable" the language that brings us back to the famous phrase "From each according to his ability to each according to his need?" Is Marx smiling?

Can rhetoric or socialist political solutions deliver the goods?

Now is the time for all the energy we can create from all the sources that can generate it.

If you were counting on cyberspace to run itself without energy, think again.
If you are counting on food and fiber to grow itself without energy, think again.
If you think humans can better their lots in life without energy, think again.
If you think conservation is an energy source, think again.
Conservation is no more an energy supply than fasting is a food supply.

Above all, think again.

November 1, 1999 -- by Floy Lilley, J.D.

**Q:** "WHAT WOULD YOU EXPECT FROM A CDM PROJECT IF ALL YOUR PERSONAL RETIREMENT FUNDS WERE INVOLVED IN IT?"

**A:** "IT BETTER NOT LOSE MY MONEY."

This refreshing question was asked and answered Saturday night in a rare side event. Ms. Satu Nurmi, Chairman of the EU Ad hoc Working Group on Climate Change, helped bring together thirty of us from business and industry to discuss private sector involvement in developing countries for two and a half hours.

UN meetings make it so clear that no delegate who is deciding our energy future has ever met payroll. No delegate has ever risked his own money in a new venture. No delegate has ever failed because his project did not satisfy consumers. Few delegates have even rudimentary understandings of what creates wealth and, therefore, what creates health.

Reactions implied puzzlement by the EU panel to a slide making the point that "Shareholders are volunteers with expectations. They are not captive." Shareholders will not support losing projects. Their money will transfer quickly to another place and a real investment.
Will a price substantially less than $10 per tonne of emission credits be 'OK'? You would think so by the 26 October spot purchase by Ontario Power of 2.5m tonnes of carbon dioxide reduction credits from Zahren Alternative Power of the U.S. for less than $25 million. Canadian companies are pushing to make sure that emissions trading is accepted as a legal means to meet Kyoto targets should the Protocol be implemented. The market will reflect how that spot purchase played with the shareholders. If Ontario Power becomes viewed as too risky for investors' funds, those funds will certainly find other homes.

Some countries adamantly refuse to believe that investor fears or cost effectiveness are even issues. China in Plenary on Friday had made the point that the Kyoto Protocol does not include any mention of markets or investors or profits. Developed nations are to fund projects, period. In return, they will receive CERs (certified emission reduction credits) from the host party, period.

Columbia concurred saying that investors must do risky, small and costly projects in order for us all to achieve sustainable development. "Money should not be a limiting factor if the project meets sustainable development objectives," the Columbian delegate stressed.

Spoken like true bureaucrats.

Meanwhile, the real people who will have to make this monumental undertaking work if the Kyoto Protocol is implemented, know that they must abandon sheer speculation and get clear on specifics in order for a single project to happen.

'Potential dispossession' faces the business who undertakes any project now. It is a problem that probably will have to be settled by national law. It is industry that is going to earn the credit that their government is going to capture. Mechanisms fulfill only Party obligations, therefore industry sees that what should be a property right is really only a contingent property right. Domestic law will have to address this or the process is pure theft.

Likewise, business and industry must be held harmless if the single project does work, but the Government is overall in a NON-compliant position. What will those shareholders do if you have earned the credits, but those credits are essentially worthless?

"Will any economic analysis be done before COP6?" asked John Palmisano. He softly summarized,"We are talking about creating money."

Are any delegates listening?

Are any delegates investors?

October 29, 1999 -- by Floy Lilley, J.D.
Q: WHAT ARE SOME OF THE UNDERCURRENTS AT COP5?

A: EDDIES ABOUND, BUT A "GO WITH THE FLOW" RIPTIDE GRABS ALL.

The positions that make this world so interesting surface every day at this climate change conference. Most make a lot of sense when you consider what a nation is being asked to do in order to go along with this global intervention into all matters economic.

A few examples illustrate some positions:

- **Russia** has basically said that she won't sell any of her hot air until the value of those tradable emissions is higher. Hot air is about all the country has. Might as well hold out for a high market. She thinks the time will not be right for another thirteen years.

- **Turkey** is trying to exit from the ranks of committed nations. Does she see more technology transferring to her if she is on the outside? Others bristle at the loose precedent that letting Turkey leave would set.

- **Kazakhstan** is begging to get onto the same list Turkey is trying to get off. Would some big emitter be behind this effort? Kazakhstan, like Russia, is mainly a source of hot air. Does she see a future transfer of hot air for technology [spelled $$$]?

- **Japan** is asking a question that sounds like "Who's the father?" Everything Japan needs has to be shipped or flown to her. The difficulties in differentiating emissions resulting from national and international fuel is problematic for this island nation. If the fuel has originated in an OPEC nation, but has been transported to and used by another nation, whose emission is it? Those of paper and lumber will match this bunker fuels' paternity suit dilemma if wood products are included in carbon stocks. Not surprisingly, Australia, New Zealand and The Republic of Korea support Japan's concerns.

- **China** joins the Saudis and the Philippines in stressing that their countries should receive technology transfers unrelated to any CDM (Clean Development Mechanism). They want the technology now and they do not want the hassle of the bureaucrats that will be involved in UN mechanisms. They are accurate in saying that this technology transfer was already a prior commitment under the UNFCC (the original Convention on Climate Change of 1992).

- **United States** won the environmentalists? "Fossil of the Day" award for attempting to delay COP6 until after its presidential elections.

Then comes the main current.
It rushes and gushes and sweeps over every little eddy.

The deep and surging powers of the go-with-the-flow forces prevail. They declare that, even if human-induced catastrophic global warming were known to be NOT a problem, your country will be left behind in global commerce and position if you do not jump into the current.

Get busy sewing the Emperor's clothes.

October 28, 1999 -- by Floy Lilley, J.D.

Q: HOW WILL GREENPEACE CLOSE THE ELECTRICAL GENERATION GAP IN 2020?

A: "BIOMASS."

What gap?

The gap exposed by the following tale:

Greenpeace in collaboration with European Wind Energy Association (EWEA) and German Wind Energy Promotion Association (FGW) described yesterday an aggressive program to expand wind power generation from a current 0.15% of world electricity supply to 10.0% by 2020.

Based on the assumption of a doubling of demand for electricity during the twenty-year period, their projected wind power generation would be equivalent to 20% of present world production, or an amount equal to the present contribution to the world by nuclear power.

Between now and 2020, however, fossil fuel generation will have to be kept constant or reduced to comply with the potential Kyoto Protocol, implying a drop to 36% from 73% current total world production by 2020. Acknowledging that hydropower has little room to expand, a drop to 9% from current 18% levels is anticipated.

Thus, the total make up of electricity supply in 2020 will be 45% from existing fossil and hydro sources, plus 10% from wind power. That totals 55%.

This leaves a gap of 45% in the world's electricity demand.

A gap of this magnitude can only be filled by nuclear power if increased carbon dioxide emissions are prohibited. But, Greenpeace's position opposing nuclear is well known. That opposition surfaced when Karl Mallon accused the nuclear industry of "opportunism by taking advantage of climate change, while ignoring problems down the track."
Don Schutz, NGO representative for the American Nuclear Society (as is this author), unabashedly asked the panel, "What is going to be the source of the energy needed to fill the 45% gap?"

"Biomass," was the reply.

"That's a lot of biomass," retorted Schutz.

"Well, besides biomass, it would include geothermal, photovoltaics, and other alternative energy sources," offered Andreas from FWG.

Realistically, what kind of market can wind power find?

Even though Mallon had asserted that "Wind power doesn't cost money," he must have meant compared with coal or nuclear plants. Wind power certainly does cost money. Its financial success is heavily dependent upon government intervention through subsidies, tax incentives and regulatory preferences. Mallon wants windfalls for wind power and he wants subsidies stripped from fossil fuel and nuclear power generators. He complained, "Coal and nuclear, with current subsidies, keep wind out."

But, Andreas with FGW suggested that Mallon might find that government largesse is not enough. He strongly emphasized, "We learned in Denmark in '80, Germany in '90, and Spain in the mid-90's that first a country needs markets [to sustain wind turbine energy production]."

Venturing an additional question as the session wound to a close, Schutz queried, "Do you envision any opposition from environmental groups because of the recognized problems of noise, bird kills, and land-use associated with wind turbine generation?"

"Obviously wind is OK if Greenpeace is supporting it," Mallon asserted.

Trust me.

October 27, 1999 -- by Floy Lilley, J.D.

Q: WHEN IS YOUR COTTON CROP "KYOTO LAND?"

A: WHEN "FOREST" INCLUDES HARVEST AND REGENERATION.

Just what can you do with land that can offset the allegedly harmful effects of your use of energy?

What land use captures the carbon dioxide you just released?
That was the subject of Tuesday's significant meeting. It was a side event that aired a report handed to 160 represented governments for review. The UN scientists with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) made game attempts to clarify issues involved in the global warming treaty [Art 3.3 & 3.4] called "sinks."

Carbon "sinks" collect carbon. Carbon "sinks" exist in the land, sea and air. Everywhere carbon, especially carbon dioxide, is captured, or sequestered, is a carbon "sink" with its "carbon stock."

The IPCC presentation was about land-use, land-use change, and forestry. And, yes, that is referred to as "LULUCF." These terrestrial carbon stocks include the soil itself, the roots of all vegetation and, of course, any forests upon the land.

Hmm.

But, when is a forest a forest?

How is carbon stock to be accounted?

How deep into the ground do you measure?

How are changes to carbon stock to be monitored?

Are crops, like cotton, which are planted, harvested, then replanted, included in these "Kyoto Lands?"

And, when is land "Kyoto Land?"

Bert Bolin is the lead author of the report. Bolin called upon Bob Watson and Ian Noble to help him explain "Kyoto Lands." They are all lands upon which direct human-induced activities [e.g., planting or cutting] have taken place and some lands where indirect [e.g., CO2 fertilization] human-induced activities have taken place. Kyoto Lands are certainly lands where aforestation, reforestation, or deforestation (ARD) has occurred. They may be able to be identified once there is any agreement as to what forest is.

Is a forest to be a forest because of the number of trunks? The coverage of leafy canopy? The carbon density of growth? Any final definition and any single threshold on what constitutes "forest" will produce problems. People can be relied upon to seek loopholes in land-use policy.

How is rapidly decaying "forest" to be counted? Is it stock (you win) or emission (you lose)?

How is drying wetland to be counted? Its soil is losing carbon. Is that emission (you lose again)?
Is the withdrawal of active tree management direct human-induced activity or indirect activity (you lose either way)?

Is carbon accounting to be full and costly (you lose) or selective and speculative (you lose again)?

Are wood products like paper and furniture to be counted where they are produced or where they are eventually used (like the bunker fuels issue)?

Will reduced tillage, better fertilizer management, low-impact logging, or soil conservation be included in human-induced activities that might be calculated?

Will value be added for biodiversity?

Valid data on aboveground biomass are scarce enough. Soil data are scarcer still. Figures on forestation and deforestation are lacking. Noble sees these obstacles as the clear mandate that the UN "must monitor everything or we will never know if the Kyoto Protocol has been achieved."

One minor glitch was mentioned.

Bolin says the planet is currently in a "net sink" position. More CO2 is being stored than emitted.

Bolin says, "things are growing better because carbon dioxide is fertilizer to plants. Plants are greening and growing so well that they are sucking up all the extra carbon dioxide. The planet can expect to be a net sink for several more decades."

Then Bolin says, "because we can not know beyond those decades, we must curtail emissions now."

This entire topic is complex, challenging and interesting.

I would launch a business making "Kyoto Land" signs for cotton fields, if I were not convinced that this LULUCF activity is yet another sad demonstration of bureaucrats in search of a cause.

October 26, 1999 -- by Floy Lilley, J.D.

Q: WAS THE KEYNOTE SPEECH ON OPENING DAY INSPIRATIONAL?

A: ONLY IF YOU CONSIDER THAT IT MIGHT INSPIRE THE COMMITTEE TO SECURE A DIFFERENT SPEAKER NEXT TIME.

He sounded more like Bonn's Mayor than Bonn's Mayor did. Gerhard Schroder, Chancellor of the
Federal Republic of Germany, launched into his prepared remarks with campaign-like promises to bring more and more United Nations organizations to the city.

The final six pages of his speech focused on the BIG problems of "above all, global warming" and "meteoric population growth."

Schroder offered three solutions: 1) "an eco-tax," 2) an "increase in energy taxes," and 3) continued taxation and "any necessary further measures."

The Chancellor boasted that "the German Government has decided to phase out [nuclear] technology." He called for "renewable forms," an "Energy Savings Ordinance," "vehicles which use less fuel," a "shift from transport by road to rail," and "energy-saving appliances."

He continued on his embarrassing round up of the usual suspects by railing against bad weather.

Winding down, Schroder scolded, "No one should be allowed to talk their way out of taking action by pointing out remaining uncertainty among scientists."

And, in a remark that the United States could also take as intended toward them, he pushed that "emissions trading or joint projects can be no replacement for [domestic] efforts."

An inspirational speaker would have told us how to fight speculative global warming without drastically raising energy prices. Policies that weaken wealth weaken health.

**Q: WHY WOULD CHOOSING A MEETING DATE LEAD TO HOT TEMPERS?**

**A: IT WOULDN'T NORMALLY.**

"The US has an election in the fall of 2000 to attend. They have asked that COP6 be held in the spring of 2001 to accommodate that political fact. Some countries have made a big deal out of sacrificing their customary timetable for the US' sake. It is not worth making this an issue." -- Written 11 June 1999.

This would not be worth dredging up if it had not boiled over yesterday.

Did the leader of the pack know exactly what he was stirring up fourteen days ago in New York? Michael Cutajar, Executive Secretary of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, stressed several times in a speech there that COP6 would be November 2000. He glowed of the November 2000 date as "being a peak as significant as those in 1992, 1995 and 1997 [in the history of this conference]."

Cutajar stressed that the Convention's rules require an annual meeting and that it is, nonetheless,
desirable to meet often in order to "keep the private sector engaged."

Could Cutajar's move be political hardball to inject muscle into anti-United States forces?

Delegates to the International Criminal Court displayed that kind of bravado when they defeated one U.S. amendment in Rome. There were stirring cheers then. The world does love underdogs.

Cutajar knows the date is problematic. Why the fresh insistence? Is it a way to show others how to thumb their noses at the superpower? 

October 25, 1999 -- by Floy Lilley, J.D.

**Q: IS THIS MEETING ABOUT GLOBAL DELIVERANCE OR GLOBAL DECEPTION?**

**A: GREEN IDEOLOGY MIXES A BIT OF THE FIRST AND A BUNCH OF THE OTHER TO COMMAND THAT THE PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLE REQUIRES TECHNOLOGY FORCING BY DEVELOPED COUNTRIES. IT IS A FALSE PREMISE DRIVING AN UNWORKABLE UTOPIAN IDEA.**

Scotch and security are buzzwords at the opening to COP5 - the 5th Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change.

"I always bring a bottle of scotch to these events, and I don't normally have even two beers in a whole year," confessed a USA member of the press. A G-77 representative confided, "Delegates are being put up in places other than the Maritim this time for security reasons."

These are the preparations two individuals made for this two-week meeting of five thousand attendees.

What thoughtful preparations has the U.S. Delegation made before it leaps into this briarpatch?

Does the U.S. Delegation know that a chief climatologist of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is completely puzzled as to why two-thirds of the half-a-degree Celsius substantiated warming that has taken place in the past one hundred years took place before 1940 - before there was any build-up in carbon dioxide levels? Dr. Robert Balling wonders why no computer model is able to explain this. Balling considers this failing to be fatal to the global warming theory. The treaty is based upon computer model predictions when those models do not accurately portray the actual climate that has occurred.

Does the U.S. Delegation know that Professor Bert Bolin, chairman emeritus of the IPCC, has said that the science of climate change has "considerable uncertainties" and that the climate system is "only partly predictable"? The treaty is based upon computer models as if climate changes were certain and
predictable.

Does the U.S. Delegation know that the NASA scientist who started all this global warming hysteria has changed his mind? In the Journal of the National Academy of Sciences James Hansen granted that using computer models to predict temperature changes was not scientific. The forces that drive long-term climate change are not known with an accuracy sufficient to define future climate change,? he said. The treaty pretends that future climate changes are knowable.

Does the U.S. Delegation know that another IPCC member and U.S. DOE economist has declared that "the target [of the Kyoto Protocol] is unachievable even with all three flexible mechanisms put to full use"? The main reason Robert Reinstein concludes that the targets are unachievable is because the infrastructure makes every timeframe completely unrealistic. The capital stock of electric utilities, transportation, manufacturing, and buildings require between ten and eighty years for replacement, not the brief eight to twelve years under the Kyoto Protocol. Reinstein finds few analyses ever address this economic flaw. Reinstein concludes that it is "imprudent to create policy on this bad data. It is irresponsible for politicians to distort science." The treaty pretends that neither economics nor science matters.

Does the U.S. Delegation pay any attention to the chairman of the U.S. House Committee on Science? "To be perfectly blunt, the Kyoto Protocol is seriously flawed - so flawed, in fact, that it cannot be salvaged. The Kyoto treaty is based on immature science, costs too much, leaves too many procedural questions unanswered, is grossly unfair because developing countries are not required to participate, and will do nothing to solve the speculative problem it is intended to solve." Thus, Representative E. James Sensenbrenner (R-Wisconsin) concludes that the treaty is unfounded, unfair and unworkable. The treaty pretends to be founded, fair and workable.

Let the false premise driving an unworkable utopian idea begin. Welcome to COP5.

________________________________________
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