Climate Change: Facts and politics; science and art; present and future
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Procrastination no option

- In our interest to get an **effective deal**
- But also imperative that deal is based on **principles of equity**
- Our right to development secured

- How? **Possible?**
THE END IS NEAR...

Apocalypse Now
Tough negotiations ahead

- World is getting warmer
- Impacts are beginning to show
- Rich did not reduce as committed
- Poor are increasing emissions
- Space has been occupied – historical
- Remaining carbon space is limited
- Funds and technology transfer remain empty promise
1992-2012: Rio-Peru: world has changed

- 1992 Annex 1 countries = 70 per cent of annual emissions
- 2012 Annex 1 countries = 43 per cent of annual emissions

- Rich did not reduce
- But rest grew to take up space
- Now run out of space
Status: 1992-2012

In 20 years since 1992:

- Global CO$_2$ emissions increased by 50% and reached 32 billion tonnes in 2012.
- CO$_2$ concentration in the atmosphere increased from 356 ppm in 1992 to 400 ppm now.
- Number of people without access to electricity remained more or less the same: 1.5 billion in 1992 to 1.3 billion in 2012.
Agreement in 1992: built on science and good politics

- UN Framework Convention on Climate Change 1992 is based on the principle that a group of countries (Annex 1) created problem; have to reduce emissions first; create space for the rest to grow

- Common but differentiated Responsibilities
Principles are politics

Principles:
• Rights to the global common
• Historical responsibility of some
• Right to development
• Responsibilities of rest to act based on finance and technology access

Inconvenient truth
1998: Kyoto Protocol

- Annex 1 mitigation target: 5.2% below 1990 levels between 2008-2012.
- Despite weak targets, KP remains the only legally binding mitigation agreement as per the principles of the convention.
- Calling it ‘fatally flawed’, US walked away in 2001; Australia, Japan, Russia, Canada walked away in 2011.
Rich countries: not meeting Kyoto target

- USA: 8.64
- Japan: 6.88
- Canada: -6.0
- Australia: 56.57
- Germany: -20.67
- France: -21.0
- UK: -20.24
- Italy: -4.47
- Spain: 29.39
- Netherlands: 1.86
- Poland: -6.0
US called Kyoto fundamentally and fatally flawed
- It wanted all countries to take action
- It wanted the firewall – between those who have contributed to the creation of the problem and the rest removed
- It wanted equity to be redefined so that it meant what countries will do
Copenhagen-Paris Framework changed

- Principle of firewall removed: now universal commitment. All have to take action
- Principle of historical erased:
- Principle of action based on contribution removed
How to share the past, present and future?

- That is the question
- Developed countries say historical emissions is past, cannot be counted
- Now must talk about what is left to meet 2 degree target
- All must contribute
Copenhagen-Paris
All have to act

- Yes
- But action is not based on contribution to the problem
- Action is based on what each country can do. Will do
- Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC)
Equity re-defined

- **All** countries will put on the table their INDC
- What they can do and by when
- It is voluntary
- **They decide so it is equitable**
- Will it add up?
- Will it keep world below 2°C?
Copenhagen-Paris Act but will it add up

- This is the bottom-up formula
- All countries put forward their INDC
- Then it is added up
- Will the world stay below 2°C?
- No.
- Then what?
Paris
Decide on further review

- Paris: Will ‘add’ up INDC
- Does not add up
- So now action will be reviewed
- Countries will be asked to ‘increase’ contribution
- But on what basis?
Funds not coming

- Green Climate Fund: $100 billion by 2020
- Empty
- Adaptation Fund: From CDM proceeds
- Empty

- Fight is to delink INDC from financial commitment
Equity is pre-requisite

Is about cooperation. If the rich emitted yesterday, the emerging rich world will do today and tomorrow

Cooperation demands equity and fairness

Effective action only possible with equity
Climate change real

- Action urgent
- Ambition necessary
- Take national action
- But demand global action to match scale, pace of climate change and contribution to creating the problem