Climate change: Poznan-Copenhagen-Cancun
What is at stake and play?

Sunita Narain, director, CSE
The underlying politics

1. South Asia will be (is) a victim of climate change impacts
2. North wants to shift the burden of mitigation – cutting emissions on us
3. India must (and is) doing emission reductions in its interest
4. In negotiations we are compromising our position and getting too little to prevent catastrophic climate change
**Impacts**: difficult to predict

1. Impacts need long term data to corroborate future trends, but this does not exist
2. There are compounding reasons for impact – heavy rainfall in a region could be part of the trend of climate, but floods are also due to mismanagement of floodplain
Impacts: latest reports

MoEF: Climate change in India: 4x4 assessment

Temperature: higher annual mean by 2030 – between 1.7° - 2° C. Maximum increase in coastal areas

Rainfall: more rain – 5-10 days in all regions. Risk of floods. Storm surges

Agriculture: higher temperature, CO2 concentration and precipitation will impact production

Sea level rise: predicted to continue at rate of 1.3mm/year
Impacts: uncertain but clear

- Changes are afoot
- Beginning to see extreme rainfall events: more rain, less rainy days, cloud bursts, unseasonal, variable extreme rain
- Beginning to see some trend in mean temperatures, impacting crops
- Beginning to see some intensification of tropical cyclones/sea surges because of warmer temperatures
- All in all: bad news ahead
Need effective action> But

- First climate conference in 1988; Convention signed in 1992

- In 1997 world agreed in Kyoto to small change – 5% reduction by developed world

- In 2010: Kyoto targets not met; industrial country emissions increasing; world at risk
Annex 1: No cut in emissions. Hiding behind the decrease of Economies in Transition
Between 1990-2006

- CO2 emissions have increased in the industrialised world
- Only small gains in UK, Sweden and Germany
- Global meltdown brought down emissions
- But increasing again. Fiscal stimulus to grow, not green
Politics 2: shift burden to us

Climate change linked to economic growth

- Agriculture: 16%
- Industrial Processes: 3%
- Other Fuel Combustion: 9%
- Transportation: 15%
- Manufacturing & Construction: 15%
- Electricity and Heat: 35%
- International Bunkers: 3%
- Waste: 4%
Climate change is about sharing growth. We will have to increase our emissions as we grow. We need ecological space. Deal was: they would reduce so that we could grow. But North has reneged on deal. *Wants to rewrite the terms of agreement*
India’s emissions linked to energy

Enteric fermentation 63%
Emission from soils 13%
Rice cultivation 21%
Agricultural crop residue 2%
Manure management 1%

Cement 32%
Food processing 7%
Ammonia production 2%
Nitric acid production 1%
Ethylene production 2%
Pulp and paper 1%
Ferroalloys 1%
Aluminium 1%
Others 25%
Iron and steel 28%

Electricity generation 65%
Fugitive emissions 3%
Agriculture/Fisheries 3%
Other energy industries 3%
Residential 13%
Transport 13%
Historical emissions: A tonne of CO2 emitted in 1850 same value as tonne of CO2 emitted in 2005

Cumulative CO₂ emissions from fossil fuels, 1902-2004

Source: Carbon dioxide Information Analysis Centre, 2007

Per capita burden (1902-2004)
Graph 2: Cumulative emissions 1950-2000 (CO₂ emissions without land use):

- US 28%
- China 9%
- EU-25 23%
- Rest of the world 26%
- Japan 5%
- Canada 2%
- Australia 1%
- Brazil 1%
- India 2%
- Indonesia 1%
- South Korea 1%
Climate injustice: per capita emissions in the world
How? What’s the current play?

1. Remove/delete ‘historical emissions’ from negotiations
2. Remove distinction between Annex 1 (past and current polluters who need to take action) and non-Annex 1 (developing countries)
3. Take no legally binding targets. Destroy the Kyoto Protocol
Copenhagen: Game-changer or Game-loser?

Copenhagen Accord: Built a ‘coalition of the willing’ to bring the US on board

Built on the following propositions:

1. Global emission targets based on domestic pledges and then review
2. All must join in cutting emissions
3. Money given to partners of the coalition
Copenhagen Accord: What it means?

1. Inadequate pledges: puts the world on course for 4°C temperature increase
2. Legitimizes the meaningless US target of -3% below 1990 by 2020
3. Builds an ineffective voluntary framework for emission reduction in the future
4. Removes distinction between developed and developing
Copenhagen Accord: Overwrites the principle of equity

5. Global targets based on domestic pledges – what a nation can do; not what a nation must do

6. Targets do not take into account historical or current responsibility
The budget: 2020

The world must emit by 2020: 40-44 gtCO2e to keep it within 1.5° -2° C

Business as usual scenario: 57 gtCO2e

Reduce: 13-17 gtCO2e by 2020
Copenhagen: Inequity in pledge

Current pledges (UNFCCC leaked paper)
2.1 gtCO2e for Annex 1 parties
3.7 gtCO2e for non-Annex 1 parties
1.5 gtCO2e from LULUCF (Brazil and Indonesia)

Burden of emission cut shifted to us
Copenhagen Accord: Bad for transition

1. Erasing responsibility means that there is no right to development
2. There is no responsibility to pay for the transition
3. Transition will cost. Transition must happen today
4. No leapfrog possible. Business as usual
5. We get the right to pollute
In our interest to act

- India 8 missions on climate change
- Solar: ambitious; 1000 mw by 2012. Investing US$ 20 billion for 25 years
- Coal tax: to invest in renewables/clean coal
- Energy efficiency in industry programme…

But is this enough?
Can we reduce emissions **substantially** when the world has not been able to do?

What does low carbon growth mean?

What will it cost?

Can we afford it without a global deal to pay for our transition?
Figure 1: McKinsey’s global GHG abatement cost curve

Source: Pathway to a low carbon economy, version 2 of the GHG abatement cost curve, McKinsey & Company
4: The current compromise

We give
MRV/ICA
REDD
**We do not get**
Money
Technology
Emission reductions targets from North
MRV/ICA: what and why?

MRV – measure, report and verify – is to account for action being taken by all countries and to report on progress, which is then verified by international agencies. US says without MRV there is no deal.

Why does this matter so much?
MRV/ICA

MRV: tool to remove difference between annex 1/non annex 1

We all report on action equally

All our actions will then be verified. So no commitment becomes a target. We take on global commitments to cut emissions without taking them on.

Now being called ICA – International Consultation and Analysis. Sweet
MRV/ICA: 2% move

At Major Economies Forum last week
India and US want world to accept
“All countries whose emissions have crossed 2% of world GHG emissions will take on MRV/ICA”
Only 6 countries in this list – China, US, Russia, India, Japan and Germany – distinction removed
REDD and REDD+

Deal on forests to be signed at Cancun

Forests are sink for carbon dioxide and source of emissions

Our forests are not carbon sticks, but habitats of people.

What is being discussed here? What will be sold? Who will pay price?
Unequal deal. Will cost us earth

Fast track: new and addition US$ 30 billion between 2010-2012
Pledged US$28 billion. But fudged accounts. Aid shown as new
+US 100 billion annually by 2020
High level group says private sector will give. No commitment to change
Unequal: targets mean nothing

- US says it will cut up to 17% over 2005 levels = 3% below 1990 levels
- It needs to cut 40% below 1990 levels
- Even this is no longer on the table. Energy bill is not being considered
- No meaningful actions from North
Cancun: better no deal

10. Climate agreement is being rewritten
10. We will be double losers
10. Victims of climate change
10. We will have to take on cost of transition
10. No action from North means more cost
10. So what is the deal we want in Cancun? No deal? **Bad deal**
Acceptable???
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