

# 100 Days to the Copenhagen Climate Summit

## Greenpeace Political Briefing

---

This briefing lays out:

- The current state of play
- The desired outcome
- The possible shape of the agreement
- Positions of the key players
- What needs to happen

### The current state of play

With only three UN negotiating weeks to go before the Copenhagen Climate Summit, the outcome is looking bleak – but it doesn't need to be. The talks are currently deadlocked over two key questions:

- Will the developed world take on strong mid-term targets?
- Will the developed world provide adequate finance for the developing world to both mitigate and adapt to climate change and stop deforestation?

Developing countries have indicated that they are willing to do their fair share, but they have been unwilling to discuss the magnitude and details of their actions before seeing industrialised countries live up to their promises by taking on ambitious mid-term targets and providing finance.

There was no progress on these issues at the G8, MEF or G20 meeting in London. Daily, we see evidence of the Chinese government's willingness to act on climate change, as long as they see industrialised countries living up to their promises of strong targets and adequate financing. The problem lies in the reticence of industrialised nations, such as the US, Australia and Japan, to agree mid-term targets and financing.

### The desired outcome

Leaders of industrialised countries could, if they wanted, agree tomorrow the framework of a climate deal that would keep global temperature rise to below the 2°C threshold many of them agreed at the G8 and the MEF. Such a deal would contain:

- strong mid-term targets for industrialised countries of 40% by 2020
- financing for the developing world in the order of \$ 140 billion US dollars a year
- deviation of 15-30% from business as usual greenhouse gas emissions for the emerging economies of the developing world
- an end to deforestation by 2020
- a legally binding outcome comprising an amended Kyoto Protocol and a new Copenhagen Protocol

### Agreement Architecture

There are several architectural proposals for the Copenhagen agreement, ranging from one or two protocols, to an 'implementing agreement' (the US approach). The implementing agreement appears to contain some risks

- The US asks that targets be '*in accordance with domestic law*'. This suggests that the US wants to get rid of the strict international emissions accounting system set up by Kyoto. Without a strong compliance regime and internationally agreed reporting mechanisms, any country could make its achievements look greater than they are by altering domestic reporting standards. With the US proposal, the UNFCCC and Kyoto would cease to be the multilateral agreements they are today.
- A proposal that the agreement be 'bottom up' where nations commit to what they can within the constraints of their domestic political climate. The aggregate figure would then be the Copenhagen target. At the moment this approach would produce an aggregate greenhouse gas emissions reduction target of, at best, 10-16% by 2020 (at 1990 levels) for industrialised countries. This is less than half what is required and would not keep temperature rise below 2°C.

The most desirable form of final agreement is that there will be two protocols. A strengthened Kyoto Protocol, and a new Copenhagen Protocol which will bring the US on board.

## Key Players

### The US

Seven months after President Obama promised to take a lead towards a good outcome in Copenhagen, US negotiators continue to slow down the talks. The US is constrained by the weak Waxman-Markey bill. This is draft legislation which, even with massive offset provisions, will only cut US emissions around 4% by 2020 (at 1990 levels).

It is obvious that ambitious leadership from Obama is needed - the type of leadership that will see him step above domestic politics and the increasing attacks by the energy industry to get the climate deal the world needs.

### China

In addition to action China has already taken on energy efficiency and renewables, China has stated that it will incorporate combating climate change and a low carbon development path into the country's national economic and social development plan – and that this will be a benchmark for other mid-term development plans - at all levels of government. This is a significant development – and shows that China is moving forward on climate change despite what is going on in the negotiations.

US-China talks have been underway throughout the year with the principle issues being those of finance and mid-term targets discussed earlier.

### The European Union

The EU has ceased to be a climate leader and become part of the deadlock within the talks. On the area of mid-term targets the EU's offer of 20% cuts (possibly rising to 30%) should be increased to an unconditional 40% - including some offsets. On finance the EU has proposed nothing despite the Netherlands, the UK and EU member states' financial advisors (EFC-EPC) all agreeing that at least \$ 100 billion US dollars a year is required.

Under the Swedish Presidency, a progressive position to provide public funding for forest protection until 2020 is again under attack.

All eyes are now on the European Commission - expected to launch a new proposal on climate financing in early September. The Commission's proposal is expected to include detailed and concrete sections on the scale of finances, finance sources and the role of carbon markets.

On the 17 September EU Heads of State are expected to meet for an additional, extraordinary EU Summit in Brussels. This meeting will prepare the EU for the G20 Summit in Pittsburgh. Specific elements of the Commission's communication could already be adopted during this Summit.

October will see the EU's "climate super week", beginning 20 October, when Finance Ministers meet; Environment Ministers on 21 October, and Heads of State on 29-30 October, the week before the Barcelona UNFCCC negotiations on 2 November.

### The rest of Annex 1 (Umbrella group)

The target Canada has pledged is even lower than their commitment under the Kyoto Protocol. Japan is willing to raise its target by only a couple of percentage points. Neither Australia nor New Zealand's targets give any cause for optimism.

### Other key developing countries

South Korea and Mexico have announced they are taking on absolute targets. India has announced a massive energy efficiency mission to tackle climate change. By 2015 this legislation is predicted to result in preventing 100 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> from being emitted every year.

### Least Developed Countries

The Association of Small Island States (AOSIS) and the world's most vulnerable countries (78 in all), are now calling for the developed world to take on targets of 45% by 2020 and for global temperature rise to be kept to 1.5°C. Their statement, released at the end of Bonn two weeks ago, was a first for this combined group. The Maldives are going carbon neutral. Tuvalu is going 100% renewable. They are doing what they can to combat their own emissions. For these countries, it's a question of survival.

### What needs to happen?

The developed economies need to commit to mid-term targets and to financing developing country action. If that doesn't happen, there won't be progress.

The first opportunity for this to happen will be at the UNGA meeting in September, which is immediately followed by the G20 in Pittsburgh.

Heads of State need to commit to attending the Climate Summit in Copenhagen. Without their presence it is unlikely that a sufficiently ambitious deal will be achieved.

### **For more information/background interviews on the negotiations, please contact key members of the Greenpeace International political team:**

Martin Kaiser, lead climate political advisor: +49 171 878 0817

Kaisa Kosonen, climate political advisor: +358 50 368 8488

Joris den Blanken, EU expert: +32 476 961 375