The fight against climate change and the alleviation of poverty cannot be separated. Effective action to reduce world greenhouse gas emissions cannot be envisaged without taking environment-related issues into account. Equity must lie at the heart of the post-2012 climate regime.

In view of the interactions between development and the fight against climate change, the French international environmental and solidarity NGOs have decided to pool their efforts within the Coordination SUD’ad hoc climate change group1, in order to support the definition of climate policies, concerned by the imperatives of development.

A new agreement on the post-2012 climate regime must be concluded by the end of 2009 at the Copenhagen Conference. The Poznan Conference (COP14/MOP4) is a vital step on the way to this goal. For Coordination SUD and Climate Action Network-France (CAN-F), it must send out positive signals to the international community on the implementation of the future post-2012 climate regime.

Defining an ambitious and fair “shared vision”

Recognising two degree as the ultimate threshold

The scientists’ conclusion could hardly be clearer. A planet warming beyond 2°C will have irreversible consequences on ecological balances and on society. If we are to avoid crossing this fateful threshold by the end of the century, significative reductions in emissions will be required at world level in the very near future. To this end, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the concentration of greenhouse gas emissions must not exceed 450 ppm eqCO2. Bearing in mind that the current concentration is 375 ppm eqCO2, the challenge is huge but attainable.

At Poznan, the countries Parties of the Convention are to discuss the content of the “shared vision”, the first pillar of the Bali Action Plan. It is important that they reach an agreement on the climate warming threshold that must not be exceeded.

**R1**: The need to avoid warming greater than 2°C must lie at the heart of the Parties’ conclusions on the shared vision.

---

1 The Coordination SUD ad hoc climate change group gathers the NGO members of Coordination SUD and environmental NGOs, members of CAN-France. The group was created while preparing the follow-up program of the French EU-presidency of Coordination SUD. Its objectives are: the exchange of experience and expertise between development and environmental NGOs, the construction of common positions for international negotiations and capacity building.

---
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Mobilising all countries according to their respective responsibilities and capacities

According to the IPCC scenario, world emissions will have to culminate at 45 ppm eqCO₂ in 2015 and then decline by 50% to 85% by 2050, compared to 2000. The industrialised countries will have to reduce their emissions by between 25% and 40% for 2020 and by between 80% and 95% for 2050, compared to 1990. However, these efforts will not be sufficient. The IPCC affirms that certain developing countries in South America, Eastern and Central Asia and the Middle East will also have to curb the increase of their emissions by 2020. The participation of these countries in the effort to reduce emissions is considerable, over and above that of the industrialised countries.

The current context of the negotiations for the new post-2012 climate agreement is very different from that pertaining in 1997 when the Kyoto Protocol was concluded. In absolute value, the developing countries today emit as much greenhouse gas than the industrialised countries but represent 80% of the world’s population. Their emissions per inhabitant are thus much lower compared to those of the industrialised countries and it would be unfair for them to be subject to the main restrictions. A political agreement will not emerge unless the specific situations of the developing countries are fairly reflected. The chief challenge facing the negotiators is to provide scope for legitimate development while at the same time guaranteeing drastic reductions of greenhouse gas emissions.

R2: A key must be defined for dividing the efforts required to combat climate change. This key must take into account the responsibility and respective capacities of each country.

Fixing restrictive and precise objectives for the reduction of emissions for all the industrialised countries

When it comes to combating climate change there cannot be any uncertainty as to the exact volume of reduction in emissions necessary to prevent the planet from warming by more than 2°C between now and the end of the century. The solution lies in finding, not what can be done, but what must be done. The Kyoto Protocol fixed a legally binding ceiling for limiting the emissions of thirty industrialised countries. Today, far more substantial reductions must be achieved by all the industrialised countries, including the USA.

R3: The Parties must commit themselves to an objective consisting of an ambitious reduction of emissions for all the industrialised countries. This reduction must be in the region of 25 to 40% for 2020 compared to the 1990 level and must be carried out in priority on their own territory.

R4: The necessary support of the industrialised countries to the limitation of emissions in the developing countries must come on top of this domestic reduction.

Defining actions of differentiated reduction in the developing countries

The developing countries assembled within the “G77/China” group, make up a series of extremely heterogeneous countries in terms of their levels of development and greenhouse gas emissions. From which it follows that differentiated actions for reducing emissions will have to be envisaged. Indicators must be defined in order to identify adapted measures according to the categories of country.

Up to now, the only action in the developing countries recognised by the Kyoto Protocol is the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). This mechanism must generate additional reductions of greenhouse gas emissions and at the same time contribute to the long term sustainable development of the host countries. This objective has still not been attained.

Moreover, the CDM suffers from an intrinsic weakness: since it is centred on a “project” approach it is unable to mount a more global attack on sectors where emissions can be very high, such as transport, housing and electricity generation. Thus one of the challenges confronting the new agreement will consist in revising the CDM in order to improve its impact on the sustainable development of the host countries and its contribution to the reduction of emissions at world level.

Implementing engagements and differentiated actions for the reduction of emissions

At the end of 2007 in Bali, a negotiating approach associating all the industrialised and developing countries was implemented in order to define the future post-2012 climate regime. The type and the nature of mitigation actions and/or commitments on mitigation that will result from these negotiations will be differentiated between industrialised countries and developing countries.
3 Combating the causes of deforestation and forest damage (REDD)

Greenhouse gas emissions resulting from deforestation account for 17% of total world emissions, and 96% of deforestation takes place in tropical regions. Fighting against climate change and halving world emissions by 2050 also involves a major effort by the international community in combating deforestation and forest damage.

4 Expressing adaptation needs in concrete and operational measures

Adaptation to climate change constitutes the third pillar of the Bali Action Plan. By virtue of the convention, the least advanced countries have drawn up National Action Programmes on Adaptation (NAPAs), listing their urgent needs in the field of adaptation and the measures to be implemented in order to address them. But in the absence of available resources, most of these measures have yet to be put into practice. Over and above the by-project approach, an integrated method of adaptation must be promoted.

R5: The Parties must define indicators to be able to differentiate the future reduction actions of the developing countries. The responsibility of the countries in terms of cumulated emissions, their ability to contribute (per capita income) or their potential to reduce emissions (per inhabitant or per GDP intensity) should be adopted by the Parties as key indicators.

R6: The eligibility criteria must be reviewed in order to meet the high environmental and social requirements, by taking into account the criteria developed by the Goldstandard.

R7: The “project” approach of the CDM must be enlarged to embrace an approach by policies or programmes. Different instruments currently under discussion should be studied with greater care to this end: the programmatic CDM, the policies and measures of sustainable development or sector-based approaches. This last type of instrument, covering a multitude of definitions, would make it possible to reduce the sector-based emissions of a developing country, if possible through such incentives as the obtaining of “carbon” credits if the reductions are attained or even exceeded beyond a pre-established reference scenario.

R8: Whatever the action plans to be set up by the developing countries, they will have to be sustained by financing, a technology transfer and reinforced capacities which must be measurable, notifiable and verifiable, in compliance with the Bali Action Plan.

R9: The REDD mechanism will have to provide guarantees for the respect of the rights of local populations, particularly the possibility to decide for their future for native peoples living off the forest. It must not reinforce certain forestry policies which are already unjust towards these peoples.

R10: The REDD mechanism must not be based on a per-project approach similar to the CDM, attached to the carbon market. This could lead to serious “leaks” of carbon towards other territories or countries and constitute an additional incentive for industrialised countries to reduce their emissions in other countries and not on their own territory.

R11: The REDD mechanism will have to be financed by a durable and sufficiently financed fund. Such a fund financing activities addressing the root causes of deforestation and forest damage. In order to perpetuate such funding, compulsory contributions from mechanisms such as the taxation of international air or maritime transport or the use of income derived from from the auction of emissions originating in industrialised countries, should be put in place.

R12: As a matter of priority, funding must be allocated for the implementation of the NAPAs, even before the new post-2012 agreement is concluded.
R13: The local populations, who are particularly concerned by the impact of climate change, must be more closely involved in the definition and application of these NAPAs.

R14: In addition to the NAPAs, actions providing joint benefits for development and reduction of climate vulnerability must be favoured. Such strategies inevitably entail establishing geographical and subject-specific action priorities, in view of the large number of projects that could then be funded.

R15: In order to make the international community’s contribution as effective as possible, it is essential to ensure a systematic integration of adaptation to climate in the development policies and projects.

5 Installing sustainable funding and an effective technology transfer for sustaining developing countries in the fight against climate change

In the Bali Action Plan, the developing countries agreed to launch national plans to reduce their emissions after 2012 provided that such actions are “appropriate in the context of sustainable development” and “backed up by reinforced capacities, funding and technology transfers”. The industrialised countries, the main culprits of the current climate imbalance, will have to contribute to adaptation and emission limitation on the part of the developing countries.

The funding currently available within the framework of the Kyoto Convention and Protocol is woefully inadequate – running to millions of euros whereas what is required is an annual injection of billions of euros. Official Development Assistance, which has been dwindling for several years, will not be enough to meet requirements. It follows that one of the major challenges in the negotiations of the new post-2012 agreement will be to find supplementary funds, at once durable and proportional to these requirements.

R16: The Parties must narrow the scope of the options put on the table up to now concerning innovative sources of funding: allocation of part of GDP to a fund for adaptation, tax on the income derived from the auction of the industrialised countries’ emissions rights, tax in those countries whose per capita emissions are in excess of 1.5 tons of CO2 per year, etc. With this in mind, countries will have to make their choice in a way calculated to ensure lasting and appropriate funding in relation to needs, and to share financial efforts bearing in mind each country’s responsibility and capacity.

R17: The new financing instruments must in all cases come on top of the Official Development Assistance.

The question of technology transfer, whether with respect to emissions or adaptation to the impacts of climate change, is also of central importance. An unprecedented development and dissemination of technologies is essential for keeping the planet from warming by more than 2°C between now and the end of the century and increase the resilience of populations and the countries facing climate change. A change of scale is indispensable and cannot be achieved without removing the economic, regulatory or institutional constraints currently weighing on technology transfer, and without setting up a coherent institutional framework.

R18: Priority must be given to the dissemination of the most efficient existing technologies for reduction (in particular energy efficiency) and adaptation. This transfer must target all developing countries, based on an equity principle and should be adapted to the level of technology. Beyond the transfers North-South, the South-South transfers should also be promoted according to the needs of the countries.

R19: There must be incentives for increased private investment in developing countries, in particular by means of a risk premium guaranteeing investors a minimum profitability.

R20: A coherent institutional framework must be drawn up in order to facilitate the implementation of the measures to be taken regarding technology transfer, and also to ensure a link with the ongoing non-UN initiatives and the non-governmental development and environmental parties to involve such as the private sector.

Contacts in Poznan:
For GRET/ Coordination SUD: Anne Chetaille, e-mail : chetaille@gret.org
For CAN-France: Morgane Créach, e-mail: morgane@rac-f.org