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Bali Negotiations (2007-2009 ...)

• Major Drivers
  – Expiration of 1st Kyoto commitment period in 2012
  – Desire to enunciate long-term global goal to avoid “dangerous” impacts
  – Recognition of need to engage all major economies
  – Continuation of CDM and carbon markets
  – Desire to mainstream adaptation
  – Collective wish to mobilize efforts to protect forests

• Agreement posed far greater challenges than Kyoto
  (expectations/aspirations in lead up discussions):
  – Developed nations to cut emissions 25-40% below 1990 by 2020
  – Significant commitments for developing countries
  – Scale of funding: ~100s B$/yr each for adaptation and mitigation

Expectations raised for significant emissions reductions and aid
Bali to Cancun to Durban

- **Copenhagen (2009)**
  - Dramatic, visible failure to conclude Bali Mandate
  - *Copenhagen Accord* agreed in a political process outside UNFCCC
  - Rancor and concern for integrity and future of international process
- **Cancun (2010)**
  - Mexican Presidency effort to re-establish trust
  - Agreements materially advanced implementation of Copenhagen Accord
  - No progress on Bali Mandate matters of interest to developing nations
- **Durban (2011)**
  - Further implementation and “operationalization” of Copenhagen Accord
  - Launch Durban Platform (ADP): comprehensive 2020 agreement by 2015
- **Startup of new institutions (2012, 2013)**
  - Green Climate Fund
  - Technology Mechanism: TEC, (CTC&N 2013: UNEP-led Consortium)
  - Finance and Adaptation Committees

Copenhagen Emissions Pledges: only through 2020, many caveats
Durban: Unresolved Political Issues

- Fate of Kyoto Protocol (Absent: Canada, Japan, NZ, Russia, USA)

- Ambition of national emissions pledges
  - Inadequacy of Copenhagen pledges to achieve 2 °C goal (*not on track*)
  - Date for global emissions to peak; target level in 2050

- Sources and uses of funds (*mobilize 100 B$/yr by 2020*)

- IPR (off the agenda in Cancun now back on)

- Legal form and timing of ultimate long-term agreement

Growing gap between statements of political aspirations and actual policies and trends
Doha Outcomes 2012

• **Kyoto Protocol**
  – 2nd Period covers 2013-2020
  – Cover <15% of global emissions (and falling)
  – Opportunity to revisit and strengthen commitments in 2014
  – *Declarations* by Australia, EU, Japan, others not to use carry-over AAUs

• **Unresolved issues**
  – Mitigation gap: 2 °C goal
  – Understanding and implementing NAMAS: finance, technology
  – New Mechanisms for mitigation: Various Approaches, New Market Mechanisms, non-Market Mechanisms, Sectoral Approaches (relevance KP?)
  – Information on *mobilizing 100 B$/yr by 2020*
  – Shared vision (emissions: date to peak, level in 2050)
  – Review of adequacy of long-term goal and progress

• **ADP proceeds: 2 work streams on ambition and 2020 agreement**
  – Develop options to close the pre-2020 mitigation gap, finance
Noteworthy & Problematic Decisions

• **Shared Vision (LCA):** … and take into account the imperatives of equitable access to sustainable development, the survival of countries and protecting the integrity of Mother Earth;

• **Temperature goals:** Noting with grave concern the significant gap between … mitigation pledges… and pathways consistent with … holding the increase … below 2 °C or 1.5 °C.

• **Mechanism on Loss and Damages:** COP-19 will establish institutional arrangements, such as an international mechanism, to address loss and damage in developing countries…
ADP Major Issues

- **Progress to increase pre-2020 Ambition: Mitigation, Finance +**
  - Mitigation
    - Developed Nation’s economy-wide mitigation pledges
    - Developing Nation’s mitigation commitments
  - Means of Implementation: Finance, Technology, Capacity Building

- **Post 2020 Mitigation, Adaptation**

- **Framework and Principles**
  - Common but differentiated responsibilities
  - Equity
  - Historical responsibility

- **Legal form of agreement**

Continues trend toward extremely complex process
Actions and progress perhaps more likely in other settings
ADP Process

• **Hybrid Approach: Bottom UP (✓), Top Down (?)**
  – Commence with voluntary, self determined national proposals
  – Opportunity for dialogue to clarify pledges
  – Assessment of combined implications for global goals
  – (?) Forced reconciliation to be “on track” to meet global goals…or
  – (?) Opportunity for nations to revise pledges

• **EU and G77 & China**
  – Must go beyond pledge and review
  – Requires legally binding commitments with common MRV and compliance
  – On track not to exceed 2 °C

• **USA Views**
  – Actions pledged based on domestic regulations and legislation
  – MRV according to US methodology
  – Opportunity to enhance pledges (no forced reconciliation)

Time for discussion, assessment, reconciliation (?)
A Glimpse at the Future

- ADP mandate has not pre-ordained evolution to a less strong manifestation of “common but differentiated responsibilities”

- Unrealistic expectations for funding are multiplying:
  - Mitigation
  - Adaptation
  - Adverse impacts of response measures
  - Loss and Damages from climate change

- Growing differences within G77-China
  - BASIC nations resist acknowledging mitigation challenge for them
  - Major splits on, e.g. IPR, Trade, CCS, Forests, C-markets

- US pursuing its own path?

Continue to fuel: unmet expectations, divisive interactions
Thank You & Discussion