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**GEOTHERMAL PROMOTERS TOLD TO SEEK OPPORTUNITIES IN CARBON MARKET**  
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from THE JAKARTA POST -- WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2007 -- PAGE 13 The government  
wants geothermal energy promoters to take advantage of global carbon trading  
market as an alternative source of funding to help lower their investment and  
production costs, a minister says  
  
Energy and Mineral Resources Ministry Purnomo Yusgiantoro said Tuesday that  
geothermal energy promoters could benefit hugely from the global carbon credit  
program to compensate for their huge investment costs, thereby allowing them to  
offer competitive tariffs to state power firm PT PLN as their buyer  
  
"Let say that to build a 100-megawatt geothermal power plant, the investors will  
need some $100US million. If the project was eligible for carbon credits, for  
example, credits worth $70 million, that means that the investment would only  
cost $30 million," Purnomo said  
  
The carbon-credit mechanism was created under the Kyoto Protocol to help  
developed nations meet the target of reducing their carbon dioxide emissions by  
5 percent from the 1990 level by 2012  
  
Under the scheme, businesses developing clean projects in developing nations can  
seek compensation in the form of carbon credits, certified by the United Nations  
(UN), and then sell these to the developed nations  
  
Purnomo's remarks came after a recent study by a special ministry committee  
showed that the feasible price for geothermal-generated electricity is around 7  
to 8 U.S. cents per kwh, well above PLN's standard purchase price of around 5  
U.S. cents per kwh  
  
The committee, which was established to come up with a formula for determining  
an economically feasible ceiling price for electricity, said the main reason for  
such a high price was the huge investments geothermal projects require  
  
However, according to Purnomo, the carbon-credit trading mechanism now provides  
a quid pro quo for investors in the geothermal sector  
  
"With lower investment costs, we can expect the price of the electricity to be  
much lower than the 8 U.S. cents per kwh suggested by the committee," he said  
  
Purnomo pointed to three geothermal projects -- Drajat and Kamojang in West Java  
and Lahendong in North Sulawesi -- which he said had secured carbon credit  
certificates worth $156 million  
  
Indonesia has great potential to participate in the carbon-credit market through  
geothermal projects as it is host to 40 percent of the world's reserves  
  
Currently, the country only has seven geothermal plants in operation, which have  
a combined capacity of a mere 852 megawatts  
  
Ika Krismantari, The Jakarta Post, Jakarta Copyright 2007 The Jakarta Post
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BALI, Indonesia - The negotiators at the U.N. climate conference here in Bali  
came from almost 200 countries and spoke almost as many languages, but driving  
them all to find a better way to address climate change was one widely shared,  
if unspoken, sentiment: That "later" is over for our generation.  
  
"Later" was a luxury for previous generations and civilizations. It meant that  
you could paint the same landscape, see the same animals, eat the same fruit,  
climb the same trees, fish the same rivers, enjoy the same weather or rescue the  
same endangered species that you did when you were a kid - but just do it later,  
whenever you got around to it.  
  
If there is one change in global consciousness that seems to have settled in  
over just the past couple of years, it is the notion that later is over. Later  
is no longer when you get to do all those same things - just on your time  
schedule. Later is now when they're gone - when you won't get to do any of them  
ever again, unless there is some radical collective action to mitigate climate  
change, and maybe even if there is.  
  
There are many reasons that later is over. The fact that global warming is now  
having such an observable effect on pillars of our ecosystem - like the frozen  
sea ice within the Arctic Circle, which a new study says could disappear  
entirely during summers by 2040 - is certainly one big factor. But the other is  
the voracious power of today's global economy, which has created a situation in  
which the world is not just getting hot, it is getting raped.  
  
  
Throughout human history there was always some new part of the ocean to plunder,  
some new forest to devour, some new farmlands to exploit, noted Carl Pope,  
executive director of the Sierra Club, who came to observe the Bali conference.  
But "now that economic development has become the prerogative of every country,"  
he said, we've run out of virgin oceans and lands "for new rising economic  
powers to exploit."  
  
So, too many countries are now chasing too few fish, trees and water resources,  
and are either devouring their own or plundering those of neighbors at alarming  
rates.  
  
Indeed, today's global economy has become like a monster truck with the gas  
pedal stuck, so no one can stop it from wiping out more and more of the natural  
world, no matter what the global plan.  
  
There was a chilling essay in The Jakarta Post last week by Andrio Adiwibowo, a  
lecturer in environmental management at the University of Indonesia, about how a  
smart plan to protect the mangrove forests around coastal Jakarta was never  
carried out, leading to widespread tidal flooding last month.  
  
This line jumped out at me: "The plan was not implemented. Instead of providing  
a buffer zone, development encroached into the core zone, which was covered over  
by concrete."  
  
You could read that story in a hundred different developing countries today. But  
the fact that you read it here is one of the most important reasons that later  
has become extinct. Indonesia is second only to Brazil in terrestrial  
biodiversity and is No.1 in the world in marine biodiversity. Just one and a  
half acres in Borneo contains more different tree species than all of North  
America - not to mention animals that don't exist anywhere else on earth. If we  
lose them, there will be no later for some of the rarest plants and animals on  
the planet.  
  
And we are losing them. Market-driven forces emanating primarily from China,  
Europe and America have become so powerful that Indonesia recently made the  
Guinness World Records for having the fastest rate of deforestation in the  
world.  
  
Indonesia is losing tropical forests the size of Maryland every year, and the  
carbon released by the cutting and clearing - much of it from illegal logging -  
has made Indonesia the third largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in the  
world, after the United States and China. Deforestation actually accounts for  
more greenhouse gas emissions than all the cars and trucks in the world, an  
issue the Bali conference finally addressed.

I interviewed Barnabas Suebu, the governor of the Indonesian province of Papua,  
home to some of its richest forests. He waxed eloquent about how difficult it is  
to create jobs that will give his villagers anything close to the income they  
can get from chopping down a tree and selling it to smugglers, who will ship it  
to Malaysia or China to be made into furniture for Americans or Europeans. He  
said his motto was, "Think big, start small, act now - before everything becomes  
too late."  
  
Ditto for all of us. If you want to help preserve the Indonesian forests, think  
fast, start quick, act now. Just don't say later.  
  
Thomas Friedman is a New York Times columnist.
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Global warming is real, but mankind can beat the heat by following the example  
of Europe -- and California -- in getting a start on reducing greenhouse gas  
emissions into the air.  
  
That was Mike Chrisman's "take home" message after a week in Bali, Indonesia, at  
the United Nations conference on climate change.  
  
Chrisman serves as secretary of the California Resources Agency. He hails from  
Visalia, spending weekdays in Sacramento and weekends at the family ranch.  
  
"The argument about global warming is pretty much over," Chrisman said,  
rejecting the belief espoused by critics that global warming is a myth.  
  
Industrial societies make "greenhouse gases" such as carbon dioxide, methane and  
nitrous oxide that get into the air. These gases trap heat in the atmosphere,  
causing a one degree Fahrenheit rise in mean global temperatures (two degrees at  
the poles) over the past 100 years or so, according to the scientists, causing  
the globe's climate to change.  
  
"There will always be doubters on this," Chrisman acknowledged.  
  
But "the scientific evidence is very compelling," he said. "It is happening. You  
look at the rate that glaciers are melting."  
  
  
One thing new that Chrisman learned on the trip is that Indonesia, a nation of  
about 17,000 islands, has lost 30 to 35 islands to rising sea levels -- an  
effect of global warming.  
  
In Bali, Chrisman traded tips with officials from other countries, including the  
environmental minister of Sweden, and folks from nongovernmental organizations.  
  
The California delegation gave its PowerPoint presentation about the state's  
Global Warming Solutions Act, signed into law last year, which establishes a  
"cap and trade" market system to push down greenhouse gas numbers to 1990 levels  
by the year 2020.  
  
"There's going to be a generation or two to slow it down and reverse it,"  
Chrisman said.  
  
It's not just the United States that needs to reduce emissions, he said. China  
and India must get with the program, too.  
  
By the way, just because California is ahead of the Bush administration in  
getting a law on the books does not mean that Republicans like himself and Gov.  
Schwarzenegger have a beef with the White House, he said.  
  
"Good people disagree," Chrisman said. "We just disagree with the national  
administration. California has always been ahead, particularly on environmental  
stuff."  
  
LAW LIBRARY: Tulare County Public Defender Mike Sheltzer and lawyer John Bianco  
have been reappointed to the Tulare County Public Law Library board of directors  
by the Tulare County Board of Supervisors.  
  
The law library, in the basement of the Tulare County Courthouse, is open 8 a.m.  
to 5 p.m. weekdays. It is used by judges, lawyers and the public, said Director  
Anne Bernardo.  
  
About 65% are nonlawyers, many preparing to defend themselves in court or file a  
lawsuit on their own, which is why the "how to litigate" books are popular.  
  
Lewis Griswold's column appears on Wednesday, Friday and Sunday. He can be  
reached at [lgriswold@fresnobee.com](mailto:lgriswold@fresnobee.com) or (559) 622-2416.
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THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL Panel on Climate Change estimates that temperatures will  
rise by 1.8° to 4° C this century. A less stable climate will bring massive  
ecological and economic challenges.  
  
Already, we see that droughts, floods, hurricanes and heat waves are becoming  
more common. Will we watch as catastrophic disruption to Earth's environment and  
its people occurs on an unimaginable scale? Or will we change course and work  
together to mitigate the effects of global warming?  
  
For the global South, and especially Africa, environmental issues are not a  
luxury. Arresting the world's warming and protecting and restoring our natural  
systems are issues of life and death for much of the world's population.  
  
In its recent report forecasting the effects of global warming on Africa, the  
IPCC predicts that the volume in rivers will fall as temperatures rise, making  
it harder to access clean water. Some regions will receive more rain, allowing  
cultivation of new crops.  
  
BUT OTHERS, ESPECIALLY in southern and western Africa, will become drier,  
fuelling desertification. As rainfall patterns shift, the IPCC estimates that by  
2100, crop revenues could fall by 90 per cent, devastating Africa's small-scale  
farmers. Climate change will also create new malaria zones, affecting 80 million  
people.  
  
Resource scarcity made worse by global warming, will cause conflicts to flare  
up. We see this in Darfur, where unscrupulous leaders have used clashes over  
resources to stir up massive violence.  
  
Africa's greenhouse gas emissions are negligible compared to the industrialised  
world's, and those of the emerging economic giants of China and India, yet those  
of us living in the southern hemisphere are likely to be most affected by global  
warming.  
  
For this reason, I and many others are challenging the leaders and citizens of  
industrialised countries, and in fact, all nations, to reduce energy consumption  
and to move beyond fossil fuels; to cut greenhouse gas emissions from all  
sources; and to adopt policies so that corporations operate more responsibly and  
individuals can live more sustainably on the planet.  
  
As major polluters, industrialised countries have a moral responsibility to  
assist Africa and the rest of the developing economies by making available  
technology affordable to reduce our vulnerability and increase our capacity to  
adapt to global warming, including through the use of alternative and renewable  
sources of energy.  
  
Natural resources provide a buffer against the effects of climate change. While  
technological advances and developing alternative sources of energy are  
essential, we cannot forget to conserve and act to restore what we have.  
  
One of the most important policy measures is to prioritise protection and  
rehabilitation of standing forests - such as those in Amazonia and Indonesia,  
the Boreal region and the Congo Basin.  
  
These forests are the ecosystems that make life possible for numerous species,  
including our own. They are also Earth's lungs, absorbing enormous quantities of  
carbon dioxide and holding significant stores of carbon in their soils. We have  
a global obligation to safeguard them.  
  
We also must make concerted efforts to end unsustainable logging, and support  
initiatives, like reforestation programmes, through which poor people can secure  
a livelihood by protecting, not destroying, their environment.  
  
Well-managed, participatory tree-planting programmes that serve as carbon  
offsets as well as delivering livelihood benefits to local communities, are an  
important means to support mitigation efforts in southern countries.  
  
Such activities, of course, do not provide an excuse for industrialised  
countries' greenhouse gas emissions. All countries both in the North and South  
must act to deal with the negative impacts.  
  
BUT INDUSTRIALISED COUNTRIES should enable countries with developing economies  
to participate in the carbon market and to develop industry based on renewable  
energy sources. This is a case of environmental justice that ought to be  
addressed more responsibly by all.  
  
Although the challenges posed by global warming are enormous, we can rise to  
them. At last year's UN climate meeting in Nairobi, the Green Belt Movement, the  
United Nations Environment Programme (Unep) and the World Agroforestry Centre  
(Icraf) launched the Billion Tree Campaign.  
  
The campaign inspired millions across the planet. Pledges came in from  
individuals, NGOs, businesses, governments, communities and associations in all  
regions. And in a year, we met our goal: planting a billion trees worldwide.  
  
Prof Maathai, the 2004 Nobel Peace Prize laureate, is the Goodwill Ambassador  
for the Congo Basin Forest Ecosystem.  
  
Distributed by AllAfrica Global Media. ([allafrica.com](http://allafrica.com))
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BALI, Indonesia - As readers of this column know, I have a rule that there is a  
simple way to test whether any Arab-Israeli peace deal is real or not: If you  
need a Middle East expert to explain it to you, it's not real. I now have the  
same rule about global climate agreements: If you need an environmental expert  
to explain it to you, it's not real.  
  
I needed 10 experts to explain to me the Bali climate agreement - and I was  
there! I'm still not quite sure what it adds up to. I'm not opposed to forging a  
regime with 190 countries for reducing carbon emissions, but my gut tells me  
that both the North and South Poles will melt before we get it to work.  
  
There is a better way. Just make America the model of how a country can grow  
prosperous, secure, innovative and healthy by becoming the most clean,  
energy-efficient nation in the world - and let everyone follow us.  
  
Unfortunately, the Bush team has not been able to lead on this issue - for two  
reasons. First, its credibility is shot, even though if you add up all the clean  
energy, biofuel and other programs the administration has initiated over the  
past two years, plus the half-a-loaf energy bill spearheaded by the Democrats  
that the President is scheduled to sign today, they're not a zero anymore.  
  
There was a revealing encounter here Thursday between the U.S. negotiating team  
and environmentalists that was worthy of pay-per-view. The American team was  
giving its big briefing. The room was packed with activists from around the  
world. They came loaded to carve up the Americans, who, it was just assumed, had  
to be stupid because they represented the Bush administration.  
  
  
And then something unexpected happened. For 90 minutes, Andy Karsner, who runs  
the Department of Energy's renewable energy programs, James Connaughton, who  
heads White House climate policy, and their colleagues put on a PowerPoint  
performance that was riveting in its understanding of the climate problem and  
the technologies needed to solve it. Their mastery of the subject was so  
impressive that it left this room full of global activists emotionally confused:  
On the one hand, it was obvious that these U.S. officials really knew their  
stuff, yet on the other, I'd bet not a single person there believed they  
reflected the true Bush policy.  
  
As if reading the minds of everyone there, Malini Mehra, the chief executive of  
the Centre for Social Markets, an Indian activist group, took the microphone  
and, in so many words, asked the Bush aides: Who are you, and what planet did  
you come from? It could not possibly be from planet Bush.  
  
"Anyone who has been listening to the news on climate change knows that there  
has been one message from this administration - that any serious action on  
climate change threatens the U.S. economy and our way of life," Mehra said to me  
later.  
  
So to now hear these American technocrats "present what was a thoughtful  
analysis that made sense, flies in the face of what we have come to know about  
this administration," she added.  
  
A lot of this is the price America is paying for the gratuitous way President  
Bush trashed the Kyoto treaty in 2001, without presenting any alternative for  
six years. Message to world: "Get lost. We only care about ourselves."  
  
So now, when both Bush and Congress have moved a little, few people believe even  
that is for real. As Irwandi Yusuf, the governor of Indonesia's Aceh province,  
bluntly said to me: "We don't believe the Americans in this administration."

The other reason we can't be a model is that whatever the U.S. is now doing to  
address the global warming challenge, it is not transformational. It is an  
incremental approach to a scale problem that can only be solved by triggering  
massive innovation in clean power. And without a price signal - a carbon tax or  
cap-and-trade system - to make it profitable to invest enormous sums, long term,  
in new clean technologies, it will not happen at scale.  
  
The Bush team loves new technologies, but not the price signals needed to  
initiate them. By the way, finance or energy ministers who deal with price  
signals weren't even at the Bali convention, which was dominated by  
environmental regulators.  
  
"This is a problem of economic transformation, not environmental regulation,"  
said Glenn Prickett, senior vice president at Conservation International.  
(Disclosure: My wife is on its board.) "The transformation needed will require  
far more than just passing one law or signing one treaty. It will require the  
same level of focus and initiative that the Bush administration is devoting to  
the war on terror. No political leader in the U.S. is approaching this issue yet  
with anywhere near the seriousness required."  
  
So I still don't know what Bali was about, but I do know that it was  
incremental, not transformational - and incrementalism, when it comes to clean  
energy, is just a hobby.
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HIGHLIGHT: The Bali global warming talks ended with a stubborn U.S. finally  
making promises that other countries could live by.  
  
Booing, jeers, tears and finally cheers lent high drama to the conclusion of the  
United Nations climate change talks in Bali last weekend. The talks culminated  
in a meeting in which the United States delegation was publicly humiliated.  
"I've never seen anything like it," declares David Doniger, who attended the  
meeting as the policy director of the Natural Resources Defense Council's  
Climate Center, and had been a negotiator for the Clinton administration at  
Kyoto. "The U.S. was pounded for nearly an hour by country after country."  
  
Differences between countries are usually hammered out in private during breaks,  
or behind closed doors. Yet in the public plenary, the U.S. objected to an  
attempt by India to reword a sentence concerning how rich countries might aid  
developing ones in reducing their greenhouse gas emissions. None of the usual  
U.S. allies, such as Japan, South Africa and Canada, took its side, and the  
international frustration with the Bush administration boiled over in the public  
forum. The island nation of Papua New Guinea castigated the industrial giant.  
"We seek your leadership," Kevin Conrad, the delegate from Papua New Guinea,  
told the Americans. "But if for some reason you are not willing to lead, leave  
it to the rest of us. Please get out of the way."  
  
Within the hour, the apparently chastened U.S. reversed course, inspiring  
cheers, and an agreement was soon reached. "The U.S. caved from the  
psychological and emotional pressure of 190 countries in a room," says Peter  
Goldmark, director of the climate and air program for Environmental Defense, who  
attended the talks in Bali. "The Bush team was really battered and isolated, and  
any American who said it was not painful to see was lying."  
  
  
After two weeks and many late-night meetings, the delegates agreed to a "road  
map" for future climate negotiations, which they will attempt to ratify in a new  
climate treaty by the U.N. climate change conference in Copenhagen in December  
2009. "Nobody was there to commit to anything, and nobody did commit to  
anything," says Elliot Diringer, director of international strategy for the Pew  
Center on Global Climate Change, who attended the Bali talks.  
  
The Bali conference did produce a few significant developments. Developing  
countries, including China, South Africa, Brazil, India and Mexico, agreed to  
consider taking action to curb greenhouse gases. Previous climate negotiations  
exempted developing countries from doing anything to reduce their emissions  
growth. "It doesn't put anyone on the hook right now for emission reductions,  
but it doesn't let anyone off the hook either. If we had let developing  
countries off the hook, we'd never get an agreement that the United States could  
ratify," says Diringer.  
  
In Bali, fighting deforestation, which accounts for some 20 percent of  
human-induced greenhouse gas emissions, also became a priority for future talks.  
Indonesia, Brazil, Papua New Guinea and other countries with rain forests want  
financial incentives from the carbon markets to help them cut down on illegal  
logging and conserve forests. "Right now, the forests are valued as wood or  
acreage for farming and plantations," explains Doniger. "We have to have a world  
where it's just as valuable, maybe more so, to keep the forests standing."  
  
Even with these positive developments, a pall hung over Bali, as the U.S. played  
a game of climate-change chicken with developing countries like China. Now that  
Australia has agreed to the terms of the Kyoto Protocol, the U.S. is the only  
industrialized nation that has refused to cap its emissions. Developing  
countries are using the U.S. reluctance to commit to a carbon cap as a way to  
avoid making commitments of their own. The result: The final documents from Bali  
do not include even a range of possible emissions targets that will be  
considered in future negotiations.  
  
"The Bush administration still managed to force any mention of the specific  
limits needed to head off climate catastrophe into a footnote in the Bali  
agreement," says Rep. Edward Markey, who chairs the Select Committee on Energy  
Independence and Global Warming, in a statement: "Not since Emperor Nero tried  
footnoting firefighting through more fervent fiddling, have we seen such a  
transparently vain effort to avoid the inevitable. When it comes to meeting the  
challenge of climate change, the Bush Administration still appears willing to  
operate on the basis of denial and obfuscation, not science and logic."  
  
  
And there's no evidence that will let up, at least until there's a new president  
in the White House. Just hours after the talks ended, the White House released a  
statement expressing "serious concerns" that the Bali road map doesn't demand  
enough of the developing world.
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"The principal tasks of the committee will involve examining the program of  
events and activities for the conference; identifying md discussing key issues  
and areas of relevance to Guyana; and to prepare briefing documents for Guyana's  
representafives to conference", the Government Information Agency GIN A) said in  
a statement.  
  
"Guyana would ensure guaranteed sustainable forestry practices as well as focus  
heavily on conservation if there is economic reward for that and that we're  
prepared to work with bilateral donors, as well as commercial entities to put  
this to the market or to guarantee a financial flow to the country," [Bharrat  
Jagdeo] said when questioned afterwards.  
  
FULL TEXT  
  
GEORGETOWN, Guyana, CMC - A newly formed local body has met ahead of a December  
climate conference in Bali, Indonesia to draft and refine a blueprint to push  
major climate change concerns of Guyana and the rest of the region.  
  
A statement from the Guyana government said the National Climate Change  
Committee, under the auspices of the Agriculture Ministry, will prepare a  
document for the Bali Conference "to encourage stronger global actions and  
support in addressing the issues.  
  
"The principal tasks of the committee will involve examining the program of  
events and activities for the conference; identifying md discussing key issues  
and areas of relevance to Guyana; and to prepare briefing documents for Guyana's  
representafives to conference", the Government Information Agency GIN A) said in  
a statement.  
  
  
According to GINA, in a oid to sharpen the focus of the briefing document, the  
National Climate Change Committee is to hold talks with national stakeholders.  
  
'ROADMAP'  
  
The effects of global climate change have generated much debate and many  
countries are co-operating to formulate effective strategies to help mitigate  
the problem. The conference in Bali is aimed at looking at possible solutions.  
  
The government release said a "Bah Roadmap" is expected to establish the process  
to work on the key building blocks of a future climate change regime, including  
adaptation, mitigation and technology co-operation and financing the response to  
climate change.  
  
Guyana is willing to deploy its vast rainforest in the global climate change  
fight if there will be financial rewards for the sacrifice, President Bharrat  
Jagdeo told the recent Commonwealth Finance Ministers Meeting which was held in  
the capital city, Georgetown.  
  
"Guyana would ensure guaranteed sustainable forestry practices as well as focus  
heavily on conservation if there is economic reward for that and that we're  
prepared to work with bilateral donors, as well as commercial entities to put  
this to the market or to guarantee a financial flow to the country," Jagdeo said  
when questioned afterwards.  
  
"We're hoping that in the post-Kyoto protocol framework that there would be  
provisions for standing rainforests and a mechanism for rewarding countries for  
conserving those rainforests," the president added.  
  
In the interim, Jagdeo said work needs to be done with bilateral donors so they  
can guarantee a particular financial flow to the country and then possibly use  
the carbon credits that could be derived from standing rainforests if they are  
assessed, to offset carbon emissions.
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Monitoring the progress of the United Nations climate change conference in Bali,  
Indonesia, was a bit like watching a battle unfolding in front of me.  
  
No, this was not a war between rich countries - particularly the United States,  
which has been polluting our sky for the past 300 years and continues to do so  
on a large and escalating scale - and poor countries - with China as a glaring  
example, though it has entered the polluting game late and committed much lesser  
crimes per capita, but is seen to be making its best effort to clear up the  
mess. This is all about mankind confronting a common problem, one that might put  
us out of existence. It is our common war.  
  
Report upon report from different groups of independent scientists have clearly  
warned us that we are heading toward a global catastrophe and are about to pass  
the point of no return. The most recent scientific data from the  
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) clearly shows that action to  
reduce emissions must be taken now. Something urgent and drastic has to be done  
about the situation if we are to have any hope of heading off our common  
extinction. We have the means to slow down climatic change, and even ultimately  
reverse the situation and get back to a healthier ecology, but it seems we just  
do not have the collective wisdom to do so.  
  
The adoption of the United N...
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Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.) today said a stringent short-term greenhouse gas  
reduction goal favored by the European Union and others would generate too much  
political opposition to be included in a cap-and-trade bill that will be brought  
before the Senate next year.  
  
"It's not going to happen," Kerry said this morning when asked about adding the  
EU's favored limits to the Lieberman-Warner Climate Security Act (S. 2191), a  
cap-and-trade bill passed by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee  
earlier this month.  
  
The EU at the United Nations climate change talks in Bali, Indonesia, earlier  
this month pressed for the inclusion of a goal for developed nations of 25 to 40  
percent reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 2020. The figure was dropped  
because of opposition from the United States delegation and others.  
  
Jim Connaughton, the White House's top environmental official who attended the  
Bali talks, told reporters this afternoon the goal was unattainable. "The United  
States and most other countries could not accept that," he said.  
  
But Kerry said new technologies and the right policy approaches could be  
employed to meet the schedule. "We're not going to get 25-40 percent now, but  
that doesn't mean it shouldn't be a goal," he said this morning after giving a  
speech on his trip to the Bali meeting. "If you don't have goals, you don't  
achieve anything."  
  
Kerry was the lone member of Congress to travel to Indonesia for the climate  
talks, which represent the initial effort to map out a successor to the Kyoto  
Protocol, the international global warming treaty that expires in 2012. He said  
he spent 40 hours traveling to the talks to deliver a key message to  
participants.  
  
  
"That message: There is real movement on this issue in America, and we are ready  
to lead again," he said. "The United States is not going to continue to be the  
skunk of the party." Kerry also said the Bush White House, which opposes  
mandatory controls on carbon dioxide favored by much of the world, is  
"increasingly irrelevant" to future climate talks.  
  
But Connaughton disagreed.  
  
He said the Bush administration's decision to join the consensus Bali document  
mapping out the path forward will make it easier for the next administration to  
transition into international climate negotiations in early 2009.  
  
In addition, he highlighted upcoming talks among major economies that the Bush  
administration will convene in Hawaii next month. "We have a lot to offer," he  
said.  
  
Connaughton also cited progress in another key area: the role of major  
developing economies like China and India - which are currently exempt from the  
Kyoto Protocol - in a future treaty. He said the administration was pleased that  
major developing economies acknowledged they too must make emissions cuts, which  
he called a "modest first step."  
  
He declined to comment on specific bills or policy approaches under discussion  
in Congress, but said the White House continues to talk to the Hill on climate  
change. "We will be constructive participants in those discussions," he said.  
  
For his part, Kerry told CongressNow he and other Senators are working to build  
bipartisan support for the Lieberman-Warner bill, which he said is likely to be  
brought to the Senate floor in the first half of 2008.
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Bali was indeed a fitting setting for global negotiations on how to address  
climate change.  
  
Emerging from the airport in Denpasar into the pressing tropical heat, humidity  
and humanity, I quickly escaped into an air-conditioned taxi. On the way to the  
conference, my taxi travelled through semi-urbanised areas that epitomised the  
emerging economies of Asia - throngs of people, living simply but busy trying to  
get ahead. Small shops lined the streets.  
  
Motorbikes were ubiquitous - a common means of transport for everyone from  
grandmothers to families of four, on one motorbike. We passed the heavy security  
cordon into the luxury resort area of Nusa Dua - a dozen five-star hotels, all  
of them air-conditioned, surrounding the Bali International Conference Centre.  
  
The thought occurred - should emissions from catering to rich tourists and  
climate change bureaucrats be exempt from Kyoto emission limits just because  
they occur in a developing country?  
  
The climate change conference in Bali was actually two conferences, side by  
side. One was an ideas-bazaar-cum-trade-show, with all and sundry presenting  
concerns for the planet and/or protests about the injustice of it all, mixed  
with businesses promoting their ideas and services to help solve the greatest  
challenge of our time.  
  
This was a cacophony of voices - on such a diverse range of topics that they  
could only be related by climate change: deforestation of peat lands, the  
potential for seaweed to absorb carbon, carbon markets and derivatives, worries  
about production of biofuels displacing food production and natural habitat,  
impacts on indigenous peoples, the world energy outlook, next year's G8 summit  
in Japan.  
  
  
The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley, a climate change skeptic, made a minor scene  
because he wasn't given a seminar room (he hadn't booked one). Government  
officials sang the virtues of their policies - which, in many cases, including  
New Zealand's, have yet to be enacted. Harvard academics described - to the  
audience's dismay - why the world shouldn't expect the USA to join a global  
agreement.  
  
Business leaders described what their industries are doing to reduce emissions,  
and to persuade the US government to act.  
  
The second conference - the negotiation itself - was labyrinthine and obscure,  
with long-winded debate over words with hidden meaning and uncertain  
implications. Officials haggled over text describing not some concrete action on  
climate change but rather what these same officials will argue about the next  
time they meet to discuss the next small step towards reaching a global climate  
agreement by the end of 2009.  
  
The tedious haggling occurred not once or twice, but on at least two dozen  
different agenda items, all inter-linked but negotiated separately and often  
simultaneously in ``contact groups" and ``informals" in different rooms,  
generally for government officials only.  
  
One such agenda item was the terms of reference for a scheduled review of the  
Kyoto Protocol. Developed countries wanted this review to focus on  
``effectiveness", hoping the review would conclude that the protocol cannot be  
effective without some limitations on developing country emissions. Developing  
countries, not surprisingly, resisted this suggestion at every turn, and  
proposed that the review focus on ``implementation" of the protocol. They want  
the review to highlight that the rich countries have not fulfilled their  
commitments to provide funding for adaptation, technology transfer and capacity  
building.  
  
Perhaps, given the paltry efforts to date, developing countries could be  
forgiven for thinking that the rich countries are never going to reduce their  
emissions, and therefore for focusing on funding for adaptation. But it didn't  
help get agreement on a framework for emissions reductions. In the end, the  
wealthier countries conceded the point, presumably concluding that it wasn't a  
big enough issue to fight over.  
  
Another example. In one room, countries engaged in a ``dialogue" on how to make  
further progress under the Framework Convention on Climate Change - the 1992  
treaty that virtually every country signed up to because it had no legally  
binding emission obligations.  
  
  
Meanwhile, in another room, were the countries that have ratified the Kyoto  
Protocol - ie, the US was not in the room. Here, officials were negotiating a  
framework for negotiations on further commitments after 2012, when the first set  
of Kyoto obligations end. Surely this depended upon whether the US would re-join  
the global consensus, which was the unspoken question in the ``dialogue" in the  
other room.  
  
And in yet another room, officials discussed what, when and how they should have  
further negotiations on reducing emissions from deforestation in developing  
countries. This accounts for 20 percent of global emissions and is therefore a  
key part of the bigger picture.  
  
All of these items needed to be resolved and incorporated into the ``Bali road  
map".  
  
Tensions between developing and developed countries are constantly in evidence.  
Developing countries constantly remind everyone that the wealthy countries have  
caused this problem, and still have per capita emissions that are many times  
those of developing countries. China, Brazil and India are determined to fulfill  
their economic (and geopolitical?) potential, and are not about to accept  
obligations that will stymie their superpower ambitions.  
  
Meanwhile, Russia is an enigma. Is it being difficult just to show that Russia  
is still a force to be reckoned with? Australia was welcomed back into the fold  
- the prodigal son. But the USA remains a pariah, Canada is in danger of  
becoming one for saying it will not honour its Kyoto commitments, and Saudi  
Arabia complains that not enough is being done to address impacts on  
oil-producing nations from the rest of the world using less fossil fuel. Yeah  
right.  
  
It would be easy to despair given the snail's pace of progress. Given that the  
world needs to reduce emissions by around 30 percent by 2020 and 80 percent by  
2050, relative to 1990 levels (which we are already well above) to avoid  
dangerous climate change. Given that those who will be most affected by climate  
change are least able to bear the costs, and those who need to pay are likely to  
be the least affected.  
  
How can we overcome the rich-poor divide? What will bring us together in the  
common cause? Yet I derive hope from the fact that a solution is within reach.  
There is an enormous amount of brainpower being devoted to the problem. Major  
multinational corporations have added their voices to the call for action.  
Foreseeable technologies could achieve the necessary reductions in emissions at  
reasonable cost if we would only invest in developing them, and learn by doing.  
  
  
Large reductions can be achieved from energy efficiency - and will actually save  
money. There is a willingness to address deforestation in developing countries.  
Solar energy can meet the world's insatiable demand for energy - if it can be  
harnessed efficiently, without covering a sizeable portion of the earth in solar  
panels. And finally, I am still optimistic because, as was said many times in  
Bali, we simply cannot afford to fail.  
  
Jim Sinner, who heads the sustainable business group at Nelson's Cawthron  
Institute, attended the UN Climate Change Conference in Bali as a member of the  
New Zealand delegation. Nelson MP Nick Smith's take on the Bali conference will  
run tomorrow.
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Alternative fuels are vying for a spot on the transportation highway as  
petroleum costs escalate, light oil reserves diminish, and environmental issues  
raise concerns. Bioethanol, biodiesel, and other alternative fuels will be  
needed to fill an expected petroleum supply gap, sources say.  
  
  
Global demand for transportation fuels, including alternative technologies, is  
expected to reach 1,021 billion gals/year by 2030 -- a 50% increase over 2005  
demand, says ExxonMobil, a major blender of ethanol in gasoline. Transportation  
will be the fastest-growing energy sector in 2030, the company says.  
  
  
Bioethanol and biodiesel currently comprise just 1% of global transport fuel  
consumption, according to a recent study by Accenture (New York). This number is  
projected to grow to about 5%-10% by 2017, the report says.  
  
  
Crude reserves are sufficient to meet projected demand through 2030, says  
ExxonMobil. However, existing local production volumes in the European Union  
(EU) and the U.S. have declined, and access to and development of existing  
reserves "in an environmentally responsible way" are problematic, the company  
says.  
  
  
Also, addressing renewable fuel mandates as well as GHG legislation in the EU  
and the U.S. will further drive growth in the alternative fuel market, says  
Melissa Stark, senior executive/energy industry group at Accenture.  
  
  
There are several promising alternative fuel technologies, but biofuels, in  
particular, are making headlines as the near-term solution to those issues.  
"It's only biofuels that can really respond powerfully to both greenhouse gas  
issues and concerns around energy security," says Phil New, president/biofuels  
at BP, a major ethanol blender. Biofuels could supply 10%-25%, or 85 billion-195  
billion gals/year, of road transport fuels in the U.S. by 2030, New says.  
  
  
"Our research shows that technology is the biggest uncertainty in the future of  
the biofuels industry," Stark says. "Technology will continue to improve the  
economics of biofuels development, but it is still uncertain which technologies  
will have the most impact and what the ultimate scale of the industry will be,"  
she says.  
  
  
Bioethanol and biodiesel are the most abundant biofuels currently produced.  
Ethanol can be made from any source of fermentable sugars but is primarily made  
from food crops including grains, oilseeds, and sugar cane.  
  
  
First-generation ethanol has several drawbacks, however. It puts a strain on the  
food supply. "There's simply not enough arable land available to grow the crops  
necessary" to meet demand of both food and fuel, New says. Other issues include  
performance, he says. Bioethanol is a low energy-density fuel that cannot be  
blended with gasoline in high quantities. Also, there are issues surrounding  
transporting ethanol, as well as uncertainty regarding emission-reduction  
potential of biofuels, including ethanol.  
  
  
Given those issues, the ceiling on the amount of corn-based ethanol that the  
U.S. can produce is about 12 billion-15 billion gals/year.  
  
  
However, next-generation products including cellulosic biofuels will address  
some of the first-generation's drawbacks. Commercial production has yet to begin  
using second-generation products, though it is expected in 2010.  
  
  
Cellulosic biofuels allow for use of a wide range of non-food crops, including  
fibrous plant material, that can be converted into fermentable sugars. Producing  
ethanol from cellulose sources requires three main steps: A thermochemical  
pretreatment process to open up the structure so it is accessible to enzymes;  
hydrolyzing the material into simple sugars using special enzymes; and  
fermenting the sugars into ethanol.  
  
  
Several chemical companies are partnering with the National Renewable Energy  
Laboratory (NREL; Golden, CO), part of the U.S. DOE, to develop cellulosic  
ethanol technology. Genencor and Novozymes have been selected to work on  
lowering the cost of enzymes (p. 21); UOP and Pacific Northwest National  
Laboratory are ceveloping technology to enable the production of biofuels in  
existing U.S. petroleum refineries; and Archer Daniels Midland (ADM) and DuPont  
are also involved with the project.  
  
  
The goal is to develop a process to convert cellulose into ethanol that is cost  
competitive with corn ethanol within the next five years, and cost competitive  
with petroleum-based gasoline by 2030.  
  
  
Cost is a major hurdle for making cellulosic ethanol commercially viable,  
companies say. "Feedstock cost, enzyme cost, and depreciation are the three big  
cost factors for cellulosic ethanol plants," says Jack Huttner,  
v.p./bio-refinery business development at Genencor. Cellulosic biomass is more  
difficult to break down into fermentable sugars than corn, Huttner says. The  
process requires a factor of 50-100 more enzymes. This translates into an  
operating cost that is 2-3 times more expensive than producing corn ethanol.  
  
  
"The challenge for enzyme development for cellulosic ethanol is that every  
combination of feedstock and pretreatment conditions changes the optimal enzyme  
cocktail required," Huttner says. Genencor focuses on three feedstocks -- sugar  
cane bagasse, corn-stover, and wood pulp -- and one pretreatment process. The  
company has developed the first commercially available enzyme for cellulosic  
ethanol (CW, Oct. 24, p. 8). The enzyme, trade named Accellerase, is probably  
not the optimal enzyme for cellulosic ethanol plants, but it is a good starting  
point for producers to design their cellulosic facilities, Huttner says.  
  
  
Mascoma (Cambridge, MA), a Dartmouth College (Hanover, NH) spinout, will use  
Genencor's enzyme for a previously announced 500,000-gals/year cellulosic  
ethanol demonstration facility at Rome, NY. The company broke ground on the  
facility this month, and expects it to be operational in 2009.  
  
  
An alternative to bioethanol is biobutanol, which is a higher-performing fuel.  
Biobutanol contains 86% energy relative to gasoline, compared to ethanol which  
contains only 66%. DuPont was the first chemical company to invest in this  
technology, though it has also broadly invested in several other bio-fuel  
technologies. DuPont says it intends to improve existing ethanol production  
through ag-biotechnology, and develop cellulosic bio-fuel technologies as well  
as next-generation biofuels. DuPont expects its process technology for  
biobutanol and cellulosic ethanol to be ready for commercial introduction in  
2010.  
  
  
DuPont is working with BP through a 50-50 joint venture to develop, produce, and  
market biobutanol (CW, June 28, 2006, p. 13). The companies expect biobutanol to  
be commercially available in the U.K. in 2007, and in the U.S. by 2010. The jv  
will build a 20,000-liter/year biofuel demonstration facility designed to  
produce advanced biofuels from feedstocks such as wheat, corn, barley, and rye  
-- the first such facility worldwide, the companies say. DuPont expects the  
plant to start up in early 2009.  
  
  
While not currently used in the U.S. as a transportation fuel, biodiesel is  
gaining ground in other countries. It is the predominant biofuel consumed in the  
EU. Biodiesel is generally produced by reacting methanol with vegetable oils,  
used cooking oils, or animal fats.  
  
  
ADM is one of the world's largest producers of biodiesel and is investing in  
biodiesel production in Brazil and Indonesia. Dow Haltermann Custom Processing  
(DHCP), a Dow Chemical business, also manufactures biodiesel. DHCP has been  
producing biodiesel at a Houston plant for almost two years in an exclusive  
supply deal with World Energy Alternatives (Chelsea, MA).  
  
  
UOP and ENI (Rome) have developed an alternative technology for producing  
biodiesel, trade named Ecofining. The technology uses hydrogen and vegetable oil  
to produce high-cetane diesel fuel. The resulting fuel is a "an  
ultra-high-quality hydrocarbon resembling Fischer-Tropsch diesel," says Jennifer  
Holmgren, director/renewable energy and chemicals at UOP.  
  
  
Further out on the commercial development timeline is hydrogen fuel. "The  
ultimate end-game of trying to meet the objectives of sustainability, energy  
security, and energy independence is going to require a variety of fuels," says  
Nick Mittica, commercial manager/hydrogen energy systems at Air Products.  
"Biofuels do help extend the current gasoline pool but they have some  
limitations in terms of emissions potential and availability," Mittica says. Air  
Products, the world's largest hydrogen producer, has set its sites on hydrogen  
fuel.  
  
  
Air Products expects the use of hydrogen as a transportation fuel to take off in  
2015, Mittica says. About 2,500 hydrogen-ready vehicles will be available in  
California in 2010, and hydrogen fueling stations will be built in concentrated  
areas in Los Angeles and San Francisco to support these fleets. Buses and other  
transit vehicles equipped with hydrogen fuel cells will be released more broadly  
across the country, he says. "Hydrogen fueling stations will be built to support  
buses in major cities, and that will be the beginning of the hydrogen  
infrastructure around the country," he adds.  
  
  
Air Products says it uses the traditional method of steam methane reforming to  
produce hydrogen, but that it also invests in renewable production methods.  
"Clearly, the win over the long run is going to be the production of hydrogen  
from renewable sources," Mittica says. The company is exploring the use of  
several other processes for producing hydrogen, including methane-rich offgas  
from landfills, and biodigesters at waste treatment facilities. "We'll take that  
offgas and convert it into electricity, power, and hydrogen," he says.  
  
  
Air Products is also developing technology for the capture and sequestration of  
carbon dioxide (CO[2]) to be used with steam methane reforming, as well as a  
process to produce hydrogen from nuclear sources, which do not produce CO[2].  
  
  
Meanwhile, coal and natural gas will continue to play a role in transportation  
fuels, companies say. Technologies, including gas-to-liquids (GTL), and  
coal-to-liquids (CTL), will be used to produce cleaner-burning synthetic diesel  
fuel, they say.  
  
  
"There was an initial flurry of activity in the early 2000s, up until about 18  
months ago for GTL projects in the Middle East," says Tom Mutchler, general  
manager/worldwide equipment at Air Products. Soaring construction costs and  
concerns about natural gas supply have slowed GTL projects, however. ExxonMobil  
and Qatar Petroleum (QP; Doha) recently dropped plans to build a $ 7-billion GTL  
project, in favor of developing an LNG project in the Norrh Field reservoir of  
Qatar.  
  
  
Air Products is currently completing construction of two 3,500-m.t./day air  
separation units (ASUs) for the GTL plant that QP and Sasol are jointly building  
at Ras Laffan, Qatar. The plant will produce 34,000 bbl/day of liquids,  
comprised of 24,000 bbl/day of synthetic diesel, 9,000 bbl/day of naphtha, and  
1,000 bbl/day of liquefied petroleum gas.