

Doha must deliver strong and effective second commitment period, says G77/China

Doha, 27 November (Fauwaz Abdul Aziz) – Doha must deliver a strong and effective second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol.

This call was made by Algeria, speaking for the G77 and China at the opening plenary of the 8th session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) held on 26 November

Meanwhile, New Zealand announced in the plenary that it would not commit to emissions reduction under a second commitment period. Australia said it would make a commitment under the second commitment period.

(However, Australia's target that works out to be 5% below 2000 levels by 2020 was strongly criticised by the Green Party member of parliament, Senator Christine Milne, in a press release of 26 November that described it as "an insult to countries like China and India, which have far lower emissions than ours both per capita and per unit of GDP. And it's an absolute slap in the face to our neighbours like Tuvalu and Kiribati, whose very survival depends on rich countries like Australia doing as much as we can to tackle global warming." The statement also said that, "this kind of behaviour at international climate talks, with rich countries refusing to pull their weight, is exactly why the world is still waiting for a global deal. Why should poorer countries act while we refuse to do our fair share?")

Algeria for the **G77/China** said Doha must deliver a strong and effective second commitment period of the KP that preserves environmental integrity. Parties must have the willingness to resolve the remaining legal and technical issues that will allow us to reach a multilateral consensus and to strengthen the spirit of international cooperation.

Algeria referred to the outcome document of the Rio+20 Conference on Sustainable Development which urged Parties of the KP to fully implement

their commitment as well as decisions adopted under those agreements. During this CMP8, Parties must work together with urgency and a common purpose to deliver the mandate collectively committed to more than six years ago to complete the work of the working group of further commitments for Annex 1 Parties under the KP (AWG-KP), in time, to ensure that there is no gap between the first and second commitment periods.

Algeria said that by the opening of the Doha Conference, only some Annex 1 countries had expressed their intention to participate in taking mitigation commitments and presented information on their "provisional" quantified emission limitation or reduction commitments (QELROs). A higher level of ambition on the scale of emission reductions in aggregate as well as joint and individual contributions of Annex 1 Parties must be ensured in order to overcome the wide gap between the insufficient pledges that are currently on the table and what is required by science, equity and historical responsibility, said Algeria.

The G77 and China expected the Annex 1 Parties to the KP to put forward ambitious quantified emission reduction commitments for the second commitment period following the expiry of the first commitment on 13 December this year. The Durban outcome (of the Conference of Parties in 2011 - CMP7) invited Annex 1 Parties to submit information on their mitigation commitments or QELROS by 1, May, 2012 in order to enable the AWG-KP to deliver the results of its work on QELROs in Doha, said Algeria.

A second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol must be established as the basis for comparable Annex 1 emission reduction commitments by those countries not Party to the KP by the second phase of the Protocol, Algeria said further.

Algeria said that at Durban, CMP7 mandated some specific work for narrowing down technical aspects required for adopting a CP2 under the Kyoto Protocol in Doha. These issues include the submission of QELROs; provisions for ensuring a smooth continuity between commitment periods and rules for the use of excess units as well as the flexibility mechanisms.

It stressed the importance of the full implementation of the Durban package in all its aspects, including the achievement of a quality legal second commitment period, the successful conclusion of the work of the AWGLCA, in line with the Bali Action Plan and the substantive progress made in the Cancun and Durban decisions, incorporating comparable ambitious targets for Annex-1 non-KP Parties.

The Philippines, speaking also for Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, India, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Paraguay, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Venezuela and itself, emphasised that the KP as the only legally binding, rules-based instrument with quantitative emissions reduction targets for Annex I Parties.

As such, it must be preserved because it is consistent with what science requires, and it is in Doha that Parties are faced with the last possible opportunity to operationalise the second commitment period under the KP without any gap between the first and second commitment period.

It said that Parties were thirty-five days away from the end of the first commitment period and avoid that perilous gap. Therefore, above all else, Doha must be the KP-CP2 COP. A meaningful and effective second commitment period of KP must be the single biggest measure of success in Doha, said the Philippines.

It noted, in particular, several matters as being the benchmarks of success for the KP:

- Annex I Parties to the KP must commit at Doha to ambitious QELROs to be provisionally applied with effect from 1 January 2013, putting them on a pathway to reducing their emissions to at least 40-50% below 1990 levels by 2020 while ensuring emissions reduction by at least 25-40% by 2017;
- The above, in turn, should result in the adoption of an ambitious agreement, through amendments to Annex B of the KP, for a second commitment period of comparable,

single number, unconditional, and legally-binding emission reduction targets for developed countries under the KP, to be applied starting on 1 January 2013. In order to be meaningful, the emission reduction targets of Annex I parties must be sufficiently deep and in line with the requirements of actions to curb rising temperatures, at least within the range of 40 to 50% below 1990 levels by 2020 while ensuring emissions reduction of at least 25-40% below 1990 levels by 2017. Annex I parties that are not parties to the KP, or who have withdrawn from the Protocol, or who do not intend to join the second commitment period should also take on comparable and ambitious emission reduction commitments under the LCA;

- And it should also result in access to the KP's flexibility mechanisms being made available only to those Annex I parties that have commitments under the second commitment period of the KP;
- It should also result in the KP's compliance mechanism being made applicable to commitments under the second commitment period; and
- it should result in the use of surplus units from the first commitment period must be limited in the second commitment period to protect the environmental integrity of the second commitment period. I reiterate the G77&China position on carry-over of surplus Assigned Amount Units (AAUs).

The Philippines also expressed concern with the lack of funding for the Adaptation Fund under the KP, despite it being the only operational fund that allows developing countries direct access to be able to implement crucial and urgent adaptation actions on the ground. The future of the Adaptation Fund likewise depends on these same benchmarks we have laid down. The future of the Fund therefore depends on the future of the KP, said the Philippines.

Nauru, for the **AOSIS** said what the world expects from Doha is a new set of clear, ambitious and credible emission reduction commitments from Annex I Parties for the Protocol's second commitment period, which will begin in just over one month's time.

Such commitments, AOSIS believes, should be established in the context of a five-year second commitment period under the KP to run from 2013 to 2017, and there should be no gap in the legally-binding nature of commitments between

commitment periods through agreement on the provisional application of amendments pending their ratification.

The emission reduction commitments we agree under the KP are the most visible part of Kyoto's multilateral, rules-based system, and we all know that the level of ambition of the Kyoto commitments has for years set the tone for the international process as a whole. These commitments must send a signal to the world that we are serious about addressing climate change, and that our multilateral process can deliver internationally legally-binding commitments at a scale that responds to what the science demands, and with the urgency required.

While AOSIS expressed appreciation to the large and growing number of Annex I Parties that have unambiguously expressed their willingness to participate fully in the Protocol's second commitment period through binding commitments in an amended Annex B, and look forward to similar expressions of willingness from a broader group of Parties as we go forward, it also lashed out at the laggards who have demonstrated lack of commitment to the goals of the KP.

We all know that we have clear leaders in this process, and we have clear laggards. And there is a reason we focus on the leaders. Although the KP covers only a subset of Annex I emissions, the KP is where those Annex I Parties that are truly committed to addressing climate change demonstrate this leadership by taking ambitious, legally-binding individual emission reduction commitments, said Nauru.

In weighing up a move to deeper commitments, AOSIS asked all Parties to put the interests of vulnerable countries on the scales with their own interests, and to really consider which way these scales should tip. The numbers we adopt here under the Kyoto Protocol are not just abstract numbers. These numbers represent emission levels that translate directly to lives lost, to land area lost to sea level rise, to families displaced due to droughts and floods, and to suffering that some of us cannot begin to comprehend. It is not an exaggeration to say that over time, as a result of action taken or not taken here in Doha, we may see whole languages, cultures and potentially whole countries lost, it added.

Parties must also ensure – here in Doha – that hot air and surplus units are not allowed to diminish the effective emission reductions delivered.. The carryover of surplus Kyoto units must be addressed decisively in Doha because it holds the potential to

completely erase what may otherwise be achieved from CP2 commitments.

AOSIS said other issues of importance include the extension of the share of the proceeds to provide much needed revenue for the Adaptation Fund, the improvement of the environmental integrity of the Kyoto mechanisms, and the reaffirmation of the eligibility rules to ensure that only Parties with legally binding QELROs in Annex B for the second commitment period remain eligible to participate in the flexible mechanisms.

China spoke on behalf of Brazil, India, South Africa and China (BASIC) expressed concern about the low level of ambition reflected in the QELROs submitted by Annex I countries that are Parties to the KP, said these are far below what is required by science and the Annex 1 countries' historical responsibility for climate change.

These countries should raise their level of ambition reflected in the QELROs in Doha and beyond. It called for the continued discussion on higher QELROs. It reiterated the perspective of Annex I Parties leaving the KP to present their mitigation contribution under the AWG-LCA can only be the reflection of reduced political will to cut their greenhouse gas emissions. These developed country Parties should undertake quantified emission reduction commitments under the Convention which should be comparable in terms of form, magnitude and compliance. It is our understanding that developed countries that are not Parties to the KP or do not participate in its second commitment period should not benefit from the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) of the Protocol.

Swaziland, on behalf of the **African Group**, stressed the successful adoption of the second commitment period under the KP as the single most important outcome from Doha, and expressed the hope that the AWG-KP would finalize its mandate regarding all outstanding issues.

The African Group which represents the most vulnerable people on this global who contribute very little to greenhouse gases, expects nothing less than a resounding success in the agreement of a second commitment period, whereas anything less than this undoubtedly will constitute the worst failure by any CMP ever.

The African Group said it looked forward to discussing in Doha issues related to CDM, the lack of funding for the Adaptation Fund, the slow pace of accrediting national implementing entities due to the strenuous process that poor developing countries

with less capacity have to follow, the loopholes that continue to exist in the KP system, and the withdrawal of certain Parties from the first commitment period and the KP itself.

The **European Union** said its commitment to a second commitment period is demonstrated by its submission of QERLOs and its preparedness to adopt an amendment to the KP that inscribes a new QELRO for the EU and its member states in Annex B. Referring to EU legislation, it said it had already implemented its QELROs into legally-binding commitments to ensure that the EU and its member states comply with their obligations and fulfil the 2020 target.

It said that it should go without saying that ratification of the amendments to the KP are clearly EU objectives. Once the EU left Doha with an amendment to the KP, would start the immediate application of the second commitment period in Doha as of 1 January 2013, regardless of the timing of ratification of other Parties. The EU said it will also initiate its ratification processes as soon as possible. It was for a legally-binding second commitment period.

Australia, speaking for the **Umbrella Group (Japan, Kazakhstan, NZ, Norway, Russia, Ukraine, Australia)**, said all Parties must preserve

and build on the Durban compromise by ensuring that the second commitment period of the KP becomes operational on 1 January 2013 and thereby make good on one major element of the Durban deal. The other essential and intrinsic elements of the Durban compromise that must move forward involve progress in the Durban Platform and by concluding an agreed outcome in the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long term Cooperative Action.

Explaining its recent announcement that it was ready to join a second commitment period of the KP alongside its Umbrella Group colleagues Norway, Ukraine and Kazakhstan, Australia said it had submitted its QELROS submission and said it will work constructively with parties to resolve the key outstanding issues through the AWG-KP so that the second commitment period starts from 1 January next year.

New Zealand, on the other hand, said it had decided not to commit to a second commitment period but remained committed to active participation in the efforts against climate change. It believed that the new rules in the KP would exercise a strong influence on the future agreement to be forged and as such it will act in accordance to its rules.