UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE*

CAN applauds the generally constructive, creative, and forward looking exchange of ideas that occurred Monday and Tuesday in the SOGE. We were pleased to see that many countries expressed a need to begin real negotiations in Montreal. The path forward will require a clear map, both in terms of procedure and in order to untangle the numerous concerns and issues that countries want to be addressed. CAN especially recognizes the openness demonstrated by many developing countries and, for example, the leadership of South Africa clearly calling for a Montreal Mandate, and Korea expressing interest in the using the EU’s 2 degrees limit on warming as guidance for post-2012 work.

Adaptation is an issue that deserves more attention, and will need to find a clear place in the Montreal “map.” It was remarkable how many countries presented an assessment of current impacts and projected vulnerabilities, and how this emerging understanding drove a sense of urgency. The US stands out as a country that largely ignored impacts and adaptation in its presentation, both in regards to impacts within the US and on other countries. CAN was impressed by the number of developing countries that have already begun to work on building adaptive capacity and assessing needs, although clearly this is just the tip of the iceberg. Complexities obviously remain, for example on how adaptation relates to mitigation, where and how it should be handled in the “map,” and how it should be coordinated with a broader development agenda. We hope that the discussion on Saturday on the Work Programme on Adaptation can begin to frame this complicated issue for Montreal negotiations.

Another useful theme was the need to recognize the many differences in national circumstances, and how this means that a successful post-2012 regime must have several different elements, especially in regards to developing countries. Moving beyond the simplistic Annex I vs. Non-Annex I split to a more sophisticated approach to “differentiated commitments” is surely an important lesson. The multi-stage approach was mentioned, and the “map” must provide a place for each stage as well as for flexibility within each stage.

CAN intervention at SOGE

“On behalf of Climate Action Network I would like to thank you for this opportunity to address you all.

We have been listening carefully over the last couple days to the experts. We are encouraged by clear interventions from a number of countries who recognize that the situation is urgent, impacts are happening, and that we need a clear mandate for the negotiations coming out of Montreal. We welcome this clarity and urge all parties to spend the rest of the time here in Bonn discussing how to make such a Mandate happen.

CAN firmly believes that urgent action must be taken to preserve our ability to limit overall warming to under 2 degrees Celsius in comparison to pre-industrial levels.

Several statements in this seminar have mentioned a multistage approach as a basis for post-2012. There seems to be a remarkably…
...common understanding of what the elements of a mandate for the negotiations would look like. Let us spend the remaining time here in Bonn solidifying this understanding.

The Climate Action Network has a proposed Future Framework that responds well to many of the points made in this Seminar. It has 3 tracks, which we offer as a starting point for Parties to discuss.

The first track should elaborate further absolute mandatory emissions reduction commitments for industrialized countries for the second commitment period. The second “decarbonization” track should focus on enabling developing countries to rapidly deploy clean technologies, meeting sustainable development objectives and bending the curve of their emissions of greenhouse gases. As a matter of justice and equity industrialised countries should make new finance and technology streams possible. This track would not include the Least Developed Countries. The third “adaptation” track, relevant for all countries, should aim to substantially increase the capacity of developing countries to cope with the impacts of climate change. A negotiating mandate that includes all these tracks is the essential task for the meeting of the parties in Montreal.

We cannot delude ourselves that we can engage the US at this point, nor can we wait for the US to change its views before we start post-2012 discussions.

The Kyoto Protocol’s binding emission reductions for developed countries have been a landmark first step in dealing with climate change and must be continued. Continuity between the first commitment period and the second commitment period is crucial to ensure that emissions markets and other domestic policies do not falter. Moreover, the negotiation process takes time and we, therefore, cannot wait another year.

Several countries have called for a Montreal mandate; others have not been so clear. We ask the EU and others: Do you or Do you not support or want a mandate to be adopted in Montreal under the Kyoto Protocol to further develop the climate regime? We need clarity and leadership for the future, not discussions of the past.

We also ask my own country, India, a country with 100s of millions of people where livelihoods and development prospects are threatened by climate change to take a fresh approach to this issue and support the development of a Montreal Mandate.

Time is not on our side. Given the disturbing and accelerating pace of climate change and the rate of energy infrastructure development in the world, we only have a narrow window of opportunity to take the next steps in time to prevent dangerous climate change. Developing and agreeing on a Montreal mandate is the least you can do.”

*Way forward according to the Samoan

---

**PHILOSOPHY CORNER**

“one does not have to perfect the previous stage in order to progress to the next”

Kierkegaard

---

Cont. United for Change, Seamless continuity and strengthening of the existing elements of the Kyoto Protocol is important. In particular, Kyoto’s market mechanisms and their “carbon price” send a critical signal to businesses. Continuity is vital for investment and planning certainty, and filling the 1st Commitment Period with life. This continuity is also necessary to drive the effectiveness of the CDM, which several developing countries mentioned as spurring interest from host country business and other stakeholders (despite its imperfections).

A related discussion revolved around how to strengthen and broaden the existing mechanisms, so they can most effectively promote investment in low-carbon technologies in developing countries. For example, more sectoral rather than project-based approaches were discussed. More broadly, a range of technology transfer or “decarbonisation” approaches will be needed.

Annex I countries were repeatedly asked whether they are meeting their existing commitments. Many domestic policies were described. At the end of the day, however, meeting Kyoto first commitment period targets is a critical step for building trust.

Well, no one ever said this would be easy, being on the Titanic trying to avoid icebergs. But we have made a small but good start here. The SOGE showed that the months and years ahead of us need careful negotiations on the complex issues and questions raised here, imbued by the sense of urgency expressed by many countries here in Bonn: we are affected by climate change already, and the windows of opportunity both to remain below 2°C global warming and to avoid for countries investing in the wrong development paths are closing rapidly. CAN hopes that those countries who have expressed their wish to make concrete progress on the further development of the Kyoto and FCCC framework in Montreal will continue to converge, and help Canada to make COP11/MP1 the start of something...