Lets get serious about change

The imperative of equity for an effective climate agreement
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Our position and our politics

- Climate change is real
- We are already feeling the pain of *what possibly* are climate impacts
- Monsoons have become more variable; more extreme; we are seeing impacts on agriculture
- The world needs to **cut emissions drastically** and urgently
Negotiations failing people and Planet

Last 20 years the world has been negotiating for an effective deal to cut emissions

But is failing

Emissions are increasing; not just in the emerging countries but in almost all countries

Inconvenient fact. Not discussed
Numbers are politics

2009-2010: % increase

- China +10.4%
- India +9%

But not highlighted that

- USA +4%
- EU-15 +2.8%; Germany and UK +4%

These countries have legal commitment to reduce, not increase
Compare India and US

Between 2009-2010
India increased by 9 per cent
US increased by 4 per cent

“India is the problem..”

But..
India increase = 0.15 billion tonnes
US increase = 0.2 billion tonnes
Equity is a pre-requisite for mitigation

Emissions are linked to growth
Already-rich emitted for their growth in the past; emerging-economies will emit for growth in the future
An agreement to cut will have to set limits for all; this can only be based on equal entitlements to all countries
No other way
This is not acceptable
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Equity is imperative for transition

We have opportunity to reinvent growth, without pollution
We have not built all infrastructure as yet
But this transition will cost
Need costs to be paid as a right so that emissions can be avoided

No cheap answers will work
Pledges do not add up to effective action – even without double-counting; leakages and loopholes – 2.5°C to 5°C

Pledges are based on voluntary action

It junks the principle of common but differentiated action

It junks the principle of historical emissions and equity
Shifts the burden of transition

- SEI assessment of UNEP report on ‘emission gap’ makes clear ‘gap is growing’ – between rich and poor

![Graph showing emissions gap](chart.png)

- In GtCO₂e
  - Low pledges / lenient rules: 0
  - Low pledges / strict rules: 1.2
  - High pledges / lenient rules: 1.7
  - High pledges / strict rules: 3.8

Legend:
- Annex 1: Blue
- Non-Annex 1: Red
Who is ‘not flexible’?

- Even with high pledge and strict rules Annex 1 take on only 40% of emission cuts between now and 2020

So who is not acting?

So who is the problem in negotiations?

We are taking on burden, when we have the right to grow – cannot negotiate on future budget without accounting for past
Space occupied; needs to be vacated

Cannot make a ‘deal’ on remaining space

Historical emissions are part of the future
Historical is part of future

- Cannot dismiss historical emissions
- Cannot write off differentiation between past polluters and future polluters
- Action has to be based on contribution to the past stock and future limits on emissions
Right to development

- Not asking for the right to pollute
- But demanding the right to development
- Future agreement on climate change must be based on this principle of differentiation and justice
- No other agreement can be acceptable or will be effective