I. State of play in climate negotiations -- video

II. Two big questions regarding international negotiations
A. Where do government positions come from?
   1. Sprinz and Vaahtoranta’s article
   2. NGOs, MNCs, and other sources of pressure for agreement
   3. Individual leaders, e.g., Obama vs. Bush approach BUT note that substantively not much different because constrained by basic politics of US
B. Positions of different country groups in the negotiations
   1. Developed (Annex I) states
      a) US – United States
      b) EU – European Union
   2. Developing states: “cumulative emissions of developing countries will have surpassed those of developed countries by 2020.”
      a) AOSIS – Alliance of Small Island States. “Calls by small island states and other vulnerable countries for compensation for the damage resulting from climate impacts such as rising seas and droughts.”
      b) OPEC – Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries
      c) BASIC – Brazil, South Africa, India, China
      d) Latin American/Caribbean countries committed to climate action
      e) Other developing states
C. How do these competing and different positions get cobbled into an agreement?
   1. Game theory: configuration of interests influences what can be agreed to
   2. Reaching agreement may require leaders:
      a) “An essential goal in Cancun was for the parties to maintain sensible expectations and develop effective plans. That they met this challenge owes in good measure to the careful and methodical planning by the Mexican government, and to the tremendous skill of Mexican Foreign Minister Patricia Espinosa in presiding over the talks. For example, at a critical moment she took note of objections from Bolivia and a few other leftist states, and then ruled that the support of the 193 other countries meant that consensus had been achieved and the Cancun Agreements had been adopted. She pointed out that "consensus does not mean unanimity." Compare that with Copenhagen, where the Danish prime minister allowed objections by five small countries to derail the talks.”
         http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/20625/why_cancun_trumped_copenhagen.html
      b) “It's also vital to note that China and the United States set a civil, productive tone, in contrast to the Copenhagen finger-pointing”
         http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/20625/why_cancun_trumped_copenhagen.html
   3. Underdal’s “law of the least ambitious program”
   4. Vary membership and commitments of parties to find a ZOPA
   5. Victor article: don’t need universal cooperation -- with just a few countries (among whom it may well be easier to negotiate) you can get a lion’s share of the problem AND you might get more ambitious agreement among them then among a larger group
      a) 10 countries represent 75% of emissions!
      b) The more you require that it be formal and legally binding, the less a state may be willing to agree to
      c) But also, if you don’t include the countries that are most-affected/most-harmed, then where does the motivation to take action come from
   6. Power matters -- if US doesn’t play, it may not matter what others do, because agreement becomes harder to reach.
D. Equity and “everybody should pitch in” (whether from the South or the North)
   1. Developing states and developed states
   2. Responsibilities and obligations
   3. Arguments for equity may not be productive but doesn’t mean they won’t be used
III. Substantive components and their implications
   A. Who is in?
   B. How ambitious?
   C. Which contributing pollutants and activities?
   D. Adaptation vs. mitigation vs. compensation

IV. 2010 Cancun/ 2011 Durban / 2012 Doha agreements on climate change. Key elements of deal:
   A. Dimitrov’s vision that it’s not treaties or not but whether there is “aggregate climate governance”
   B. “The EU, Japan and Norway pledged over US$ 25 bn for fast-track adaptation and mitigation policy in 2010–2012” [Dimitrov, 2010 #6533]. How important is this??? $750B in one year in the US to mobilize the economy.
   C. “the Agreements are no more stringent that the collection of submissions made under last year’s Copenhagen Accord” [Dimitrov, 2010 #6533].
   D. Goal to limit global warming to below 2 degrees (subject to science review) -- same as at Copenhagen a year earlier but this time accepted formally

F. Registry for developing country actions
   G. Establish a Green Climate Fund (with the World Bank at the helm for 3 years)
   H. Finance of $30 billion for 2010-12 and $100 billion per year by 2020
   I. International Technology Mechanism for environmentally friendly technologies
   J. Establish the Cancun Adaptation Framework including an Adaptation Committee (to help countries adapt to the negative impacts of climate change)

K. REDD + (forest-related emissions): Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
   1. “Brazil and Indonesia alone account for more than 51% of the world's emissions from forest loss.”
   2. “Reducing emissions from forests is a crucial step with deforestation representing up to 20% of global carbon dioxide emissions – more than that of the entire transport sector.”
   3. REDD complicated by fact that efforts to manage forests run up against countervailing pressures to address rights of indigenous people who live there and pressures to convert it into agricultural land for poor people.

L. Establishes international forum for the consequences of climate policy (a Saudi Arabia proposal on ‘response measures’)
   M. Includes carbon-capture-and-storage as policy option
   N. LULUCF decision with Annex with reference levels for Annex I countries

V. Next steps
   A. COP-21: November/December 2015 in Paris, France
   B. UNEP definition of what’s needed: “Emissions should peak at 44 GtCO2e by 2020 and fall to 22GtCO2e by 2050 to stay within a 2C target, but under a business-as-usual scenario, which includes no emissions pledges, emissions would reach 59 GtCO2e in 2020.” Last recorded year (2010) was 50GtCO2e. And “even if nations meet their current climate pledges, greenhouse gas emissions in 2020 are likely to be eight to 12 (GtCO2e) … above the level needed to have a good chance of remain below 2C by 2020.”
   C. Current status:
      1. “On legal form, the 2011 conference achieved an unexpected breakthrough, subsequently cemented at the 2012 conference in Doha. It was agreed to begin a new round of negotiations towards a new ”protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force”, to be concluded by 2015 and to take effect after 2020. At the same time the Kyoto protocol, thought by some to be on the verge of collapse, was kept alive until at least 2020.”
2. “On financial assistance to developing countries, both for adaptation to the effects of climate change, and to help them mitigate their emissions, negotiations have effectively stalled.”

http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2012/sep/17/international-climate-talks-faq

3. “On technology, the goal of developing countries has long been the free or cut-price transfer of low-carbon technologies from developed countries, including the intellectual property rights which would allow domestic manufacture. But this has always been rejected by developed countries, concerned to protect their trading advantages.”

http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2012/sep/17/international-climate-talks-faq

4. “the shifting alliances and positions of different countries. Traditionally, negotiations were conducted with developed (‘Annex 1’) and developing countries (‘Non-Annex 1’) on opposing sides. At Copenhagen and Cancun a fissure opened up among developing countries, with the emergence of the Basic grouping and increasingly open divergence of interest between them and the poorest and most vulnerable nations. At the Durban conference, the final outcome owed much to a new coalition between the EU, the least developed countries and the Alliance of Small Island States, and a new grouping of Latin American and Caribbean countries with strong commitments to climate action. Its success caused further rifts within the Basic group, with India attempting to hold out against the legal goal but in the end not being supported by China, Brazil or South Africa. As negotiations start in earnest at the December 2013 conference in Poland, much will depend on how these shifting alliances develop over the next few years. With civil society now gearing up for a major new campaigning push, it is possible that Paris in 2015 could achieve what Copenhagen in 2009 could not.”

http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2012/sep/17/international-climate-talks-faq

D. Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA) – group to include US in the process

E. Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP) – group of states that have ratified Kyoto Protocol

F. Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) is a subsidiary body that was established by decision 1/CP.17 to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties. The ADP is to complete its work as early as possible but no later than 2015 in order to adopt this protocol, legal instrument or agreed outcome with legal force at the twenty-first session of the Conference of the Parties and for it to come into effect and be implemented from 2020.

G. State Department negotiator noted that the real action won’t come until 2015. Negotiators need deadlines and sense of pressure. Todd Stern, Obama’s special climate change envoy “stressed that all nations would be required to play a part, and that countries previously classed as developing would have to take on national commitments on emissions.”

VI. Other non-international action

A. Governments: India, China, US, Europe, Japan; Costa Rica: 3.5% carbon tax since 1997

B. States: Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative; Western Climate Initiative

C. Cities: ICLEI-Local Governments for Sustainability: >1000 cities, towns

D. NGOs/Corporations: WWF, Greenpeace, Nike, Levi’s, etc.

E. Religions: Faith Action on Climate Change, Interfaith Power & Light, Evangelical Environmental Network,

F. Individuals: Voluntary Simplicity, direct action