

INDIA CLIMATE WATCH

CSM@Bonn3 (10-14 August 2009)

CSM will be reporting from all the negotiating sessions of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) this year leading up to the Copenhagen (COP15) talks in December 2009. Follow our Daily Updates from the talks in addition to our monthly INDIA CLIMATE WATCH newsletter on the negotiations.

DAY 5 - FRIDAY 14th AUGUST

Headline News

*Small Island Countries and Least Developed Countries join forces on climate change: Two of the most vulnerable blocks of countries - the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) and Least Developed Countries (LDCs) have joined forces to demand for a new Copenhagen Climate Agreement that agrees to limit temperature rise **far below** 1.5 degrees C.*

Long-Term Cooperative Action (LCA) Chair Michael Zammit Cutajar asks all delegates to “please bring your Copenhagen Cards with you to Bangkok and play them there.”

India, Mexico China and many other developing countries reiterate that ‘external fora’ can only help build momentum, but cannot influence the negotiation process here at the UN FCCC climate talks leading to COP15 in December.

Condensing the revised negotiation text makes more progress in some areas than ‘expected’ - Technology Transfer, Capacity Building, Adaptation, and Reducing Emissions through Decreased Deforestation REDD.

China, India make formal statements against trade links and emission caps: both countries table motions that developed country parties shall not resort to any form of unilateral measures including countervailing border measures against goods and services imported from developing countries on grounds of protection and stabilization of climate.

Optimism for Bangkok talks: Countries express their willingness to get some hard work done at the Bangkok session - time for ‘good old negotiations’ come September.

Key Issues of the Day

Day Five: The last day of the Bonn 3 round of negotiations was marked by some degree of optimism from Parties - that they could get 'down to business' at Bangkok, and some even wanted to jump-start the negotiations at Bangkok.

The revised negotiating text has been consolidated in some areas of work, particularly technology transfer, capacity building, adaptation and REDD & LULUCF. The text on Shared Vision (the opening section of the Bali Action Plan in which countries agree there should be an ambitious level of commitment and a strong enough political statement) has also begun to be consolidated into a more coherent form. The outcome of all the consolidation has been a series of informal 'non-papers' that will be out at least two weeks before the Bangkok session for Parties to reflect on.

The actual process on 'negotiations' has not yet begun - although that would have been greatly welcomed. Parties know only too well that negotiations are a highly political and complex process, and seem to be delaying that process for as long as they can. They also see that circumstances are vastly different this time, than they were in Kyoto, in 1997. It could therefore be much harder to agree to a Copenhagen text.

The Chair of the working group on Long-term Cooperative Action (LCA), Michael Zammit Cutajar acknowledged that there are many areas of convergence on which progress can be made. The areas of divergence as also as clear and contentious.

The last session on mitigation concluded with many developing countries asking for a clear distinction between the nature of the targets that developed and developing countries take on. Developing country Parties clearly seem to fear that merging text into one paragraph can provide room for 'alternative interpretations'.

On the tricky issue of targets for Annex I countries and technology transfer and finance, the G77 and China charge that developed countries are blocking negotiations and not putting anything positive on the table (in terms of technology transfer initiatives or commitments to public finance). The US for instance made clear references to the fact that IPR was a fairly non-negotiable issue. The EU has been silent on it, as were Japan and Australia. As for putting down public finance on the table, although Gordon Brown said US\$100 billion per year of public finance is required, the EU has made no comment on this as a grouping.

The uneasy relations between the Indian and US delegations continued, with the US reiterating that they were keen on a deal at Copenhagen in which, in the words of Jonathan Pershing, the head of the US delegation; 'WE WANT AN AGREEMENT WITH ALL OF OUR COLLEAGUES and I STRESS, ALL OF OUR COLLEAGUES'. Both countries agree that the MEF and G20 are key summits that can be potential game-changers. But each is doggedly hoping that their ideas will gain universal acceptance. If the US thinks they can persuade developing countries to accept targets, India thinks it can persuade developed countries to aid in technology transfer and commit finance.

The closing plenary of the Kyoto Protocol (KP) section agreed that the contribution of Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) and REDD were an important part of the process by which developed countries would meet their Kyoto targets. The Chair of the KP also said

that Parties would have to work twice as hard on the ‘numbers’ (developed country targets) to make progress. But the clear lack of ambition from Annex-I countries does not bode well for developing countries including India.

In the LCA closing plenary, the Chair noted that some progress had indeed been made on several sections, but that “nothing is agreed and everything is agreed, which is until the last day at Copenhagen”.

Focus on GOI

India reiterated its positions on the structure and position of the text, on the need to separate developed and developing country MRV targets (commitments that would be Measurable, Reportable and Verifiable), and reiterated that fora such as the MEF and G20, although important in building momentum towards COP15 and Copenhagen, would not and could not be processes whose outcomes could be included in this negotiation process.

Several countries agreed with India on this, raising the valid point that the Major Economies Forum, or the G20 summits, were exclusive, did not include voices from many of the most vulnerable regions or constituencies.

India and China both separately made submissions to the Secretariat on trade and climate issues, nothing that developed country parties shall not take any unilateral decision on taxing the import of goods and services from developing countries that did not take on emission targets.

These statements come close behind the heels of the US Energy and Climate Bill (still to be passed by the Senate), and its implications for international trade. Several developing countries agreed that an open and international economic system is critical to progress and equality.

Views on India

Bangladesh: *India and China are the next big emerging economies. Therefore, the decision they take at this forum, will have several implications for their future. It is only likely therefore, that they will consider their actions very carefully.*

Within the G77, several countries are pushing for more movement at the negotiations, and so far, the negotiations are not proceeding so well, however, one is hopeful that things will move forward in Bangkok.

India will certainly move cautiously in the coming months, and assess the track that the negotiations will take, before taking any hard stand.

Other Links: [Adopt a Negotiator - India](#)
[ECO - the daily newsletter of the Climate Action Network \(CAN\)](#)