

Third World Network Tianjin Climate News Updates

(October 2010)



TWN

Third World Network

Third World Network
TIANJIN CLIMATE NEWS UPDATES
(October 2010)

TWN

Third World Network

TIANJIN CLIMATE NEWS UPDATES (OCTOBER 2010)

is published by

Third World Network

131 Jalan Macalister

10400 Penang, Malaysia

Website: www.twinside.org.sg

© Third World Network 2010

Printed by Jutaprint

2 Solok Sungei Pinang 3, Sg. Pinang

11600 Penang, Malaysia

ISBN: 978-967-5412-41-7

CONTENTS

NOTE

Update No.	Title of Paper	Page
1	Key Issues in the UNFCCC's Tianjin Climate Session	<i>1</i>
2	Developing Countries Call for Balanced Outcomes in Cancun	<i>7</i>
3	Developing Countries United on Ambitious Kyoto Protocol Reduction Targets	<i>12</i>
4	Mandate of the AWG-KP Contact Group on Legal Matters in Dispute	<i>16</i>
5	“Stock-taking Meeting” Midway through Tianjin Shows Divergence of Views on Process and Outcome for Cancun	<i>19</i>
6	Call for a Permanent Forum on Potential Consequences from Response Measures to Climate Change	<i>24</i>
7	AWG-KP Legal Matters Group Deadlocked over Mandate	<i>26</i>
8	Long Way to Go on Fast-start Finance – Says Development NGO	<i>31</i>
9	Divergent Views Remain over Kyoto Protocol Second Commitment Period	<i>33</i>
10	Kyoto Protocol's Future Still Uncertain	<i>37</i>
11	Parties Voice Concern over Limited Progress in Tianjin Climate Talks	<i>41</i>
12	Developing Countries Stress on Party-driven Text for Cancun	<i>46</i>
13	BASIC Countries Set out Expectations for Cancun Conference	<i>49</i>

NOTE

This is a collection of the 13 News Updates prepared by the Third World Network for and during the United Nations Climate Change Talks (Twelfth Session of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change – UNFCCC AWG-LCA 12, and the Fourteenth Session of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol – AWG-KP 14) in Tianjin, China, from 4 to 9 October 2010.

TWN

Tianjin News Update

1

www.twinside.org.sg

Published by
Third World Network

4 October 2010

Key Issues in the UNFCCC's Tianjin Climate Session

Tianjin, 4 October (Meena Raman) – The United Nations climate negotiations resume in Tianjin, China on 4-9 October 2010, with a continuation of the two tracks in the two working groups on Long-term Cooperative Action under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (LCA) and the Kyoto Protocol (KP).

The Tianjin meeting is the final meeting before the annual climate conference in Cancun, Mexico in late November.

New draft text for the LCA group

At the LCA group, it will be the first occasion in which a real engagement will take place to negotiate a text. The previous meetings after the Copenhagen Conference were spent on procedural issues (such as which text should be used in future negotiations) and on the re-building of a new draft text (in which various Parties in spin-off and drafting groups proposed the adding of language or square-bracketing of language to a previous Chair-written draft).

Significant progress has been made, in that there is now a new Member-driven draft text, issued on 13 August. Thus, the Tianjin meeting can now negotiate on the basis of this draft.

The various positions are placed as different options in this draft. It is clear that there are big differences between the Parties, and especially between developed and developing countries, in all the sections and issues. But there is at least a basis for negotiations.

One of the interesting aspects in the Tianjin negotiations is how the interface will play out between elements of the Copenhagen Accord and other positions that are opposed to it in the new text.

The United States and other developed countries (especially in the Umbrella Group) have insisted on the operationalising of the Copenhagen

Accord. The controversial Accord was not adopted by the Conference of Parties at the Copenhagen meeting, as several developing countries saw it as having emerged from an undemocratic process. However, many developing countries have also associated with the Accord since the Copenhagen meeting, while many others have stayed out.

The language of the Accord has now been integrated as options in the various parts of the new text of the LCA working group. Several developing countries and their groupings have also placed language representing their positions (which often are greatly different from the Accord positions) into the new text. Some developing countries that are associated with the Accord also prefer other options with language different from the Accord.

Kyoto Protocol track

The other working group, to negotiate the further commitments of Annex I Parties in the Kyoto Protocol, will also have a new draft before it. The draft was prepared by the group's Chair, Ambassador John Ashe of Antigua and Barbuda. It contains various options which include amendments to Article 3.9 of the KP, that provides for the emission reductions of Annex I Parties (developed countries) for their second commitment period, following the expiry of the first commitment period in 2012.

The negotiations under this working group have been marked by resistance and reluctance on the part of developed countries that are members of the Protocol to agree on the numbers for their emission reduction targets under the Protocol.

The United States is not a member of the Protocol, although it is a Party to the Convention. The other Annex I Parties do not want to make binding commitments under the KP while the US is left out.

At the Bali conference (December 2007), the Parties agreed (in the Bali Action Plan under the Convention) that all developed countries would make a comparable effort in emissions reduction. This was taken to mean that the US would make its commitment either as a new member of the Protocol or through a separate decision under the Bali Action Plan process in the Convention.

In the past year it became clearer and clearer that most developed countries that are KP Parties no longer want to make a commitment inside the KP. They are proposing a new set-up under the Convention that also covers the emission reduction commitment of the US as well as the mitigation pledges of “advanced developing countries”.

In October 2009, the European Union also stated it wanted a single agreement in the Convention (which was widely interpreted as the phasing out of the KP). Recently however it has indicated it is willing to consider establishing a second commitment period for emissions reduction under the Kyoto Protocol.

The developing countries on the other hand are united in opposing any move to kill the KP and have called on Annex I Parties in the Protocol to confirm their mitigation commitments in a second period beginning in 2013.

Most developing countries have proposed that the Annex I Parties shall commit to an aggregate reduction of emissions by at least 40-50% by 2020 compared to the 1990 levels. The G77 and China also recently agreed that the second period should be 2013-2017. Thus the 40-50% figure would be calculated to fit the 2017 end-date.

Tianjin will witness the continuation of the most strategic battle of the climate talks, with developing countries lined up on one side to insist on the KP’s continuation beyond 2013 and most developed countries on the other side stalling in the negotiations on numbers for their KP commitment because they want to jump ship from the KP but do not dare to say so explicitly and do not want to be blamed for stopping the KP negotiations altogether.

Meanwhile, many developing countries are contemplating what they should do if it is clear that the Annex I countries in the KP do not want any meaningful outcome in the KP talks. Should the developing countries continue to negotiate new obligations for themselves, especially to take mitigation actions that are subject to MRV (measurement, reporting and verification), when the developed countries are downgrading their own mitigation commitments (from the legally-binding environmentally-ambitious KP targets being

negotiated, to the voluntary pledge system of the Copenhagen Accord)? This is a strategic question that some developing country delegations are asking.

ANALYSIS OF THE NEW LCA TEXT

In the LCA track, the 13 August text was the result of negotiations in the last Bonn session on 2-6 August. It comprises 70 pages, with 9 chapters dealing with shared vision for long-term cooperative action; enhanced action on adaptation; mitigation for developed and developing countries; the provision of financial resources and investment; technology development and transfer; and capacity-building.

Under mitigation, the sub-topics involve reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, cooperative sectoral approaches, various approaches including the use of markets and the economic and social consequences of response measures (that include the climate and trade linkage).

As noted by the Chair of the LCA working group Ms. Margaret Mukahanana-Sangarwe of Zimbabwe in her scenario note for the talks in Tianjin, “The text is now richer in substance and reflects more accurately the perspective of Parties on the issues. At the same time, many challenges remain and a significant number of issues still need to be resolved and differences overcome.”

The following is a summary of the Third World Network’s analysis of the 13 August text, which highlights the major issues that are expected to feature prominently in Tianjin and Cancun.

Shared vision

The developing countries have insisted on an “integrated approach” to the shared vision, which could include the key elements of the four building blocks of mitigation, adaptation, finance and technology. It should not be focused only on the aspect, also mandated by the Bali Action Plan, of the long-term global goal of emission reductions.

An associated issue is the limit to the global temperature rise to be achieved by 2050. On this, the Copenhagen Accord agreed to a 2 degree C limit while many developing countries have advocated a 1.5 degree C and some even a 1 degree C level.

In order to limit the temperature rise, developing countries have proposed that the deep cuts in emission levels must be “consistent with the science and on the basis of equity in accordance with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, taking into account historical responsibilities and be preceded by a paradigm for equitable access to global atmospheric space”.

Bolivia in particular has called for “*allocating the remaining carbon budget up until 2050 according to the criteria of population and the climate emissions debt of Annex I Parties*”, while China has called for emission reductions to be “*based on per capita accumulative historical emissions, under which the leadership on emission reductions needs to be shown by Annex I Parties*”. These are all in the 13 August text.

According to sources from developing countries, at the last meeting in Bonn in August, the US is reported to have said that “equity” means a fair share of obligations by all Parties and Russia was said to be opposed to “historical responsibility”.

The European Union on the other hand has been advancing a global cut in emissions of at least 50% from 2020 levels by 2050 and for developed countries as a group to reduce their emissions by 80% from 1990 levels.

Analysis by the South Centre shows that the EU proposal would implicitly mean a 20% cut in emissions for developing countries from 1990 levels by 2050, which would amount to an 80% cut per capita for developed countries and a 60% cut per capita for developing countries as the population of the developed countries is expected to remain the same while that of the developing countries would double.

In terms of the carbon budget, a South Centre analysis shows that the EU proposal would imply that the Annex I countries’ share of the carbon budget for 2010-2050 would be 30-35% or double their projected share of the world population of 16%. According to the Centre, “this not only worsens the developed countries’ cumulative carbon debt but writes it off as well for the period 1850-2009.”

Several developing countries have argued that such proposals by developed countries are inequitable and unfair as the developed countries continue to over-consume the remaining atmospheric space.

The issue of fair burden-sharing as regards the emission cuts of developed and developing countries has been a highly contentious matter. The developing countries insist that the developed countries accept their historical responsibility and recognise their carbon debt, and have this reflected in the numbers for future emission reduction targets including in the “shared vision.” The equity principles involved have now been further developed with the concept of “equitable sharing of the atmospheric space”, which is in the new text. Some developing countries are asking that the discussion on the atmospheric space

precede an agreement on long-term emission reduction. However, developed countries have so far resisted this concept and its implications.

Mitigation of developed countries

On the mitigation commitments of developed countries, some developed countries introduced a new proposal (at the August Bonn session), now in paragraph 14 bis: “*As of [date], Annex I of the Convention will be deemed to include those Parties that meet the following criteria:[J]*”.

From the viewpoint of developing countries, this is a dangerous proposal as it seeks to redefine who are Annex I Parties and is an attempt to differentiate among developing countries. Developed countries already commonly refer to “advanced” or “major” developing countries, but there is no agreement that these terms be used, or how these categories are defined. In the course of negotiations, several developing countries including India, Singapore and Malaysia have opposed such proposals, stating that this is contrary to the Convention and the Bali Action Plan.

The negotiating text also contains proposals from the Copenhagen Accord which was primarily advanced by the US for a system of voluntary and non-binding emission-reduction national pledges, instead of the system containing a top-down aggregate number (consistent with the science) combined with mitigation targets of each developed country which are comparable with one another.

Paragraph 14 of the text is from the Accord which merely provides that “*Developed country/ Annex I Parties commit to (shall) implement individually or jointly the quantified economy-wide emissions targets/commitments for 2020/2017, to be submitted by these Parties in the format given/set out in Appendix I*”.

Developing countries are of the view that agreement on this proposal alone would effectively lead to the demise of the Kyoto Protocol and its top-down aggregate number approach. They have therefore proposed the inclusion of language in the text (in paragraphs 15-19) which ensures the need for aggregate cuts by setting a collective goal through which the individual targets will be arrived at through a process of sharing of effort among developed countries and as advanced in the Kyoto Protocol to which the United States is not a Party.

During the Bonn session in June, developing countries favoured the approach of a collective or aggregate target to be set, in a top-down approach based on what is scientifically needed, and not through individual pledges in a bottom-up process.

The European Union was in favour of an aggregate target to be set, proposing a 30% emissions reduction by 2020 compared to 1990 levels.

The United States did not refer to an aggregate target for developed countries but referred to a “collective goal” of limiting temperature rise to 2 degrees C by 2050, while Russia explicitly favoured a bottom-up approach where the collective goal would be arrived at by adding up the individual pledges of all developed countries.

The US in Copenhagen, during the AWG-LCA negotiations, had proposed the same approach as Russia; it had proposed that the aggregate target be determined by the sum of the individual pledges of Annex I Parties which is reflected by the figure (X%) in paragraph 18 of the then negotiating text with a footnote.

The developing countries’ preferred options in the 13 August text include paragraph 16, that developed country Parties’ quantified economy-wide emission reduction commitments will be formulated as a percentage reduction in greenhouse gas emissions with a placeholder for this to be decided based on the outcome of the AWG-KP in relation to the emission cuts for the second commitment period.

Paragraph 17 has options for the targets of developed countries to be those adopted for the second or further commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol as inscribed in Annex B of the Kyoto Protocol as amended, and for other Annex I Parties that are not Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (referring to the US), the agreed economy-wide quantified emission reduction commitments to be in an appendix to a decision herein.

These proposals by developing countries underscore their position of the need for an outcome in the AWG-KP track and an outcome in the AWG-LCA to accommodate the US consistent with paragraph 1(b)(i) of the Bali Action Plan.

This battle between the two approaches (now reflected in para. 14 versus paras. 15-19) is a fundamental one, and can be expected to feature prominently in Tianjin.

Nationally appropriate mitigation actions of developing countries (NAMAs)

At the Bonn August session, the text in the section dealing with the mitigation actions of developing countries was expanded significantly, with developed countries making more proposals for further obligations by developing countries, including very detailed reporting once in two years of their greenhouse gas emissions, as well as their

mitigation actions (this is now reflected especially in para. 35 of the new text).

The developed countries have also proposed details of: (i) the system of the measuring, reporting and verification (MRV) for the developing countries’ mitigation actions that are internationally funded, and (ii) a newly proposed system of “international consultation and analysis” (ICA) of the developing countries’ mitigation actions that are not internationally funded.

The MRV concept was agreed to in the Bali Action Plan but how it is to be operationalised has not been agreed on. The ICA concept was introduced through the Copenhagen Accord, but many developing countries that have not associated with the Accord do not agree that their domestically-funded NAMAs have to be subjected to an ICA system.

In para. 35, developed countries have proposed that the NAMAs of developing countries which are “*enabled and supported by finance, technology and capacity-building shall be subject to international measurement, reporting and verification, including for new procedures described in paragraphs 38–43quater, accompanied by a review of the effectiveness of measures, financial auditing, and quantitative assessment of results achieved by supported activities by financial institutions and entities, and any additional guidelines....*”

In para. 39, developed countries have proposed that developing countries in addition to the submission of their national communications also prepare and submit biennially to the COP a report containing the following elements: (a) national greenhouse gas inventories, and supplementary information specific to the pledged mitigation action, (b) a detailed description of the nature and status of implementation of mitigation actions, (c) methodologies used and assumptions made in quantifying emission reductions or removals, (d) information on receipt of finance, technology and capacity-building support [how the support was used, and how it related to needs identified in the Party’s low emission development strategy, enabling environment for receipt of support, and actions linked to international offsets, (e) a detailed description of the system of domestic measurement, reporting and verification (including methodologies and assumptions used and independence and expertise of reviewers) and detailed results of domestic verification of mitigation actions and (f) information on adaptation needs, including adaptation projects or activities and difficulties encountered in their implementation.

In relation to the ICA (a new concept that arose from the Copenhagen Accord), developed countries have made new proposals on what they want.

Paragraph 41 states that *“the purpose of international consultation and analysis is to assist Parties to improve the quality of greenhouse gas inventories and national communication reporting over time, to share experience and lessons learned, and to promote the environmental effectiveness and transparency of mitigation actions”*.

Para. 42 states that: *“The analysis in the context of paragraph 41 above will be a technical assessment of the information, focusing on correct application of methodologies on transparency and completeness of information reported and will be undertaken by an independent panel of experts ...The panel’s greenhouse gas inventory review experts will conduct analysis of national inventories...”*

Para. 42bis states that *“Following submission of national communications, biennial reports or one year after their non-submission, the panel will analyse the extent to which the Party has followed the reporting requirements for biennial communications, the national greenhouse gas inventory, the extent to which the Party has implemented its mitigation actions and the effect of such actions on emissions.”*

Clearly, these paragraphs if accepted will place new onerous obligations on developing countries, which lack the capacity both to carry out the mitigation actions and to report on them and on their greenhouse gas emissions.

Finance

On the issue of finance, there are many components. On the scale of the finance needed, there is much disagreement between developed and developing countries. Developed countries are pushing the Copenhagen Accord which only promised to mobilize \$100 billion subject to this condition: “in the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation”.

The G77 and China had called for developed countries to commit to an assessed contribution of at least 1.5 per cent a year by 2020 of the GDP of developed countries, while Bolivia has proposed at least 6 % of GDP.

On the institutional issue, there is an emerging consensus for the establishment of a new fund under the authority or guidance of the Convention. However there is no consensus on the trustee and secretariat of the fund. The G77 and China has proposed that the trustee be selected through open competitive bidding. However the US, backed by

some developed countries, has proposed that the World Bank be invited to serve as the trustee or interim trustee of the Fund. This is not agreed to by many developing countries, which have not had good experience with the Bank.

Technology transfer, a technology mechanism and intellectual property rights (IPRs)

On the issue of technology, the G77 and China had proposed the setting up of an Executive Body on Technology comprising government representatives elected by the COP. The EU proposed an Executive Committee while the US proposed a Climate Technology Centre and Network.

The text provides for the setting up of a Technology Mechanism comprised of a Technology Executive Committee and a Climate Technology Centre and Network.

An issue to be resolved is the relationship between the two major components of the Technology Mechanism and the need for clarity on the details i.e. the nature and scope of work of the components, hierarchy between the components of the mechanism and who will guide its work.

In Copenhagen, the US took the position that its Climate Centre should be on equal standing with the Executive Committee, and that it should be independent and not be accountable to the COP, nor be guided by it.

Another contentious issue is intellectual property rights. The G77 and China has called for the relaxation of IPRs in addressing climate technologies for mitigation and adaptation, as well as suggestions for cooperation such as establishing a “technology pool” and publicly-funded joint research and development. The US and Japan in particular are opposed to any negotiations on the IPR issue or even a mention of IPRs in the text.

Use of markets

The text includes the developed countries’ proposals to establish new market-based mechanisms beyond the existing emissions trading scheme and the clean development mechanism under the Kyoto Protocol.

Several developing countries are opposed to these proposals as they view the issue of market mechanisms to be within the purview of the KP working group and not the LCA working group. They are concerned that agreeing to discuss market mechanisms in the LCA track could build the way for the transfer of the markets issue out of the KP and moving it into the LCA.

Further, some countries are opposed to the idea of new market mechanisms being a means to enable developed countries to create further offsets by passing on emission reduction obligations to developing countries instead of undertaking the emission reductions domestically.

Climate and trade

Developing countries have been very concerned about the rise of trade protectionism on climate grounds. This fear increased after the US House of Representatives passed a bill in 2008 that

included a section authorising the President to impose border tax adjustment measures on selected products of countries deemed not to meet US standards for emissions control.

Developing countries have made proposals for disallowing such unilateral trade measures on grounds of controlling climate change, and their proposals are reflected in the new text. However, some developed countries do not agree to this strengthened language on trade and climate change and prefer to retain or re-use the existing language on the trade-climate link in the Convention.

Developing Countries Call for Balanced Outcomes in Cancun

Tianjin, 5 October 2010 (Meena Raman) – Developing countries called for a comprehensive set of decisions at the 16th meeting of the Conference of Parties in Cancun, Mexico in November this year that will ensure balance between the negotiating tracks under the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol as well as balance within decisions under each of the negotiating tracks.

This call was led by the G77 and China at the opening of the 12th session of the Ad-hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA) on 4 October, to implement the mandate of the Bali Action Plan.

The 14th session of the Ad-hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex 1 Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) also began its work in Tianjin on the same day.

Chair of the AWG-LCA, Ms. Margaret Mukahanana-Sangarwe of Zimbabwe, said at the opening session of the working group that the Tianjin climate talks were a make-or-break for Cancun. She said that Parties needed to focus on what was achievable in the negotiations, bearing in mind the need to present a balanced set of draft decisions to be presented at COP 16 for adoption.

She also proposed the establishment of a contact group which will organize the work on the negotiating text by having four drafting groups – on shared vision for long-term cooperative action; adaptation; mitigation; and finance, technology and capacity-building. Parties agreed to the proposal by the Chair and proceeded to meet in drafting groups in the afternoon.

On the proposal by the Chair of the AWG-LCA with regard to presenting a balanced set of draft decisions to the COP for adoption, **Ambassador Abdullah M. Alsaidi of Yemen**, speaking for the **G77 and China**, said that the Group was looking for a comprehensive set of decisions at Cancun.

He said that the Group could agree in principle with the idea of a balanced set of decisions provided that - (i) Parties proceed with the negotiations and then determine what elements might be ripe to be included in this package; (ii) the decisions to be adopted in Cancun must be in accordance with the Bali Action Plan covering all its elements; (iii) the balance between the negotiating tracks i.e. the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP is respected and the balance in decisions within each track is maintained; and (iv) these decisions should not compromise the overall objective of a comprehensive and ambitious and legally binding outcome.

Alsaidi said that if Parties were to make progress in the negotiations, the work must be based on the principles and provisions of the Convention and the Bali Action Plan (BAP).

“In this regard, ideas and proposals that are inconsistent with the Convention and the BAP such as the re-classification of countries or differentiation amongst developing countries will impede the process and that such proposals do not advance our work and could in fact be counterproductive,” he said.

The G77 and China also reaffirmed the centrality of the UNFCCC in addressing climate change and stressed that the process of work must be open, party-driven, inclusive and transparent.

The **Democratic Republic of Congo**, speaking for the **African Group**, said that it expects negotiations under the AWG-LCA track to result in a legally binding, inclusive, fair and effective outcome, which prioritizes both adaptation and mitigation.

It said that Tianjin should focus on establishing consensus on the elements that will allow the Cancun climate conference to facilitate the conclusion of a balanced set of outcomes under each of the negotiating tracks. It must unite the world in building

an inclusive, fair, legally binding and effective international climate regime based on the principles of the Convention.

The Group said that adaptation is the highest priority for Africa, which requires the effective implementation of adaptation actions through the establishment of the Adaptation Framework with the required financial, technical and capacity-building support from developed country Parties. Africa sees the Adaptation Committee as a key institution that will provide coherence on implementation of enhanced actions on adaptation under the Convention.

The African Group also said that the long-term solution to the climate crisis is an effective and ambitious global effort to mitigate emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG). In this regard, Africa believed that agreement on a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol (KP) is absolutely essential to facilitate agreement under the AWG-LCA on absolute GHG emission reduction mitigation targets by Annex 1 countries not Party to the KP, which are comparable in terms of ambition, accounting and compliance rules. It said that the AWG-LCA should focus on clarifying the approach to enhance the ambition of Annex 1 countries not Party to the KP and the issue of comparability as well as design, function and institutional arrangements for the proposed mitigation mechanism supporting Non-Annex 1 countries' nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs).

(Comparability refers to the agreement in the BAP that the United States, which is not a KP Party, should nevertheless take on emission reduction targets that are comparable to those of the KP Parties.)

On the issue of REDD-plus (reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation etc. in developing countries), it said that it was necessary to launch the "readiness phase".

On finance, the African Group called for the establishment of the new fund under the COP and the need to identify the mechanisms and institutional arrangements that would give meaning to the means of implementation such as a finance committee under the COP. The Group said that 1.5% of GDP of developed countries per annum based on assessed scale of contributions set by the Finance Committee and approved by the COP will be important to ensure predictability, adequacy and sustainability.

On capacity building, the Group said that it should remain a standalone issue, like technology transfer and finance and there was a need for a new

mechanism under the Subsidiary Body on Implementation for this.

Grenada, for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), said that it looked to COP 16 to deliver a legally binding outcome and that if this was not attained, it looked for a package of COP decisions. It said the decisions must be comprehensive and ambitious and must represent a major step forward which must rebuild confidence and momentum and deliver practical and tangible results that will help realize a legally binding agreement in South Africa (venue of COP 17 in 2011).

If all the work under the Bali Action Plan will not be completed in Cancun, then a process decision on extending the mandate of the AWG-LCA will be necessary which must establish a mandate and deadline for achieving a legally binding agreement. For AOSIS these decisions must be framed within the overall objective of limiting global warming to well below 1.5 degrees C and coupled with a review in 2015 to assess the adequacy of the long-term goal and actions taken in response.

On adaptation, it called for the formal establishment of a new permanent body under the Convention; a clear link between implementation of adaptation action and finance and clarity on institutional arrangements to address loss and damage including insurance.

A decision on mitigation ambition must be scaled up to deliver emission reductions consistent with the science-based long-term goal; and a decision to bring mitigation pledges of Annex 1 and non-Annex 1 countries into the Convention process; MRV (measuring, reporting and verification) for developed countries must build upon those applicable under the KP; MRV for mitigation actions of developing countries, including new rules on the frequency of inventories and national communications and related support, the general framework for a process of international consultation and analysis (ICA) and MRV of support; a decision on REDD-plus; and a way forward on response measures.

On finance, it also called for the formal establishment of a new climate fund. The basic architecture of the fund, particularly the composition of its board, should be decided at Cancun and the mandate to design this new fund should be entrusted to a representative body created under the Convention that is balanced in its representation.

It also wanted the elaboration of the functions of a new oversight body on climate finance and a process to ensure its operationalization by COP 17.

It further wanted a decision on a goal on longer-term financing beyond 2012 that is new, additional and predictable and to establish a process to consider the various options to mobilize the financing to meet that goal.

Lesotho, for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), said that there was a need for early acknowledgement of the need to extend the mandate of the AWG-LCA beyond Cancun and this should be done carefully in a manner that would maintain the balance between the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP; the balance between the issues within the AWG-LCA and more importantly, the balance between COP 16 decisions and continuing AWG-LCA negotiations.

It said that finance is critical and key to the effective implementation of adaptation, mitigation, technology transfer and capacity-building efforts in LDCs. The LDC group was looking forward to negotiations that would lead to the creation of a new fund that would streamline the various funding sources and needs under the Convention.

It stressed the importance of capacity building for the LDCs and proposed the setting up of a technical panel that will be financially supported by developed countries to ensure that capacities at institutional, individual and systemic levels are being built to address short, medium and long-term needs.

Venezuela, speaking for the ALBA group (The Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas, including Nicaragua, Cuba, Ecuador, Bolivia and Venezuela), said that it was essential to preserve the existing legally binding regime which is the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol. The challenge for Cancun is to achieve balanced results at two levels – (i) to balance the decisions under the AWG-LCA and the amendments under the Kyoto Protocol; and (ii) within the AWG-LCA for an equitable balance in the progress of all elements under the Bali Action Plan which will allow progress towards adopting a legally binding instrument to strengthen and complement the existing legal regime.

Limiting the increase in global mean temperature is the central element of a balanced agreement and this was only possible with specific mitigation commitments by developed countries that are historically responsible, according to the group.

It called for the abandoning of the obsolete negotiation strategy by developed countries based on bargaining and pressuring where progress in the AWG-KP is blocked if there is no progress in the AWG-LCA. It said that developed countries must be ready to show real commitments. Referring to the political situation in the United States, Venezuela said that it was unacceptable for the rest of the world

to wait for the outcome of its elections before knowing if the US will be able to make commitments.

Egypt, speaking for a group of Arab countries, also underscored the need for balance not only within the elements of the Bali Action Plan but also between the two tracks of the AWG-KP and the AWG-LCA.

(Its representative announced that the recent September meeting of the Arab League mandated Egypt to speak on behalf of its 22 members.)

Belgium, for the European Union, said that multilateralism within the UN framework remains the core of finding global solutions to global problems. For the EU, the overall goal for Cancun is to make as much progress as possible towards an ambitious, comprehensive and legally binding outcome in line with the 2 degree C objective.

It expected a balanced set of decisions within and across both negotiating tracks (the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP). It said that significant progress is both necessary and achievable on the elements of the Bali Roadmap. It said that Cancun should integrate the political guidance given in the Copenhagen Accord and put in place key institutional and architectural arrangements.

On its priorities for Cancun, the EU said that on mitigation, there was a need to anchor all countries' pledges and set up a further process to clarify them, to mobilize support and to discuss options for strengthening the collective level of ambition. It said there was a need to establish the framework for the MRV system, based on existing provisions, and including international consultations and analysis (ICA).

A balanced package should also include the operationalisation of the REDD-plus mechanism, address bunker fuel emissions and lay the foundation for the creation of new, scaled-up market mechanisms.

It looked forward to the establishment of an Adaptation Framework, of the Technology Mechanism and for their institutional arrangements.

On finance, it said there was a need for a decision regarding the establishment of the Copenhagen Green Climate Fund, the periodic overview of climate financing and a way forward on options for mobilizing US\$100 billion of climate finance, as part of a balanced package.

The EU expressed concern with the slow pace of the negotiations in the LCA track as compared to the KP track at the last session in Bonn and wanted a much more dynamic negotiation mode in Tianjin. At the end of Tianjin, it hoped for a draft of a balanced set of decisions to be available for further consideration which clearly distinguishes between

what was feasible to include for the different items in Cancun and what will need further work after Cancun and topics that will need particular political attention. It said that time was lacking to have yet another comprehensive reading of the text and wanted to find a way of extracting from the negotiating text those elements that can realistically contribute to a meaningful and balanced outcome in Cancun.

Australia, speaking for the Umbrella Group, said that the best way to ensure a balanced package of outcomes in Cancun is to lock in the progress to date and to implement the understanding of leaders reached in Copenhagen (referring to the disputed Copenhagen Accord that was “taken note” of but not adopted at the last COP meeting).

It wanted a durable, fair and effective climate regime with the participation of all major economies. A balanced package for the group must have something for everyone. It must include a robust outcome on MRV, mitigation actions and ICA and must build on the Copenhagen Accord where there must be an affirmation of all the pledges made under the Accord. It said that the current negotiating text was 70 pages long and there was a need to focus rather than on a line-by-line approach.

Australia said that elements for draft decisions could be extracted which can include REDD-plus and a Technology Mechanism; a robust MRV framework and an ICA process tailored to meet the needs of all Parties.

Issues regarding finance were already resolved by the Copenhagen Accord and there could not be a re-negotiation of this, it said.

In her address at the welcoming session of the climate talks in Tianjin, Ms. Christiana Figueres, the Executive Secretary of the UNFCCC, stressed that a concrete outcome in Cancun is urgently needed to restore the faith in the ability of Parties to take the process forward and to prevent multilateralism from being perceived as a never-ending road. Figueres said that for a tangible outcome in December, it was time for Parties to clarify what could constitute an achievable and politically balanced package for Cancun and what could be subject to further work after Cancun.

She said that it would seem that Parties are on the verge of being able to agree on a set of decisions to start operationalising some aspects of each element of the Bali Action Plan which include but are not limited to an adaptation framework; a technology mechanism and capacity-building arrangements; a new fund to house long-term climate financing and

the launch of a readiness phase for REDD-plus.

Figueres said that it was clear that not all the details of these elements can be agreed to and that there was a need for these elements to be elaborated to a comparable level of detail. “It is evident that these operational issues cannot advance without clarity on fast-start finance and an overall agreement on a package of more politically charged issues that includes, but is not limited to the future of the Kyoto Protocol, specifically how to take commitments forward; the formalization of mitigation pledges put forward by Parties in 2010 and the accompanying accountability for their implementation; the mobilization of long-term financing and the accompanying accountability of its delivery; response measures and the understanding of fairness that will guide long-term mitigation efforts,” she added.

Mr. Dai Bingguo, State Councillor of the People’s Republic of China, also spoke at the welcoming ceremony which was also attended by Mr. Xie Zhenhua, the Vice Chairman of China’s National Development and Reform Commission and Mr. Huang Xingguo, the Mayor of the Tianjin Municipal Government.

Dai made three suggestions on how to make the Cancun conference fruitful.

First, Parties must adhere to the basic framework of the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol and the mandate of the Bali Roadmap and, building on the outcomes of the Copenhagen conference, promote the full, effective and sustained implementation the UNFCCC and the Protocol.

Secondly, the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities must be followed and targets set for developed countries to take the lead in substantially reducing their GHG emissions; arrangements be fleshed out for providing adequate financial and technological support to developing countries and help the latter take active measures to adapt to and mitigate climate change.

Thirdly, Parties must abide by the principle of sustainable development, strike a good balance between economic development, poverty eradication and climate protection and seek the win-win outcomes of both achieving development and countering climate change, so as to ensure the development right of developing countries.

Dai said that China was a developing country with fast yet unbalanced development with 1.3 billion people and in terms of GDP per capita, it ranked 100 in the world. He said that as it still has tens of millions of people trapped in poverty, China faces

the arduous task of growing the economy and improving peoples' livelihoods while facing significant constraints in controlling GHG emissions.

“China had announced its target of controlling GHG emissions by cutting CO2 emissions per unit

of GDP by 40-45% from 2005 levels and to raise the share of non-fossil fuels in primary energy consumption to around 15% and to increase forest coverage by 40 million hectares from 2005 levels and forest stock by 1.3 billion cubic meters,” said Dai.

Developing Countries United on Ambitious Kyoto Protocol Reduction Targets

Tianjin, 5 October (Hilary Chiew) – The 14th session of the Ad hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG- KP) opened on Monday with calls from developing countries to Annex I Parties to show leadership in combating climate change by raising their level of ambition in greenhouse gas emission reduction.

Non-Annex I developing countries placed strong emphasis on a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol as essential for the future of a climate change regime and denounced attempts by some Parties to undermine the prospect of a continuation of the Protocol. The first commitment period will end in 2012.

The AWG-KP has before it a draft proposal that was prepared by the group's Chair, Ambassador John Ashe of Antigua and Barbuda, at the last session in August in Bonn. It includes options for amendments according to Article 3.9 of the Kyoto Protocol, that provide for the emission reductions of Annex I Parties (developed countries) for their second and subsequent commitment periods after 2012.

Yemen, on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, reiterated the Group's serious concern with the extremely slow progress of the AWG-KP in completing the essential tasks of its work programme, the primary objective of which was to adopt conclusions on the scale of emissions reduction for Annex I Parties in aggregate and individual Annex I Party contributions to this overall aggregate scale.

It appealed to Annex I Parties to show the necessary political will and leadership in combating climate change and to move forward and accelerate the negotiations to set the scale of emission reduction in the light of historical responsibility and equity and in accordance with science.

The Group believed that ambitious quantified emission reductions are needed for the second Kyoto

Protocol commitment and that the continuity of the Protocol is an essential element for any future of the climate change regime. It stressed the need to avoid a gap between commitment periods and warned that any gap would have serious implications. For this reason, it said Parties must deliver their work in Cancun and as much agreement as possible at Tianjin is therefore needed.

In this regard, it stressed that the Group insists and would not compromise on the requirement of the second commitment period as well as on the basic principles of the climate change regime and on the interests of developing countries.

The Group believed that Parties should be able to reach agreement on a five-year commitment period with a single, legally binding base year of 1990. It further said that Parties must focus on the amendment of Annex B and the definition of Annex I Parties' commitment. It is now more urgent than ever that Parties progress as quickly as possible to quantified emission limitation and reduction commitments for Annex I Parties. Failure to do so would send a negative signal regarding the readiness of Annex I Parties to take forward their legal obligations under the Protocol and contribute to a strong climate change regime.

The insufficient level of ambition expressed in the current mitigation pledges of Annex I Parties is an obstacle Parties must overcome for it is blocking significant progress in our negotiation as a whole in both the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA (Ad hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the UNFCCC), it added.

It appealed to all Parties, particularly Annex I Parties, to use the actual text of the AWG-KP Chair as the basis for negotiations in order to build a strong Kyoto Protocol.

The **Democratic Republic of Congo, speaking on behalf of the African Group**, stressed

that the AWG-KP must make progress on further commitments of Annex I Parties for an amendment to establish a second and subsequent commitment periods.

It said it witnessed attempts by some Parties to take the process backward and it is clearly evident that some Parties have no interest in securing a second commitment period.

On the other hand, the developed countries are asking Africa to take mitigation commitments and other undefined actions that they refer to as a balanced set of decisions, it said, adding that this is a clear sign that Annex I Parties are not fully committed to reaching an agreement under the AWG-KP.

It put on record that the most important decision that Africa will put forward for adoption in Cancun is an amendment of the Kyoto Protocol to effect the second commitment period. It is difficult to imagine any agreement on any set of decisions that does not include a decision to effect the second commitment period for Annex I Parties, it emphasised.

It said the Group concurred with the conclusion of the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) that only ambitious reductions of greenhouse gas emissions by Annex I Parties can ensure that the impacts of climate change do not undermine African development and poverty eradication goals.

As such, it said, it required agreement on the continuation of the two-track approach, culminating in an amendment of the Protocol thereby establishing the second commitment period. This amendment of the Protocol must contain deep economy-wide quantified emission reduction and limitation targets for all developed countries for the period beyond 2012.

It further said the Group would like to conclude the discussion on Land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF) rules and modalities for accounting of forest management.

To avoid a gap between the first and second commitment periods, the meeting in Tianjin should focus on exploring all legal options so that Parties can adequately be prepared for all eventualities. Resolving these legal matters must be one of the core elements of this session, it said.

Grenada, representing the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), said it is essential that the session in Tianjin deliver the results of its work at Cancun to avoid a gap between the first and second commitment periods.

It warned that failure to do so would have significant implications for the carbon market and related initiatives underway in many countries

besides sending the wrong political signal regarding Kyoto Protocol Parties' commitment to a multilateral approach to removing the global threat of climate change.

Recalling the findings of the workshop at the August session in Bonn, it said it's been confirmed that Annex I Parties' pledges would only achieve between 1 and 7% reduction in emissions below 1990 levels, as a result of many loopholes in the Kyoto Protocol accounting system in the areas of LULUCF accounting and surplus AAUs (Assigned Amount Units). This was not acceptable to AOSIS.

It believed that with the requisite determination, the time in Tianjin would enable Parties to reach agreement on a five-year second commitment period with the baseline year of 1990, agree on LULUCF accounting rules by substantially narrowing down options, identify the most feasible ways to manage the difficult issue of surplus AAUs, agree on a transparent process to transform mitigation pledges to quantified emission reduction commitments that relate clearly to QELROs (quantified emission limitations and reduction objectives) for the first commitment period, and concrete demonstration from negotiating partners (referring to Annex I Parties) of their willingness to increase the level of ambition of their mitigation pledges.

It said without substantial scaling up of pledges from Annex I Parties, it is impossible to come close to the more than 45% reduction that is essential to achieve a long-term limitation of temperature increase to well below 1.5 degrees Celsius or even the 25 to 40% reduction the IPCC associates with a 2 to 2.4 degree increase in temperature.

It further said more than 100 countries had called for a limitation of temperature increases to below 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels and a stabilisation of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere at a concentration of well below 350 parts per million of carbon dioxide equivalent.

Belize, representing the Central American Integration System, said pledges from Annex I Parties so far translate into emission reductions of 12 to 19% below 1990 levels, which could lead to warming of between 2.9 and 3.9 degrees Celsius by 2100 and must not be allowed.

It said the region is experiencing more frequent and severe natural hazards related to climate change, leaving it in a near state of perpetual reconstruction and threatening its development prospects while indecision remains the order of the day in the UNFCCC negotiations.

Clearly there is an unacceptable gap between what the science demands and the current pledges of Annex I Parties. As we resume our discussions,

Annex I Parties must raise their level of ambition in their current mitigation pledges. Moreover, we must avoid a gap between the first and second commitment periods. In this regard, Annex I countries should take on ambitious quantified emission limitation and reduction commitments, it said.

Egypt, speaking for the Arab group of 22 countries, said the group presented a united front due to the urgency of the matter where some Parties attempt to do away with the Protocol at the end of the first commitment period. The continuation of the Protocol is a necessary condition for the success of the climate regime.

The group, it said, would not tolerate endless delay as CMP6 (6th meeting of the Kyoto Protocol Parties) closes in. Negotiation needs to be accelerated to implement the mandate in accordance with the first resolution of CMP1 to agree on a second commitment period for Annex I Parties in line with Article 3.9 of the Protocol. Reaching this goal is our top priority going to Cancun, it stressed.

To achieve that, it said, would require quick engagement in genuine negotiation where all Parties take responsibility to ensure the required progress in Tianjin to pave the way for success in Cancun. It said that the draft proposal is a good basis for negotiation despite no agreement over all the contents, adding that there is a group of options that is very far from the mandate.

It also rebuked the comparison made between the Kyoto Protocol and the Copenhagen Accord as being inaccurate as there is no consistency between declared emission reductions with the necessary level of ambition to control increasing temperature.

Bolivia representing the ALBA group (The Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas) said it is not possible to speak of a balanced result without considering the impacts of climate change from an increase in temperature of between 3 and 4 degrees Celsius based on the percentage of reduction offered by developed countries.

We are deeply concerned that the reduction up until now could not grapple satisfactorily with climate change while some developed countries intend to eliminate the Kyoto Protocol, which is the only legally binding instrument, it said.

It said Parties should not be too preoccupied that there is a lack of compromise for a negotiation text and that Parties should use the draft proposal from the Chair (of the AWG-LCA) as a basis for negotiation.

If developed countries don't adopt a second commitment period in Cancun, the Protocol will start a slow and agonising death which will certainly affect

the principles of the UNFCCC and its objectives, the group said.

In reference to the United States, it said it's not possible to continue delaying a decision just to wait for the election of one country that is not even Party to the Kyoto Protocol while some countries continue to experience climate-exacerbated natural disasters. It is critical that Kyoto Protocol signatories take their international commitments seriously to save mankind and mother earth, it urged.

Belgium on behalf of the European Union reiterated the importance the bloc attaches to the Kyoto Protocol track in the overall negotiations. It said the EU is committed to make progress in both negotiating tracks towards a successful, balanced and concrete outcome at Cancun, as a constructive step towards a global, ambitious and comprehensive agreement in line with the 2 degree Celsius objective.

However, it also reiterated its preference for a single legally binding instrument that would include the essential elements of the Protocol, but remains flexible regarding the legal form as long as it is binding.

We are therefore open to consider a second commitment period under the Protocol, as part of a wider, more rigorous and ambitious agreement and provided that certain conditions, founded on the urgent need for environmental integrity and effectiveness of international action, are met, it added.

This, it stressed, would mean that Annex I countries that did not ratify the Protocol and other major emitters take on their fair share of the global emission reduction effort in the context of an ambitious, legally binding global agreement. It would also mean that the environmental integrity of the Protocol is addressed appropriately, in particular regarding LULUCF accounting and the carry-over of AAUs and that progress is made on the reform of existing market mechanisms and on the establishment of new ones, adding that the EU already has binding legislation in place which is based on the Protocol architecture and provisions.

Within the Kyoto track, it said the challenge is to further streamline the present text and identify the political options on main outstanding issues and it is the EU's expectation to have a set of decisions that is balanced within and across both negotiation tracks.

The Cancun outcome in the Kyoto track should, in its view, include an appropriate solution for the surplus of AAUs, decisions on the starting point and the duration of a future commitment period, a basis for new market mechanisms as well as the

continuation of and improvements to the existing mechanisms.

It further said that there's a need to discuss both the mitigation pledges within the Kyoto track and other countries' pledges whether made according to the Copenhagen Accord or otherwise in the context of the UNFCCC to clarify how far Parties have advanced in achieving the 2 degree Celsius goal.

Australia, representing the Umbrella Group, said it looks forward to a durable, fair and effective outcome with the participation of all major economies. It said progress of work on forest matters has implications for the outcome and Parties must not operate in isolation and must think about practicality.

It said negotiations should focus on areas of possible progress such as in the LULUCF and market mechanisms. It also said there cannot be further clarity on numbers (reduction targets) until there is clarity on rules (on these issues).

It also praised the effectiveness of the Copenhagen Accord which has a broader participation of Parties compared to the Kyoto Protocol which represents only 28% of global emissions while the Accord represents the most substantial emission reduction ever put forward at 80%.

(The Accord is a controversial document that was "taken note of" but not adopted by UNFCCC Parties at the 15th meeting of the Conference of Parties in Copenhagen in 2009.)

TWN

Tianjin News Update

4

www.twinside.org.sg

Published by
Third World Network

6 October 2010

Mandate of the AWG-KP Contact Group on Legal Matters in Dispute

Tianjin, 6 October (Chee Yoke Ling) – Developing countries have insisted on a review of the organization of work of the contact group on legal matters set up under the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP), pointing out that issues before the contact group are outside the mandate of the AWG-KP.

At the first meeting of the contact group on legal matters on Tuesday morning (5 October), co-chair Mr. Daniel Ortega of Ecuador outlined the week's work where six slots have been allocated to cover a range of issues set out in paragraph 18 of the scenario note of the AWG-KP Chair, Mr. John Ashe of Barbuda and Antigua. This involves proposed amendments to Articles 3, 4, 9, 15, 18 and 21 of the Kyoto Protocol.

The contact group was tasked to consider the selected parts in Mr. Ashe's draft proposal (FCCC/KP/AWG/2010/CRP. 2), remove options, streamline the text, draft solutions where needed, and discuss any other legal issues referred to it by the other three contact groups. Mr. Ortega reminded Parties of the legal nature of this group.

Developing countries have all along stressed that priority must be given to the discussion on the scale of greenhouse gas emission reductions to be achieved by Annex I Parties, in aggregate and individually or jointly, in line with the mandate of the AWG-KP "*to consider further commitments for Parties included in Annex I for the period beyond 2012 in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 9, of the Protocol*". Over the years since the AWG-KP started its work in 2006 a number of proposals have been submitted on various substantive matters, and many developing country Parties have expressed concern and objections that these go beyond the specific mandate of the group.

(Each session of the AWG-KP needs to agree to the setting up of contact groups, and the necessity

of establishing a legal matters contact group has been a point of debate at several meetings of the AWG-KP over the past few years. This group was eventually set up but debate over its scope of work continued. In the Tianjin session Parties have agreed to the setting up of 4 contact groups. The contact group on the scale of emission reductions by Annex I Parties, known as the "numbers contact group", has been allocated 8 slots for the Tianjin session, and consensus is still far from sight. The other two groups are on "other issues" including land use, land use change and forestry, methodologies etc, and on potential consequences of response measures.)

At Tuesday's first meeting of the legal matters group, China called for a point of order saying that Parties needed to have a general exchange of views before they can agree to the suggested organization of work.

Australia said that it was happy to work through the issues identified in the AWG-KP Chair's scenario note, and that one missing element was its proposal on provisional application (of amendments to the Protocol until the entry into force of the amendments for each Party). This was followed by almost an hour of intense exchange.

China voiced its concern on the substantive issues identified for the contact group as well as the organization of work. It said, "To be frank, for several meetings in the past there has been confusion. We do not see a need for this legal contact group. We have for the past two years said that the mandate of the AWG-KP is very simple – to agree on the second and subsequent commitment periods. We are not going to revise or amend the whole KP into a new protocol. That is not our mandate. We are not negotiating a protocol here. This needs to be repeated again at the beginning of the discussion here (in Tianjin)".

It agreed with taking the Chair's text as a basis for negotiations but "that does not mean we are

prepared to go into proposals that are beyond the mandate of the AWG-KP. We are willing to use the Chair's proposal to move forward but the legal discussions that are happening here should also be consistent with the bigger group's discussion (referring to the AWG-KP) and that is amendment of Annex B of the KP. So we cannot go with the scenario note".

It added that it could not go along with the logic of the scenario note as it is a totally wrong logic; nobody has discussed these issues because they are not issues under this body.

China said that in the past some of the issues were discussed in the SBI (Subsidiary Body on Implementation of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change) and at the CMP (UNFCCC Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol) but never here in the AWG – for example, review of the Protocol, immunities (for persons serving on Protocol bodies), and amendment procedures.

It reiterated that it will not go into discussion of proposals beyond the mandate of the AWG-KP, and since time is very limited, "our work should focus on the numbers discussion". China asked for a clear indication on how much time will be allocated to this discussion.

Saudi Arabia said that there was a lot of panic when the report of the Secretariat was published (in the August session of the AWG-KP in Bonn, FCCC/KP/AWG/2010/10: *Legal considerations relating to a possible gap between the first and subsequent commitment periods*).

"Then we came back in good faith and listened in good faith and in a cooperative way. We then said there was no need for a legal group – no need to discuss gap and implications. We agreed that we should discuss Article 3.9 of the Protocol (amendment for the second and subsequent commitment periods). There should be no gap and no phasing out of the KP," it said.

It also said that when the Group of 77 met with the AWG-KP Chair on Sunday (3 October) it asked about the legal group but did not get an explanation. It cannot accept the organization of work and fully supported China in opposing the proposed work programme.

It added that if there is amendment of Annex B then we can have the legal group and expressed deep concern to hear that there will be 6 meetings (of the legal group) when there are 5 days of the session left.

It also recalled that the AWG-KP Chair had promised at the plenary (on 4 October) that most of the time will be allocated to numbers.

Belgium on behalf of the European Union said that it was willing to engage constructively in this contact group on matters that Parties decide on. It said that the group may not need 6 slots, comparing this to the fewer slots allocated for the group on other issues such as LULUCF. It added that the time allocated should be kept under review.

Australia said the contact group is "crucial for us". It said that there are several serious proposals and there are legal proposals and Australia has one that it sees as necessary to discuss. "It has not been taken up in the numbers group. There have been umpteen meetings over the years and the discussion (in the numbers group) is now sterile," it added.

"We don't see how we can adopt a decision if we don't discuss those issues. Some Parties may think some options are not relevant here but we have not even discussed them yet. I can't remember how many numbers meetings we have had," it said.

Brazil supported China and Saudi Arabia. "We fully oppose discussing paragraph 18 (a) to (f) of the scenario note as most of it is completely outside the mandate of the AWG-KP. Articles 4, 9, 15, 18, 21 and even Article 3 other than paragraph 9 are not relevant," it said. It said that Parties are free to raise these issues at the CMP but not here under the AWG-KP.

Tuvalu said there are consequential amendments that are required as a result of amendment to Annex B so there is validity for a broader discussion to ensure there is legal consistency. It sees the AWG-KP Chair's draft proposal as a basis for consideration.

India said that time should be spent on substantive issues (in other contact groups) and also opposed the legal matters contact group.

Bolivia said it is open to discussion of proposals but in the right place. Any Party has the right to present proposals for discussion in the CMP. But this group has a very clear mandate and that is amendment pursuant to Article 3.9 of the Kyoto Protocol.

It added that the legal group has to respond to other contact groups, and fully supported China, Saudi Arabia, Brazil and India, and also called for a revision of the allocation of time slots.

It stressed that it is fully engaged in discussion on Article 3.9 and was surprised that its objection to the scenario note was not reflected in the organization of work.

Ghana on behalf of the African Group also agreed with China, Brazil and Saudi Arabia.

Micronesia said that a number of the issues tasked to the contact group are proposals that AOSIS (the Alliance of Small Island Developing States) has

proposed. The question is of course where to discuss these, it said, adding that there are consequential amendments and so a broader approach is needed.

It gave the example of how to increase stringency of commitment during the next commitment period, saying that it would like to engage but also echoed concerns others have raised on a number of sessions.

Switzerland fully supported the proposed organization of work that arose from the Chair's scenario note. It said that Parties should not be rigid, and that the group should go beyond the rigidity of negotiators, referring to a ministerial meeting at St Petersburg.

At this point the contact group co-chair summarized the discussion saying that most of the comments were on the mandate of the AWG-KP, and that goes beyond the mandate of the contact group. He said that he and his co-chair (Mr. Gehrard Loibi of Austria) would bring those to the AWG-KP Chair. They would convey the message to the Chair on the time allocated for this work.

He also observed that during the plenary on 4 October the Chair had presented the scenario note and plan of work but there were no comments and the mandate was endorsed. This led to reactions from some Parties.

Saudi Arabia said that at the G77 consultation with the Chair he promised more time would be given to the numbers group. At the plenary the Chair did not say anything about time, otherwise it would have opposed at the plenary. It had also raised the issue of

the legal group and the Secretariat paper of the last session (in Bonn) during the G77 consultation.

Egypt said that the Arab group's statement at the plenary said that the draft proposal and scenario note presented a good basis for work but it wanted to remind the group that there was no blank cheque given to do whatever even though there was enthusiasm for work on the text.

Brazil said that this is a contact group of the AWG-KP, and it is not superior to that group.

China said that, "enough is enough". It asked who is leading the negotiations – the Chair or Parties? It said that views have been expressed by the majority of Parties and asked why those have been ignored.

It added that the pure legal question is quite clear: "We don't need to confuse ourselves – the AWG-KP work is about Article 3.9 amendments for the second CP and nothing else. We should focus on this mandate".

On the possible gap (between commitment periods) it said that before we decide to give up any discussion of the second commitment period there is no need to discuss gap.

Australia said it was getting very mystified by the discussion about mandate, and that the decisions of the CMP1 and CMP5 were clear and that the options in the draft proposal of the AWG-KP Chair are important options. It said it was prepared to take on QELROS (quantified emission limitations and reduction objectives) and that the discussion was a very retrograde step.

The meeting ended at 1 pm.

“Stock-taking Meeting” Midway through Tianjin Shows Divergence of Views on Process and Outcome for Cancun

Tianjin, 7 October (Meena Raman) – At the UNFCCC climate talks in Tianjin, a “stock-taking” meeting was held on 6 October which revealed divergent views among several Parties on what the outcome of the forthcoming Cancun conference should be and how the process should move forward from Tianjin to Cancun.

The stock-taking exercise was carried out under the contact group of the Ad-hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA), for delegates to assess how much progress has been made so far during this one-week session in Tianjin, which is the last before the Cancun conference.

Differences of views emerged from among developing countries as well as among and with developed countries on their expectations for Cancun, with most Parties expressing disappointment on the slow and uneven progress of the negotiations so far this week.

While all Parties expressed the need for a balanced outcome under the AWG-LCA, there were divergent views on what “balance” means and what the content of the elements for a Cancun outcome should be.

Several developing countries stressed that “balance” must also importantly take account of the progress (or non progress) in the other track in the Kyoto Protocol. They stressed the importance of having an outcome in the Kyoto Protocol working group, for the Protocol’s second commitment period. (It is notable that Norway also called for an outcome for the second commitment period of the Protocol). Some of the countries also questioned the inclusion of some of the elements or terms in the Chair’s paper.

On the other hand, several developed countries stressed that there was not enough progress in the

negotiations on mitigation. Some of them promoted accepting the Copenhagen Accord as the solution, with the United States stating that the balance sought was already in the Accord and if Parties started from the Accord, there would be an outcome and if not, “the process was unhelpful.”

There was also a lack of clarity on how to arrive at draft decision/decisions in Cancun and what would be the legal form of the outcome.

Much of the time of the meeting was also taken up by responses from Parties to a new one-page paper distributed by the Chair of the AWG-LCA Margaret Mukahanana-Sangarwe on ‘Possible elements of the Cancun outcome’ that she said she had produced following informal consultations. Sangarwe said that there “was a great deal of commonality” among Parties and that her paper reflected “some issues of commonality”.

It was not clear what was the specific purpose of the listing of issues, whether it was meant to be a list of issues that could possibly be the subject of separate decisions in Cancun, or of a single decision, or whether it would merely serve as a guide to the drafting groups.

In their response, many countries said that not all elements listed were ripe for decisions and that there were elements which were also missing. Some developing countries were also worried that focusing on elements of an outcome would create a diversion from negotiations on the 13 August text. Bolivia and Nicaragua were concerned that on one hand Parties were supposed to be negotiating the text in drafting groups, as agreed to at the last session in Bonn, but on the other hand there were now separate discussions taking place on the elements for a Cancun outcome that were not based on the text-negotiations and which were diverting from the

negotiations on text and which were not in line with the agreement that the work should now be focused on the text.

Sangarwe said that the paper was “not for approval but was a progress report on what Parties had started to do among themselves.” She said that there was a need for further discussions on the elements and invited Parties to give their views on what Cancun could deliver. In response to a question by Pakistan on the status of the paper, the Chair said that the paper “had no status” and if Parties could agree on the elements, it could guide the work in the drafting groups.

The elements listed in the paper were as follows:

- On shared vision – shared vision for long-term cooperative action, including a long-term global goal for emission reductions and process to review the long-term global goal and overall progress towards meeting that goal;
- On Adaptation – adaptation framework and institutional arrangements for its implementation and approach to address loss and damage;
- On Mitigation – economy-wide emission reduction commitments or actions by developed country Parties; MRV for developed country Parties’ commitments or actions; NAMAs by developing country Parties and associated support; MRV for developing countries’ NAMAs; readiness phases of activities that contribute to mitigation actions in the forest sector (REDD-plus); work programme on mitigation in the agricultural sector; reducing emissions from bunker fuels; various approaches including opportunities for using markets to enhance the cost-effectiveness of and to promote mitigation actions and the economic and social consequences of response measures;
- On finance, technology and capacity-building – reporting on fast-start finance for 2010-2012; establishment of a new fund and process for its design; arrangements to improve coherence and coordination in climate change financing; mobilization of long-term finance; MRV of support; establishment of the Technology Mechanism, the Technology Executive Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network and capacity-building.

Facilitators of the drafting groups also presented updates on the negotiations. The facilitator of the shared vision drafting group, Anders Turesson of Sweden, said that two meetings were held and Parties had an initial consideration of paragraphs in the negotiating text on the review of the long-term goal and had come up with new text (relating to

paragraphs 68-71 of chapter 1). Turesson said that the scope of the review needs to be resolved. He added that the elements of the Bali Action Plan could not be addressed. On the long-term global goal for emission reductions, there were different ways of expressing this and there was a need for restructuring of the text for more clarity.

Kisihan Kumarsingh of Trinidad and Tobago, who facilitated the drafting group on adaptation, said that Parties had agreed to continue the work as they did in Bonn, discussing clusters of issues rather than dealing with paragraphs line by line. He said that the discussions were going well to the point that Parties had exhausted discussions on the clusters. He expressed hope that a revised text would be presented by the end of the week.

Auden Rosland of Norway, who co-facilitated the mitigation contact group, said that work advanced on the consideration of elements of mitigation which was constructive. He said that there was an exchange of views on key issues in relation to paragraphs 1(b)(i) (relating to the mitigation commitments of developed countries) and 1(b)(ii) (on the nationally appropriate actions of developing countries) of the Bali Action Plan. Although the exchange was substantive, difficult issues remain. In the case of paragraph 1(b)(i), the issues were on the inscription of economy-wide targets for developed countries, their measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) and relation to the Kyoto Protocol and various aspects of comparability of efforts.

In relation to paragraph 1(b)(ii), the issues were about the registration of NAMAs, their MRV, national communications, GHG inventories and international consultation and analysis (of unsupported mitigation actions).

Rosland said that there was good progress in relation to paragraph 1(b)(iii) on REDD-plus (reducing emissions from deforestation and degradation in developing countries etc.).

Burhan Gafoor of Singapore co-facilitated the drafting group on finance, technology and capacity-building. He reported on the negotiations regarding finance and said that 3 meetings were held which dealt with the establishment of the new fund, a new body and fast-start finance. On the new fund, there was a spin-off group where discussions were constructive. On the new body, there continues to be divergence of views and on how such a body is linked to other institutional structures within the financial architecture and the broader architecture. Gafoor said that there was divergence of views on fast-start finance as to whether and how the issue is to be dealt with in Cancun.

Marinus Goote of the Netherlands reported on the work on technology transfer and said that Parties discussed the relationship of the issue to finance and the mandate and composition of the Technology Executive Committee. He commented that the discussions were continuing and were productive.

Following the report of the facilitators, the Chair invited Parties to give their views.

Pakistan said that work on the possible elements for Cancun must come from a party-driven process and that any process that remains exclusive will be deficient. It said that there was no discussion yet on the issue of ‘vulnerability’ in relation to adaptation and this element was not reflected.

China, while expressing appreciation for the effort of the Chair, said that the process was party-driven and governed by the Bali Action Plan. On the possible elements for Cancun, Parties must bear in mind the mandate of the BAP and the need for balance in the structure of those elements as well as balance in the two negotiating tracks (the AWG-LCA and Ad-hoc Working Group under the Kyoto Protocol) and within the two tracks.

China said that it was better to follow the elements of the BAP. It was surprised to find (in the Chair’s paper) separation in the concept of MRV of support and of NAMAs. The MRV in the BAP is of mitigation actions that are supported and enabled by finance, technology and capacity-building which are both MRV-ed (the actions supported and the support itself), it said. On fast-start finance, what was important was actual delivery of finance and not just the making of any pledges and there was a need for guidelines on reporting to avoid double counting of elements.

South Africa said that Parties were working under the mandate of the BAP and the Bali Roadmap under the two tracks. The Cancun outcome should be legally binding and there was a need for balanced progress on the Bali Roadmap. It said that there was language in the text that may compromise the final outcome in terms of integrity and outcome.

South Africa proposed the need for decisions for an enhanced climate change regime beyond 2012. There was a need to have clear language that these decisions are advancing key elements of the building blocks of the BAP towards a legally binding agreement. It said that decisions could be either in a single omnibus or an overarching process decision where there is decision on the legal form of the outcome.

South Africa said that there must be decisions in the two tracks with amendments to Annex B of the Kyoto Protocol or alternative decision/decisions

that reflect the commitments of Parties to the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. The BAP talks of implementation now, up to and beyond 2012 and so, there was a need for a set of operational decisions taken in that respect. Its key concern was the framing of decisions in a manner that would compromise a legally binding agreement.

Grenada, speaking for the **Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)**, expressed concern over the lack of time and on procedural tactics to block progress in substance. It wanted progress for a balanced package that creates the post-2012 regime in the context of the BAP where there would be a legally binding outcome alongside the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol. It welcomed the Chair’s paper as a useful map.

Peru, speaking also for Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Guatemala, Honduras and Panama, agreed with the paper produced by the Chair and said that further elaboration was needed and hoped for progress on draft decisions by the end of the week. It said that a set of decisions for Cancun are a milestone for a legally binding outcome in South Africa and also for a second commitment period for emission reductions by Annex 1 Parties under the Kyoto Protocol.

Egypt said that it was not sure if there can be results before Cancun on the issue of (carbon) ‘markets’. It reiterated that a fundamental element for a Cancun outcome under the AWG-LCA was a parallel outcome for a second commitment period by Annex 1 Parties for emission reductions under the Kyoto Protocol.

Venezuela said that the Chair’s paper only relates to outcomes in the AWG-LCA and that there was no movement in the Kyoto Protocol track and this cannot be the approach. It said that on the issue of reporting on fast-start finance, there must be delivery of finance before there is reporting.

Cuba said that the shared vision section is not only about the long-term global goal but also of other details. The whole core of the finance discussion or package is on long-term financing. He expressed concern that the Chair’s paper talks about “mobilizing finance” when what is reflected in the BAP instead is for the provision of new, additional and predictable finance and not “mobilization” which is an alien concept.

India said that while it appreciated the Chair’s efforts at expediting progress in the negotiations, there was a need to take into account realistically the level of consensus that remains. It also stressed the need for a balanced outcome in the two tracks which should be comprehensive and consistent with

the BAP and the Convention. In relation to the Chair's paper on the possible elements for Cancun, it said that the issue of unilateral trade measures must be reflected in the shared vision and it was unsure whether the issue of bunker fuels was mature for consideration when it should remain an issue under the Kyoto Protocol. It said that the elements must emerge from what the drafting groups have said.

Bolivia said that when Parties left Bonn in August, they said they would work on the negotiating text to clean it up and remove brackets. Three days have gone by and no brackets have been removed. Parties have instead gone to repeat process that they had in July this year where there was an exchange in points of view of possible elements for an outcome in Cancun. With facilitators drafting decisions, Parties were losing the process that was arrived at in August. It said that Parties should be working on the negotiating text to come back to a shorter text and the process was now unclear. Another concern Bolivia had was that the texts which are being drafted are more about the process than about the substance. It said that Parties were not negotiating but were exchanging views on possible elements for an outcome in Cancun. On the paper distributed by the Chair, Bolivia said that it had problems with some elements and there were some elements which were missing.

Nicaragua also expressed sadness that Parties were repeating a process that they had previously gone through. There was a need for more flexibility and political will for more progress in the negotiations. In relation to the Chair's paper on the elements, it said that some elements were not ripe yet for inclusion and some were missing.

Brazil said that a balanced set of decisions was needed for all elements of the BAP and for decisions in the two-track negotiations. It was important to capture the essence of issues knowing that Cancun will not be the final word on all issues. It must however be a step forward. Hence, there was a need for an approach that moves with comprehensiveness but not with the exhaustion of all the elements. It said that the Chair's paper on the possible elements provided a fair basis to continue work. It expressed hope for Parties in Cancun to be able to adopt a package of decisions for the sake of the multilateral system.

Saudi Arabia said that the Chair's paper was in a way picking and choosing of elements and was not comprehensive in all the elements of the BAP. The elements must reflect what Parties were negotiating in the text.

Singapore said that any balanced outcome must address the legal form and a legally binding agreement and should not hasten the demise of the Kyoto Protocol.

Mexico said that as the incoming Presidency of the COP in Cancun, it needs to admit that Parties were not making enough progress. The package for Cancun must truly be a package that can deliver immediate action for implementation of the Convention and should be built on a legally binding agreement. It also needs to be one that addresses the two negotiating tracks.

Belgium for the **European Union** said that for a balanced package, it was clear this was without prejudice to the legally binding outcome for both negotiating tracks for all Parties. In mitigation and MRV, it said that there had been no progress. It said there was a need to understand the mitigation pledges in the AWG-LCA track. There was not enough progress and balance between paragraphs 1(b)(i) and 1(b)(ii).

The **United States** said that at this stage of the process, it appeared as if Parties were bogged down. It said that it was foolish to waste time in areas where there is no agreement. It said that many countries have associated with the Copenhagen Accord which was balanced in key issues and key elements for all Parties. Referring to the Accord, the US said that there was balance in the context of mitigation for both developed and developing countries, transparency in relation to MRV of supported actions and of support, and for unsupported actions, the ICA. There was also balance in relation to finance. It said that there was a need to start from the Copenhagen Accord and if Parties did, there would be time to have an outcome. If not, the process was unhelpful. It said that the process must work on the hard areas and negotiate agreement.

The US said that a number of countries had referred to its domestic realities and it stressed that it was committed to continuing its efforts on reducing GHGs and in being fully engaged in meeting its mitigation and finance commitments.

Australia said that for the Umbrella Group, mitigation, MRV, ICA, REDD-plus, finance and technology are all part of a carefully designed package. It said that there has not been progress in relation to mitigation, MRV and ICA and asked for focus on these issues. There was a need for affirmation of the mitigation pledges of developed and developing countries and for an update of the pledges in the AWG-LCA and also the Kyoto Protocol. It stressed the need for an operational framework for MRV and ICA.

Japan said that more time should not be used in relation to the negotiating text as there would be no progress but instead, time should be used to extract the elements for decisions by the Conference of Parties in Cancun which are based on the Copenhagen Accord. It said that the Chair of the

AWG-LCA should put effort in drafting decisions for Cancun.

Russia said that the results of work were below expectations. It was seeking a comprehensive treaty outcome encompassing all Parties and there was a need for a set of decisions to design this.

Call for a Permanent Forum on Potential Consequences from Response Measures to Climate Change

Tianjin, 8 October (Hilary Chiew) – Developing countries have proposed a single permanent forum to deal with the issue of potential consequences from response measures to climate change that is currently being negotiated in both the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperation under the Convention (AWG-LCA) and the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP).

Parties are currently negotiating in four contact groups that are set up under the AWG-KP to deal with the five chapters of the draft proposal by the Chair, Mr. John Ashe of Antigua and Barbuda.

At the contact group on potential consequences on 7 October morning, supporters of Option 1 under Chapter V (*Consideration of information on potential environmental, economic and social consequences, including spillover effects, of tools, policies, measures and methodologies available to Annex I Parties*) clarified their proposal and assured Parties especially those in Annex I (developed countries) that the discussions in the two negotiating tracks are heading in the same direction.

Option 1 reads as follow: *Decides to establish a permanent forum as a means for Parties to report and evaluate impacts and consequences of policies and measures; this would offer a common space where Parties may provide information on their specific needs and concerns relating to such consequences, and identify ways to minimise negative consequences of the policies and measures adopted by Annex I Parties on non-Annex I Parties.*

Argentina said what proponents have in mind is one forum that will report separately to the Conference of Parties (COP) and the COP serving as the Meeting of Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP). For the CMP, the forum will look at the

consequences of Annex I Parties' actions on non-Annex I Parties and for the COP, it will assess the consequences of developed countries' actions on developing countries.

It further said the forum will offer a common space to allow for sharing of information and interactive dialogue to discuss the matter since it has been agreed by all that it is challenging to anticipate, attribute and quantify potential consequences.

Saudi Arabia said at the present time it is unclear if the AWG-LCA will agree to establish the forum but once the issue has been decided by any of the bodies, it will end up as one forum with unified language. It said it is prepared to work together on the terms of reference, what to accomplish and who should be involved once there is an agreement on the forum which should help all Parties, those that are affected by and those contemplating the actions.

Annex I Parties like New Zealand, the European Union and Switzerland say that the need for information and data could be provided through the National Communication and clarification can be sought at the meetings of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI) and Subsidiary Body on Scientific and Technological Advice, the bodies of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

Hence, their preference for Option 2 which reads: *Decides that Parties should use existing channels, including national communications, and report on observed impacts and specific needs and concerns relating to social, environmental and economic consequences of mitigation actions taken by Parties.*

At an earlier meeting of the contact group on Wednesday (6 October) **China** said it supported the establishment of a permanent forum as the existing

channel was inadequate in addressing all the potential consequences and focus has largely been on potential consequences in Annex I countries but not abroad.

New Zealand said the existing channel process has not failed but it should be given a chance to be strengthened. It said many Annex I countries have reported in their National Communication on the potential consequences and its own report in accordance with obligations under Article 2.3 (of the UNFCCC) came to 122 pages about the activities that it had been doing in striving to minimise the impacts of its actions in reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

It also said Annex I Parties are not required to report on the potential consequences until the fifth National Communication. Acknowledging the shortcomings in the first four National Communications, it said what is important is the fact that they are now reporting in great detail and the point is to be forward looking.

In response to China, New Zealand said its National Communication covered what happened in other countries and not only domestically.

Switzerland acknowledged that Annex I Parties have to strive to reduce impacts of their mitigation policies on third parties and it is important to work together to collect information on these efforts and deepening understanding and listening to experiences a country may have but said that the existing channel is the approach which involved trial and error.

Belgium, representing the European Union, said there remained differences and inconsistencies in the negotiation text on the same matter under the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP where the former has three options and the latter has two. It suggested that the text should mirror each other to ensure convergence into a single forum later (if such a forum is agreed on), noting that at least one Party of Annex I that is not Party to the Kyoto Protocol (referring to the United States) should be included in this forum and not left out.

It agreed with the flow of information and the need for a place to discuss them but it would like to seek clarification on additional information on top of that provided through the National

Communication and inventories that already contained a substantial amount of information.

At the Thursday (7 October) contact group meeting, New Zealand pointed out that a substantial amount of information on climate change (including potential consequences of response measures) is already made available in other international avenues and diplomatic dialogues like the G20, besides at the UNFCCC.

Saudi Arabia said the idea of the permanent forum can be viewed as the UNFCCC contribution and cooperation with those avenues and it will not render the other avenues redundant and neither would the forum be redundant.

It said the forum will be cost-effective and not burden any Parties as it is proposed to take place in conjunction with the UNFCCC subsidiary bodies' meetings in the same location.

On the forum's function, it said it will involve Parties, intergovernmental organisations and the participation of scientific, financial and research communities to review and evaluate the various options and develop a work programme and the SBI can then report once a year to the COP on the findings of the forum, and make recommendations to the Parties.

Argentina stressed that the central body for climate change is the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol. Recognising that there are huge amounts of information out there but the information should be organised in the UNFCCC and issues should be resolved within the UNFCCC, let's not undermine the central role of the UNFCCC, it said.

China said the existing channel approach could not assure others that Annex I will fulfill their commitments as shown by their failure, except the EU, that they will meet their targets.

New Zealand said it was surprised with China's conclusion as it is completely unknown if Annex I will meet their commitments until 2014 when all data are compiled but added that New Zealand is fully on track to meet its first commitment period targets.

The EU, Russian Federation and Australia also said they are on track to meet the targets.

China replied that it stands to be corrected and will be patient to wait till 2014 to see the final results.

AWG-KP Legal Matters Group Deadlocked over Mandate

Tianjin, 7 October (Lim Li Lin) – The legal contact group of the 14th session of the Ad hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) was deadlocked over the issue of the mandate of the group. Two sessions were held on Thursday, following an initial session on Tuesday (*see TWN Tianjin News Update No. 4*) but the group was still unable to resolve differences.

The issue that has bogged down the group is the long-standing issue over the mandate of the AWG-KP. The mandate of the AWG-KP (contained in Decision 1/CMP.1 that established the working group) is for determining further emission reduction commitments for Annex I (developed country) Parties for the second commitment period in accordance with Article 3.9 of the Kyoto Protocol. Article 3.9 sets out the legal obligation of Parties to establish commitments for subsequent periods for Annex I Parties in the form of an amendment to Annex B of the Kyoto Protocol, which contains the individual commitments of Annex I Parties for the first commitment period (2008-2012).

Over the course of the negotiations, other issues have been introduced into the work programme of the AWG-KP. These relate to land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF), market mechanisms, methodological issues, and potential consequences of response measures. These issues are contained in the draft text proposed by the Chair of the AWG-KP (John Ashe from Antigua and Barbuda). They are contained in Chapters II to V, in the form of draft CMP (Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties) decisions.

Chapter I contains the proposed amendments to Annex B of the Kyoto Protocol for the second commitment period as well as related consequential amendments to a few Articles of the Kyoto Protocol (in Option A). Option B contains the same consequential amendments as well as other proposals

by some Parties for further amendments to the Kyoto Protocol that are not consequential amendments arising from the amendment to Annex B for the second commitment period.

In the AWG-KP Chair's scenario note for this session, he had proposed that the legal contact group consider the parts of the Chair's proposed text relating to entry into force of any amendments to be adopted by the CMP as well as those that are not considered by any of the other contact groups. He outlines a number of sections that are contained in Option B for discussion.

The understanding, based on past practice at previous sessions of the AWG-KP, has been that the legal contact group only convenes when there are legal matters referred to it by the other contact groups (on the scale of Annex I Parties' emission reductions, on the other issues and on potential consequences).

After the hotly disputed session on Tuesday, the Co-Chairs Gerhard Loibl from Austria and Daniel Ortega from Ecuador conducted informal consultations with the Parties. They opened the second session of the contact group by announcing that there is an emerging consensus that the group could work on some text, and proposed dropping a couple of sections from the list in the Chair's scenario note (which contains Option B issues that are not consequential amendments).

This prompted firm reactions from developing countries.

Brazil speaking on behalf of the G77 and China said that they were only prepared to discuss legal matters relating to the amendment to Annex B and consequential amendments that are within the mandate of the AWG-KP.

China, Micronesia, Ghana, Sudan, Bolivia, Bangladesh, Egypt, India and Benin all spoke up in support of the G77 and China position.

China said that it was not authorized to discuss any amendments to the Kyoto Protocol other than to

Annex B. With regard to “improving” the rules of the Kyoto Protocol, it said that “A more beautiful Kyoto Protocol without the second commitment period is a dead treaty. This is a way of blocking the process, and under no circumstances can we do that.”

It proposed that instead of selecting issues in Option B, to first focus on issues in Option A, as that is our focus and mandate. Only with consensus and progress in Option A, can we then move on to discuss a better second commitment period. It suggested doing this line by line in the text, and then to have a discussion on how to avoid a gap between the first and second commitment periods in the next session of the contact group.

Brazil went on to say that the mandate of the AWG-KP was very precise and that amendments proposed to Article 21 for example in Option B are not consequential amendments, and was a diversion. This does not prevent any Party from discussing the issue in the CMP. It said that the issue of the mandate of the group should be discussed in the AWG-KP plenary. We are not here to make a new protocol, or make it a beautiful instrument, it said.

Ghana also wanted the legal contact group to discuss the possible implications of a gap between the first and second commitment periods.

Bolivia contended that the Chair’s scenario note is just a note, and it was up to Parties to decide.

Egypt agreed that the issues have to be discussed in the right place, and urged to focus first on the scale of Annex I Parties’ emission reductions.

However, **Micronesia** had a broader understanding of consequential amendments and considered that proposals dealing with the level of ambition such as those by AOSIS relating to the carry-over of surplus AAUs (assigned amount units), extending the share of proceeds from other market mechanisms, etc. are relevant.

(The AOSIS proposals relate largely to the scale of Annex I Parties’ emission reductions and are linked to determining the second commitment period in so far as the second commitment period relates to Annex I emission reductions after 2012. They are, however, not direct consequential amendments.)

Many of the proposals by Annex I Parties for additional amendments to the Kyoto Protocol would result in a quite different legal instrument. Most developed countries would like to terminate the Kyoto Protocol and replace it with another treaty. Parties can, at any time, propose amendments to the Kyoto Protocol in accordance with Article 20, and these proposals are taken up by the CMP.)

Tuvalu requested the Co-Chairs to rule on this matter so that the group could proceed, and said that

the mandate was established by the Chair to have a discussion on the entire text.

Developed countries urged for a broader view on the mandate.

Australia considered that everything in the Chair’s scenario note (including issues mentioned in Option B) is within the mandate of the AWG-KP and wanted to discuss its proposal on conditional application of the Kyoto Protocol. It said that it did not see the point of discussing the scale of Annex I emission reduction commitments (“numbers”) unless this was discussed. It accused developing countries of blocking progress in the AWG-KP by not allowing the opportunity to discuss other issues. It suggested that the impasse may have to be dealt with at an AWG-KP plenary session with the Chair, and said that it had no idea what we intend to have as the Cancun outcome.

Belgium, speaking for the European Union, expressed that the CMP may not be able to handle all the issues that needed to be discussed under Option B. It said that the mandate discussion had a good track record of blocking progress, and that we have different interpretations of the mandate, and in the past have found a way to move forward. Without improved rules, the Kyoto Protocol is also a dead treaty, it said. As long as we discuss all issues, it could live with addressing Option A first. It also wanted to discuss implications of a possible gap between the commitment periods.

New Zealand contended that it was necessary to discuss all that is necessary to do to bring a new commitment period into being, and that legal certainty is very important. It said that Option B did not reflect on what the mandate is, but contains proposals that were not allowed to be included in Option A. It accused Brazil of being inconsistent as it had a proposal in Option B.

Brazil responded by saying that opening each and every Article of the Kyoto Protocol would create uncertainty. It said that its proposal is in Option B as it is not a consequential amendment. It had made this proposal to put some ideas on the table, but not to engage on it. However, it could be discussed if Parties want to, when the time comes. It said that the intention of killing the Kyoto Protocol by trying to reopen all the Articles of the Kyoto Protocol at this late hour, is what is blocking the negotiations.

China said that the legal issues relating to the Annex B amendment are quite straightforward, and rejected the delaying tactics by developed countries. It said that the mandate of the AWG-KP, adopted in a decision in Montreal, is very clear. Until we discuss Option A, we should not be distracted. Option A and

the discussion on numbers will set the necessary basis for the CMP decisions in Cancun.

Switzerland requested for the AWG-KP Chair to join the group in order to understand his proposal so that the group can continue working.

The Co-Chair announced that the AWG-KP Chair was not available. He said that the group was given the mandate at the start of the AWG-KP session to look at Option B, and that it had no mandate to look at Option A.

China challenged the fact that a mandate for the legal group had been adopted, and said that there was nothing in the Chair's scenario note that suggested that we cannot address Option A. It said that the Chair's scenario note is not a decision for the mandate of the organisation of the group's work. We did not know what should be discussed, and how much time was being allocated to the group, it said. If necessary, another AWG-KP plenary was needed to take a decision on this matter.

New Zealand said that as they did not hear anyone object to the Chair's proposal for work at the AWG-KP opening plenary, they assumed that that was the consensus at that time.

Brazil said that the scenario note is not a decision, but a suggestion by the Chair. When it was time to consider it, we said that we were not willing to discuss Option B. The Chair has no authority to go against the mandate of the AWG-KP.

Ghana then made a proposal to start work from Option A, then to move on to work that flows from that, and then if there is time, other issues. This was supported by Benin and Bangladesh.

Switzerland and the EU wanted to have certainty and agreement that there would be a space to discuss all the issues that are contained in the text.

Ghana further proposed asking the Secretariat to identify what are the consequential amendments.

Micronesia suggested that those who do not want to discuss do not have to engage or say anything, but those who do, can discuss.

At the start of the third session of the contact group in the afternoon, the Co-Chairs announced that they would like to have informal consultations with the Parties on the Ghanaian proposal.

China said that while it appreciated the Ghanaian suggestion as a way to move forward, it doubted that the Secretariat should undertake the task, as that is the job of Parties. It said that it is clear that Option A contains the consequential amendments. It urged for sequencing and focusing the work of the group, as Option A together with progress in the numbers contact group, could be the basis for draft decisions in Cancun.

Australia and the EU agreed that it would not be useful for the Secretariat to undertake the task, as Parties would still disagree.

The Legal Advisor of the Secretariat, Dan Ogolla, said that the task would be putting the Secretariat in a difficult position. He referred to a previous paper by the Secretariat that identified possible elements for an amendment to the Kyoto Protocol pursuant to Article 3.9 that informs on the Secretariat's view on what are consequential amendments.

(The document FCCC/KP/AWG/2009/3 confirms that only the Articles in Option A are consequential amendments, as it deals with Article 3.1, 3.7 and 3.9. Two other provisions that are contained in Option A are not considered in the Secretariat's paper (Article 4.2 and 4.3) and Mr. Ogolla stated that in his view, they are also consequential amendments, and the Secretariat's document should have included those Articles.)

The Co-Chair said that they would conduct consultations to see what are elements in Option A and then in Option B that Parties are willing to discuss.

This immediately led to Parties re-stating their positions. Australia said that it would expect everything to be addressed.

Brazil and Bolivia said that Option B is not in the mandate of the AWG-KP.

China said that it preferred Option A and that it was not simply an issue of time whether or not Option B is discussed, and that confirmation by the Chair of the AWG-KP is needed that the legal contact group should follow the mandate of the AWG-KP.

New Zealand said that it was disingenuous to say that we are not supposed to discuss anything not in the mandate, but that yesterday the Brazilian proposals on how to deal with carry-over of surplus AAUs were discussed. (These were discussed in the contact group on numbers.)

The Co-Chair said that in Option A the group could only discuss what is not being discussed in other contact groups. Then it could move on to Option B. The issue of the mandate would have to be discussed in a plenary session of the AWG-KP.

Brazil said that it could not accept the Co-Chair's proposal and agreed with China that the mandate of the AWG-KP would have to be clarified in a plenary session of the AWG-KP. China also said that the status of the AWG-KP Chair's scenario note had to be clarified.

The Co-Chair said that they would conduct informal consultations and that the AWG-KP would have to consider the issue of mandate.

This led to further disagreement. The Chair of the AWG-KP appeared in the room and was greeted with applause.

The AWG-KP Chair said that the legal contact group was convened based on recommendations he made. There was no a priori assumption that everything he referred to was what Parties could agree to. He was inviting the Parties to engage in discussions without prejudicing the outcome. He said that at a minimum, Parties could exchange views on those items, and had not intended for a discussion of mandate, which is for the CMP. He said that the Parties should engage in a discussion and report to CMP 6, on the basis of the report from CMP 5 which contained all the proposals from Parties. He said that he would be happy to make proposals and was in the Parties' hands on how to proceed. He urged Parties to listen and hear the rationale, and not to refuse to even before beginning, even if some proposals may be difficult to accept.

Brazil said that the legal contact group is not supposed to discuss proposals, as these should be discussed in the substantive contact groups. Option B is not in the mandate of the AWG-KP and at this late point in time, it should not discuss other amendments to the Kyoto Protocol as these should be discussed in the CMP.

China said that it was right to conduct substantive discussions to fulfill the mandate of the AWG-KP. It said that issues relating to the scale of emission reductions for Annex I Parties should be discussed in the numbers contact group. In the Chair's scenario note, the issues listed from Option B are legal issues but have nothing to do with the mandate of the AWG-KP. Legal issues are confusing, but they should not be used to change the mandate of the contact group. The legal group is not supposed to discuss all legal matters relating to the Kyoto Protocol. It does not have the authority to amend the whole Kyoto Protocol.

It said that the issues listed in the Chair's scenario note have changed the mandate of the AWG-KP and prejudged its outcome. Option A is not mentioned, but it cannot be that we cannot discuss Option A. We had a very rushed and quick opening plenary without an opportunity to discuss what would be discussed, it said. There was no clear understanding of the time allocation.

India agreed that what the legal group is supposed to do flows from the AWG-KP mandate.

Micronesia, speaking for AOSIS, said that Parties should be allowed to explain why they have made proposals.

New Zealand said that it was not possible to discuss the other amendments at the CMP as Ministers would not understand. (However, the regular meetings of the CMP are at the negotiators level.)

The AWG-KP Chair said that the purpose of the legal group is to consider proposals by Parties, and not for Parties to say prior to that that they are not prepared to consider those proposals. He said that "You could give common courtesy to that Party to listen to their proposals. You could let them know that you don't agree."

(However, this is not the agreement of the AWG-KP on the nature of the legal group, which is to consider legal matters that are referred to it by the other contact groups.)

He referred to the work programme adopted in Poznan. (This work programme contains "other issues" that are being taken up in the other contact groups, and are addressed in draft CMP decisions in the Chair's proposed text. This is distinct from the additional proposals to amend the Kyoto Protocol.)

Ghana said that it agreed with China and Brazil and suggested starting with Option A, then using the Secretariat's paper as a guide, to consider Option B to see if there are other consequential amendments there, as perhaps the Secretariat's paper was not exhaustive.

The AWG-KP Chair proposed that the group should consider Ghana's proposal and discuss when it meets again.

China expressed concern that three slots had already been used by the contact group and if there was sufficient time for the numbers discussion. It asked if there would be another legal contact group.

Australia said that it wanted a clear understanding that everything will be discussed, and it might be necessary to carve out some time from the other contact groups. It asserted that as the legal group did not progress, other groups had not been able to progress.

The AWG-KP Chair said he would consult on all these matters.

Postscript

At the closing plenary on Saturday, the Co-Chair of the legal contact group reported that the group had met again that morning. He said that some Parties raised the issue of mandate of the AWG-KP and that proposals contained in Option B are out of the mandate of the legal contact group. The issue was resolved when the contact group agreed to go through

Chapter I of the text, starting with Option A, and then to Option B, with the understanding that the objective was to hear the thinking behind the purpose of the text, and to streamline or clarify the text as necessary.

The Co-Chair said that the views of the Parties on this matter will be reflected in the report of the AWG-KP for this session. The discussion on all the relevant parts of the text did not imply that the text

was endorsed or accepted by the contact group or Parties.

He said that Parties provided clarifications, and views were expressed both on the wording of the text and the concepts behind that, and that some Parties would like to discuss some of the provisions at the next session of the AWG-KP.

China, which has strong views on this mandate issue, has requested that its own specific language be reflected in the report.

Long Way to Go on Fast-start Finance – Says Development NGO

Tianjin, 9 October (Meena Raman) – Of the \$30 billion promised by developed countries under the Copenhagen Accord, only 13 per cent or \$3.9 billion has actually been given so far and just 7 per cent or \$2.2 billion is additional to pre-existing aid commitments, said the World Development Movement, a UK-based NGO in a report entitled '*A long way to go*' on the state of fast-start climate finance.

"Most countries are double-counting all of their fast-start finance as helping to meet their aid commitments as well," said the report further.

"Of the \$30 billion, only \$27.5 billion was ever pledged. Just 26 per cent (\$7.9 billion) has actually been committed to specific bilateral or multilateral programmes."

"Of the \$7.9 billion which has been committed so far, 42 per cent or \$3.3 billion is to be given to the World Bank and 47 per cent or \$3.7 billion is to be given to programmes which will give loans rather than grants," the report added.

The report, which provides an update on the state of the fast-start finance, was released end of September before the climate talks began in Tianjin, China.

According to the controversial Copenhagen Accord (which was not adopted by the Conference of Parties), developed countries were "to provide new and additional resources, including forestry and investments through international institutions, approaching USD 30 billion for the period 2010-2012," referred to as fast-start finance.

According to the WDM report, "'new' would commonly be understood to mean that it was money which had not been announced before and 'additional' means it would be additional to developed countries' pre-existing aid commitments."

"However, nine months into 2010, developed countries have done little to reveal how they are

meeting their pledges. On 3 September, the Netherlands published a voluntary database where governments can disclose how they are meeting their pledges and on what money is being spent. So far, only six countries have put information on this website, and not all have given full details of their spending," said the report.

"Using the Dutch website, and information in the public domain, we did the work of developed countries for them 'to reveal how much money has been pledged, committed and actually given, how much is additional and new, and how much is being given through the World Bank and as loans'," said the report.

The research showed that "of the \$30 billion, only \$27.5 billion was ever pledged. Just 26 per cent (\$7.9 billion) has actually been committed to specific bilateral or multilateral programmes. For example, Canada, Denmark, Finland and Ireland have not yet made any announcements as to how their money will be spent."

"Just 13 per cent (\$3.9 billion) has actually been given so far. The vast majority of this is from Japan's Cool Earth Partnership, which was first announced in 2008," said the report.

"Just 7 per cent (\$2.2 billion) is additional to pre-existing aid commitments. The Netherlands has made all of its fast-start finance additional to its aid commitments. However, most countries, including the UK, are double-counting all of their fast-start finance as helping to meet their aid commitments as well, such as those agreed at the G8 meeting in Gleneagles, Scotland, in 2005," it added.

"Just 17 per cent (\$5.2 billion) is clearly new money which had not been announced before Copenhagen. For example, \$770 million of UK fast-start finance was first announced in 2007. \$14 billion of Japan's \$15 billion pledge was first announced in 2008 (and it includes money from the private sector in this total as well)," said the report.

“Moreover, of the \$7.9 billion which has been committed so far, 42 per cent (\$3.3 billion) is to be given to the World Bank; 47 per cent (\$3.7 billion) is to be given to programmes which will give loans rather than grants; less than 1 per cent (\$70 million) is to be given to the UN Adaptation Fund, the main fund established by international negotiations to help developing countries adapt to climate change,” said the report.

According to the WDM report, “the UK pledged £1.5 billion (\$2.3 billion) over three years, £500 million a year, at Copenhagen. Of this, £519 million has been committed to particular programmes; £190 million has been given so far and none of it is additional to aid commitments.”

“Of the UK money so far committed, 89 per cent (£463 million) has been given or committed to

the World Bank; 72 per cent (£376 million) has been given or committed to programmes which will give loans rather than grants,” it said further.

According to the WDM report, “the coalition government has re-committed the UK to spend £1.5 billion out of the aid budget on climate change between 2010 and 2012. It has yet to decide how to allocate money which has not already been spent.”

“The Conservative Party policy is as far as possible, to give aid as grants not loans, and will encourage other donors such as the World Bank to give aid for social objectives, whenever possible, as grants. However, all UK money to the World Bank’s two main climate funds, the Clean Technology Fund and Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience, will be given as loans,” according to the report.

Divergent Views Remain over Kyoto Protocol Second Commitment Period

Tianjin, 9 October (Hilary Chiew) – There is still no agreement among developed countries on the post-2012 commitment period of greenhouse gas emission reductions under the Kyoto Protocol.

On Friday afternoon (8 October) an informal plenary of the Ad hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) that met to take stock of progress in the four contact groups set up on 4 October showed this lack of consensus.

Although the European Union and Norway expressed their willingness to adopt a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, other Annex I Parties, notably Japan and the Russian Federation, were firmly opposing the move.

The EU however reiterated its preference for a single legally binding instrument that would include the essential elements of the Kyoto Protocol.

Others maintained that their emission reduction pledges were conditional upon ‘other major emitters’ also take on binding emission reductions.

Developing countries reiterated their position as expressed at the beginning of the Tianjin meeting that they would not compromise on the requirement of a second commitment period as this is fundamental to a balanced outcome in Cancun by year’s end.

[The 16th Conference of Parties (COP) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the 6th COP serving as the Meeting of Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) will be held in Cancun, Mexico.]

Some non-Annex I Parties (developing countries) also openly spoke out against Annex I Parties for stalling negotiations and using the excuse of the absence of rules to justify their reluctance to commit to a second commitment period.

Chair John Ashe from Antigua and Barbuda said the stock-taking meeting offers an opportunity for Parties to express what would constitute a balanced outcome in Cancun.

Yemen, speaking on behalf of the G77 and China, said it has serious concern with the extremely slow pace of progress in the AWG-KP and that it is lagging behind in completing the central task of its work programme.

It urged Annex I Parties to show leadership by accelerating their emission reduction targets in the light of historical responsibilities and equity and in accordance with science. It is essential that the Kyoto Protocol continues (into a second commitment period) and the elements of the Kyoto Protocol are very important for the future of a climate change regime.

In that connection, it said, any gap in the commitment period would have serious implications. It reminded Parties that a new quantified emission reduction target is a legal obligation that must be met and is fundamental to the success of Cancun.

It emphasised that the Group will not compromise with the requirement of the second commitment period, the historical responsibilities principle and interests of developing countries. Therefore, it said, the focus should be an amendment to Annex B and definition of Annex I (Parties’) commitment.

Failure to do so will send a negative signal of Annex I Parties to take forward their legal obligation and their readiness to forge a strong climate change regime.

Australia said that Parties should capture progress so far and settle the forward agenda for the year ahead. In terms of capturing progress, it said it is important to seek decision on a number of matters related to rules: those that cover the metrics under the Kyoto Protocol to create synergy for target setting; accounting rules for Land use, Land use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) and a decision on emission trading which would help Parties in establishing quantified emission reduction targets.

It said it intends to commit to quantified emission reductions but would like it to be based on sound rules. The sooner Parties settled it, the better would the progress be, it added.

Belgium, representing the European Union, said it has repeatedly expressed its commitment to the work of the AWG-KP and that it sees progress in this group as an essential part of joint efforts under both tracks of the Bali Roadmap to deliver a successful outcome in Cancun.

It said while the EU continues to have a preference for a single legally binding instrument that would include the essential elements of the Kyoto Protocol, it is flexible about the legal form as long as it is binding.

It said a positive and successful outcome in Cancun that captures progress in both the AWG-KP and the AWG-LCA (Ad hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention) is an interim step towards reaching a legally binding outcome as soon as possible.

Achieving such a success in Cancun, it said, would require balance both within the proposals on the table in the AWG-KP as well as balance across negotiating tracks and that it is important to capture progress on the following three elements of the negotiation text in Cancun: reduction commitments; a confirmation of the continuation of the Kyoto Protocol architecture; and a characterisation of further work.

On further commitments of Annex I Parties (referring to scale of emission reductions), Parties should aim to consolidate the progress made so far by clarifying the underlying assumptions and conditionalities of those pledges.

From the EU perspective, it would not be an endorsement of the current level of ambition implied by those pledges as those pledges are not yet sufficiently ambitious and neither would it be a stepping stone for a pledge-and-review approach.

(A pledge-and-review approach would be contrary to the system envisaged for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol where an aggregate target is first set from which individual or joint targets of Annex I Parties are determined, backed by the compliance regime of the Kyoto Protocol.)

It further said that the EU would continue efforts to inscribe further emission reduction commitments by Annex I Parties into a legal instrument and further step up those commitments to a level that constitutes a fair and ambitious contribution towards the common goal of staying below 2 degrees Celsius (in temperature increase from pre-industrial levels).

On the continuation of the Kyoto Protocol architecture, the EU said it is important in Cancun to send a strong message to the world that Parties want to preserve and enhance the architecture of the Protocol. To do so, it is essential to confirm the use of common and robust accounting rules, confirm the continued use of the flexible mechanisms and their improvement to enhance their environmental effectiveness, geographical distribution and contribution to sustainable development.

It also wanted to see the continuation of various Kyoto Protocol institutions like the Adaptation Fund, Clean Development Mechanism and Compliance Committee.

On further work, it said it is essential that Parties agree in Cancun on a way forward to a legally binding outcome. It said that the outlined package would ensure the preservation of the institutional architecture of the Kyoto Protocol with a view to avoiding unnecessary uncertainties for policy makers, stakeholders, markets and citizens in general.

It urged Parties to work constructively and turn to a full discussion based on the text and identify the political options with a view to agreeing on an overall package in Cancun, but concluded that ambitious commitments of Annex I Parties in isolation would not be enough and a legally binding outcome in both tracks is needed.

Norway said it is worried about the slow pace in the AWG-KP and that it is a friend of the Kyoto Protocol and would commit itself to a second commitment period where it pledges a 30% nationwide emission cut.

It added that it has no hidden agenda and is confident that a good solution under the AWG-KP is possible and essential to the final outcome. It supported the EU statement on the essential elements for the AWG-KP in establishing a new and stronger framework for the future.

Switzerland said having a balanced package is important and acknowledged that the current pledges are insufficient. It said it considers a legally binding and quantified emission reduction after 2012 as part of a broader and comprehensive package defining the future climate change regime but it is flexible on two legally binding instruments.

Japan said it participated in the AWG-KP negotiation with the expectation of achieving clarity on rules in LULUCF, mechanisms and the methodological issues.

It said all the pledges by Annex I Parties are premised on the establishment of a fair and effective global deal which would include all major emitters and market mechanisms as the main outcome.

It also said Japan inscribed the 25% target premised on a fair framework. Hence, it said it would not support a second commitment period as it does not constitute a fair and effective framework, and implies an imbalance of a legal nature.

New Zealand said it is not engaging in tit-for-tat negotiation tactics as talked about by one group of Parties (referring to some developing countries). It said it is reasonable that Annex I Parties know the rules before setting targets and signing a legally binding commitment. It is concerned that some Parties are pursuing an all-or-nothing approach which would not lead to a final decision in this negotiation track. It said refusal by some Parties to address legitimate concerns would not drive Annex I Parties to take on targets and that it would not support an outcome that is not fair. (*Please see TWN Tianjin News Update No. 7 on the debate and deadlock in the legal contact group on the issue of the AWG-KP's mandate.*)

Micronesia speaking for the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) said it is time to confirm and consolidate the Kyoto Protocol foundation as it is designed for emission reductions but current pledges only add up to a 12 and 18% reduction from 1990 levels and there is no effort to get closer to a 45% reduction to limit temperature rise to well below 1.5 degrees Celsius from pre-industrial levels.

Rather than scoring political points, it said Annex I Parties need to commit and follow through with the amendment of Annex B (to the Kyoto Protocol that sets out the reduction targets). Any further ambiguities would prolong the deadlock. It said many developing countries have expressed with absolute clarity for the AWG-LCA to produce a legally binding agreement so it needs to achieve symmetry with the AWG-KP. These two instruments will form the global architecture which is the AOSIS architecture vision as well.

Tuvalu expressed its frustration on one particular LULUCF issue and urged the Chair to seek some sanity in the process. It said the endless computations, permutations and delays by key Parties negotiating LULUCF should not create a procedural blockage to the entry into force of the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol nor should it undermine meaningful emission reductions.

It said a joint proposal by the G77, the EU and others relating to accounting for forest management will make it difficult to conclude the accounting rules for LULUCF by CMP7 (7th meeting of Parties to the Kyoto Protocol) or even beyond.

In effect the G77, the EU and others are creating a gap in the commitment periods of the Kyoto Protocol, it added. It said it is unacceptable that on the verge of CMP6 it is being told that there will be no conclusion in Cancun and even at South Africa (that will host CMP7).

South Africa said Parties should develop an overarching decision that outlines the elements of a complete package for the AWG-KP and AWG-LCA. In Cancun, it said, Parties should capture progress as building blocks to a legally binding two-track agreement.

In doing so, it will give comfort to Parties that they are working towards a two-track outcome, which allows them to capture progress and that areas with less progress will develop as the process unfolds.

It urged the Chair to consult with Parties in terms of adopting decisions in Cancun and facilitate the work going forward.

The Russian Federation said it is highly unlikely that it would go ahead with the Kyoto Protocol track without a clear vision of the global climate architecture for a post-2012 regime. It said to date the Copenhagen Accord is the only blueprint that might provide a basis for moving forward.

China said even though Parties talked about a balanced outcome there are those who want to kill the Kyoto Protocol especially one that has the Protocol named after one of its cities, in clear reference to Japan. It said any balanced outcome must include the two tracks, a second commitment period, finance and technology transfer and stressed that China will not compromise on these key elements.

It said "legally binding" extends beyond historical responsibilities but also legal responsibilities as Parties cannot throw out a legal instrument like the Kyoto Protocol but must comply with obligations under the treaty.

It said to rebuild trust and confidence, Annex I Parties must take the lead in producing a fair, balanced and legally binding outcome.

India said the Kyoto Protocol is the heart of the challenge in the global cooperation for climate change mitigation. It said Parties should remain committed to the tasks before them and in the absence of success in Tianjin, Parties will fail to create legally binding obligations in Cancun.

Venezuela said commitment under the Kyoto Protocol should not be bargained against other positions in the AWG-LCA track. As the Kyoto Protocol is a legally binding agreement, so are its principles. As such, (Non-Annex I) Parties cannot

accept the line of thought that some countries will fulfill their obligations in exchange for something else.

It said a new, legally binding obligation in the AWG-LCA track is not the way for Parties to get out of the Kyoto Protocol but they should use Article 27 under the Protocol to do so if they so wish (referring to withdrawal provision of the Protocol). It urged Parties to work towards two protocols – the continuation of the Kyoto Protocol and the one to be born (under the AWG-LCA track).

Saudi Arabia said the primary objective of the AWG-KP is adhering to the legal mandate of Article 3.9 which is the amendment of Annex B. In this context, it said, it noted with great concern that many Annex I Parties have not yet made concrete proposals.

It said without concrete actions and balance, Parties would fail to reach an equitable outcome. It hoped Annex I Parties will show leadership and allow the AWG-KP to achieve concrete results in completing its work programme in Cancun to avoid any gaps between the commitment periods.

Brazil praised Norway which clearly spoke about its commitment and said that it (Norway) is a lonely voice amidst other Annex I Parties which seemed to have the utmost difficulty in uttering words referring to a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol.

It said other Annex I Parties spoke of rules, norms, architecture and markets but all of them seemed void of linkage to a true second commitment period.

It stressed that Brazil does not belittle the importance of strong rules but to say that without rules one cannot commit is far from the truth. It said in reality, (some Parties) used that as a guise in wanting to renegotiate the whole Kyoto Protocol.

It said leadership is needed and that Brazil has committed to a set of actions that are much more

ambitious than the pledges of many Annex I Parties without asking to know the rules in advance. Leadership and actions are lacking from those Annex I Parties that still refuse to adopt the second commitment period.

It said discussion about rules must be clearly linked to an unequivocal second commitment period; otherwise it will not make any sense. It urged Parties to work together towards adopting a balanced set of decisions that includes a clear commitment to the second commitment period.

Third World Network, speaking as a member of civil society, stressed that the Kyoto Protocol is the lynchpin of the whole climate negotiations and reminded Parties that the AWG-KP started long before the AWG-LCA. There must be continuation of the Protocol as it is the only legally binding treaty. If it fails, TWN warned, everything else is in danger of collapse.

It said the worst scenario would be if the legally binding Kyoto Protocol regime were to be replaced by a new regime in which Annex I Parties only make national pledges without them having to be adequate and there is no aggregate Annex I target. Even if this new voluntary regime becomes legally binding, it would be a disaster because it would be a climb-down from comparable and adequate efforts into a regime of mere voluntary efforts which may only yield a 13% target by 2020 compared to 1990 levels and with loopholes it may even be zero.

Thus, TWN called on all Kyoto Protocol Parties to complete the negotiations for a second commitment period by Cancun, adding that this important result would unlock everything else in the LCA track.

Chair John Ashe said the diverse views from the stock-take showed that there is general recognition that there ought to be a balanced package in Cancun, but no consensus on what it should be. But there is still some time until Cancun (to work out the problems).

Kyoto Protocol's Future Still Uncertain

Tianjin, 11 October (Lim Li Lin) – The working group of the Kyoto Protocol closed on Saturday (9 October) in Tianjin, China with the Protocol's future still hanging by a thread. Deep divisions between developed and developing countries over its survival and the further emission reduction commitments of Annex I (developed country) Parties under the Kyoto Protocol remain unresolved despite the legal mandate to conclude discussions at the 6th Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties (CMP) in Cancun, Mexico later this year.

This session of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) was the last before Cancun. Developing countries all insisted that the amendment to Annex B of the Kyoto Protocol must be adopted in Cancun, while developed countries all clearly have no intention of doing so.

(Annex B of the Kyoto Protocol lists the emission reduction targets of Annex I Parties for the first commitment period from 2008 to 2012.)

At the Tianjin session, four contact groups were set up: on the scale of Annex I Parties' emission reductions ("numbers") in the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol; on "other issues" including land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF), emissions trading and the market mechanisms, and the baskets of methodological issues; potential consequences of response measures; and legal matters.

The legal contact group was deadlocked over the issue of the mandate of the AWG-KP (*see TWN Tianjin News Updates #4 and #7*). Developed countries would like to discuss amendments to the Kyoto Protocol that do not fall within the mandate of the group, but insist that they are "clarifying" the rules and that this is necessary for them to take further emission reduction commitments. At the same time, they are not putting on the table the necessary mitigation commitments as needed by science, nor committing to the continuation of the Kyoto Protocol.

Yemen, speaking on behalf of the G77 and China, said that the discussion on the scale of emission reductions of Annex I Parties was delayed through the inability to resolve an array of technical issues. It appealed that now is the time to translate discussions into specific quantified emission reduction commitments for Annex I Parties in the second commitment period, rather than further delaying by setting preconditions or discussing subjects far from the mandate and work programme of the AWG-KP.

Yemen said that the continuity of the Kyoto Protocol is an essential and basic element for the future of the climate change regime, and that we need to avoid a gap between the commitment periods as it would have extremely serious consequences for Mother Earth and humanity. Defining new quantified emission reduction commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol is a legal obligation that must be met and the Kyoto Protocol must lead the way, and is the cornerstone of the Cancun outcome as a whole, it said.

The Group insists and will not compromise on the second commitment period for Annex I Parties, which must be from 2013 to 2017 and be measured against 1990 levels. To strengthen the global effort to address climate change, it is essential to have balance between the two negotiating tracks [the other being the Ad hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA)], with all Annex I Parties showing leadership through ambitious emission reduction commitments, as the current level of Annex I mitigation pledges is insufficient and is an obstacle that must be overcome. The AWG-KP must deliver the result of its work pursuant to Decision 1/CMP.1 for adoption at CMP 6, Yemen said.

Belgium, speaking for the European Union, said that it is "fully engaged in the Kyoto Protocol track, and that we aim to make all the progress necessary for a balanced pack that would allow for

a step towards a global comprehensive legally binding framework in line with the 2 degrees Celsius objective.”

It said that it is “open regarding the legal form of the outcome as long as it is binding. Ultimately we would still prefer a single legally binding instrument that would include the essential elements of the Kyoto Protocol. However, we are open to consider a second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol, as part of a wider, more rigorous and ambitious framework and provided that certain conditions, founded on the urgent need for environmental integrity and effectiveness of international action, are met.”

The EU would like to have a series of CMP decisions from the AWG-KP process in Cancun and to pursue further work thereafter. Capturing progress in both negotiating tracks will be a vital step towards a legally binding result, it said. Its goal for Cancun is to achieve results on: further commitments of Annex I Parties, the continuation of the Kyoto Protocol architecture, and deciding on next steps with a view to a legally binding outcome.

Its position is that emission reductions by developed countries in aggregate by 2020 should be in the order of 30% below 1990, and that it is necessary for developed countries to enhance their pledges. Its own commitment is a 30% emission reduction, “if other developed countries commit themselves to comparable emission reductions and if advanced developing countries contribute adequately and according to their responsibilities and respective capabilities.”

Belgium said that current pledges in the negotiations should be reflected, but this is not a suggestion to consolidate the current unsatisfactory level of ambition. Cancun needs to send a strong message that we want to preserve and enhance the architecture of the Kyoto Protocol. We should confirm the use of common and robust accounting rules, the continued use of the flexibility mechanisms and their improvement, and the continuation of Kyoto Protocol institutions.

It emphasized ensuring the environmental integrity of the Kyoto Protocol and the necessity for improvements to the Kyoto Protocol rules, especially with regard to LULUCF and the flexibility mechanisms. The use of surplus assigned amount units (AAUs) should be addressed in Cancun, it said, and we should set a basis for new market mechanisms. The scope of the Kyoto Protocol should be extended to other sectors and gases. All this will avoid unnecessary uncertainties for policy makers, stakeholders, markets and citizens, in line with the

ambition to avoid a gap between the first and second commitment periods.

It said that it relies on the Chair of the AWG-KP and the incoming Presidency of CMP 6 (Mexico) to prepare the documentation and to actively consult Parties in the run-up to Cancun. In Cancun, political options on outstanding issues should be addressed. It emphasized that progress is needed towards a legally binding and balanced outcome in both negotiating tracks, with broad participation from Parties.

The **Democratic Republic of Congo, on behalf of the African Group**, said that a long-term solution to the climate crisis is a global effort. Agreement to a second commitment period is absolutely essential to facilitate agreement under the AWG-KP. The African Group’s expectations for Cancun are for the adoption of the amendment to Annex B for Annex I Parties’ emission reductions in the second commitment period. Emission reduction commitments should be strengthened to be consistent with the goal of limiting temperature increase to below 2 degrees Celsius from pre-industrial levels.

It emphasized that the rules should be resolved in a manner that does not delay the work on the numbers and lead to a gap between the first and second commitment periods. It re-affirmed the two-track approach of the negotiations and said that reaching agreement on the second commitment period is crucial for reaching agreement in the AWG-LCA.

Australia, on behalf of the Umbrella Group, said that clarity on the rules is necessary to consider what emission reductions are possible. It said that the legal discussion on the rules should be a priority early at the next session of the AWG-KP in Cancun. It emphasized the need for a balanced, fair and effective legally binding outcome that includes all major emitters, and that the Kyoto Protocol is part of the comprehensive outcome in Cancun. All developed countries have put forward quantified emission limitation and reduction objectives in the context of a comprehensive climate framework, and these are contained in Appendix 1 of the Copenhagen Accord, it said.

Grenada, on behalf of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), said that the longer the delay on ambitious emission reductions by Annex I Parties, the more difficult and costly it is to guarantee the survival of small island developing states and other vulnerable countries. Annex I Parties must take the lead in committing to binding economy-wide emission reductions that are sufficiently ambitious in scale in the Kyoto Protocol’s second commitment period.

It expressed satisfaction that AOSIS' proposals for amendment of the Kyoto Protocol with regard to market mechanisms, carry-over of surplus AAUs and new gases are reflected clearly in the Chair's draft proposed text, and are for maintaining environmental integrity. The proposals aim to reduce uncertainty and increase the scale of Annex I Parties' emission reductions as a number of proposed options are likely to undermine the environmental effectiveness of pledges on the table, it said.

Grenada said that far more ambitious targets are needed as current pledges are consistent with a temperature increase of 3.5 degrees Celsius or more. AOSIS' position is that Annex I Parties should reduce their emissions by 45% below 1990 levels by 2020, according to the best-available science. CMP 6 must adopt the amendment to the Kyoto Protocol for Annex I Parties' emission reductions in the second commitment period, in accordance with Decision 1/CMP.1.

Switzerland, on behalf of the Environmental Integrity Group, said that some progress had been made on key elements for Cancun, with a view toward a balanced package of decisions. It said that the Kyoto Protocol was still important but alone, would not meet the global climate change challenge. Further improvements to the valuable features of the Kyoto Protocol in Cancun are needed, including progress on LULUCF and market mechanisms. The package under the AWG-KP must be balanced with the AWG-LCA, and there should be balance within the decision of the AWG-KP. The Kyoto regime should be strengthened and its mandate fulfilled.

Lesotho, on behalf of the least developed countries (LDCs), said that it was disappointed with the AWG-KP outcome in Tianjin. An ambitious post-2012 regime that is backed by the best-available science is needed, and political will to limit temperature increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius, it said. It welcomed the statements of some developed countries for a two-track legally binding outcome and expressed hope that it would also be the position of all developed countries. It said that the amendment of the Kyoto Protocol for the second commitment period of Annex I Parties' emission reductions is of paramount importance, and that it must enter into force by 1 January 2013.

Egypt, on behalf of the Arab Group of 22 countries, said that it was concerned about the results of the negotiations in the AWG-KP. Delays continue to prevail in the numbers group, and there were no serious discussions on loopholes (that allow Annex I Parties to avoid taking real emission reductions). It said that some Parties insisted on discussing

controversial issues on legal matters, when the mandate of the group is to determine Annex I Parties' emission reductions for the second commitment period according to Article 3.9 of the Kyoto Protocol and Decision 1/CMP.1.

The Arab Group will not accept terminating the Kyoto Protocol, and refuses any such attempt by the major players that do not have any intention of committing to a second commitment period, which is the real key to unlocking the impasse in the negotiating process. Egypt said that we should agree as early as possible in Cancun on the second commitment period, which must be ambitious and in line with environmental integrity.

Bolivia, on behalf of the Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas (ALBA), said that the second commitment period is absolutely necessary, and that Annex I Parties are obliged to commit to quantified emission reductions. The proposals on market mechanisms would enable them to hand over their responsibility to developing countries. Developed countries should not condition their commitments on rules which give greater flexibility to them, it said.

It said that proposals for emission reductions by Annex I Parties are not consistent with science, the need for development by developing countries, or fair and equitable sharing of the atmospheric space. It supported the existing climate change regime, and that temperature rise must be limited to 1 to 1.5 degrees Celsius.

It asked the Chair of the AWG-KP to outline an effective schedule, so that the group can debate and agree on results for Annex I Parties' emission reductions in the second commitment period. It said that the international negotiating process must be respected. The Chair's scenario note was accepted, but it was not a blank cheque to change the mandate of the group. The group's mandate derives from Article 3.9 of the Kyoto Protocol and Decision 1/CMP.1, it said.

Norway said that it supported the Kyoto Protocol and would like to have a second commitment period as part of a broader framework. The Kyoto Protocol has quality elements and is a strong environmental agreement because of the form of its emission reduction commitment, with compliance, etc. and flexibility for governments in fulfilling their commitments.

However, its second commitment period is not enough, it said, and all major emitters must do their fair share, to be environmentally meaningful. It said that it is necessary to keep warming to below 2 degrees Celsius, and it is important to ensure

transparency by all Parties to reduce emissions. The level of ambition for emission reductions must be raised, and substantive discussions on the rules, legal issues and numbers are necessary for a second commitment period, it said.

The work done in Tianjin this week has been reflected in a new text – “Draft proposal by the Chair to facilitate preparations for negotiations”. This document will be forwarded to Cancun. The Chair invited Parties to submit their views on the text by 31 October.

TWN

Tianjin News Update 11

www.twinside.org.sg

Published by
Third World Network

12 October 2010

Parties Voice Concern over Limited Progress in Tianjin Climate Talks

Tianjin, 12 October (Hilary Chiew and Meena Raman) – Parties at the closing plenary of the 12th session of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long Term Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA) under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), held on 9 October in Tianjin, China, expressed that there was limited progress in the climate negotiations.

Developing and developed countries also voiced varied expectations for the Cancun meeting of the Conference of Parties in late November this year.

It was clear that deep divisions continued to remain on key issues, especially on mitigation, and developing countries called for greater political will on the part of developed countries for positive outcomes.

The G77 and China and the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) also urged developed countries not to hold back progress in the negotiations especially in relation to the establishment of the Climate Fund under the UNFCCC just because developed countries did not get what they want from developing countries in the area of mitigation.

The G77 and China emphasised the need for a comprehensive set of decisions at Cancun that must be in line with the Bali Action Plan, covering all its elements. It also called for balance between the two negotiating tracks (of the AWG-LCA and the Working Group under the Kyoto Protocol on further emission reduction targets of developed countries), and balance in decisions within each track.

Referring to the need for a balanced outcome on all the elements of the package in Cancun, Bernardita Muller of the Philippines, speaking for the G77 and China, said that in Tianjin, negotiations on some elements were being held back just because some Parties were not getting what they wanted and this was unfair.

(Muller was referring to negotiations on the establishment of a new fund under the UNFCCC which was being held back by the United States as it wanted to see progress on new mitigation obligations for developing countries.)

AOSIS also expressed similar sentiments saying that it was not helpful to hold hostage the establishment of the fund by events elsewhere. It stressed further that the perception of a balance in the Cancun outcome did not include movement in the mitigation block and that AOSIS “was not prepared to play poker”, as the stakes were far too high for them.

Ambassador Abdullah M. Alsaidi of Yemen, speaking on behalf of the **G77 and China**, said that the Group had argued for a comprehensive set of decisions at Cancun and stressed that these decisions must be in line with the Bali Action Plan (BAP), covering all its elements; that a balance between the two negotiating tracks (of the AWG-LCA and the Kyoto Protocol working group) must be respected and the balance in decisions within each track must be maintained. It also stressed that whatever outcome reached in Cancun must not compromise the overall objective of a comprehensive, ambitious and legally binding outcome.

The G77 and China said climate change is a universal threat that respects no borders in time or space. It said that its people were suffering and their developmental prospects were at stake, as well as their very existence jeopardised. It was a matter of life and death for many countries. Therefore, it called for urgency in the negotiations.

The Group said further that it was incumbent on all Parties, particularly the developed countries given their historical responsibility, to address climate change within the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol, by adhering to the provisions and principles of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities.

It urged Parties to approach Cancun with determination to do more and said that the Group has negotiated in good faith notwithstanding impediments to achieve concrete steps necessary for the edifice of a comprehensive and legally binding outcome.

Grenada representing **AOSIS** said that the 16th Conference of the Parties in Cancun later this year must deliver a comprehensive and ambitious outcome, rebuild confidence and generate momentum in delivering a tangible result in South Africa in 2011 (at the 17th Conference of Parties).

It said the AWG-LCA process outcome must sit alongside the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol and Parties must avoid further uncertainty by addressing the continuation of this architecture in Cancun. It said that while there was some movement in the negotiations in Tianjin, Parties remained deeply divided in many elements of the discussion.

Given the scale and impact of well documented effects of climate change and their consequences, it asked what more was needed to spur them on (to resolve the deadlock). Grenada called for action to match the rhetoric. It said that it was irresponsible, unethical and unjustifiable in failing to meet the challenge demanded by science.

It added that the contours of a balanced package were clear and true leadership was needed. It said that it was not helpful to hold hostage the establishment of the fund under the UNFCCC by events elsewhere.

Grenada said that the perception of balance does not include movement in the mitigation block and that AOSIS was not prepared to play poker as the stakes are far too high for them.

Lesotho speaking for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) drew attention to the flood in the Hainan province of China where more than 1.6 million people have been affected. It said the magnitude of extreme weather events and their impacts can no longer be over-emphasised and with the rise of sea surface temperatures as a result of climate change, the extent of destruction and loss of property and lives can never be imagined.

It reiterated its previous call to have an outcome on a set of decisions that adequately address elements of the BAP to enable the full, effective and sustained implementation of the Convention now, up to and beyond 2012 which would eventually lead to a legally binding agreement.

It said the set of decisions must include an agreement on the establishment of a new Fund and a decision on a committee that will lead the process

to operationalise the Fund. As adaptation was a priority of LDCs, the group underscored the need for the COP to reach agreement on the Adaptation Framework for Implementation and the associated means of support for implementation. This framework should include a process for LDCs to develop medium and long-term adaptation plans that build on the NAPAs (National Adaptation Plan of Actions).

On capacity building, it said as it is essential for LDCs to fully engage in the implementation of adaptation and mitigation actions, it expects the issue to be addressed. As the best option to adapt is to start mitigating now, the LDCs expect a decision that would enable technology development and transfer. It also hoped that consultations will be carried out in an inclusive, open and transparent manner with the intention of maintaining trust within the UNFCCC process.

The Democratic Republic of Congo, representing the African Group, said that while the work in Tianjin had been instructive, there was much left to be resolved if Parties are to expect an ambitious outcome in Cancun and negotiations are progressing far too slowly to respond to the needs of developing countries.

It stressed that for the period beyond 2012, the outcome of negotiations must be, firstly, a shared vision for long-term cooperative action which includes a global goal for emission reductions, adaptation, mitigation, finance, technology transfer and capacity building in a balanced and comprehensive manner to achieve the ultimate objective of the Convention.

Secondly, it said, the agreed outcome of the comprehensive process mandated in the BAP must be a legally binding outcome under the Convention. Thirdly, finance is a cornerstone for achieving a balanced deal that ensures the enhancement of the climate change regime and supports developing countries' efforts to adapt and to take voluntary actions to reduce their emissions as part of the global effort to deal with the issue of climate change.

It expressed its disappointment that there was no clarity on any of these issues and suggested that Parties focus efforts on making progress in several overarching areas:

- that the AWG-LCA take into account the requirements for rationalisation and coherence of the arrangements for the means of implementation, including finance, adaptation, technology and capacity building, and undertake the preparatory work in order to ensure the effective functioning of proposed institutions, mechanisms, procedures and processes.

- Annex I Parties should commit to long-term finance based on assessed contributions of 1.5% of GDP and work towards establishing the new fund, including addressing the balance in allocation between adaptation and mitigation.

- that the SBSTA (Subsidiary Body on Scientific and Technology Advice) develop technical guidance for the implementation of REDD+ (forest-related) activities and report to COP17.

- the AWG-LCA should focus on clarifying the approach to enhance the ambition of Annex I countries not Party to the Kyoto Protocol (referring to the US) and the issue of comparability as well as design, function and institutional arrangements for the proposed Mitigation Mechanism supporting Non-Annex I countries relative to voluntary nationally appropriate mitigation actions.

Egypt representing 22 countries in the Arab Group said that while there is progress in finance and technology transfer, the session registered regression in the field of adaptation and capacity building. It said that divergences continued over emission reductions. It stressed the need for balance among the various elements of the BAP and in the two tracks of negotiations as well. It expressed concern over elements that are being proposed which are not in the BAP or the Convention. It said that it was important to have a financial mechanism in Cancun and there must be an agreed decision on a standing committee and the establishment of a fund.

Ecuador representing the Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas (ALBA) Group (including Bolivia, Cuba, Nicaragua, Venezuela, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Paraguay) said there has been no significant progress on the negotiating text and called for greater commitment from developed countries without whose political will there could be no outcome. It stressed that there was no room for conditionalities and even less for the prevalence of financial and commercial interests. It said the negotiating process required absolute transparency and the inclusion of all Parties, guided by the UNFCCC. There was a need for a legally binding outcome and Ecuador hoped that Cancun would see a comprehensive set of decisions both in the AWG-LCA and the Kyoto Protocol. It expressed cautious optimism over the outcome in Cancun.

Pakistan was pleased to note progress in the negotiations in Tianjin. It said that it was cognisant that a search for an agreed outcome could take years but this should not lead to complacency. It said that the recent floods in Pakistan posed a new challenge and showed its vulnerability, with the loss of 1,700

lives and effects on 20 million people, with 8 million being made homeless. One-fifth of the country was under water and 2 million hectares of agricultural lands were damaged with loss of property running to billions of dollars. Pakistan said that there was a need to have a more accurate view of the concept of 'vulnerability'.

It said that efforts must be geared up on consolidating the trust built from Copenhagen to Tianjin and Cancun could provide fundamental agreements that could be operationalised, in areas such as institutional arrangements for nationally appropriate mitigation actions of developing countries, the REDD-plus framework, the climate fund, its framework and principles, the technology mechanism and an adaptation framework.

India said that for the further work in Cancun, Parties should stick to certain fundamental principles. First, it said, the outcomes and decisions must be comprehensive and be achieved in both tracks. An outcome on ambitious emission reduction targets of Annex I Parties is key to success at Cancun. However, India expressed disappointment with the emerging signals as it has not seen willingness to fulfil legal obligations nor was there indication that Parties were anywhere near a comparable and rule-based regime of emissions reduction in the AWG-LCA track.

It said that equity was central to the composition and impact of the work of Parties and there was a need to define it operationally with reference to equitable access to global atmospheric resources so that the development prospects of developing countries and the global eradication of poverty are not compromised.

India also said that Parties should avoid selective decisions as all four pillars of the BAP are equally important and critical to a balanced outcome. Balance has to be achieved not only in the two tracks but also in all pillars of the BAP.

Thirdly, it stressed that the nature of the results of the negotiations should not prejudice the agreed outcomes at Cancun. The legal shape of the outcome will be determined not by the form but the substance and the mandate of Parties was not to negotiate a fresh treaty or agreement. It emphasised that the UNFCCC is a legal treaty and the Kyoto Protocol is the legal instrument of the Convention. Whatever Parties choose to do must only enhance and not alter the principles and provisions of the Convention and the Protocol. Any other approach will not only amount to failure in meeting the existing legal obligations but also damage the credibility of any future legally binding outcomes.

It further stressed that success in Cancun will depend on the comprehensive, transparent and inclusive nature of the consultations which may be necessary in the run-up to Cancun.

China said that when it decided to host the climate talks, it was preparing to welcome delegates to Hainan island, which was hit by heavy rains with 1.6 million people being affected, stressing the vulnerability of the country to climate change. It called for urgency and urged all countries, especially the developed countries, to do something real and commit to emission reduction targets and provide technology transfer to developing countries. China stressed that the Convention and the BAP are the basis for the outcome in Cancun. There was a need for balance in both negotiating tracks and within the various elements.

The Marshall Islands chided Parties who remained cynical about fast-start finance. It said that it was caught in the middle of a downward spiral of the negotiations. To build a balanced and practical outcome, it said, more work should be in crystallising mitigation targets, up-scaling of actions and advancing international consultations and analysis and MRV (measuring, reporting and verification of actions).

Singapore said that references to concepts such as the equitable sharing of atmospheric space were not helpful and it could not find convergence in the selective definition of the principle of equity.

Belgium speaking for the European Union said it could not but feel that this session (in Tianjin) did not live up to its expectations in terms of progress and of striking the right balance. It said that progress was simply too limited for some of the topics that are crucial to achieving a balanced package. In particular, it said, Parties have not progressed enough on mitigation, MRV and market approaches which are essential elements for the EU in terms of a balanced packaged for Cancun.

The EU wanted all countries' pledges to be reflected in the UNFCCC process and there was a need to initiate discussions to clarify them and to consider options for strengthening the collective level of ambition which remains insufficient in light of our 2 degree Celsius goal. It also stressed that this was without prejudice to the ongoing discussions on the further commitments under the Kyoto Protocol track and did not also mean that the EU would accept a pledge-and-review approach for Annex I Parties.

The EU sought to set up a framework for enhanced MRV taking into account the different responsibilities and capabilities of developed and

developing countries as well as the different nature of their commitments. On market approaches, it said, although there was support from most Parties for progressing on this issue which is important for delivering results on mitigation, it wanted clarity in the text on key principles and to launch a work programme.

It said that during consultations, it became clear that many Parties were concerned that decisions on mitigation could move Parties away from the objective of a legally binding outcome for the AWG-LCA. The EU affirmed that it aimed for no less than a legally binding outcome for the Convention track and the Cancun outcome will have to define the next steps to reach this goal.

The EU said that progress was achieved on the setting up of the Copenhagen Green Climate Fund and constructive decisions also took place on the Adaptation Framework, the technology mechanism, capacity building and their institutional arrangements and Parties are also closer to setting up the REDD-plus mechanism (reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries etc.) but said much remained to be done to complete the work in Cancun. It counted on the Mexican government to create a sound environment for a focused political discussion to resolve the main outstanding issues.

Australia speaking for the Umbrella Group said it supported a durable, fair and effective legally binding outcome which includes the contributions by all major emitters. The Group affirmed support for the Copenhagen Accord which it said provided guidance on all elements of the Bali Action Plan. It said that a balanced package of decisions will allow progress towards an agreement.

It said the package should include elements on mitigation and MRV both for developed and developing countries. There was good progress on finance, adaptation and REDD-plus but progress on mitigation and MRV was limited.

It added that for a balanced outcome in Cancun, decisions on mitigation and MRV must be detailed and operational. The mitigation pledges of both developed and developing countries should be affirmed and it would also like new and updated pledges and to begin a process for understanding these pledges. It wanted the pledges in appendices and said that the Accord provided guidance on this. In addition, a registry would provide an avenue for developing countries to seek support for their actions. It said that transparency was key and there was a need for a robust framework for MRV and ICA with

decisions on frequency, form and content for transparency post-2012.

Australia said that a package of decisions must be a package and not a list of individual elements.

The **United States** said that there was limited progress in Tianjin and there must be progress on all

elements. On mitigation, it said that it tried to be flexible so as to move forward in a differentiated manner on (mitigation) activities (between developed and developing countries). It expressed sadness that the notes by the facilitators on mitigation had no status. It said that there was a need for time for key issues to ensure a balanced package.

TWN

Tianjin News Update 12

www.twinside.org.sg

Published by
Third World Network

12 October 2010

Developing Countries Stress on Party-driven Text for Cancun

Tianjin, 12 October (Hilary Chiew and Meena Raman) – Developing countries at the closing plenary of the 12th session of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long Term Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA), under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) held on 9 October in Tianjin, China, stressed that the basis of negotiations in Cancun must be the negotiating text which is driven by Parties.

The G77 and China stressed that its understanding was that the basis of negotiations for the 16th meeting of the UNFCCC Conference of Parties in Cancun in November must be the negotiating text of 13 August, and this understanding was confirmed by the AWG-LCA Chair, Margaret Mukahanana-Sangarwe of Zimbabwe.

This understanding was stressed in a three-hour closing plenary which was marked by confusion following the distribution of documents capturing the outputs from the drafting groups in Tianjin, after one week of discussions which began on 4 October.

Parties also expressed mixed feelings over what would be achieved in Cancun. (*See TWN Tianjin News Update No. 11 for further details.*)

The AWG-LCA Chair said that the progress of the work of the drafting groups and some spin-off groups (from the drafting groups) was captured in draft texts which were distributed to Parties. To take that work forward (to Cancun), an 'INF' (information) document would be produced by the Secretariat containing these draft texts, said the Chair. She also said that the negotiating text of 13 August will also be on the table for Cancun. Focus in Cancun will be on issues where there was not much progress, said the Chair further.

Confusion stemmed from the distribution of the different outputs of the four drafting groups on shared vision for long-term cooperative action; adaptation; mitigation; and finance, technology and capacity-building. Some drafting groups produced

revised draft texts which were based on the 13 August negotiating texts which were, in some instances, accompanied by notes by their respective facilitators.

However, in the mitigation drafting group as regards developed countries' mitigation [paragraph 1(b)(i) of the Bali Action Plan] and developing countries' mitigation [paragraph 1(b)(ii) of the Plan], the co-facilitators produced notes expressing their own 'reflections on the issues discussed'. Work on the two paragraphs was facilitated by two different facilitators. Since negotiations were at an impasse there was no Party-produced negotiation text from these two groups.

The G77 and China as well as several other members of the Group raised issues regarding the status of the notes by the facilitators, which were subsequently clarified by the Chair as having no status or bearing on the negotiations.

The Chair, Margaret Mukahanana-Sangarwe, also distributed her own report on 'consultations with Parties on elements of the outcome' (for Cancun) which she first introduced at the midway 'stock-taking meeting' of the AWG-LCA on 6 October.

South Africa, speaking for the **G77-China**, said that it had fundamental concerns over the process related to the formulation of the co-facilitators' notes on paragraphs 1(b)(i) and (ii) of the Bali Action Plan on mitigation. It said unlike other drafting groups where Parties had provided inputs to the text by facilitators, in this case, due to a lack of time, there was no opportunity to engage on the co-facilitators' notes and Parties only saw the text for the first time at the plenary. It said the understandings captured by the facilitators were not necessarily comprehensive or an accurate reflection (of the discussions).

South Africa said that the G77 and China at the beginning of the week had also objected to the structure of the facilitator's text in relation to paragraph 1(b)(i) when it was presented, but for the

sake of progress, the Group agreed to begin substantive discussions. The document produced however reflected the facilitator's structure. It also said that the Group could not accept the sub-titles in the structure of the facilitator's note as the document reflected only the facilitator's understanding.

It said further that the document in relation to paragraphs 1(b)(i) and 1(b)(ii) does not have a chapeau to clarify that the note reflects the understandings of the co-facilitators and that the negotiating text (of 13 August) is in fact the basis for the work of Parties in Cancun. It said the G77 and China was not in a position to accept the transmission of the co-facilitators' text on paragraphs 1(b)(i) and 1(b)(ii) to Cancun as they stood.

In response, the Chair of the AWG-LCA asked the secretariat to read out the clarifying chapeau to be introduced under the two notes [of paragraphs 1(b)(i) and (ii)]. The secretariat said that the title under the two notes from the facilitators will be changed to "facilitators' understandings of the issues discussed". This will be followed by a chapeau as follows: "*Co-facilitators understandings are derived from some statements made during the drafting group on mitigation. As such, the co-facilitators' understandings will have no bearing on the negotiations. Negotiations will continue on the basis of the negotiating text (of August 13) without prejudice to the position of Parties.*" The secretariat also informed Parties that the sub-titles in the note relating to paragraph 1(b)(i) will be deleted.

The G77 and China then accepted this proposal.

[The note by the facilitator on paragraph 1(b)(i) was controversial, for among other contentious aspects, it contained among other matters reference to the concept of "graduation" and criteria for countries to be included in Annex I and the reclassification of Annex I (developed country) and non-Annex I (developing country) Parties.]

Bernarditas Muller of the **Philippines**, who is also coordinator of the G77 and China for the AWG-LCA as well as for finance and technology transfer for the Group, noted that the list of elements for the outcome prepared by the Chair for Cancun did not have any status as informed by the Chair.

Referring to the issue of finance, she said that the G77 and China had presented its submission for a draft decision for a new fund and so did another Party. These proposals were set aside in favour of the facilitator's note. She also said that the process was a problem.

Muller stressed that for Cancun, work must proceed on the basis of texts developed by Parties and that the negotiating text was the only basis of

negotiations. She said that her understanding was that the notes of the facilitators were like an aide memoire and would not have any status in Cancun. Her understanding on the matter was confirmed by the Chair.

China sought further clarification on the issue as it said that there was confusion. It said that its understanding was that the negotiating text was the basis for continued negotiations. The notes by the facilitators served as a memoire and do not enjoy formal legal status nor are they the basis for future negotiations. It said that the whole process was Party-driven and the negotiating text from a Party-driven process should be the basis of the work of the next AWG-LCA session. China was not clear if the 'INF' document can serve the same purpose.

In response, the AWG-LCA Chair said that the 'INF' document was to capture what was discussed in Tianjin. The notes of facilitators have no status in relation to the negotiations and were like an aide memoire and will not have any bearing. The Chair further stated that the chapeau in relation to paragraphs 1(b)(i) and (ii) can be extended to all the notes of the facilitators on the other issues as well.

Egypt on behalf of the Arab Group said that whatever was the status of the outputs from the drafting groups, the note by the co-facilitators in relation to paragraphs 1(b)(i) and (ii) was different as it was not discussed and was not the basis of negotiations and despite the clarification by the chapeau, had a lesser status.

Argentina, the **G77 and China** coordinator in relation to adaptation, also sought clarification regarding the introduction of a new text by a Party after the concluding of negotiations (in the Tianjin session) and expressed surprise as this was not the methodology adopted during the negotiations. It said that the text had to be corrected in this regard and suggested that the new text be moved to the note by the facilitator.

(Argentina was referring to an additional input by a Party for paragraph 6 under Option 2 on page 3 of the revised text on adaptation. That paragraph provides for "priority to be given to particularly vulnerable developing countries, especially LDCs, SIDs and other developing countries...taking into account the needs of countries affected by droughts, floods and sea-level and temperature rise in Africa and Asia." The issue of who is a particularly vulnerable country has been contentious in the negotiations.)

Guatemala speaking for several countries wanted the inclusion of countries from Latin America and the Caribbean in the new text in this regard.

The Chair of the AWG-LCA agreed to move the said paragraph to the note of the facilitator.

The Chair also distributed her report on ‘Consultations with Parties on elements of the outcome’ which she first introduced at the midway ‘stock-taking meeting’ of the AWG-LCA on 6 October. In her report, she said that “there was a shared desire for a balanced outcome in Cancun from the AWG-LCA across all elements of the Bali Action Plan that will not prejudice prospects for a legally binding outcome and that respects the two-track approach (between the AWG-LCA and the working group under the Kyoto Protocol).”

The report contained a list of possible elements of such a package, which the Chair said “would need to be advanced to a comparable level of detail.” The elements listed in the paper were as follows:

- On shared vision – shared vision for long-term cooperative action, including a long-term global goal for emission reductions and process to review the long-term global goal and overall progress towards meeting that goal;

- On Adaptation – adaptation framework and institutional arrangements for its implementation and approach to address loss and damage;

- On Mitigation – economy-wide emission reduction commitments or actions by developed country Parties; MRV for developed country Parties’ commitments or actions; MRV of support; NAMAs by developing country Parties; MRV for developing country NAMAs; MRV of support; readiness phases of activities that contribute to mitigation actions in the forest sector (REDD-plus); general framework on cooperative sectoral approaches and sector-specific actions, including agriculture and on international bunker fuels; various approaches including opportunities for using markets to enhance the cost-effectiveness of and to promote mitigation

actions and the economic and social consequences of response measures;

- On finance, technology and capacity-building – long-term finance; fast-start finance for 2010-2012; establishment of a new fund and process for its design; arrangements to improve coherence and coordination in climate change financing; mobilization of long-term finance; establishment of the Technology Mechanism, the Technology Executive Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network and capacity -building.

China stressed that the Chair’s report would not be part of the information document for Cancun and was without any status in the work of the Working Group at the next session. It also reiterated that balanced text on all elements of the Bali Action Plan was the only basis for a possible balance. It said that there was no need to re-interpret the Bali Action Plan which was a delicate balance. If some elements were quoted and not others, the balance would be destroyed.

India also sought clarification from the Chair on the status of the Chair’s report and other papers prepared by the facilitators on their own understanding.

The Chair reiterated that her report and that of the facilitators had no status.

Saudi Arabia referred to the list of elements produced by the Chair and said that that list was supposed to follow the Bali Action Plan. It said that under shared vision in the Plan, there is no review plan. Also under paragraph 1(b)(iv) of the Plan on cooperative sectoral approaches, it does not provide for a general framework for cooperation on agriculture and bunker fuels. These issues were not part of the Plan. The list of elements could be an indicative list but it could not agree that these elements are the package for the Cancun outcome.

TWN

Tianjin News Update 13

www.twinside.org.sg

Published by
Third World Network

13 October 2010

BASIC Countries Set out Expectations for Cancun Conference

Beijing, 13 October (Chee Yoke Ling) – Ministers from the BASIC countries (Brazil, South Africa, India and China) reiterated the importance of the two-track approach under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and its Kyoto Protocol for climate change negotiations, and reaffirmed that the outcome of the climate conference in Cancun, Mexico in November should be based on the balance between and within these two negotiating tracks.

In a joint statement on 11 October released in Tianjin, China the Ministers emphasized that the Cancun Conference should be open, transparent, inclusive, Party-driven and based on consensus.

They reiterated that the BASIC as part of the G77 and China will continue to work and strengthen the unity of the group, and play a constructive role in facilitating climate change negotiations. (The BASIC platform was formed for the four countries to coordinate among themselves for the 2009 climate negotiations in Copenhagen and since then has broadened to cooperation at the experts and technical level as well.)

The Ministers also rejected unilateral measures on the ground of combating climate change that are incompatible with the principles and provisions of the UNFCCC. They also agreed that intellectual property rights should not be allowed to become a barrier to technology transfer.

The 5th BASIC Ministerial Meeting on Climate Change was held in Tianjin on 10-11 October, immediately after the negotiation session (4-9 October) in the same city of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA) and the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex 1 Parties under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP).

Attending the BASIC meeting were Xie Zhenhua, Vice-Chairman of the National

Development and Reform Commission of China, Jairam Ramesh, Minister of Environment and Forests of India, Buyelwa Sonjica, Minister of Water and Environmental Affairs of South Africa, and Luiz Machado, Ambassador and Director-General of the Department for the Environment and Special Affairs of the Ministry of External Relations of Brazil. Liu Zhenmin, Assistant Minister of China's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, was also present.

In line with the "BASIC-plus" approach started in the last ministerial meeting in Brazil, at the Tianjin meeting there were also invited observers: representatives of Yemen (Chair of G77), Argentina (incoming Chair of G77 for 2011), Ethiopia (Chair of the African Union), Grenada (Chair of the Alliance of Small Island States), and Egypt (Chair of the 22-member Arab Group).

The BASIC meeting focused on issues related to the Cancun climate conference to be held late November this year.

The Ministers supported the reflection of the elements of the Copenhagen Accord that contains the political understandings in the negotiating texts of the AWG-LCA and AWG-KP.

(The Accord is controversial as it was negotiated by a small group of heads of state in the 2009 Copenhagen meeting of the UNFCCC Parties, and when it was presented at the final plenary there was no consensus to adopt it, with the Parties only "taking note" of this political document. The BASIC countries have associated themselves with the Accord but maintain that while it contains "political understandings" the UN framework is the appropriate one.)

The Ministers reiterated the importance of the two-track approach, which envisages an ambitious and comprehensive outcome for the negotiations under both working groups in Cancun. They also emphasized that the outcome in Cancun should pave

the way for a legally binding outcome next year in South Africa (where the 17th meeting of the Conference of Parties will be held in late 2011).

They stressed that the Cancun outcome should not in any way deviate from the mandate of the Bali Roadmap. (This refers to the carefully negotiated mandate in the Bali Action Plan in the 2007 meeting of the Conference of Parties in Bali that launched “a comprehensive process to enable the full, effective and sustained implementation of the Convention through long-term cooperative action, now, up to and beyond 2012, in order to reach an agreed outcome” for a decision to be adopted in 2009 in Copenhagen. This deadline was not met and the AWG-LCA’s work continues. The other component of the Bali Roadmap is the Kyoto Protocol negotiations that started in 2006 for the second commitment period of greenhouse gas emission reductions by Annex 1 developed countries when the first one ends in 2012. The original deadline has also passed.)

On the USD 30 billion fast-start finance now and up to 2012 (pledged under the Copenhagen Accord), the Ministers underscored that this will be the key to enhance confidence in the multilateral process and enable success in Cancun. They emphasised that this should be made available as soon as possible in a transparent manner, and expressed concern with the lack of transparency and the relevant information on that fast-start finance, reiterating that these resources must be new and additional to the existing ODA and bilateral funds.

On mid- and long-term financial support provided by developed countries, the Ministers agreed that this is also an important part of the Cancun outcome. They affirmed their full support for the establishment of a new fund under the UNFCCC and agreed that the public funding provided by developed countries should be the primary source of this fund.

On emission reduction targets under the Kyoto Protocol second commitment period, they urged developed countries to commit to more ambitious targets, calling for developed countries that did not ratify the Protocol to undertake comparable emission reduction targets under the UNFCCC (this was referring to the United States that agreed under the Bali Action Plan to take on “comparable” efforts in relation to Protocol Parties).

The Ministers also noted the significant distinction between the emission reduction commitments by developed countries and the nationally appropriate mitigation actions by developing countries both in terms of their nature and content.

(Under the UNFCCC developing countries do not have legally binding emission reduction commitments in recognition of their need for development and their historical low emission levels. BASIC countries have however announced their national mitigation actions, particularly in setting targets for reducing energy intensity per unit of GDP growth.)

On adaptation, the Ministers reiterated the need to deal with this as a matter of urgency in Cancun. They emphasized that developing countries are the most affected by the impact of climate change and that developed countries have an obligation to provide finance and technology support to developing countries for adaptation.

They further underscored the importance of developed countries fulfilling their obligations of technology transfer and agreed that intellectual property rights should not be allowed to become a barrier to technology transfer. They were of the view that positive progress should be made in Cancun for the establishment of an effective mechanism for technology development and transfer.

The BASIC Ministers reaffirmed their support for the aspirational objective of keeping global temperature increase well below 2 degrees C, bearing in mind that social and economic development and poverty eradication are the first and overriding priorities of developing countries. They also recognized diversity of views on more ambitious aspirational objectives (referring to the lack of consensus in the negotiations on “shared vision” in the AWG-LCA), and believed that the resolution to this issue links directly to reaching a political understanding of equity (referring to the concepts of historical responsibility of developed countries and the equitable sharing of remaining atmospheric space between developing and developed countries).

They also reaffirmed that equitable access to sustainable development will be the core of and foundation for any climate change agreement and that this will be the prerequisite for setting up any global emission reduction target. This must take into account historical responsibility of developed countries, the need for space and time to achieve sustainable development in developing countries, and the need for the provision of adequate finance, technology and capacity building support by developed countries to developing countries.

In addition to the ministerial meeting, experts from the BASIC countries also met on issues of equity, and trade and climate change as requested by the last meeting in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. A similar experts meeting was held in Rio.

The Ministers welcomed the results of the BASIC experts consultations and underlined the need for further collaboration among them on the issues concerned. They emphasized the importance of the issue of equitable access to sustainable development as a central element in building a comprehensive and balanced outcome for climate change negotiations. They called for the experts to continue discussions and to extend them to the equity dimensions of adaptation.

They also rejected the notion of unilateral actions against the products and services of

developing countries on grounds of combating climate change, including tax and non-tax, or other fiscal and non-fiscal border or other measures, which are incompatible with the principles and provisions of the UNFCCC and will seriously jeopardize international collaboration on climate change and international trade.

The next and 6th BASIC Ministerial Meeting on Climate Change will be hosted by India in February 2011, and the “BASIC-plus” approach will be continued.

Previous compilations of the News Updates and Briefing Papers prepared by the Third World Network for and during the United Nations Climate Change Talks are:

1. Bali News Updates and Climate Briefings
2. Bangkok News Updates and Climate Briefings
3. Bonn News Updates and Climate Briefings
4. Accra News Updates and Climate Briefings
5. Poznan News Updates
6. Bonn News Updates and Climate Briefings (March/April 2009)
7. Bonn News Updates and Climate Briefings (June 2009)
8. Bonn News Updates and Climate Briefings (August 2009)
9. Bangkok News Updates and Climate Briefings (September/October 2009)
10. Barcelona News Updates and Climate Briefings (November 2009)
11. Copenhagen News Updates and Climate Briefings (December 2009)
12. Bonn Climate News Updates (April 2010)
13. Bonn Climate News Updates (May/June 2010)
14. Bonn News Updates and Climate Briefings (August 2010)

TWN
Third World Network

ISBN 978-967-5412-41-7



9789675412417