

H_3

www.h3operations.com

Kyoto
II

Kyoto II
Discussion Paper
 H_3

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
What's the Difference	4
Purpose of Kyoto II	5
Cost of Kyoto II	6
The Research Organisations	7
Technology Options and Research Methodology	9
Balancing Reforms	10
Repercussions for Industry	11
CO2 Sequestration	12
Incentives to Participate	13
Conclusion	14
Kyoto II Draft Agreement	15

Sean Gallacher
57 Harden Street
Acacia Ridge 4110
Queensland Australia
61 7 3277 2975
h3@h3operations.com
www.h3operations.com

Introduction

Kyoto II is a recommendation to fill the global policy vacuum that exists in the area of climate change.

Everybody now agrees that climate change is real, but there is currently no agreement on what to do about it.

Kyoto II is what its title suggests it is. It is a global agreement that is meant to supersede the first Kyoto Protocol.

Many of the elements of the original Kyoto Protocol are included in Kyoto II, but there is a change of emphasis on key points that changes the perception of the Protocol from one that costs money, to one that makes money.

The principal purpose of Kyoto II is to get the world moving in the same direction on the issue of climate change.

The key shift in emphasis is the subordination of emissions targets to the creation of technology and balancing reforms; technology to eliminate fossil fuels and reforms that will completely mitigate the introduction of such technology.

In other words, eliminating fossil fuels from the global economy will take several trillion dollars out of it and the primary focus of the research, the purpose of the balancing reforms, is to add a lot more into the global economy than we take out, and with genuine commerce (NO robbing Peter to pay Paul).

Emissions targets are a part of Kyoto II, but they have been reduced from the primary focus to a supporting element.

The financial consideration (and main focus) in Kyoto II is that governments will divert one percent of GDP towards new research for new technology and balancing reforms. There are many elements to the draft agreement of Kyoto II but a country will be deemed to be in compliance by diverting this one percent. So money spent to increase commerce; which government doesn't want to do that?

One of the strengths of Kyoto II is that it doesn't require a stretch into unfamiliar territory. It is simply a new and improved Kyoto Protocol. And another is that it will not interfere with a developing economy's ability to grow.

What's the Difference

This is the very heart of the issue. What is the difference between Kyoto Protocol I and Kyoto II?

Kyoto II places the focus of compliance into a realm where governments prefer to operate.

To the casual observer of the draft agreement the differences would appear to be subtle, but those subtle differences make all the difference in the world.

The first significant difference is the inclusion of a search for balancing reforms to completely mitigate a massive reduction in the use of fossil fuels. Balancing reforms are political, social and economic instruments that ensure there are no negative impacts as a result of an initiative or action.

The second major difference is in taking the focus off emissions targets and placing the focus squarely on the development of new technology and balancing reforms. In the first Kyoto the emissions targets are ALL, and everything else in the Protocol is in there to support this drive towards emissions targets. In this new Kyoto the development of new technology and balancing reforms are ALL, and everything else in the Protocol, including emissions targets, are there to support this drive towards the technological and sociological development. In this world perception is king, and this changes the perception of the Protocol considerably. Be under no misapprehension here, this is NOT a cosmetic change.

The third major difference is in the ambitiousness of the emissions targets. In Kyoto II the emissions targets are far more ambitious, and as a supporting element rather than the focus of compliance, they can be extraordinarily ambitious. The emissions targets were the reason Kyoto I never got off the ground and in Kyoto II targets many times more ambitious will only serve to encourage participation.

The fourth major difference is in the wording of the emissions targets in that they are there as an incentive target for the many scientists and executives (in business and government) who will be working the problems. The purpose is to switch the pressure felt by these individuals from external pressure to internal pressure. Almost every great accomplishment in the history of the human race has come about as a result of internal pressure. External pressure is ham-fisted and very unintuitive. It is the blunt instrument, whereas internal pressure is the finesse. Emissions targets in Kyoto II are goals for researchers and fodder for the media, not enforceable targets.

The final major difference is that Kyoto II will not try to be something that it's not. It is a bridging tool towards a first step in addressing climate change and not a first step. When there is so much disagreement on an issue, a great deal of work needs to be done before we can get ourselves to a first step. Our inability to solve most of our biggest problems comes about because we always try to jump straight into the first step, until now.

Purpose of Kyoto II

The intention of introducing a new Kyoto Protocol is to bring the world together on the issue of climate change. To bring it together in action that even a conservative American administration would actively participate in.

A new Kyoto Protocol is not being designed to be the primary solution in the issue of climate change (even the first Kyoto Protocol was only trying to be a small first step). We cannot even begin to think of things such as “primary solution”, or even “first step”, until everybody is on the same page, until everybody is moving in the same direction.

The principal purpose of this new Kyoto Protocol is as a co-operative instrument. If we are to address an issue as expansive as climate change then we need to make sure that everybody who matters is going to get involved, and will do so “boots ‘n’ all”.

The design of this new Kyoto Protocol will do just that, and a great deal more.

Kyoto II will ensure the creation of more than half a dozen new research organisations, each of a size we have never seen outside wartime.

Kyoto II will place the climate change issue back on the agenda as something that can truly be addressed, as opposed to how it is viewed at the moment. Many would have different takes on how it is currently viewed, but at the moment it is not viewed as something we can solve.

With the development of balancing reforms being added into the mix we will transform the climate change debate into one where the previously opposing sides become blurred, and this will pave the way towards being able to use terms such as “primary solution” and “first step”, and to truly mean them.

Its purpose is to be part of a concerted attack on the root causes of climate change; an attack that will solve the issue completely.

Cost of Kyoto II

Governments hate to spend money if it is going to mean even the hint of reducing commerce. Even if something is going to increase commerce, but the perception of it is that it will reduce commerce, or even if it just has a chance of reducing commerce, then governments will want nothing to do with it. In the society we live in this is an understandable attitude to have.

And this is why the first Kyoto Protocol never got off the ground. From its outset, it was perceived as an instrument that was going to reduce commerce, and because we have been so conditioned, for decades now, to believe that “good for green” means “bad for commerce”, Kyoto One being good or bad for commerce in reality was always going to be irrelevant.

Climate change has now moved on to be one of the biggest political issues around the world, but if we try something new we’re going to need to learn this lesson or any action will suffer the same fate as Kyoto One. Kyoto II has learnt this lesson.

Kyoto II is part of an agenda that will conduct enormous and flashy initiatives that solves the issue of climate change at the same time as these same initiatives make many trillions of dollars.

Someone once said, “nothing makes a leader more loved than grand enterprises and setting a good example”, and this is not a hard thing to apprehend. People want to see action on climate change today, and they always like to see grand plans that create jobs, always, and governments understand this. Kyoto II offers politicians the opportunity to do both.

So what is the cost of Kyoto II?

It is something to be defined during its pre-acceptance, but for the purpose of this document, one percent of GDP is the slated amount. By diverting one percent of their GDP to a research organisation with very specific criteria, a country will be deemed as being in compliance with Kyoto II.

Without any shadow of a doubt Kyoto II will make trillions of dollars, but funds will be required to get it to the stage where it can, and governments do like to spend money when the goal is to increase commerce. This Kyoto II has not been tailor made for me or for greenies, it is tailored made for them; it hits every mark.

The Research Organisations

The key element of Kyoto II is the research organisations. There are two primary facets to the research.

The first is the search for technology that will reduce our reliance on fossil fuels down to zero.

The second is to develop political, social and economic reforms that will completely mitigate the effect of introducing such technology. The purpose is to develop reforms that will ensure there are no financial losers, to develop reforms so that even the big oil companies will get behind a reduction in what is currently their primary business.

We have never focussed on balancing reforms before, and balancing reforms is the key to every major problem in the world.

Although it is possible that every country will create its own research organisation in the hope of being the country that comes up with THE answer, and this would be the most ideal situation for many reasons, it is more likely that about a dozen very large organisations will be created by the larger countries. The smaller countries will comply with Kyoto II by participating in one of these.

An important qualification in Kyoto II is that funding to existing research does not count. It must be a new organisation and it must satisfy very specific criteria (If funding were simply increased to existing research organisations it would accomplish nothing):

- ❖ They must not be under the control of government. They must be truly independent.
- ❖ They must not research expansion of existing technology. So in other words all of the renewables that are currently viable do not get a space inside these new research organisations. Does anybody really believe that in fifty years time photovoltaics or wind turbines are going to be the primary source of power? The change will be as dramatic as 1950 is to 1850.
- ❖ At least 25% of each organisation's budget must be spent on unconventional technology. This is to ensure that we don't simply waste our time by placing all of our eggs in the Fusion basket, which many would be tempted to do (it may be the future, but it won't be until we get some fresh generational ideas).
- ❖ At least 25% of each organisation's budget must be spent on balancing reforms; reforms to mitigate the introduction of such technology. This is, after all, the principal function of the whole exercise; solving the human element. (can anybody get their head around just how much employment we're talking about for this particular element – 25% of about \$600 billion annually)
- ❖ Funding for research on hydrogen fuel cells is not to exceed 10% of each organisation's budget.
- ❖ Additional criteria will no doubt be developed over the course of its pre-acceptance.

Of course it will be at the discretion of each country to decide on the personnel to lead their organisation, but it is safe to say that the more conservative the leaders, the less likely they are to come up with anything of value. For success, such organisations require extraordinary

thinking, and the culture and ideology of an organisation is created from the top down. Recklessness is not called for, but playing it safe is not called for either.

In order for these research organisations to be successful it is going to be necessary to appoint leaders who normally would not even be in the top twenty choices to run a government funded research organisation, and this is going to be one of the most difficult things to overcome: Appointing leaders who have sufficiently different thought processes to guide us into a new age, rather than leaders who will simply give us more of the same. Nine out of ten of those who think they could do such a thing (guide us into a new age) could never do such a thing.

This seems like a harsh comment, but a point needs to be made. Scientists with the political connections to be first in line for such positions would be utterly useless in the positions, without exception. Such people think like politicians, not scientists, and that's not necessarily a bad thing, it's just incompatible with what is required to lead a cutting edge research organisation well.

Technology Options and Research Methodology

The issue of technology options is more of an issue for the finer details of the research organisations, so it is only going to be skimmed over here.

The focus of Kyoto II is not on an expansion of existing renewables, it is a search for what's coming next. As dramatically as the primary source of power shifted from 1850 to 1950, so too will the primary source of power in 2050 be a radical departure from what it is today.

With the exceptions of large ongoing programs to try and develop Fusion power and the development of Fuel Cell technology, both of which seemed to hit a brick wall about ten years ago, the focus of all other research in the area of energy generation is on development of existing technology, from fossil fuels to the full range of existing renewables. As quaintly as we view the use of the horse and oxen as a primary source of power, so too will our successors view our use of oil, gas, uranium, wind and low efficiency photovoltaics in one hundred years, and probably even in fifty years.

Existing technology is not the future, and the way in which we are attempting to move Fusion forward is also not the future. Although it sounds cliché, we need to start thinking outside the box, and not just saying the words and then doing more of the same, but really doing it, really thinking outside the box. We need to start breaking our preconceptions and try a new methodology in all of our research; to take a step back from the scientific and sociological laws we hold in such high esteem and view them as less certain, so that we can see a little further. The no-certainty view is very hard to get to because you can't just say it, you have to believe it to the core, and in order to learn in our institutions we had to accept all of this stuff as true, which it is, but inside this framework, true is almost always mistaken for certain; you can't just work through this by saying it's so.

There are so many cutting edge options waiting in the wings. It is theoretically possible to generate electricity from orbiting solar panels and to beam the energy down to earth by microwaves, just as it is theoretically possible to land a space ship on an asteroid out in space and carry out mining operations. These two "options" and others like them are in the realm of fantasy and we will never need to do anything like this. Just like the idea of the Space Elevator, by the time we have the technical expertise to do them we will have long surpassed the need for them. We have mainstream ideas like a Solar Tower, an improved RTG power source (that I would not be in favour of), technologies based on Nanotube technology, Electrolytic Energy and many others that will all produce exceptional options, if we start focusing on them. We can't just say hey presto, we need to devote the years, the decades, and only one who would can one day say, hey presto; the eureka moments are always reserved for those with extraordinary commitment. The Flibberty Gibbets and fly-by-nighters don't get to have days like this, and what a loss to them it is.

There are many serious research directions, and with a serious focus on the cutting edge, the first major development will emerge well inside the first decade, not maybe. Just as the Manhattan Project produced the Atomic Bomb, so too will more than half a dozen Manhattan Project sized research organisations produce both the technological and sociological solutions to our problems. Not only the technology answers, but the balancing reforms that will ensure a financially painless introduction of those technology answers.

Balancing Reforms

If we are serious about addressing the world's problems then we need to start putting forward solutions that work with human nature and not against it.

This is the idea behind balancing reforms. To take an issue and rather than suggest a solution that will require some pain, we give all sides what they want instead. But here's the catch: It is not giving them what they want as defined by them. It is giving people what they want as defined by an intimate understanding of their end goals and motivations. People take actions and those actions are taken to achieve some end goal. Almost everybody comes to relate a specific action with a specific end goal when in reality there are any number of actions that can be taken to achieve an end goal.

The Australian implementation of the Oasis Forestry Reform is a perfect example:

- ❖ Forest Industries Companies currently cut down native forests because it is cheaper and more cost effective to do so.
- ❖ Forest Industries Companies want to maintain the size of their businesses and see them grow.
- ❖ Workers in the Forest Industries want to keep their jobs.
- ❖ Environmentalists want to preserve native forests.
- ❖ Government's wish is to maintain export dollars, preserve jobs, make the voters happy and keep industry on their side.

These are the sides in the issue of native forest logging.

The Oasis Forestry Reform makes it cheaper and more cost effective for Forest Industries Companies to source plantation trees, it increases the size of their business by many factors, employment in the industry is greatly increased, native forests are left alone, exports are maintained, voters are happy because there is no loss of jobs and we are leading the world in a major climate change initiative, and industry in general is very happy because over \$50 billion is being spent across more than a dozen industries (to provide the infrastructure for the Oasis Project). And industry is doubly happy with the revelation of a new methodology that shows how to truly solve our problems in such a way so that we can actually make a huge amount of money at the same time.

In short, Oasis solves the problem of deforestation by increasing commerce, and this is the main theme behind the idea of balancing reforms. Oasis and Kyoto II are only the first amongst more than a dozen that have already been developed. But even if there is already twenty developed, we can always use forty.

Think of it in these general terms. If you are going to take action that will take three or four trillion dollars out of the global economy and you want to do it without any pain, the obvious track to take is to add in more than you're taking out, and to ensure those being effected get more than enough to make up for what they're losing. It doesn't get any simpler than that, and as soon as people start thinking in terms of balancing reforms, it really is going to be, as simple as that.

Repercussions for Industry

In the development of new technology before now, the idea of developing balancing reforms to offset the cost of introducing it was never an option. It is something that has never occurred to us, because we've never needed to do it.

Now that we are looking at eliminating the need for fossil fuels it is something that we need to do for a number of reasons.

It is true that any new technology that will eliminate the need for fossil fuels will leave a huge hole in the global economy after its implementation, and we don't need to go any further for the reason why balancing reforms are required.

What can be said is that human beings are very resourceful. If we point people in the right direction and say we **MUST** have a thing, then someone will find a way to get that thing, balancing reforms in this case.

Eliminating the need for fossil fuels as an action by itself is going to take several trillion dollars out of the global economy. But heading down the track of balancing reforms there are tens of trillion of dollars to be added into the global economy, so there will be no financial losers in our move away from fossil fuels.

With a complete understanding of the ideology behind balancing reforms, the new commerce that will be created in the coming decades will more than double the size of the global economy. The Oasis Forestry Reform and the FISCIL Fishing Industry Reform are two accessible examples of balancing reforms. There are discussion papers already online for both Oasis and FISCIL.

So the repercussions for industry?

Introduction of Kyoto II has only upside for industry. Collectively, governments around the world will spend over \$500 billion in research and programs designed to increase commerce. Industry will probably benefit to the tune of about \$200 billion of this, maybe more, but they get all the benefits of the result of this research and programs. Upside for industry? What a massive understatement.

CO₂ Sequestration

Simply put, this is the absorption of carbon dioxide by trees as they grow. It was a big issue in the first Kyoto Protocol, and it plays a part in Kyoto II as well.

As a fully developed and budget neutral initiative, the Oasis Forestry Reform is likely to feature more prominently in Kyoto II than it currently does as Kyoto II is developed beyond its original design. They are two separate reforms and they were designed separately, but because some of their goals are intertwined it is appropriate for Oasis to feature inside Kyoto II.

As two hundred million hectares of forest plantations, Oasis speaks for itself in the area of CO₂ sequestration. But even more, the primary fertilizer used for Oasis will also sequester a great deal of carbon below the soil surface (and in the trees) that would normally have bubbled up from the “sewerage layer” around our coasts.

With the adoption of the Oasis Forestry Reform and its expansion strategies the issue of CO₂ sequestration is made quite moot (We will have over thirty-five million hectares of plantation forest in Australia, and over one hundred and fifty million hectares of plantation forest in Africa.).

The Oasis Forestry Reform has the issue of CO₂ sequestration very much under control, and the simultaneous implementation of Oasis and Kyoto II will be akin to one of the greatest symphonies of the ages, and a watershed moment in our history; the moment we started heading in the right direction.

The issue of carbon credits has also been strongly connected with carbon sequestration, and so this is a good opportunity to mention it. There is a very strong objection to connecting carbon credits to Kyoto II, because carbon credits is not real commerce. Carbon credits is something imaginary that has been made real with sleight of hand, and to include it in something of substance is to degrade the thing of substance. This is only my personal preference, and the bottom line is that it will be incorporated into Kyoto II or not according to consensus.

Carbon credits and all of its variations is pretend commerce that robs Peter to pay Paul. However it may be designed, if it is ever adopted, it would end up being traded by the pretend money men who push money around all day and create nothing. Futures, Warrants, Derivatives etc. etc., are not going to sequester any carbon, nor accomplish anything of substance in the issue of climate change, and we don't need to do it to satisfy the real money men because we satisfy them with Hard Assets inside all of the various reforms. The pretend money men do not need to be satisfied in here; every new “product” is just a snack between meals and they won't even notice its absence.

Incentives to Participate

Always a key element when it is something that costs money.

All the sides in the issue agree that climate change is real, and with the first Kyoto being viewed as a bust people have been looking for other action to be taken; politicians have been looking to do something else and in Kyoto II we have something with upside for politicians and no downside, **no possible downside**.

Governments like to spend money when it means increasing commerce, and that is exactly what Kyoto II will ask them to do.

It has many of the same elements as the first Kyoto, but the language and focus of Kyoto II are shifted from reducing emissions, to finding technology and socio-economic reforms that will **increase the size of the global economy**.

The primary incentive to participate is that it gives governments an answer to one of the biggest political questions of the age: What do we do about climate change?

Another incentive to participate is the spirit of competition that Kyoto II will engender. The general spirit of the first Kyoto was “you must do this or else 50 years down the track, blah, blah, blah, maybe this, maybe that”. The general spirit of Kyoto II is “this is a competition, and the biggest prize in history is up for grabs. Which of these is more likely to get action from its human participants? Which of these runs with human nature? And which runs against?”

That Kyoto II will fill a huge hole in global policy, and in such a way that it will catalyze a huge increase in the size of the global economy is all the incentive that is needed, but just in case we needed another incentive:

Kyoto II will produce grand enterprises and set a good example, and as a famous 16th century political philosopher once said, “there is nothing that makes a leader more loved”.

Conclusion

Kyoto II is not meant to be a solution in itself, although it certainly has the potential to be so. Kyoto II is meant to be a device that gets the entire world moving in the same direction on the issue of climate change. It is meant to get us to a point where we can start looking at solutions and make the first step.

The world is ready to start solving its problems. For too long we have attempted to solve our problems without considering the human element. Without considering that people will behave in certain ways, and they will always (always) oppose action that will take the food off their table, and even if there is only a remote possibility that it will.

Kyoto II says the emissions targets are important, and the creation of revolutionary new technology is also important, but nothing is more important than the human element, and that the balancing reforms come before the introduction of any new technology and before any reduction in fossil fuels.

We are adversarial by nature and any solution we have ever proffered in the big picture has always had an adversarial flavour to it.

It has never occurred to us to use balancing reforms. It has never occurred to us for all sides to win because the zero sum always occurs to us first and we look no further. It has never occurred to us to step back and look at the world as one big issue, and that we will never solve just one major problem at a time.

Discussion papers for Kyoto II, the Oasis Forestry Reform, for climate change in general, and for FISCIL were made available in December 2010, but this is only part of a greater agenda that seeks to solve the world's problems with action that runs with human nature, rather than against it as all so called solutions always have.

Kyoto II will not try to be something that it's not. It is a bridging tool towards a first step in addressing climate change and not a first step. When there is so much disagreement on an issue, a great deal of work needs to be done before we can get ourselves to a first step. Our inability to solve most of our biggest problems comes about because we always try to jump straight into the first step, until now. In the big picture real consensus must precede formulative action.

(Some people who have been dealing with our biggest problems for decades without result are going to tell you that last statement is not right; understand?)

America is the country we must satisfy in order to have an international agreement on climate change that actually means something, and China and India are number two and three on this list of countries we must satisfy. Kyoto II speaks America's language, and it will not interfere with a developing economy's ability to grow, quite the opposite.

Kyoto Protocol II Draft Agreement

(Terms and Language will be refined)

Article 1

For the purposes of this Protocol the definitions in Article 1 shall apply.

1. "All Countries" means all sovereign states on Planet Earth.
2. "Party or Parties" means a party or parties to this Protocol.
3. "Implementation Schedules" means time frames for implementation of technologies and reforms and additional creations that have arisen from this Protocol. It does NOT mean for implementation of this Protocol as ratification implies immediate acceptance and immediate implementation.
4. "Reforms or Reform" means any social or economic reform designed to improve global environmental and social conditions.
5. "Global Environment" means the land, water and atmosphere of Planet Earth.
6. "Greenhouse Gases" means the pre-agreed compounds that will form part of this agreement.
7. "New Technology Ideas" means technology that has not been used commercially as at the date of the signing of this Protocol. It does not preclude the development of technology where a single working prototype has been built and the single working prototype is being used commercially.
8. "Corporation" means any enterprise that is engaged in the business of making money as its primary function.
9. For the purposes of the effective implementation of this Protocol the European Union is to be considered as a single entity or Party rather than as separate countries.

Article 2

The Parties to this Protocol are to meet biennially on the anniversary of the implementation of the Protocol to share technology, technology directions, Reforms, and Reform directions, and to discuss each Party's performance and Implementation Schedules, and to address the admittance of new Parties to the Protocol.

Article 3

All countries are to be evaluated with regard to their individual impact on global warming and will be assigned an initial rating based on that evaluation. Two calculations are to be made. One for the purpose of quantification of each Party's absolute contribution, and the other for their contribution to global warming relative to their population. The evaluation will take account of the following factors:

- (a) The population of each country at their last census, or an estimate from an appropriate source where census details do not exist or if a census has not been taken in the preceding twenty-four months.
- (b) Absolute annual emissions of Greenhouse Gases. Where official statistics are available these are to be used, and otherwise an estimate is to be made by an appropriate authority.
- (c) Absolute forest cover per square kilometre.

(d) The existing environmental policy of a country is to be evaluated by an impartial committee of scientists, and assigned a value that can then be included into each country's rating.

The initial absolute and relative ratings given to a country must only include these factors and the design of the equation to be used is to be decided by an impartial committee of twelve of the most senior environmental scientists around the world, and no country may have more than two representatives on this committee.

Article 4

The equation that is defined in Article 3 is to be applied to each country in turn by an impartial committee of twelve environmental scientists in the lead up to the first conference, and a final rating applied for both absolute and relative contribution to global warming.

Article 5

With regard to Article 2 of this Protocol, a recalculation is to be made for each country in the lead up to each conference. A committee of twelve environmental scientists is selected in the lead up to each new conference and may not include committee members who served on an Article 4 committee or an Article 5 committee in the lead up to any previous conference. The recalculation is to be made by this newly created Article 5 committee of twelve environmental scientists in the lead up to the biennial conference, and this recalculation is to include:

- (a) A fresh assessment of the elements in Article 3.
- (b) The Party's involvement in technological developments that affect the global environment, both negatively and positively, and with special regard to their global implementability, and commercial viability.
- (c) The Party's involvement in the development of social and economic reforms that positively impact the global environment, both implemented and proposed.
- (d) The amount of funds directed to Article 6 research organisations.
- (e) The absolute amount of funds directed to research.

To encourage revelations and discussion of technologies, technology directions, Reforms, and Reform directions, equal credit will be accorded in the calculations to the Party that proposes an idea or direction originally as the Party that fully develops a Reform or technology based on an idea proposed by another Party. Committee members must recuse themselves when their country of origin, citizenship or residence is being considered by the committee.

Article 6

Each Party agrees to establish a research organisation or to join a new organisation created by another Party to this Protocol to satisfy the conditions of Article 6 of this Protocol. Article 6 research organisations must conform to the following conditions:

- (a) Only one organisation or less is permitted per country for the purposes of satisfying this Protocol. Less refers to the ability of one Party to join another Party's organisation to satisfy the conditions of this Article 6.
- (b) The organisation referred to in Article 6(a) must be a NON-government organisation and operate as a not for profit organisation.
- (c) The organisation referred to in Article 6(a) must receive annual funding from the Party equivalent to one percent or more of the Party's GDP.
- (d) Research is to be conducted on a wide range of environmental technologies with a view to improving the Global Environment.

- (e) Research is to be conducted on socio-economic Reforms that will assist the global economy in the move away from fossil fuels, and to assist in the improvement of the Global Environment.
- (f) In Article 6(a) organisations research may NOT be undertaken on the following technology:
 - (i) Fossil fuel technology of any kind.
 - (ii) Photovoltaics where the energy is sourced from the sun with terrestrial collectors.
 - (iii) That which is commonly referred to as Wind Energy where the wind is naturally occurring from above ground sources.
 - (iv) Hydro-electricity that is created from dams.
 - (v) Bio-fuels or any other source of energy that requires the burning or use of fuel that produces a by-product of any kind other than water or water vapour.
 - (vi) Nuclear Fission technology.
- (g) In each Article 6(a) organisation the percentage of total research funds diverted to New Technology Ideas must equal or exceed twenty-five percent of its budget.
- (h) In each Article 6(a) organisation the total percentage of research funds diverted to Hydrogen Fuel Cell technology and other closely related technology must not exceed ten percent of its budget.
- (i) In each Article 6(a) organisation the total percentage of research funds diverted to Fusion technology and other closely related technology must not exceed twenty-five percent of its budget.
- (j) In each Article 6(a) organisation the total percentage of research funds diverted to technology involving materials commonly referred to as Radioactive materials, other than that which may be required for Fusion technology, must not exceed five percent of its budget.
- (k) Patents for any newly developed technologies must be held by the Article 6(a) organisation but must be made freely available to any other Article 6(a) organisation around the world for research or development purposes without license or any other equivalent type of fee.
- (l) Article 6(k) does not preclude the payment of fees or any other form of exchange where direct technical assistance is required, and without limiting too much what level of payment is reasonable, any charges or fees for assistance must not exceed what is commercially reasonable for the giving of technical advice in international commerce.
- (m) In each Article 6(a) organisation the total percentage of research funds diverted to research as specified in Article 6(e) must equal or exceed twenty-five percent of its budget.
- (n) The controlling council, committee, or directorate of each Article 6(a) organisation must be comprised of no less than six individuals, and every member of that council, committee or directorate must have a long established track record of executive participation in Not For Profit organisations with special regard to the environment, environmental sciences or energy sciences.
- (o) Article 6(a) organisations are expressly forbidden to enter into any commercial arrangement with a Corporation or any other organisation that is intended to give a commercial advantage to any organisation or Corporation other than another Article 6(a) organisation or itself.
- (p) Donations may be accepted by the Article 6(a) organisation but any such donation must not have *quid pro quo* beyond a tax deduction, or other such tax benefit as considered appropriate by the Party.
- (q) Donations from non-government sources may not be counted towards a Party's compliance with Article 6(c) of this Protocol.

Article 7

Each Party to this Protocol must undertake to strive, through development of new technologies and new Reforms that will improve their economy, to achieve a quantified emission limitation of fifty percent or better of year 2000 levels by December 2026, and twenty percent or better of year 2000 levels by December 2036 for those in Group One in the Annex, and for those in Group Two to strive to achieve a quantified emission limitation of fifty percent or better of year 2000 levels by 2036.

Article 8

Each Party to this Protocol that has in excess of five hundred thousand square kilometres of terrestrial territory agrees to facilitate the establishment of a new forestry corporation within their own country to create substantial plantations by:

- (a) Assigning unimproved or denuded land to the Article 8 Corporation equivalent to five percent or more of the country's total land area on a one hundred year penny leasehold condition, or other such non-freehold condition that will allow use of the land at a cost that does not exceed one ten thousandth of its unimproved commercial value.
- (b) Allowing access to all forms of uncommitted society waste, at no cost, for the production of low cost soil improvement.
- (c) Fast tracking infrastructure projects.
- (d) Providing favourable taxation status, including special treatment of personal income tax for staff of the Article 8 Corporation to enable special arrangements.
- (e) Other implements, financial, social and legislative, to be determined, and as appropriate for the specific conditions within each country.

Article 9

The rating of a country, calculated according to Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 of this Protocol, must improve every four years. No trading is possible to improve the rating of a country, such as in the Carbon Credits scheme previously floated.

Articles 10-20

Are roughly similar to the blah, blah that covers things such as the clean development mechanism, secretariat, advisors, multilateral consultations, amendments, disputes, about annexes and annexes, voting etc. etc. etc., in the original Kyoto documents, and with only minor difference, would have little value in reproducing here.

Although there would be a muddy middle ground of about ten to twenty countries as far as Article 7 is concerned, it is otherwise obvious who the Group One countries are, and who are the Group Two. And any elements that require additional clarification such as Articles 6(d) to 6(j) will be clarified in the annexes.

PREPARED BY:

Sean Gallacher

61 7 3277 2975

h3@h3operations.com

www.h3operations.com