

Alfred Willis, coordinator of G77 Plus China for Kyoto Protocol, addressed a press conference on October 08, 09.

Transcript:

“I think underneath the label, the group of developing countries is prepared to do a fair share in the protocol... However the reality that we face is that the cause of the fundamental emissions, which result in global warming are to a large extent the responsibility of what has been emitted... And that is the scenario of equity .. In that context the international community came together and developed the Convention on climate change, which, as the Ambassador points out, provides a strong foundation for the climate regime.

And in (this) case we as a group are permitted to negotiate the inclusive, fair sectors of the regime and (are) coming forward to take control. We are saying that the Convention itself provides principles, or the rules of the game. Principles upon which this regime is based and where it has already been agreed and included in the Convention that developed countries lead and along with that runs the principle of the Common but Differentiated Responsibilities...

(What) we have done in 1997 is to negotiate the elaboration of one particular aspect of the convention, which is that developed countries or Annexe I parties need to take the lead in that context negotiated in Kyoto Protocol. And I must tell you that most instruments thus far have been extremely effective.

The KP provides you with three instruments- emissions trading within developed countries, Joint Implementation (JI) between Annexe I countries and also former Soviet Union countries and the Clean Development partnership between developing countries.

In real terms today, as we see the CDM has delivered 333 million tones of CO₂, what is the action taken by developing countries to contribute to the effort? By 2012, all the projects that have been registered, it is estimated that amount would rise to 3.5 billion tones of CO₂.

And if you took lifetimes of projects in the pipelines, that amount rises to 6.2 billion tones. That is just one example of how effective the KP is. It is the position of the group then, if we are going to move forward and develop a regime, where developed countries take the lead and developing countries are enabled and supported to contribute their fair bit to the overall effort, then what we will be able to do is to elaborate the other aspects of the Convention, which exist and are already laid out.

Those aspects includes the obligations of all parties to take action, including obligations of developed countries to support developing countries with finance and taking action; the obligations of developed countries to provide technology support.

We believe the purpose of our work here is to build on the successes that we already have and to strengthen the international climate change regime and in that context our understanding of what we agreed at Bali (is relevant).

The KP (Kyoto Protocol) requires deep and ambitious targets to be stated by developed countries as signal to the world that, in fact, they are taking the lead in this global effort. We are developing under the Convention an outcome, which provides, as you well know, a space for the US to take on legally binding, quantified emission reduction commitments, which are comparable to those commitments taken on by developed country parties joining the KP.

It also provides us with the space to fill elaborately, how developing countries will contribute their fair share to developing mitigation. (It) also provides for that additional action that developing countries take to be supported by finance and technology and capacity building.

So in broad terms, that is the structure of how we are approaching this regime. And we are fully committed to that. Our concern is: what if it is the actual facts that the developed countries have avoided and (they) got buried in discussions of high technicalities and details but in reality have avoided keeping deep and ambitious targets for the second commitment period beyond 2012?

In fact, the pledges which are currently on the table, if you exclude the US, adds up only to 19-22% and if you add the commitments that President Obama has made from 1990 levels by 2020...you do know its another low... In aggregate (terms), emissions reduce by about 11-18%.

And if you refer to the IPCC science, this is a huge gap between what the IPCC says the developed countries need to achieve. There is a huge gap between what they've put on the table and what they need to achieve. And that is the fundamental issue that we have.

And our sense at the moment is that there are moves to try to collapse the KP... into one process and to create one outcome in Copenhagen and not build on (the existing structure).