



**A PLANETARY CITIZEN'S GUIDE
TO THE GLOBAL CLIMATE
NEGOTIATIONS
-or-
HOW TO USE A MOP**

1) Introduction:

From November 28-December 9, 2005, Canada will host the 11th Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the 1st Meeting of the Parties of the Kyoto Protocol. Veteran activists from previous negotiations (“climate junkies”) call these meetings “COP11/MOP1.”

If you are walking into a United Nations negotiation for the first time, you are likely wondering what to expect. If you are staying home, but want to make a difference through local activism, you may want a more detailed briefing on the issues and the terminology of all the different concepts.

This Guide is to help you prepare to make the 2005 Global Climate Negotiations in Montreal the most effective -- ever!

Sierra Club of Canada's *Planetary Citizen's Guide to the Global Climate Negotiations* will give you an easy to understand review of the history, science and critical issues that lie ahead.

Watch the CAN Canada website for a continuously updated calendar of events: www.climateactionnetwork.ca

1) Global climate treaties:

a) In general

There are a lot of different words for binding legal agreements between countries: *treaties, conventions and protocols.*

Environmental agreements generally start as “*conventions.*” A Convention, such as the Vienna Convention to protect the ozone layer, is a broad statement of principles and objectives without binding targets. Every convention has its own formula for *entry into force* (abbreviated in many UN documents as EIF). The EIF formula is determined in the negotiations. Governments often sign a new convention as soon as it is negotiated, but it also needs to be approved domestically -- through national parliaments and legislatures. That process is called “*ratification.*” It is particularly difficult to achieve in the US, where under the Constitution international treaties require a 2/3 majority in the Senate.

Whenever a country ratifies a convention, that country is known as a “*party*” to the convention. Once the convention has been signed and ratified by enough countries, it *enters into force.*

Every environmental convention is much more than a piece of paper. Each Convention launches a living process. All the countries that have signed and ratified (the *Parties*) meet regularly in a mini-Parliament to make sure the convention meets its goals. These mini-Parliaments are called “*Conferences of the Parties,*” or “*COPs.*” The Parties often decide that the vague statement of principles, the Framework Convention, is not enough. Then they negotiate a more meaningful and specific agreement. Any binding legal agreement negotiated by Parties to an existing Convention is called a “*protocol.*”

A good example is the progress of the U.N. Framework Convention to Protect the Ozone Layer, known as the Vienna Convention. After a few years, it was very clear that the threat to the ozone layer was urgent and that without specific targets and timelines to eliminate ozone-depleting chemicals, the results would be catastrophic. The countries began working

in scientific meetings and diplomatic sessions to develop an approach to real reductions. Those meetings culminated in a meeting in Montreal in September, 1987. The resulting treaty, the *Montreal Protocol*, was the first agreement to set out mandatory reductions of ozone-depleting substances.

The Montreal Protocol is an important agreement to have in mind as we head to Montreal 2005. For one thing, the Montreal Protocol worked! It is likely the most effective of all global environmental treaties. So, as we head into the climate negotiations, we can invoke the history of Montreal as a city symbolic of effective agreements to save the world. (for if saving the ozone layer isn't saving the world, it's hard to know what is!)

And lastly, it is important to know that the Kyoto Protocol was designed along the same principles as the Montreal Protocol. It embraced the principle that the agreement would be “science-driven” and responsive to new information of the scale and scope of the threat as it emerged. It also established the principle that industrialized countries should take the first steps. In order to ensure fairness between rich countries and poor countries, the two groups were treated differently under the Montreal Protocol and the same is true for the Kyoto Protocol. There were several reasons for this. For one thing, the problem had been created by the rich countries. For another, the rich countries had better resources to develop technologies to replace the ozone depleters. As well, developing countries had urgent need of better refrigeration and wanted to expand use of ozone depleting refrigerants. And finally, the negotiators wanted to ensure all countries were in the agreement, so developing countries could join in the reduction targets later. So, the successful Montreal Protocol of 1987 called on rich countries to reduce manufacture and use of ozone depleters by 50%, while allowing developing countries to increase, initially.

b) The climate agreements – in particular

The beginning of work to limit greenhouse gases by international treaty can be traced to the 1987 Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development (often known simply as “The Brundtland Report,” after its chair, then Norwegian Prime Minister, now head of the World Health Organization., Dr. Gro Harlem Brundtland.) The WCED's final

report, “Our Common Future,” identified three global crises -- a development crisis, an environment crisis and a crisis of militarism.¹ The Brundtland Report called for a major global summit to be held in 1992 to address the most pressing threats, of which climate change was seen as urgent.

Another relevant milestone was the first international public scientific conference, hosted by Canada, in Toronto in June, 1988. “Our Changing Atmosphere: Implications for Global Security” developed a call for a 20% reduction in greenhouse gases against 1988 levels, to be reached by 2005, as an interim step. The conference consensus statement began, **“Humanity is conducting an unintended, uncontrolled, globally pervasive experiment whose ultimate consequences are second only to global nuclear war.”**

Following the Second World Climate Conference in Geneva in 1990, the United Nations General Assembly mandated negotiations in advance of the 1992 Summit, which took place in Rio de Janeiro. The gathering became the largest summit of heads of government, to that point, in world history. The Earth Summit, as it became known, succeeded in approving two global conventions - one to protect biodiversity and the other, the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC).

The Framework Convention established several important points that have served as foundation for later action. The UN FCCC committed all Parties to a shared commitment to action. It acknowledged that climate change is real, that human activities, from land use changes (deforestation) and burning of fossil fuels were the major sources of the problem, and accepted that awaiting 100% scientific certainty would be to ask for a *post mortem*. The Convention adopted the Precautionary Principle – that a lack of scientific certainty should not be used as an excuse for inaction.

The Convention’s “ultimate objective” is to stabilize “greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the

¹ The issue of militarism was dropped from the “sustainable development” challenge when the U.N. General Assembly approved an agenda for the 1992 Summit on Environment and Development.

climate system.” In other words, the build up of greenhouse gases (GHG) due to human activity should be stopped before it can become dangerous.

The key word here is “dangerous.” It is a subjective word. If you were in France in the heat wave of 2003, watching the ice melt in the Western Canadian Arctic, or the water rise in New Orleans in August 2005, or British Columbia in the fires of 2004, you might well conclude that things are already pretty dangerous. To ensure a science based approach, the Convention relies on an expert group of scientists, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to translate complex science into “advice for policy makers.” The IPCC was created in 1988 and is comprised of scientists from government agencies, universities and private sector, appointed by governments which review all the peer-reviewed published scientific literature. It is essentially the world’s largest peer review system.

The convention committed the parties to “aim towards” stabilization of GHG in the atmosphere. It set out two large areas for work:

- Reduction of GHG, called “*mitigation*” in convention-speak; and,
- *Adaptation* to those levels of climate change that cannot be avoided.

“Mitigation” is a funny term for reducing emissions. To many people, mitigation sounds more like adapting, in the way that projects “mitigate:” an environmental impact through modifications in design. In UN FCCC-speak, “mitigation” means one thing: reducing GHG emissions.

“Adaptation” refers to those policies and practices, such as land-use planning and engineering designs that change to anticipate that level of climatic disruption that can no longer be avoided. Examples of adaptation strategies include drought-resistant cropping, higher levees and dykes in low-lying areas, and not re-building in flood plains. Virtually all aspects of human activity, as well as biological systems and species, will need some kind of adaptive response to the coming impacts of climate change. The poorer countries will have a much harder time than the wealthy industrialized world. (Although with images of Hurricane Katrina victims fresh in our minds, it’s clear the wealthy countries also need far better preparation and adaptive strategies.)

UN FCCC enters into force

The FCCC was signed within two years by over 165 countries. Over 100 ratified, including the United States, Canada and all the Annex 1 countries (developed) countries, so that by March 1994, the convention had entered into force (EIF). Once the FCCC became legally binding on the parties, the Conference of the Parties (COP) process began. The first COP was in Berlin in 1995. It was at this first and critical negotiating session that a mandate was developed for a way forward. Building on the precedent of the successful Montreal Protocol, the Parties agreed that they should:

“protect the climate system for the benefit of present and future generations of humankind, on the basis of equity and in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities. Accordingly, the developed country Parties should take the lead in combating climate change and the adverse threats thereof.”

COP2 in Geneva in 1996 advanced the work toward a protocol.

COP3 was in Kyoto, Japan in December, 1997. One is tempted to say, “and the rest is history...”

c) The Kyoto Protocol

The Kyoto Protocol followed the principles established in the ozone agreement, the Montreal Protocol. It listed the wealthy industrialized nations in an Annex, called “Annex 1.” Quite often discussions about Kyoto will refer to “*Annex 1 countries*.” This means the European Union, the United States, Canada, Japan, Sweden, Norway, New Zealand, Australia, and Russia. The former U.S.S.R. countries are another relevant group, under Annex 2. They are also referred to as “*Economies in Transition*” or EIT. Developing countries are also separate. They can be part of the protocol, but do not have emission reduction targets.

The Annex 1 countries accepted binding targets for emissions reductions. The greenhouse gases covered by the protocol are:

- Carbon dioxide (CO₂)
- Methane (CH₄)
- Nitrous Oxide (N₂O)
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HfCs) (perfluorocarbons (PFCs), sulphur hexafluoride (SF₆))

Based on the 1995 agreement at COP1 to allow for “common but differentiated responsibilities,” Annex 1 countries took on different targets. The European Union, with a negotiating position going into Kyoto demanding 15% global reductions, accepted an overall 8% target. The United States adopted a 7% goal. Canada came in with a 6% promise. All of these reductions were to occur against a 1990 base year. The reductions were to be achieved between 1997 and the period 2008 and 2012. This five year time frame is referred to under Kyoto as “*the first commitment period.*”

The Kyoto negotiations were not easy. Most global negotiations are a challenge. Even the successful Montreal Protocol negotiations nearly ended in a dead-lock. Everything fell apart that September week eighteen years ago. The same two groups that so often have been at logger-heads on Kyoto, the United States and the European Union, were not talking. President Reagan had not really wanted to curtail ozone depleting chemicals, and even the Netherlands became unhelpful. New Zealand’s Environment Minister came up with a compromise and thank God for it.

By any standard, Kyoto was worse.

It is, of course, the style of U.N. negotiations to achieve agreement by attrition. Negotiations can go into the wee hours of the morning. There is often no food. Vending machine pop and chips keep bleary eyed negotiators at their microphones so long as the translators are willing to make things work in eight official languages. It is a grim and uninspiring spectacle.

While late nights and cliff-hangers are routine, Kyoto's sleep-deprived brinkmanship remains unsurpassed. The negotiations exceeded the allowable time for the meeting itself. The last round went for an incredible, uninterrupted 36 hour marathon. By the end, the Kyoto convention facility was being dismantled to make room for a trade show. The deal was agreed upon, the ink was still wet as delegates rushed for planes home.

In order to get a deal, Kyoto had emerged with a complex set of brand new concepts. These concepts were generally called "*flexibility mechanisms*." Many environmentalists called them "loopholes." Based on the understanding that the global atmosphere is well mixed and it does not matter where emissions are released, three basic kinds of flexibility mechanisms were adopted:

- 1) *Joint Implementation* (under which Annex 1 countries can get carbon credits for projects which reduce emissions, which they fund in former USSR countries, (EIT);
- 2) The *Clean Development Mechanism* through which Annex 1 countries can get credits for funding projects in developing countries that reduce carbon emissions; and
- 3) *Emissions trading* through which Annex 1 countries can buy and sell carbon where one country has exceeded its target and can "sell" its reductions by tonne to another country.

This third element has been the most controversial. It is Russia that has always been seen as the main beneficiary of this provision. As the base year is 1990, when the USSR existed with a large and highly polluting economy, Russia can get credit for the collapse of its economy and resulting decline in GHG. Russia has met and exceeded its Kyoto targets. Trading in the former pollution of the former USSR is generally called trading in "Russian hot air."

As well, Kyoto included in article 3 the idea that Annex 1 countries can get credit for enhancing "*sinks*." In convention-speak, a sink is any natural ecosystem that sequesters carbon, holding it out of the atmosphere. The sinks are generally forest sinks under Kyoto, with carbon credits available for projects in afforestation, reforestation and deforestation. In other words, if you plant a forest where one was not before, you can get credits under

Kyoto. This does not apply to commercial logging. You cannot get credit for cutting down a forest only to plant one.

In order for the Kyoto Protocol to enter into force (EIF) the negotiators came up with a complex formula. The Kyoto Protocol would have to be ratified by 55 countries, but, in addition, those 55 countries would have to be equivalent to 55% of the GHG emissions in 1990.

d) Kyoto's rocky road

In 2001, within a few months of President George W. Bush taking office, he pulled the U.S. out of the Protocol, announcing the US would not ratify. President Bush did this without even a pretense of Cabinet consideration and without so much as a conversation with the head of his environmental agency.²

When Bush pulled the US out of Kyoto, he did more than walk away with one vote out of 55. Bush walked away with 25% of global emissions making the challenge of reaching 55 % emissions from 1990 far more difficult. Then the US exerted pressure on Russia not to ratify. The Kyoto Protocol was in trouble.

Actually, negotiations had fallen apart even while Bill Clinton was in the White House. In the fall of 2000, at the height of the US Presidential race, the 6th COP took place in The Hague.³ The EU and the US reached an impasse on the rules to make Kyoto work. The President of the COP chose not to end the meeting, but to take a pause of over six months and resume in Bonn at what was known as COP 6 (*bis*). COP6 resumed with Bush denouncing Kyoto, but still sending a US delegation to the COP (as the US was and still is a party to the FCCC) and pushed countries to abandon the treaty. The Bonn COP managed to salvage global resolve to keep Kyoto alive. **The world decided it did not and could not afford to wait**

² See Suskind, [The Price of Loyalty](#), the story of Bush's first term Secretary of the Treasury, Paul O'Neil who had favoured the Kyoto Protocol.

³ COP 4 had been in Buenos Aires, Argentina in 1998; COP 5 in Bonn Germany in 1999.

for George W. Bush. The effort to develop intricate, detailed, fair and transparent rules continued, while pursuing the up-hill work of achieving ratification.

COP7 in Marrakech (2001) achieved a breakthrough on key rules for the flexibility mechanisms. By COP 8 in New Delhi (2002), the US was overtly pressing India *not* to accept GHG emission reduction targets. As Bush had used the rationale that Kyoto was not fair because it did not require developing countries to reduce emissions, Bush had an incentive to keep the developing countries from doing what Bush refused to do.

COP 9 in Milan was held while there was still uncertainty about when or even whether Kyoto would come into force. Those difficulties were removed when Putin announced that Russia would ratify. The Russian Duma had ratified by the December 2004 meeting in Buenos Aires, but the required waiting period under the formula for EIF meant that the Kyoto Protocol would not officially come into the world as a fully binding instrument until February 16, 2005.

3) Why the 2005 negotiations are so important:

With the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol on February 16, 2005, the Protocol also launched its own governance structure. Just as the COP series of meetings governs actions under the Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Kyoto Protocol will have its own process. At the 11th COP in Montreal, the climate negotiations will also have the first “MOP” or “*Meeting of the Parties*” under Kyoto.

The Kyoto MOP will deal with the rules and procedures developed to make the Protocol operational. Many of the details ironed out at COP7 in Marrakech (2001) will need to be officially approved. The Kyoto MOP can also look ahead to the additional reductions that will be required of Annex 1 countries.

Another reason, perhaps of equal importance for the significance of the 2005 meetings, is that Canada is hosting the conference.

No doubt Canadians can get excited about a major global conference occurring in Canada, but that does not automatically translate into international excitement. The reason it does this time is that none of the previous ten COPs have taken place in North America.

At COP10 in Buenos Aires, the Bush administration made it clear it did not want Canada to offer to host the 11th COP. Environmental groups did. And Europeans did. In short, anyone interested in increasing pressure on the Bush Administration to abandon its current strategy of sabotage, favoured a Canadian location.

Why?

A meeting in Canada, specifically one in Montreal, is easily accessible to U.S. opinion leaders. It is far easier for members of the U.S. media to cover the event. Major U.S. political leaders could (if they choose) travel easily to Montreal to join the world.

The combined dynamic of this being the first-ever MOP under Kyoto, plus the first-ever COP in North America create extra interest. The Montreal global climate negotiations are expected to be the biggest such negotiations ever:

- Biggest in terms of numbers of official delegates.
- Biggest in terms of side-events and parallel events, with 3-day meetings already planned on the margins for municipal leaders, and another for youth, and another for environmentally advanced industry and technology.
- Biggest in terms of activities in the streets with a major march planned for December 3, 2005, with rallies on the same day around the world under the banner “The U.S. must join the world.”

The 2005 negotiations are also the negotiations under a climate of the *biggest risk*.

The Bush administration has developed a strategy of sabotage. This spring it announced a different, non-Kyoto approach. The U.S. government and the equally bad-boy government of Australia enticed India, China, South Korea to join a US-South Asian carbon plan

revolving around new technologies and sectoral approaches.⁴ No timelines. No mandatory reductions. In what was likely an effort to keep the anti-Kyoto plan to become seriously dangerous, Japan joined in.

Thanks to the Bush administration's anti-Kyoto efforts of the last half-decade, other governments are dispirited.

The Canadian government plays a particularly important role as host. Canadian Environment Minister, the Hon. Stephane Dion, will serve as Chairman, or President of the COP. Dion has been criss-crossing the globe for months trying to find common ground among different countries. The pressure to develop some sort of deal which might get Bush into the tent is significant. Clearly, anything that Bush would sign would be worse than useless; it would be dangerous.

It is perfectly possible to envision bland statements of principle under the COP, that would actually undermine future progress under the FCCC and the Kyoto Protocol. The most critical issue before the negotiators in Montreal will be to keep open all the potential avenues to significant reductions in GHG for future negotiations. This must be done as the scientific consensus increasingly and urgently warns that time is running out.

4) The scientific backdrop to the Montreal global climate negotiations:

Climate change has arrived. Through erratic weather patterns, forest fires and glacier melt we are already experiencing the effects of climate change. Worse, the process of climate change, based on the levels of greenhouse gases we have already put in the atmosphere, is likely to increase the severity and frequency of severe weather events. If we allow levels of greenhouse gases to continue to rise, the disasters of today will be dwarfed by future catastrophic impacts.

⁴ Maybe "bribed" would be a better word than "enticed. The week before the US/Australia/Asian carbon club was announced, the US lifted its ban on the sale of nuclear technology to India.

Humans have become addicted to fossil fuels for energy, a principal cause of human-generated greenhouse gas emissions. The ongoing assault on the world's forests through burning and cutting contributes approximately 20% to the climate change crisis.

Clearly, humanity's principal challenge this century will be to avoid catastrophic levels of anthropogenic climate change. To do this, we must drastically reduce our greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) – gases such as carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide that trap heat in the atmosphere, raising global temperature and thereby spurring climate change. We can no longer avoid a significant level of climatic disruption, as atmospheric levels of CO₂ have increased from the pre-Industrial Revolution level of 280 parts per million (ppm) to a current level of 379 ppm -- or more than 30% in the last century, largely due to the burning of fossil fuels. This increase is, in human time frames, irreversible. Our goal must be to avoid even more dangerous levels.

Increasingly, scientists worry that climate change may operate more as a switch than as a dial. Sudden, abrupt and catastrophic impacts may occur at a “tipping point.” If we allow global average temperature to reach 2 degrees Celsius increase over pre-Industrial Revolution levels, then we will likely not be able to avoid that tipping point.

The sorts of sudden and abrupt changes that are now top of mind for many scientists include loss of the Gulf Stream, the collapse of the Western Antarctic Ice Shelf or the melting of the Greenland Ice sheet. Any one of these events represents a devastating signal of abrupt climate change with global and catastrophic consequences.

The Gulf Stream could slow and stop due to the changing salinity of the oceans. As the ice in the Arctic melts, fresh water is released. The impact of fresh water at the surface of the ocean could depress the Gulf Stream's warm current. The ocean's many currents are called thermohaline circulation. The relationship between a warming atmosphere and a warming ocean include the likelihood of more intense and powerful hurricanes. If the Gulf Stream should stall, the impacts are severe for Europe, which would get colder, for China and India, which would lose rainfall and as a result see serious food production crises, all the way around the globe to Texas where dry conditions and higher winds would result in loss of

soil. The US Department of Defense study on climate change (one commissioned by Andrew Marshall and reported in *Fortune* magazine in January 2004), concluded that it was a “plausible scenario for abrupt climate change” that the Gulf Stream could stall in 2010.

The World Meteorological Organization reports that “retreating glaciers in Greenland have revealed patches of land exposed for the first time in millions of years”. The Western Antarctic Ice Sheet is enormous. It contains a mind-boggling 3.2 million cubic kilometres of ice, about 10% of the world's total ice. It appears to be weakened by warmer water eroding its base. No one knows why the water under the sheet is warming or where the water is coming from. It is not expected, but possible that the Western Antarctic Ice Sheet could collapse. The impact on sea level rise would be to change the current IPCC consensus on sea level rise of up to 0.88 metres, by 2100, to 4-5 metres.

What is dangerous? 400 ppm? 550 ppm? 700 ppm?

Kyoto was always seen as only a small first step. Avoiding a doubling of atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gas emissions, at 550 ppm, will require a reduction in global emissions of at least 60% below 1990 levels. Avoiding reaching 2 degrees Celsius warmer requires even steeper and more rapid reduction in emissions. To avoid 2 degrees C, we need to hold atmospheric concentrations of carbon at no more than 400 ppm.

5) Key issues at the Montreal global climate negotiations:

The International Climate Action Network has identified several key goals for Montreal. The goals involve decisions coming out of both the COP (where the U.S. has a vote) and the MOP (where the U.S. does not):

- **START THE SECOND COMMITMENT PERIOD (2013-2017)
NEGOTIATIONS FOR KYOTO PROTOCOL TO CONCLUDE NO
LATER THAN END OF 2008;**

- **GREENING (DECARBONIZATION) TRACK TO BEGIN ON SAME TIME FRAME AND UNDER KYOTO PROTOCOL FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES;**

- **ADAPTATION STRATEGIES SHOULD BE PULLED TOGETHER FROM DISPARATE ELEMENTS INTO UNIFIED ADAPTATION TRACK WITHIN CLIMATE REGIME (WITHIN UNFCCC);**

- **DEVELOP TRACK TO STOP TROPICAL DEFORESTATION.**

The Canadian government has a position not inconsistent with this, but with far less precision. The Canadian government is working around six large theme areas it developed in bilateral (nation to nation) discussions around the world. The Canadian approach wants to launch a work plan with activities. The agreement Canada hopes to achieve would have the following as goals:

- 1) Environmental Effectiveness;
- 2) Advance Development goals in a sustainable manner;
- 3) Include more countries (code words “broaden participation”);
- 4) Build a strong global carbon market;
- 5) Fully exploit technological innovation; and
- 6) Deal with the Adaptation challenge.

A key issue for many countries around the world is fixing the Clean Development Mechanism. Although initially proposed as a relatively small part of the global scheme to meet Kyoto, it has attracted a lot of interest. Unfortunately it has not been adequately funded. The small secretariat to review and approve projects has proven to be something of a bottle-neck. It needs a larger, more robust technical team to move projects with real benefits in poverty alleviation and carbon reduction off the drawing board and into operation.

6) How to talk about Kyoto recognizing progress is disappointing, and the agreement is not perfect:

This is one of the toughest challenges for activists. It is easy to point out the flaws in Kyoto. Many activists do not like elements of Kyoto, particularly its reliance on carbon trading. Others think Kyoto is a generally good treaty, but think the failure of so many countries, including Canada, to move quickly to meet the targets, means that we should use COP11 as an opportunity to embarrass governments.

Sierra Club of Canada understands these views, **but**....

The stakes are very high. All activists participating in any way in the Montreal meetings need to weigh carefully the risks of giving ammunition to those who want to derail global progress. Attacks on Kyoto will, inevitably, help the Bush propaganda machine.

Push for more, but watch for going over the line that justifies scrapping all the progress we have made so far.

APPENDIX 1

Annex 1 Emission Reduction Chart

Countries included in Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol and their emissions targets.

Country	Target (1990** - 2008/2012)
EU-15*, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Monaco, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland	-8%
US***	-7%
Canada, Hungary, Japan, Poland	-6%
Croatia	-5%
New Zealand, Russian Federation, Ukraine	0
Norway	+1%
Australia	+8%
Iceland	+10%

* The EU's 15 member States will redistribute their targets among themselves, taking advantage of a scheme under the Protocol known as a "bubble". The EU has already reached agreement on how its targets will be redistributed.

** Some EITs have a baseline other than 1990.

*** The US has indicated its intention not to ratify the Kyoto Protocol.

APPENDIX 2

Climate Action Network-Canada Declaration on Climate Justice and the Montreal Climate Change Summit

All around the world, human communities and ecosystems are already suffering from the impacts of climate change caused by greenhouse gases (GHGs) from human activities. The scientific consensus indicates that these impacts will become catastrophic in the absence of deep GHG cuts. The threat of dangerous climate change therefore demands urgent action by Canadians and the international community.

Over the next year, Canada will play a pivotal role in determining the future direction of global action to prevent dangerous climate change, as we play host to the nations of the world meeting in Montreal this December to discuss – for the first time – what happens after the first GHG reduction commitments under the Kyoto Protocol end in 2012. Canada will continue to serve as President of the UN climate change negotiations for the following twelve months, which will give us unprecedented influence over developments internationally.

The decisions to be made in Montreal are too important to leave to politicians and bureaucrats alone. Canadians must get directly involved, as they did so successfully during the struggle to ratify the Kyoto Protocol.

With the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol in February 2005, a milestone in international cooperation to curb climate change has been reached. Canadians should take great pride in their role in achieving this victory, which was won in spite of formidable opposition from those who benefit from the status quo.

Yet the Kyoto Protocol was only a small, first step towards a just and sustainable global regime to fight climate change. Urgent and dramatic action is needed in light of the impacts of climate change that are already being felt by many vulnerable peoples and in view of the long time lags in the planet's climate system.

If the Kyoto Protocol is not soon followed by other, much more significant steps to reduce GHG emissions, we will not be able to avoid the probable – and terrible – impacts of continued warming such as threats to water supplies and food production, increases in droughts and floods, the massive loss of species and vulnerable ecosystems, and sea level rises. These will put tens of millions of additional people at risk from coastal flooding and hunger, hundreds of millions from malaria, and billions from water shortage by the 2080s if the global average temperature approaches 2°C above the pre-industrial level. The current average temperature is already 0.6°C above pre-industrial levels.

To prevent dangerous climate change, the increase in warming needs to be limited to as far below 2°C as possible over pre-industrial levels. This long-term objective will require that global GHG emissions peak with the next 10 – 15 years and go down quickly from there.

Such a future is not only necessary, but can provide a compelling alternative vision if it is based on the principles of equity and solidarity, wherein we meet the basic needs of all without destroying the ecological and cultural systems that sustain current and future generations.

To this end, the Canadian Climate Action Network calls on Canadians to challenge their elected representatives to achieve the following.

Canada must transform itself a leader in implementing our Kyoto commitments.

For too long, Canada has relied on voluntary measures to deal with climate change with the result that our GHG emissions rose by 24 % between 1990 and 2003, whereas our Kyoto Protocol commitments require us to reduce emissions to 6% below the 1990 level in the 2008 – 2012 period. Canada must now seek to lead the way in greening our economy and society, lest our commitment to the Kyoto Protocol and the necessary longer-term action on climate change be jeopardized.

This will require making better use of regulations such as vehicle fuel efficiency rules and enhanced building codes, eliminating billions of dollars in annual subsidies to the fossil fuel industry and investing these funds in energy efficiency, energy conservation and renewable sources of energy, and ensuring that large industrial polluters do their fair share. We must also implement all the elements of the federal government's April 2005 Climate Change Plan in a timely manner. For example, prior to the Montreal meeting, the federal government should announce final agreements with the provinces resulting in at least the first half of the 55 – 85 megatonnes of reductions called for in the Plan through the Partnership Fund. These agreements should focus on technologies such as energy efficiency and renewable energy that can deliver emissions reductions before 2012. The federal government should also accelerate the implementation of the Climate Fund and increase the funds available through it from \$1 billion to at least \$5 billion if it is to achieve the anticipated reductions of 75 – 115 megatonnes.

Canada must also strive at the Montreal meeting to ensure that the tidying up of the details of implementing Kyoto internationally respects the spirit of the accord and does not create new loopholes. For example, the refinement of the Clean Development Mechanism must not result in the weakening of 'additionality' requirements.

Canada must act to protect the most vulnerable.

Climate change exposes and aggravates unjust relationships. The 20% of the world's population that consumes 80% of the world's resources and contributed 80% to historic GHG emissions also owns 80% of the wealth. But the poor and the marginalized – who contribute the least to emissions – are the most likely to suffer the severest consequences of climate change related disasters.

Canada must act in solidarity with those who will be hardest hit by the impacts of climate change. Internationally, this will mean ensuring that the developed countries commit in Montreal to providing adequate resources to Adaptation Funds to help developing countries deal with climate change impacts. It will also mean providing the assistance necessary for

developing nations to meet their expanding social needs with maximum efficiency and renewable sources of energy.

At home, this will mean providing assistance to arctic communities that are already being hard hit by climate change. It will mean the development of comprehensive energy conservation programs for low-income and First Nations households to permanently reduce pollution and bills, dramatically increased support for public transit, and the provision of targeted energy assistance for low-income households who might otherwise have to choose between eating and heating or paying the rent.

Canada must ensure that the Montreal meeting launches the negotiation, to be finalized by 2008, of an effective and equitable global climate policy regime that will limit warming to as far below 2°C as possible.

The Montreal meeting must initiate a process for negotiating a post-2012 agreement, and commit to completing these negotiations by 2008 in order to allow for timely ratification and provide the certainty needed to ensure continued investments in emission reductions.

Canada must ensure that this future climate regime includes deeper mandatory absolute GHG reductions for industrialised countries, new kinds of commitments from some larger developing countries that ensure they can meet development goals while limiting the growth of GHG emissions, support for necessary adaptation measures for the least developed countries in particular, and protections for tropical forests, as proposed in the international Climate Action Network's multi-stage approach.

Such a regime should be primarily based on the Kyoto Protocol, to be amended to fit the needs of the next set of commitments. Discussions of specific provisions under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, such as those on adaptation, can contribute to the regime negotiation process.

The international community must build on the commitment that Kyoto-signatory countries have demonstrated toward tackling global warming. These countries, including at that time the US, decided together ten years ago that voluntary measures were not adequate and that absolute mandatory caps on emissions were needed.

In order to support future reduction commitments that are consistent with the goal of preventing dangerous interference with the climate system, Canada should commit itself to, and advocate for all industrialized countries, targets of a 25-30% reduction in GHG emissions relative to 1990 levels by 2020 and an 80% reduction by 2050, in line with what scientists, governments and civil society have agreed is necessary to prevent dangerous levels of climate change.

Building international support for an effective, equitable and justifiable global climate policy regime will require a principle-based approach to allocating global GHG emission reductions amongst nations. These basic principles include:

- *The Precautionary Principle* - measures should be taken to anticipate, prevent or minimize the causes of climate change and mitigate its adverse effects. Where there are threats of

serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing such measures.

- *Equity*
 - o All have equal access to the atmospheric commons, so we must give increasing weight to the aim of allocating emissions rights on a per capita basis over the course of the 21st century.
 - o Intergenerational equity – delaying action on climate change now would transfer large costs to future generations.
- *Common but differentiated responsibilities*
 - o Historical responsibility and polluter pays: those who have already contributed most to causing the climate change problem need to act first.
 - o The ability to pay and the capacity to act should be taken into consideration when deciding who should act, when and in what way.
- The *right to sustainable development*, in particular equitable access to affordable energy services, livelihoods, food security, health, water and other basic human needs.

Canada must engage progressive US states and firms in action on climate change.

While it is clear that the US must begin taking substantial action to reduce its emissions, it is equally clear that the best strategy to achieve this goal is not by watering down any future climate regime with the hope that the Bush Administration – which is out of step with most political and business leaders – will sign on right away.

The door should be left open, however, for the next Administration to engage. Canada, and others, should undertake serious efforts to engage the progressive actors in the US, and explore what types of common policies and measures could occur between nations taking action under Kyoto, and forward-thinking US states and companies.

While the Bush Administration continues to sit at the negotiating table, it must be engaged with in a way that does not stall the international negotiations on the post-2012 regime or erode principle to accommodate the current Administration. This would be devastating for the planet.