



T.M.C Asser Institute

-5 to Copenhagen: where do we stand in the climate change negotiations?

Leonardo Massai

Keyenergy, Rimini, 31 October 2009

Contents

- Current standpoint in the negotiations
- Deadlocks
- Form of the agreed outcome

Background

- Montreal 2005
 - **UNFCCC**: Dialogue on long term cooperative action to address climate change AWG-LCA
 - **Kyoto Protocol**: Ad-Hoc Working Group on further commitments for Annex I Parties AWG-KP
- Bali Action Plan 2007:
 - 2 years of negotiations 8 meetings
 - 2 tracks: KP and LCA

2009 negotiations schedule

2008: Bangkok, Bonn, Accra, Poznan

AWG-LCA5 & AWG-KP7: March-April 2009 Bonn

AWG-LCA6 & AWG-KP8 and SB30 (SBSTA and SBI):

1-12 June 2009 Bonn

Intersessional informal consultations:

10-14 August 2009 Bonn

AWG-LCA7 & AWG-KP9:

28 September-9 October 2009 Bangkok

Resumed AWG-LCA7 & AWG-KP9:

2-6 November 2009 Barcelona

COP15 & CMP5: 7-18 December 2009 **Copenhagen**

Current standpoint in the negotiations TO BE UPDATED

- AWG LCA: reordered and consolidated negotiating text covering 5 blocks
 - shared vision, mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology transfer
- AWG KP:
 - No single/consolidated text
 - 4 main documents
 - Amendments KP (art.3.9) (.../Add.1/Rev.1)
 - Other proposed amends KP (not touched in August .. too hot!) (.../Add.2/)
 - Draft decisions on other issues (.../Add.3/Rev.2)
 - Proposals for agg/ind figures AI parties (.../Add.4/Rev.2)

Deadlocks

- Double track approach
- USA
- Numbers
- Offset mechanisms
- LULUCF

Numbers (I)

- What science (2007) requires ...
- 25-40% GHG emission reduction by developed countries by 2020: good chance to stay below 2°C

IPCC 2007 4th Assessment Report WG III

Box 13.7 The range of the difference between emissions in 1990 and emission allowances in 2020/2050 for various GHG concentration levels for Annex I and non-Annex I countries as a group^a

| Scenario category | Region | 2020 | 2050 |
|--|-------------|---|--|
| A-450 ppm CO ₂ -eq ^b | Annex I | -25% to -40% | -50% to -95% |
| | Non-Annex I | Substantial deviation from baseline in Latin America, Middle East, East Asia and Centrally-Planned Asia | Substantial deviation from baseline in all regions |
| B-550 ppm CO ₂ -eq | Annex I | -10% to -30% | -40% to -90% |
| | Non-Annex I | Deviation from baseline in Latin America and Middle East, East Asia | Deviation from baseline in most regions, especially in Latin America and Middle East |
| C-650 ppm CO ₂ -eq | Annex I | 0% to -25% | -30% to -80% |
| | Non-Annex I | Baseline | Deviation from baseline in Latin America and Middle East, East Asia |

Notes:

- ^a The aggregate range is based on multiple approaches to apportion emissions between regions (contraction and convergence, multistage, Triptych and intensity targets, among others). Each approach makes different assumptions about the pathway, specific national efforts and other variables. Additional extreme cases – in which Annex I undertakes all reductions, or non-Annex I undertakes all reductions – are not included. The ranges presented here do not imply political feasibility, nor do the results reflect cost variances.
- ^b Only the studies aiming at stabilization at 450 ppm CO₂-eq assume a (temporary) overshoot of about 50 ppm (see Den Elzen and Meinshausen, 2006).

Source: See references listed in first paragraph of Section 13.3.3.3

Numbers (III)

- What AI Parties are pledging ...

| Paese | Obbligo Protocollo di Kyoto (%) | Proposta di riduzione unilaterale entro il 2020 (%) | Obiettivo al 2020 rispetto al 1990 (%) In base alla proposta di riduzione unilaterale |
|-------------------|--|--|---|
| Australia | +8 | 5-25 al 2000 | - 2 a - 22 |
| Bielorussia | - 8 | 5-10 al 1990 | - 5 a - 10 |
| Canada | - 6 | 20 al 2006 | - 3 |
| Croazia* | - 5 | 6 al 1990 | +6 |
| EU27 | - 8 | 20-30 al 1990 | - 20 a - 30 |
| Islanda | +10 | 15 al 1990 | - 15 |
| Giappone | - 6 | 25 al 1990 | - 25 |
| Nuova Zelanda | 0 | 10-20 al 1990 | - 10 a - 20 |
| Norvegia | +1 | 40 al 1990 | - 30 |
| Federazione Russa | 0 | 10-15 al 1990 | - 10 a - 15 |
| Svizzera | - 8 | 20-30 al 1990 | - 20 a - 30 |
| Ucraina | 0 | 20 al 1990 | - 20 |
| USA | - 7 | 14-20 al 2005 | - 1 a - 8 |

Proposals by Parties on agreed outcome

- JAP: new single protocol
- TUV: amends KP + Copenhagen Protocol
- AUS: Post-2012 agreement
- CRC: Copenhagen protocol
- USA: Copenhagen agreement
- EU: Copenhagen agreement
- SAF: amends KP + legally binding instrument bridging UNFCCC and KP
- Korea

Form agreed outcome

- LCA track:
 - Protocol (Art.17, 6 months rule)
 - Amendment (Art.15,6 months rule, $\frac{3}{4}$ majority as extrema ratio)
 - COP decision (agenda items COP15,consensus)
- KP track:
 - Amendment (Art.20/6 months rule)
 - CMP decision

One single instrument

- Cherry picking from Kyoto Protocol
- Reenter long-lasting negotiation phase
- Lowering of ambitions
- Compliance system to be replaced

**‘Advanced developing countries
should take on quantified
emission reductions...’**

*US delegation chief in Bangkok,
October 2009*

‘The KP track is about to be destroyed .. The train to Copenhagen is in peril. Don’t kill the KP and don’t’t derails our Copenhagen train..’

China’s special envoy for climate

Thank you !