



Center for
Clean Air Policy

Dialogue. Insight. Solutions.

Moving Towards Agreement in Copenhagen and Beyond

Ned Helme, President
Center for Clean Air Policy

Future Actions Dialogue
2-4 February 2009
Wellington, New Zealand

Outline of the Presentation

- Overview of the Proposed Process
- Elements to be Completed by Copenhagen
- Elements to be Completed Post-Copenhagen
- Key Questions

Overview of the Proposed Process

- Need to reach agreement on the basic policy architecture for both Annex I and non-Annex I countries by Copenhagen
- From Copenhagen through COP-17 in 2011, parties will negotiate the specific details required for implementation of the policy architecture (a la the Marrakech Accords)

Negotiating tracks: KP and LCA

Option 1: merge KP and LCA negotiations in 2009

- post 2012 details are negotiated in one treaty document
- ratification of the KP or its successor by the US is required

Option 2 (G-77): keep KP and LCA separate until after 2017 then merge them under a new amendment to the UNFCCC

- ratification by the US may not be required
- Compliance with the KP 1st and 2nd commitment periods by A1 countries is demonstrated and assessed
- US commitments and developing country actions are in same package of amendments to UNFCCC at Copenhagen while new A1 targets are in Kyoto successor agreement with simple linkages between the two established

Elements to be Completed by Copenhagen

- Size of minimum Annex I targets for 2020 (and perhaps 2030)
 - » With the potential to strengthen these post-Copenhagen
 - Deviation by developing countries from BAU (aggregate goal)
 - Menu of new architectural elements for developing country Climate Change Action Plans, including:
 - Capacity building activities
 - Nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs)
 - Sectoral approaches
 - Technology deployment actions
 - REDD programs
 - SD-PAMS
- » NAMA registry

Elements to be Completed by Copenhagen (2)

- Definition of Climate Change Action Plans to be submitted by emerging economies (EEs) and developing countries (DCs)
 - » Minimum elements
 - » Unilateral actions
 - » More aggressive actions which require up-front international assistance
 - » Technology needs
 - » NAMAs/goals which, if exceeded, can generate carbon credits
- Definition of Annex I mitigation assistance plans for EEs and DCs, governance structure, and the design of incentives:
 - » Capacity building
 - » Policy development and implementation
 - » Technology development, transfer and deployment
 - » Financing to overcome barriers

Elements to be Completed by Copenhagen (3)

- MRV structure for both
 - » Annex I assistance
 - » EE/DC NAMAs
- Resolution of debate over differentiation of DCs into two CDM classes:
 - » Those no longer eligible for traditional, project-based CDM in specific energy-intensive sectors (e.g., the 8-10 highest emitting EEs)
 - » The other DCs
- Separate structure for the financing of EE/DC adaptation programs

Elements to be Completed Post-Copenhagen

- Marrakech-like negotiations of the rules for implementing the Copenhagen agreement components that cut across all Parties
- Country-specific negotiations between EEs/DCs and Annex I countries regarding the extent of NAMA implementation and the associated international assistance packages
 - » Should be flexible to account for national circumstances
 - » Could be done through a MEM-like or G-20 type process involving finance ministries, intermediaries and international financial institutions (IFIs), then presented to COP/MOP

Key Questions

- Is this pathway sufficiently ambitious? Is it achievable?
- What are the implications of following the G-77's preferred two track approach, with two separate but interlinked packages of international treaty language as a final result?
- Will a “shared vision” of an aggregate developing country deviation in emissions below BAU be sufficient at Copenhagen to allow developed nations to agree on new national reduction targets? Will it be “too much” for developing countries to agree to, if specific financing levels are not also agreed to at the same time?
- Is the governance structure for mitigation finance a “must do” at Copenhagen?