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What is your impression of the outcomes of Copenhagen Climate Change Conference?
Success or Failure?

- **Copenhagen Accord**
  - Break-off negotiation

- Agree to setup new operational rules by COP

- Agree to setup new protocol for all countries

- Agree to setup new Protocol for US and China

- Adopt new consolidated new protocol

Without Mandate of Bali Action Plan
Doubts over Copenhagen summit's last day

Leaders have gathered for the final scheduled day of the UN climate summit, amid uncertainty over the shape of any eventual deal.

A draft political agreement drawn up by a small group of countries including the UK, US and Australia was rejected during overnight discussions.

Delegates described the situation as "confusing" and "desperate".

US President Barack Obama told the conference he had come to the summit "not to talk but to act".

Addressing delegates on Friday, he said: "While the science of climate change is not in doubt, I think our ability to take collective action is in doubt right now, and it hangs in the balance."
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Brief history of Climate Change Negotiations

- **UNCED (1992)**
  - Negotiation for protocol
- **UNFCCC adopted (entered into force in 1994)**
  - Kyoto Protocol adopted
- **COP1 (1995)**
- **COP3 (1997)**
- **COP4 (1998)**
- **COP7 (2001)**
  - Marrakesh Accords adopted (CDM/JI started)
- **COP6 (2000)**
  - Negotiation for rules of Kyoto Mechanisms
- **COP11 CMP1 (2005)**
  - Negotiation for 2nd Commitment period (AWG-KP)
- **COP13 CMP3 (2007)**
- **COP15 CMP5 (2009)**
  - Negotiation for New framework (AWG-LCA)
- **COP16 CMP6 (2010)**
- **Kyoto Protocol entered into force (Feb. 2004)**
Brief history of Climate Change Negotiations

1992
- Adoption of UNFCCC

1994
- Entry into force of UNFCCC

1997
- COP3: Adoption of Kyoto Protocol
- COP7: Adoption of Marrakesh Accords

2001
- Came into force of Kyoto Protocol

2005
- COP/MOP1 @Montreal

2006
- COP/MOP2 @Nairobi

2007
- COP/MOP3 @Bali

2008
- COP/MOP4 @Poznan

2009
- COP/MOP5 @Copenhagen

2010
- COP/MOP6 @Mexico

First Commitment Period

2012

First CDM-EB(EB1)

EB23~EB28
EB29~EB36
EB37~EB44
EB45~EB51
EB52~EB58
## Recent meetings of Climate Change Negotiations


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dec.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Apr.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Jun.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poznan, Poland</td>
<td>Bonn, Germany</td>
<td>Bonn, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB29</td>
<td>SB30</td>
<td>SB31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWG-LCA4</td>
<td>AWG-LCA5</td>
<td>AWG-LCA6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB: UNFCCC subsidiary bodies (SBSTA (for Scientific and Technological Advice) and SBI (for Implementation))
AWG-KP: Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties to the Kyoto Protocol
AWG-LCA: Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Actions under the Convention
Discussion of CDM issues at CMP

- **CMP1 (Montreal, Canada, Dec. 2005)**
  - Facilitate initiative of “Future CDM” (promote EE/RE project)
  - Review of definition of SSC project (Expand the applicability condition)
  - Agreed on guiding principle of CCS (CCS is feasible as CDM project (detail procedures are under discussion))
  - Adopt the eligibility guidance of Programmatic CDM (policy or standard cannot be considered as a CDM project)
  - Enhancement of EB and Secretariat
Discussion of CDM issues at CMP

- CMP2 (Nairobi, Kenya, Nov. 2006)
  - Facilitate initiative of “Future CDM”
  - Agreed on discussion schedule of CCS guidance (guidance will adopt at CMP4)
  - Improvements of regional distribution of CDM projects
  - “Nairobi Framework” adopted (Assist to LDCs by relevant UN organs)
  - 3 months extension for application of Retroactive credit (the end of Dec.2006 -> Mar.2007)
  - Request EB to arrange the sort of guidance of PoA (Guidance and PDD format)
Discussion of CDM issues at CMP

- CMP3 (Bali, Indonesia, Dec. 2007)
  - Facilitate initiative of “Future CDM”
  - Bali Roadmap” adopted (agreed on the negotiation schedule for next commitment period)
  - Assistance to developing countries: Agreed on establish the Adaptation Fund Board (Secretariat: GEF, Trustee: WB)
  - Change the upper limit of SSC project (6ktCO2 -> 12ktCO2)
  - Exempt of fees (e.g. registration fee) for CDM project at LDCs
Discussion of CDM issues at CMP

• CMP4 (Poznan, Poland, Dec. 2008)
  • Governance, Accreditation, Regional Distribution
  • Discussion on improvement of Kyoto Mechanisms on next commitment period (after 2013)
  • Chairperson’s guidance (draft idea) includes;
    ✓ Right and wrong of scope/subject expansion of project
    ✓ Introduce sectoral credit mechanisms
    ✓ Credit issuances based on Party’s emission reduction activities
    ✓ Accredit Co-benefit aspects as registration criteria
    ✓ Emission Trading Scheme based on sectoral target
  • Invite parties to submit improvement of draft ideas
Discussion of CDM issues at CMP

• CMP5 (Copenhagen, Denmark, Dec. 2009)

  Agendas for current commitment period (-2012)
  – Expand scopes of CDM
  – Governance
  – Regional Distribution
  – Relationship with National policy (E+/E-)

(Outcomes)
  ✓ Strengthen financial support to less than 10 project country
  ✓ Simplified methodologies
  ✓ Set up appeal process
  ✓ Develop guidance on E+/E- policy
Discussion of CDM issues at CMP

• CMP5 (Copenhagen, Denmark, Dec. 2009)
  ➢ Agendas for next commitment period (2013-)
   – Expand scopes of CDM (incl. Nuclear, CCS, etc.)
   – Change rules and procedures
   – New market mechanisms

(Outcomes)

✓ No decisions above issue (still remain “options”)

Expected outcomes

• From Annex I countries:
  - New Protocol will be adopted (Kyoto Protocol will be terminated)
  - Comprehensive Agreement incl. US and China
  - Obligation to NAI countries as well AI

• From Non-Annex I countries:
  - Keep the framework “Bali Action Plan + Kyoto Protocol” (= AI keeps their obligation)
Post 2012 Target

• Kyoto Protocol (Article 3.9)
  ✓ No expiring of the Kyoto Protocol
  ✓ Prerequisite: 2nd commitment period will continue after 2012

• CMP1 (Montreal)
  ✓ No blank period between 1st (2008-12) and 2nd (2013-??) commitment period

• CMP3 (Bali Action Plan)
  ✓ Negotiation will be concluded the end of 2009 (CMP5)
Bali Action Plan (Mandate for LCA)

• Bali Action Plan (1/CP.13)

1. Decides to launch 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 and adopt a decision at its fifteenth session, by addressing, inter alia:

   (a) A shared vision for long term cooperative action, including a long-term global goal for emission reductions,...

   (b) Enhanced national/international action on mitigation of climate change, including, inter alia, consideration of:

      (ii) Nationally appropriate mitigation actions by developing country Parties, in the context of sustainable development, supported and enabled technology, financing and capacity-building, in a measurable, reportable and verifiable manner;

2. Decides that process be conducting...(skip)...AWG-LCA under the convention, that shall complete its work in 2009 and present the outcome of its work to the Conference of the Parties for adoption at its fifteenth session;
Voluntary Target for Copenhagen Conference

### Developed Countries (Annex I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Target (2020)</th>
<th>Base Year</th>
<th>Flex Mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>-5～-25%</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Market M, LUCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>LUCF: 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-27</td>
<td>-20～-30%</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Market M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>LUCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Market M, LUCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>-10～-20%</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Market M, LUCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>-20～-40%</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Market M, LUCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>-20～-25%</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss</td>
<td>-20～-30%</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Market M, LUCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Market M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Market M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>-12～-17%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1990</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Developing Countries (Non-Annex I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Ref. Year</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>-36～-39%</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>BAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>-40～-45%</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Basic unit of CO2 (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>-20～-25%</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Basic unit of CO2 (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>-26～-41%</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>BAU, LUCF (Max: incl. Int’l assistance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>Zero emission</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Net (incl. Carbon sinks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>BAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. Korea</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Absolute Amount (-30%/BAU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>BAU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Africa</td>
<td>-34%</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>BAU w/int’l financial support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Confused conference management

I am a delegate! I need to participate the session. Open the gate, please.

Don’t push me! You are not allowed to go inside the room!!
Don’t ask me.

How to proceed the conference without participation???
In the 2nd week of COP15, Media person also lock out the conference venue. (Security reason) Indian TV crews reported from the platform of subway station.
At the AWG-LCA plenary session at 1 am, midnight
Decision making process of UNFCCC

Friends of Chair (25 head of countries)
Drafted Copenhagen Accord

Conference of Parties of UNFCCC (COP)
Conference of Parties serving as Meeting of Parties (COP/MOP)

AWG-LCA
SBI
SBSTA
AWG-KP

Contact Group

Respective Reports (Containing a set of decisions)

EGTT
LEG
CGE

CDM EB
JI SC
Compliance Committee

Official documents
Negotiation/Suggestion

Other Int’l Negotiations (G8 Summit, UN, regional or bilateral talk, etc.)
Negotiation Blocs

Non Annex I

**G77 & China**
China, India, Asian Countries

**LDCs**
Bangladesh, Nepal, Ethiopia, Yemen, etc.

**Oil Exporters**
Saudi Arabia, UAE, Qatar, etc.

**Latin America & Caribbean**
Brazil, Argentina, etc.

**SIDS (AOSIS)**
Tuvalu, Samoa, Fiji, Jamaica, PNG, etc.

**Environmental Integrity Group**
Switzerland, Mexico, Rep of Korea etc.

* Depending on Issues, Countries changes their groups.

Annex I

**EU**

**Umbrella**

**KP ratification**
Japan, NZ, Russia, Norway, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, etc.

**Non Parties**
USA, Australia, Canada, etc.
Outcomes of Copenhagen CC Conference

• Copenhagen Accord drafted by Friends of the Chair (Head of 25 countries, incl. US, China, EU, Japan, Indonesia, Brazil, Ethiopia, etc.)

• “Take note” the Copenhagen Accord at the COP15 (not Adopt = couldn’t achieve as COP decision) <strong>opposed by Sudan, Cuba, Venezuela, Bolivia, etc.> </strong>

• AWG-KP and AWG-LCA will continue until Dec. 2010 at Mexico
Copenhagen Accord

Advance unedited version

Decision /CP.15

The Conference of the Parties,

Takes note of the Copenhagen Accord of 18 December 2009.

APPENDIX I

Quantified economy-wide emissions targets for 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annex I Parties</th>
<th>Quantified economy-wide emissions targets for 2020</th>
<th>Base year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emissions reduction in 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Copenhagen Accord

- [Preamble] Operational immediately
- [Para.1] Strong political will to urgently combat climate change (w/common but differentiated responsibilities principle)
- [Para.1] Global temperature should be below 2 degrees Celsius
- [Para.2] Cooperate in achieving the peaking of global and national emissions as soon as possible
- [Para.3] Developed countries shall provide adequate, predictable and sustainable financial resources, technology and capacity-building
Copenhagen Accord (cont.)

• [Para.6] Immediate establishment of REDD-plus mechanisms
• [Para.7] Enhance cost-effectiveness, utilize market mechanisms
Copenhagen Accord (cont.)

- [Para.8] New and additional funding to developing countries from developed countries
  - Agreed to pledge 30 bil USD / year (2010-12) for mitigation and adaptation (Funding for Adaptation: Prioritized for vulnerable countries, LDCs, SIDS and Africa)
  - Developed countries commit to a goal mobilizing jointly 100 bil USD / year by 2020
  - Funding flow through the Copenhagen Green Climate Fund
    - [Para.10] Copenhagen Green Climate Fund shall be established as an operating entity of the financial mechanism of the Convention
Copenhagen Accord (cont.)

• [Para.11] Enhance action on Development and Transfer of Technology, Establish a Technology Mechanism

• [Para.12] Implementation review by 2015.

• [Para.12] Consider strengthening goal incl. 1.5 degree Celsius (--> Reflect strong opinion by AOSIS)
New Crediting Schemes

- NAMA crediting
- Sectoral crediting
- REDD-plus

-> all decisions were not concluded at Copenhagen and to be discussed at Cancun, Mexico (CMP6)
Pledge commitment under the Copenhagen Accord

• Target until 2012 (30 bil USD for 3 years\(^{(2010-12)}\))
  – Japan
    • Pledge agreement until COP15: 9.2 bil
    • (New) Additional pledge agreement: 1 bil
    • (New) Mobilize from private sector: 4 bil
  – EU: 10 bil USD (Decided at EU summit)
  – US and other AI: 5 bil USD

• Target on 2020 (100 bil USD/year)
  – Depends on commitment by US
Analysis of outcomes of Copenhagen CC Conference

- High expectations from Annex I
- Annex I requested beyond the mandates of BAP to NAI
- Raised public & media concerns (high pressures from outside world)
- Too insist to establish the legal framework
- Negotiation managements were poor (by Gov’t of Denmark)
- Insufficient trusteeship among Parties
- Exposed different opinions among NAI (AOSIS vs. Newly developing countries) etc.
- Developing countries got pledge commitment from AI
Voluntary commitment actions

• Copenhagen Accord requested voluntary actions by AI and NAI

• Sri Lanka is not yet submit the voluntary mitigation action plan
### List of commitment actions submission countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annex I (43 parties) (Percentage of emission reduction target in 2020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australia (5%-15% or 25%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus (5-10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU &amp; 27 Member States (20/30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway (30-40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia (15-25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland (20/30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA (17%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of commitment actions submission countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Annex I (40 parties)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua &amp; Barbuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Party’s participation to the CA>*
98% of Annex I Parties
26% of Non-Annex I Parties
Current movements (after CMP5)

• Bolivia hosted int’l conference (April 2010)
  – ALBA countries trying to negotiate outside of UN process. (*ALBA: Cuba, Ecuador, Venezuela, etc.)

• Germany and Mexico hosted informal ministerial meeting (May 2010)
  – 41 countries (AI and NAI) agreed to draft documents at CMP6 with reflection of CA.
  – Needed to consensus to set up 2nd Commitment period of KP (from NAI parties).
Current movements (after CMP5)

• AWG-LCA13 & AWG-KP (June 2010)
  – LCA Chair issued Chair’s text (based on the negotiation) for next session, but most of the NAI parties denied to discuss it.
  – KP requested secretariat to analyze the legal matter relating to the gap between KP and New framework.

• New UNFCCC Executive Secretary (Ms. Christina Figueres) (July 2010)
UN’s Next Climate Chief Figueres Says Final Deal Unlikely in Her Lifetime

By Alex Norales - Jun 9, 2010

Christiana Figueres, a Costa Rican who on July 8 will take the helm of the United Nations body that organizes global climate-change treaty talks, said an all-encompassing deal is unlikely to happen in her lifetime.

Governments must instead focus on making incremental efforts to end global warming because the response “is going to require the sustained effort of those who will be here for the next 20, 30, 40 years,” Figueres, 53, told reporters today in Bonn, where the latest two-week round of talks is taking place.

“I do not believe we will ever have a final agreement on climate change, certainly not in my lifetime,” Figueres said. “If we ever have a final, conclusive, all-answering agreement, then we will have solved this problem. I don’t think that’s in the cards.”

More than 190 nations are trying to reach a global deal to cut emissions from polluting industries such as power and cement after efforts to craft a treaty at a summit in Copenhagen in December failed amid recriminations among developed and developing countries. Figueres said she’s confident governments will meet the challenge, and Brazilian, Indian and European
Thank you for your attention!

Satoshi Iemoto, JICA Expert
(Overseas Environmental Cooperation Center, Japan)
iemoto@oecc.or.jp