

E-news update March 20 2006

In this issue:

POLICY

1.1. German environment minister slams commission energy paper / Economic minister said energy efficiency will play a "central role" in the German EU presidency in 2007

ENERGY AND EMISSIONS

- 2.1. G8 Energy Ministerial Meeting, 15-16 March 2006, Moscow, Russia
- 2.2. Massive solar project targets 88 villages in Botswana
- 2.3. US Hopes to Reverse Oil Decline by Burying CO₂

CLIMATE IMPACTS

- 3.1. Northern Ozone Pollution Spurs Arctic Warming – NASA
- 3.2. Climate change 'irreversible' as Arctic sea ice fails to re-form

CONFERENCES

- 4.1. Methane to Markets Subcommittee Meetings registration open
- 4.2. Facilitating Multi Stakeholder Processes and Social Learning
- 4.3. Interactive forest and nature policy in practice; managing multi stakeholder learning in sector wide approaches and national forest programmes

PUBLICATIONS

- 5.1. CD4CDM working paper series
- 5.2. Hotspot Issue 41
- 5.3. 'Sourcebook for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry Projects'
- 5.4. IRES Volume 6 Number 1
- 5.5. Priority issues in the Mediterranean environment

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 6.1. Opening of call for public input on draft JI PDD form
- 6.2. Press and media accreditation for the UNFCCC May sessions is now open
- 6.3. COGENchallenge Newsflash

POLICY

1.1. German environment minister slams commission energy paper / Economic minister said energy efficiency will play a "central role" in the German EU presidency in 2007

15 March 2006, EUObserver, <http://euobserver.com/?aid=21130&rk=1>

German environment minister Sigmar Gabriel has sharply criticised the European Commission for focusing too heavily on energy security, while disregarding renewable energy and spending too much cash on nuclear power. According to the German daily Handelsblatt, Mr Gabriel formulated his criticism in a position paper for his own social democrat SPD party.

The German minister argues the commission's energy paper, presented last week, demonstrated a one-sided interest in the security of energy provision, when other goals like the fight against climate change should be given equal weight.

"The real challenge consists of a joint achievement of these goals," the minister writes.

He argued the EU should formulate clear targets for renewable energy by 2010 as well as define a post-2020 strategy against global warming.

Mr Gabriel also stated that Brussels' spending on nuclear research is disproportionate given the fact that a majority of member states have opted not to produce atomic energy.

"The commission should take note: the clear majority of member states – 17 out of 25 – runs no nuclear plants. Not a single one of these states has so far considered entering this form of power supply."

The German politician suggested the budget for Euratom, the EU's nuclear supply agency, should be shifted to other forms of energy supply.

Between 2002 to 2006, the EU spent €1.23 billion on nuclear research, "two and a half times as much as EU research money on all forms of renewable energy put together," Mr Gabriel writes.

National sovereignty: On top of this, the minister spoke out strongly in favour of national sovereignty over member states' "energy mix," describing plans to organise different forms of energy provision at the EU level as "adventurous."

The remark is in line with the general sentiment in national capitals on Brussels' drive to create an EU energy policy.

Energy ministers meeting in Brussels on Tuesday (14 March) issued a joint statement which contained strong wording on "fully respecting" member states' "sovereignty" on the key issues of which type of energy to use and where to get it from.

The joint statement also did not mention European Commission ideas on creating a common energy regulator.

German energy debate: Mr Gabriel's position paper partly reflects the ambition of his own SPD party to fully phase out nuclear power, as decided by the previous German government led by SPD chancellor Gerhard Schroder.

But the SPD is now the smallest partner in a coalition led by the conservative CDU/CSU of chancellor Angela Merkel.

CDU/CSU politicians have indicated Germany might reconsider its goal to remove nuclear power from its "energy mix" altogether in view of supply security and climate change goals.

Meanwhile, Ms Merkel wants to double Germany's energy efficiency by 2010, according to internal government papers seen by Die Welt.

A "national initiative" with this aim should be launched at a national energy summit on 3 April.

Berlin's economic minister Michael Glos said energy efficiency will play a "central role" in the German EU presidency in 2007.

ENERGY AND EMISSIONS

2.1. G8 Energy Ministerial Meeting, 15-16 March 2006, Moscow, Russia

<http://en.g8russia.ru/news/20060316/1145487.html>

Chair's statement

1. G8 Energy Ministers met in Moscow on 15-16 March 2006 in order to discuss the matters of mutual interest related to global energy security.
2. The reliable energy supply plays a key role in development of world's economies bearing in mind that the well-being, way and quality of life of people directly depend on access to energy.
3. Ministers are aware that the 21st century is sure to witness a significant increase of the global consumption of energy, primarily by dynamically developing economies. Despite the increased presence of alternative sources in the energy mix, the fossil fuels will remain the basis of the world energy industry for at least the first half of the 21st century.
4. Ministers discussed the challenges to the global energy security, issues related to promotion of market efficiency of the fuel and energy sector. We note that meeting energy security challenges will require reliance on market-oriented approaches aimed at increasing energy supply and stemming growth in demand, while encouraging market-based pricing, competition, energy efficiency, and conservation.
5. Ministers point out the importance of further development and strengthening of dialogue among energy producer, transit and consumer countries, including information exchange on the current situation as well as medium- and long-term plans and programmes of development of their respective energy sectors.
6. Ministers confirm our support for appropriate international initiatives such as the Joint Oil Data Initiative aimed at greater accessibility and transparency of data on reserves, demand and supply, stocks and production capacities.
7. Ministers note that a stable future of the international energy sector requires significant investment in the production, transportation and processing of energy resources. We recognize that to attract investment it is essential for countries to have open and favourable investment regimes including stable and predictable regulations, clear tax laws, and efficient administrative procedures as well as fair and reciprocal access to markets along the energy value chain.

8. Ministers favour the implementation of the Action plan adopted last year by our leaders in Gleneagles which includes a wide range of measures to promote innovations, increase energy efficiency and enhance environmental protection.

9. Ministers proceed from the fact that diversification of the energy portfolio in terms of energy sources, suppliers and consumers as well as delivery methods and routes will reduce energy security risks not only for individual countries but for the entire international community. Joint efforts of the G8 and other countries aimed at wider use of renewable and alternative energies, development and implementation of innovative energy technologies and development of low-carbon energy would contribute substantially to the solution of this strategic task. For those countries that wish, wide-scale development of safe and secure nuclear energy is crucial for long-term environmentally sustainable diversification of energy supply.

10. Ministers agree that continued international cooperation to develop the low carbon technologies of the future will be crucial. Facilitating development and deployment of innovative energy technology solutions will have longer term environmental, economic and energy security benefits and be key to a global sustainable energy future.

11. A significant reduction of the gap in energy supply between developed and undersupplied less-developed countries is a major aspect of global energy security.

2.2. Massive solar project targets 88 villages in Botswana

8 March 2006

A massive solar-based rural electrification of at least 88 villages is expected to be rolled out countrywide mid this year. Finance Minister Baledzi Gaolathe announced the P34 million National Rural Photovoltaic Electrification Programme during the 2005-2006 budget. He noted that the aim of the project is to improve access to energy services in rural areas and promote the use of renewable energy.

The five-year programme is intended to help households to acquire solar power systems on affordable terms. It is jointly sponsored by the government (P19 million) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (P15 million). Government has previously dabbled in solar-based projects though with little success. The most ambitious of these is the forerunner project to the current one. It was administered through the Rural Industries Promotions Company (RIPCO) and it ran from 1997-2001. It has been reviewed and reintroduced in the present format mentioned by Gaolathe in the budget. Kesetsenao Molosiwa, the principal energy officer in the Ministry of Minerals, Energy and Water Resources attributed the apparent failure of the earlier project to poor repayment rate since it operated as a revolving fund. It appears it is against this background of not-so-successful implementation that the Department of Energy in earnest joined forces with major developmental players like the UNDP and the Botswana Power Corporation (BPC) to map out the way forward in November 2001. The Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) was roped in to develop the Botswana Photovoltaic Master Plan, which included pilot projects at Motlhabaneng (Bobirwa Sub-District) Lerolwane (Southern District) and Khudumatse (Central District). With the necessary groundwork covered, the BPC has been tasked with implementing the programme on behalf of government. Molosiwa said the programme will target villages that are unlikely to be serviced by the BPC national grid network at least in the next 10 years. The other major criterion for the potential beneficiaries is population and location or buffer zone. "For the village to be selected for PV, it must be a minimum distance of 15 km from existing and future grid network. It must also have a population of between 250 and 1200 households," Molosiwa said. He added that the considerations were based on the figures of the last census. He was quick to point out the criterion was not rigid as other considerations were taken aboard. "Villages that fall under this criterion are not so many, we have been flexible to cover even villages in the range of 64 to 100 people in some instances." Unlike the RIIC-operated programme, the current one offers a highly subsidised package. The government will fund 80 percent of the total cost of the equipment installed. The client then pays only 20 percent of the costs.

Molosiwa disclosed that the package includes the PV Panels and Battery Bank, Solar Water Heating System (geysers) and LP Gas with a cooker. "The PV can do almost everything that a client wants. It is just a matter of affordability. The more equipment you install, the more the output. Even the autonomy period (when there is no sunshine) is also dependent on the capacity of the battery bank." Alban Motsepe, the BPC Manager - Rural Division who is also in charge of the PV programme is convinced that the hefty government subsidy will play the critical promotional role in the utilisation of

solar-based energy that aims to service all demographic categories. He said for the actual implementation, the BPC intends to outsource expertise from the private sector. "One of the fundamentals of this programme is to involve the private sector as much as possible. This is good for sustainability. We intend to engage many small competent local companies that have been involved with solar-based energy to ensure longevity of the programme."

Motsepe is optimistic about the sustainability of the programme. "It is a programme, not a project - thus it has only the beginning not the end.

And the ultimate aim is to have everybody having access to modern energy sources." Website: www.mmegi.bw.

2.3. US Hopes to Reverse Oil Decline by Burying CO2

14 March 2006, Planet Ark

Wanted: carbon dioxide. Large quantity needed to help superpower reverse declining oil output and halt rising emissions of heat-trapping gases.

The Department of Energy and some environmentalists hope that in coming decades oil companies will expand programs that boost the output of aging oilfields by injecting the gas most scientists call the main culprit in global warming.

Since the early 1980s, almost as long as US oil output has been waning, companies have been pumping small amounts of CO2 into old Texas oilfields to force to the surface remaining crude that is trapped between complicated rock formations.

Depending on the price of oil and CO2, the United States could quadruple its oil reserves to 89 billion barrels, by pumping more of the gas into oilfields, the Department of Energy said in a report earlier this month.

But to get to that prize the United States would need 350 trillion cubic feet, more than 10 times the amount in natural underground deposits of the gas, said Vello Kuuskraa, president of Advanced Resources International, whose study the DOE quoted.

"The great bulk of the CO2 is going to have to come from industrial sources," said Kuuskraa. Currently 80 percent of CO2 pumped into US oilfields comes from those natural deposits, such as the Bravo dome in New Mexico, of which Occidental Corp owns a majority share.

Taking CO2 from natural sources does nothing to cut emissions of the gas from coal-and-natural-gas-burning power plants, the source of 40 percent of CO2 emissions.

With incentives, CO2 could be captured from power plants helping companies to sell credits in future cap and trade emissions markets.

"Tragically in this era when we are worried about global warming and overloading the earth's atmosphere with CO2, most of enhanced oil recovery is served by pulling CO2 out of holes in the ground...and sticking it back into the ground rather than capturing it from huge industrial sources," said David Hawkins, a climate expert at the Natural Resource Defense Council in Washington, DC.

Incentives: Equipment can capture CO2 at fossil fuel-burning power plants, but the technology, in its infancy, is expensive.

Utilities, such as American Electric Power and Cinergy Corp, are building clean-burning coal plants to which the equipment can be added more cheaply than conventional plants. But until the CO2-capturing technology becomes cheaper, or is required by law, they have no plans to add it to their plants.

US utilities can't earn credits for reducing emissions as their European counterparts can in an emissions trading scheme set up under the Kyoto Protocol. President George W Bush pulled the United States out of the pact.

But seven states in the Northeast are trying to create a market in which power plants that cut emissions can sell credits to companies that chose not to cut emissions. Other states, including California, hope to follow their lead.

And incentives for oil companies to bury more CO2 could be forthcoming. Under last year's Energy Act, the Bureau of Land Management and the Minerals Management Service are considering whether to extend incentives to oil companies that pump CO2 into offshore and on land oilfields.

Oil majors did not comment on whether they are planning in coming years to expand the production of US oil with CO2.

But in a report last month Exxon Mobil Corp said carbon capture and storage is an "important option to address global CO2 emissions." BP Plc and Occidental are considering injecting CO2 from power generation at aging California oilfields.

In addition, Royal Dutch Shell Plc and Norway's state oil company Statoil said last week they are planning the world's biggest scheme to bury CO2 from power plants off Norway. The \$1.5 billion plan, due to start after 2010, would be the world's first project to use CO2 offshore.

Hurdles: Costs could be a concern. Kuuskraa said producing much of the technically recoverable 89 billion barrels in the United States would make economic sense as long as the oil price remains above \$30 a barrel. The price of CO2 itself, currently about \$1 per thousand cubic feet, would have to fall to about 75 to 80 cents.

At current costs, purchasing CO2 can cost oil companies about \$6 for every barrel produced with the technology.

Beyond the expense, some environmentalists are concerned about the permanence of CO2 burial especially in oilfields which by definition have been drilled repeatedly over the years. They also worry the gas could leak after the fields are fully drained of oil and forgotten about.

Kuuskraa said the cost of CO2 means that companies have incentive to properly stop up drilling holes. And NRDC's Hawkins is hopeful. "We think that it's technical feasible to keep the CO2 down there forever," he said.

CLIMATE IMPACTS

3.1. Northern Ozone Pollution Spurs Arctic Warming – NASA

15 March 2006, Planet Ark

Ozone pollution in the Northern Hemisphere, churned out by factories and vehicles that burn fossil fuels, is a major factor in the dramatic warming of the Arctic zone, NASA climate scientists reported on Tuesday.

This finding is surprising, since ozone has been considered a minor player in the study of global climate change, according to Drew Shindell, a research scientist at NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York City.

Carbon dioxide has long been considered a key cause of overall global warming, because it remains in the atmosphere for a long time, Shindell said in a telephone interview.

But ozone - the damaging, heat-trapping tropospheric ozone encountered at lower levels of the atmosphere, as opposed to the protective ozone observed at higher altitude - was seen as fairly perishable and therefore less of a factor, he said.

Globally, ozone accounts for perhaps one-seventh of the global warming and climate change that carbon dioxide does, Shindell said. However, a new study of climate change over the past 100 years indicates that ozone may be responsible for as much as 50 percent of the warming in the Arctic zone.

This is because many of the world's most highly industrialized nations are in the Northern Hemisphere, and at relatively high latitudes. For most of the year, that means the ozone produced in these countries is blown by prevailing winds north and east, toward the Arctic Circle.

"Instead of being this tiny player, (ozone) can be more like 30 or 40 or even 50 percent of the cause of warming that we're seeing in the Arctic now," Shindell said. "It's very dramatic."

In computer models using climate data going back to 1880, environmental scientists found Arctic temperatures remained normal until about 1950. After that, the model shows higher temperatures, widely spread around the Arctic region.

This rise in temperatures is linked to the rise in tropospheric ozone at northern latitudes, Shindell said. "Global warming has really taken off since the 1970s," he said. "The warming in the past several decades has been more than it was the whole previous record, which is about 100 years before that."

Arctic warming has been more extreme than global warming overall, he said, because as snow and ice melt they uncover darker-coloured ground or water that absorbs heat, accelerating warming.

Story by Deborah Zabarenko.

3.2. Climate change 'irreversible' as Arctic sea ice fails to re-form

15 March 2006, <http://news.independent.co.uk/environment/article351135.ece>

By Steve Connor, Science Editor:

Sea ice in the Arctic has failed to re-form for the second consecutive winter, raising fears that global warming may have tipped the polar regions in to irreversible climate change far sooner than predicted.

Satellite measurements of the area of the Arctic covered by sea ice show that for every month this winter, the ice failed to return even to its long-term average rate of decline. It is the second consecutive winter that the sea ice has not managed to re-form enough to compensate for the unprecedented melting seen during the past few summers.

Scientists are now convinced that Arctic sea ice is showing signs of both a winter and a summer decline that could indicate a major acceleration in its long-term rate of disappearance. The greatest fear is that an environmental "positive feedback" has kicked in, where global warming melts ice which in itself causes the seas to warm still further as more sunlight is absorbed by a dark ocean rather than being reflected by white ice.

Mark Serreze, a sea ice specialist at the US National Snow and Ice Data Centre in Colorado, said: "In September 2005, the Arctic sea ice cover was at its lowest extent since satellite monitoring began in 1979, and probably the lowest in the past 100 years. While we can't be certain, it looks like 2006 will be more of the same," Dr Serreze said.

"Unless conditions turn colder, we may be headed for another year of big sea ice losses, rivalling or perhaps even exceeding what we saw in September 2005. We are of course monitoring the situation closely ... Coupled with recent findings from Nasa that the Greenland ice sheet may be near a tipping point, it's pretty clear that the Arctic is starting to respond to global warming," he added.

Although sea levels are not affected by melting sea ice - which floats on the ocean - the Arctic ice cover is thought to be a key moderator of the northern hemisphere's climate. It helps to stabilise the massive land glaciers and ice sheets of Greenland which have the capacity to raise sea levels dramatically.

Dr Serreze said that some parts of the northern hemisphere experienced very low temperatures this winter, but the Arctic was much warmer than normal. "Even in January, when there were actually record low temperatures in Alaska and parts of Russia, it was still very warm over the Arctic Ocean," he said.

"The sea ice cover waxes and wanes with the seasons. It partly melts in spring and summer, then grows back in autumn and winter. It has not recovered well this past winter - ice extent for every month since September 2005 has been far below average. And it's been so warm in the Arctic that the ice that has grown this winter is probably rather thin," he explained.

Professor Peter Wadhams, of Cambridge University, who was the first Briton to monitor Arctic sea ice from nuclear submarines, said: "One of the big changes this winter is that a large area of the Barents Sea has remained ice-free for the first time. This is part of Europe's 'back yard'. Climate models did predict a retreat of sea ice in the Barents Sea but not for a few decades yet, so it is a sign that the changes that were predicted are indeed happening, but much faster than predicted."

Sea ice in the Arctic has failed to re-form for the second consecutive winter, raising fears that global warming may have tipped the polar regions in to irreversible climate change far sooner than predicted.

Satellite measurements of the area of the Arctic covered by sea ice show that for every month this winter, the ice failed to return even to its long-term average rate of decline. It is the second consecutive winter that the sea ice has not managed to re-form enough to compensate for the unprecedented melting seen during the past few summers.

Scientists are now convinced that Arctic sea ice is showing signs of both a winter and a summer decline that could indicate a major acceleration in its long-term rate of disappearance. The greatest fear is that an environmental "positive feedback" has kicked in, where global warming melts ice which in itself causes the seas to warm still further as more sunlight is absorbed by a dark ocean rather than being reflected by white ice.

Mark Serreze, a sea ice specialist at the US National Snow and Ice Data Centre in Colorado, said: "In September 2005, the Arctic sea ice cover was at its lowest extent since satellite monitoring began in 1979, and probably the lowest in the past 100 years. While we can't be certain, it looks like 2006 will be more of the same," Dr Serreze said.

"Unless conditions turn colder, we may be headed for another year of big sea ice losses, rivalling or perhaps even exceeding what we saw in September 2005. We are of course monitoring the situation closely ... Coupled with recent findings from Nasa that the Greenland ice sheet may be near a tipping point, it's pretty clear that the Arctic is starting to respond to global warming," he added.

Although sea levels are not affected by melting sea ice - which floats on the ocean - the Arctic ice cover is thought to be a key moderator of the northern hemisphere's climate. It helps to stabilise the massive land glaciers and ice sheets of Greenland which have the capacity to raise sea levels dramatically.

Dr Serreze said that some parts of the northern hemisphere experienced very low temperatures this winter, but the Arctic was much warmer than normal. "Even in January, when there were actually record low temperatures in Alaska and parts of Russia, it was still very warm over the Arctic Ocean," he said.

"The sea ice cover waxes and wanes with the seasons. It partly melts in spring and summer, then grows back in autumn and winter. It has not recovered well this past winter - ice extent for every month since September 2005 has been far below average. And it's been so warm in the Arctic that the ice that has grown this winter is probably rather thin," he explained.

Professor Peter Wadhams, of Cambridge University, who was the first Briton to monitor Arctic sea ice from nuclear submarines, said: "One of the big changes this winter is that a large area of the Barents Sea has remained ice-free for the first time. This is part of Europe's 'back yard'. Climate models did predict a retreat of sea ice in the Barents Sea but not for a few decades yet, so it is a sign that the changes that were predicted are indeed happening, but much faster than predicted."

CONFERENCES

4.1. Methane to Markets Subcommittee Meetings registration open

The Methane to Markets Partnership is pleased to announce the dates for the spring Subcommittee Meetings.

Oil and Gas Subcommittee - 27 April 2006 - Villahermosa, Mexico

Landfill Subcommittee - 12 May 2006 - Cologne, Germany

Coal Subcommittee - 22-23 May 2006 - Tuscaloosa, Alabama, USA

Registration for the subcommittee meetings is free and available online! Each subcommittee meeting is being held in conjunction with informative technical workshops. Please see below for details on each meeting:

Oil & Gas Subcommittee Meeting

27 April 2006, Villahermosa, Mexico

The Oil & Gas Subcommittee meeting is being held in conjunction with the Methane to Markets Partnership Oil and Natural Gas Technology Transfer Workshop and Plant Tour 25-26 April. The workshop will offer a great opportunity to learn about specific technologies and techniques applicable to both PEMEX operations and oil and gas operations outside of Mexico that can cost effectively reduce methane emissions loss. There will also be a one day tour of tour of PEMEX's Oil and Gas facility to provide a hands-on perspective of economic technologies and practices to keep more methane in the pipeline instead of the atmosphere. For additional information about the Technology Transfer Workshop, Plant Tour, or Subcommittee Meeting please visit: <http://www.methanetomarkets.org/events/index.htm>.

Landfill Methane Subcommittee Meeting

12 May 2006, Cologne, Germany

At this meeting the Landfill Subcommittee will discuss the Action Plan developed at the last meeting in November 2005; status of ongoing and planned activities and projects; addressing barriers to project development; and planning for future activities. Several year one accomplishments included the successful co-sponsorship of a World Bank Landfill Project Expo; conducted a landfill gas training course in Russia; began a international landfill database to track projects and identify target landfills for potential project development; and creation of a bibliography of existing landfill gas documents, tools, and resources. The Subcommittee will expand upon these successful efforts in 2006 and YOUR valuable input is greatly needed to guide the actions of the Subcommittee in the coming year and beyond. For the complete agenda or to register online please visit: <http://www.methanetomarkets.org/events/2006/landfill/landfill-12may06.htm>.

This meeting is held in conjunction with CarbonExpo. One of the largest carbon market conferences in Europe. For more information on CarbonExpo visit: <http://www.carbonexpo.com>.

Coal Mine Methane Subcommittee Meeting

22-23 May 2006, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, USA

This spring's Coal Subcommittee Meeting we will feature a guest speaker discussing the requirements for financing CMM projects. We will discuss our progress on the Action Plan which was developed at the November 2005 meeting in Argentina. We will also hear from country representatives and project network members about their activities, priorities, and needs. This is your opportunity to influence the action items and next steps for the subcommittee! Please join us for this important meeting. For the

complete agenda or to register online please visit:
<http://www.methanetomarkets.org/events/2006/coal/coal-may06.htm>.

The Coal Subcommittee Meeting is being held in conjunction with the 2006 International Coalbed Methane Symposium. The 2006 International Coalbed Methane Symposium is dedicated to the international advancement of the science and technology of unconventional gas extraction and utilization. The focus of this symposium is on the accurate delineation and efficient recovery of both mine-related and stand-alone coalbed methane resources worldwide. The 2006 International Coalbed Methane Symposium offers a series of short courses, concurrent technical sessions and field trips to examine the geology relative to coalbed methane reservoirs and/or a visit to coalbed methane production field operations. For more information about the 2006 International Coalbed Methane Symposium please visit their Web site at: <http://bama.ua.edu/%7Ecoalbed/>.

4.2. Facilitating Multi Stakeholder Processes and Social Learning

11 - 29 September 2006. It is possible to select a two or three week option. The application deadline is August 11th, 2006. Wageningen, The Netherlands.

In today's world, there is a dynamic of power between the state, the economic sphere and civil society that has enormous consequences for the types of changes that are possible and the manner in which social, political and economic change can be brought about. The issues we are confronted with require understanding from new perspectives and the questioning, challenging and changing of old assumptions, paradigms and values. Solutions are often not immediately apparent and uncertainty abounds. Moving forward requires a creative, responsive and adaptive outlook and the capacity needs for learning and innovation becomes paramount.

Topics in the international course "Facilitating Multi Stakeholder Processes and Social Learning" include:

Theoretical and ethical foundations that underpin and justify a particular MSP approach.

Methodologies and tools to design, facilitate and adapt MSPs such as interactive learning, mediation and conflict management.

The role of MSPs in institutional change and social learning.

Applications forms can be requested at training.wi@wur.nl. For more information on the courses, click here: http://www.iac.wur.nl/iac/index2.htm?courses/training2005_2006.htm.

4.3. Interactive forest and nature policy in practice; managing multi stakeholder learning in sector wide approaches and national forest programmes

27 November – 8 December 2006. The application deadline is October 15th, 2006. Bogor, Indonesia.

This two-week course adopts a learning perspective to policy development and implementation. Increasingly policy development in for example national forest programmes or the international dialogue on illegal logging (FLEGT) is perceived as a collaborative learning process. But how to make effective use of stakeholder participation to establish or adjust institutions that provide the framework for broadly supported sustainable resource management? Using the MSP conceptual framework and reflecting on participants' own work experiences, this course is providing an active learning environment to enhance your competencies in coordinating complex policy development and implementation processes. This course, combines on-line learning with an intensive course programme in Bogor Indonesia and is organized in close collaboration with CIFOR's Forest and Governance programme.

For whom? Project/program managers, policy makers, consultants, researchers, NGO staff, community leaders and business managers, who are responsible for managing or facilitating diverse groups of stakeholders. The course is designed for people who already have a basic understanding of participation and some facilitation experience.

Applications forms can be requested at training.wi@wur.nl. For more information on the courses, click here: http://www.iac.wur.nl/iac/index2.htm?courses/training2005_2006.htm.

PUBLICATIONS

5.1. CD4CDM working paper series

The Capacity Development for CDM (CD4CDM) Project at the UNEP RISOE Centre has launched a Working Paper Series. The first paper in the series is entitled "Risks & Chances of Combined Forestry & Biomass Projects under the Clean Development Mechanism", written by Michael Dutschke, Gerald Kapp, Anna Lehmann and Volkmar Schafer.

The paper assesses the realistic potential and the major constraints of combining carbon sink and bio-energy use projects in the CDM. It also provides an overview of the current state of biomass use in developing countries, and suggests a close integration of the Afforestation/Reforestation and Biomass use methodology work under the CDM, with the possibility to bundle these two kinds of project activities.

To view the paper, please visit: <http://www.cd4cdm.org/>.

5.2. Hotspot Issue 41

Hotspot Issue 41 - March 2006 is now available at webpage:

<http://www.climnet.org/hotspot/hotspot.htm>.

In this issue: EU ETS - Use the Tools - reduce now!; No Sinks in the EU ETS; Joint NGO Approach to CC in NL; Translating EU Development Policy into Programming Docs; Montreal and Post 2012 outlook. Plus all the usuals: EU Policy Focus, Hot Docs, Hot Links, Hot Gossip and Calender for this period.

5.3. 'Sourcebook for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry Projects'

Winrock International, together with the BioCarbon Fund of the World Bank, has prepared a 'Sourcebook for Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry Projects'.

The sourcebook provides guidance for those developing, and measuring and monitoring LULUCF projects under the CDM.

The document can be found, along with other Winrock tools, at:

<http://www.winrock.org/Ecosystems/tools.asp>.

5.4. IRES Volume 6 Number 1

IGES - Institute for Global Environmental Strategies- is pleased to announce its new publication, International Review for Environmental Strategies (IRES) Volume 6 Number 1.

Abstracts of each article are available at: http://www.iges.or.jp/en/pub/ires/volume6_1.html.

Price: US\$20 (JPY 2,200) including postage.

For details: <http://www.iges.or.jp/en/pub/ires/ires.html>.

5.5. Priority issues in the Mediterranean environment

EEA Report No 4/2006, published at: http://reports.eea.eu.int/eea_report_2006_4.

Abstract: The environment around the Mediterranean Sea region will not improve until there is the political will to enforce current and future environment legislation, says a new report, launched today. 'Priority issues in the Mediterranean Environment', a joint report by the European Environment Agency (EEA) and the UNEP Mediterranean Action Plan (MAP), was launched at a meeting of the Contracting Parties of the Barcelona Convention, taking place in Portoroz, Slovenia. The report, which scans existing and emerging pollution issues, draws a picture at the regional level but also provides an environmental profile for each of the Mediterranean countries.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

6.1. Opening of call for public input on draft JI PDD form

At its first meeting, the Joint Implementation Supervisory Committee (JISC) agreed on a draft joint implementation project design document (JI PDD) form. At its second meeting, it agreed on draft guidelines for users of the JI PDD form and requested the secretariat to launch a call for public input on the structure and content of the JI PDD form and the respective draft guidelines as well as on the need for development of a separate JI PDD form for LULUCF projects.

Public comments shall be sent to the UNFCCC secretariat by 16 April 2006 (17:00 GMT).

