Climate Negotiations

ENGO perspective
How we view the Copenhagen Agreement

- Due to scale of the problem
- Due to urgency of the problem
- Copenhagen: Our last chance to avoid catastrophic impacts
- Progress: Commitments so far are committing us to 4 degrees increase
Shared Vision: ENGO Position

• A pathway towards 350ppm CO2 equiv, to stay as below as 2C as possible

• Need more than 85% global GHG emission reduction by 2050 compared to 1990 levels

• Emissions need to peak around 2015, and be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020

• A1 countries need to reduce more than 40% by 2020 compared to 1990 level

• Oil exporting and Newly Industrialized Countries take responsibility

• Bunker fuels
Mitigation

• Annex I commitments:
  – Dual responsibility: domestic cuts + International mitigation effort
  – A1 countries need to reduce more than 40% by 2020 compared to 1990 level,
  – 95% by 2050
  – Development of ZCAPs

• Non-Annex I responsibilities
  – NAMAs (production of LCAPs)
  – ‘Agreed’ full incremental costs
  – Peaking before 2020
Other Pillars of BAP

• Finance:
  – 160 -200 billion/year till 2020
  – AAU’s auctioning and bunkers’ levy

• Adaptation:
  – Mitigation is the best adaptation
  – Poorest and most vulnerable
  – Response measures

• Technology:
  – CDM: Nuclear and CCS
  – Off-setting and market mechanisms to the minimum
Legal structure and Process

Legal structure:
• Amendments to Kyoto Protocol
• New Copenhagen Protocol
• Decisions under the CoP

Process:
• Joining the two tracks
• Beyond CoP15
Processes

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)

Kyoto Protocol
First Commitment Period
2008-2012

G8
G8+5
G20
Gleneagles

UN Security Council
UN General Assembly
UN CSD

AWG
SBSTA
SBI
AWG

IPCC
Miscellaneous
Bi/Multi-laterals

US: Major Econom
APEC
APP

OPEC
Milestones for the Rest of the Year

• Bonn III informal (10 - 14 Aug)
• UNGA summit
• G20
• Bangkok
• MEF
• Barcelona
• WTO
• Copenhagen
Countries Critical To Achieving an Ambitious Agreement in Copenhagen

- **EU**: leadership must come from Germany, France and the UK, sufficient to overcome resistance from Poland and Italy
- **Japan and Canada**: Move from Blockers to Players
- **USA**: Increase the Level of Ambition
- **+5 Countries**: The large developing countries need to be ready to engage proactively and ambitiously.
- **Deal Breakers**: The Gulf States, in particular Saudi Arabia. Russia also a problem.
- **Most Vulnerable Countries and SIDS**
- **Other Important Players**: Latin America (at least one country); South Korea; Australia; Turkey
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