



Konrad  
Adenauer  
Stiftung

## Conference

# "Lessons learned from Copenhagen, Cancun and Durban"

Taking stock of the participation of developing and newly industrialising countries to global governance processes on Climate Change

**Tuesday, 31<sup>th</sup> January 2012**

**09.00 h to 15.00 h**

**Conference venue**

Résidence Palace  
Salle Maalbeek  
155, rue de la Loi  
1000 Bruxelles

*(Conference language: English)*

**For more information, please, contact:**

***Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung – "Multinational Dialogue on Development Policy"***

**Andrea E. Ostheimer de Sosa, Programme Director  
Elisabeth Sandfuchs, Research Associate**

**Tel +32 (0) 2 743 24 52 - Fax +32 (0) 2 743 07 49  
e-mail: [mned.brussels@kas.de](mailto:mned.brussels@kas.de)**

This conference aims at providing an overview of the main issues at stake in the process of a yearly negotiation cycle on climate change. Stakeholders from EU Institutions, from developing countries and emerging economies will be brought together to give us their views and will try to make projections and recommendations on the necessary steps in order for the negotiations to come to a successful conclusion. One of the key issues is the question on whether the group or **coalition of countries pushing towards a binding commitment** for the reduction of emissions will be strong enough to prevail. Another issue is how the term "**legally binding**" should be defined for the coming negotiations. Will such a legally binding agreement include sanctions, and if so, what kind? What is the EUs position on this issue compared to other countries? A further theme is the open question on the sources of funding of the **Green Climate Fund**.

Climate change poses one of the most complicated riddles to the international community. Whereas the effects of a projected global warming lie in a distant future and still cannot be predicted with sufficient precision, it is very clear that the fight against these potentially dangerous effects is a task of today's generation. Starting with the Earth Summit in Rio in 1992 the need for an agreement on how to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions has become a subject of long and complicated negotiations. With the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol and the **commitment to reduce six of the most important GHGs<sup>1</sup> of at least 5%** below the level of 1990 it seemed that a good first step had been made but subsequent conferences have not been as successful. The Kyoto Protocol will expire in 2012<sup>2</sup> which makes the need for progress in the yearly negotiations a matter of great urgency.

The reasons why the negotiations prove to be so difficult are manifold: climate change is a long term and not immediately obvious change in the climate and unlike natural catastrophes does not create a sense of urgency to react on it. Also, the countries responsible for the great majority of emissions, the industrialized countries, are not the ones which have to fear the most severe consequences, mostly the least developed countries. Furthermore, in the global power play between countries, the developing countries have so far not been in a position to dictate the terms of agreements and can only revert to remind the industrialized countries of their moral obligation to reduce their emission of GHGs. On the other hand, the industries of emerging economies themselves, even though they may not have caused a great deal of pollution in the past, have now joined the group of big polluters. The economies of China, India, Brazil and South Africa rely on high-emission productive processes, such as agriculture and mining, and most emerging economies regard it as their right to develop these industries even further in order to allow for economic growth.

The negotiations on an agreement for the reduction of GHG emissions are an excellent example of the current status quo in the power relationship between countries and regions. For instance, in the latest rounds of negotiations at the **Cancún summit 2010** the BASIC countries (Brazil, South Africa, India and China) have managed to come to the negotiating table with a joint position which increased considerably their leverage. On the other hand European negotiators have agreed on a common position only at a very late stage and during the negotiation the EU has not been able to speak with one voice. In many cases single member states did not want to follow a joint EU position. The USA on the other hand at first seemed to have reverted their reluctant position with the Obama administration but due to the multitude of pressing foreign relations problems have other than expected not become an explicit supporter of binding GHG reduction goals.

---

<sup>1</sup> Amongst others CO<sub>2</sub>, Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), FCKW in the period between 2008 to 2012

<sup>2</sup> The outcome of the first commitment period of Kyoto shows that **the total emissions** of all industrialized nations with Kyoto-commitments between 1990 and 2008 have **reduced by 6,1%** compared to 1990 levels. **Worldwide the emission trend** points in an entirely different direction: until 2006 global GHG emissions have **risen by 24%** compared to 1990. Besides some industrialised countries, the fast growing emerging countries such as China and India, whose emissions increase steadily, are responsible for this development.

The negotiations during the **summit in Durban 2011** left the observers even more with the question whether this form of negotiations will ever be capable of coming to a substantive result. The negotiations were characterised by intensive block building of groups of countries, most prominently the BASIC countries, which acted as a formal block and took the floor in a very coordinated manner. Also the EU itself acted much more coherently than in previous summits and formed an alliance with developing countries from Sub-Sahara Africa and the alliance of small island states (AOSIS).

At first sight there seem to be positive results, as an agreement to a **binding follow-up arrangement**, the conditions of which have to be finalized by 2015 and which has to enter into force by 2020, was reached. This agreement would include China and India as well as commitments by developing countries, which so far has not been the case. In the meantime, the **Kyoto protocol is to be prolonged** until the new agreement enters into force. Furthermore the **Green Climate Fund** has been formally adopted. The question on the sources of funding for the fund has however yet to be resolved. Also, as the dropping out of Canada from the Kyoto protocol shortly after the summit shows, the agreements stand on very shaky grounds and it's an open question whether the major polluting countries in the end will really adopt a binding commitment. A development which seems to have positively influenced the negotiations is the **alliance of EU negotiators** with African countries and the AOSIS group which exerted pressure to major polluter countries to agree to a binding commitment for reduction of GHG emissions, China, India and also the US. In general the EU seems to have provided a much better negotiation tactic than in Cancún and was indeed able to propose a joint position.

## PROGRAMME

- 09:00**      **Registration of participants**
- 09:15**      **Welcome note by Andrea E. Ostheimer de Sosa**  
Programme Director, Multinational Dialogue on Development Policy,  
Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, Brussels
- Moderator: **Christian Hübner**, Coordinator Environment, Climate and Energy, Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung Berlin
- 09:30**      **The EU, Africa and the climate negotiations: will the alliance between the EU and developing countries have game-changing leverage?**
- Artur Runge-Metzger**, Director, International and Climate Strategy, DG Climate Action, European Commission  
**Alf Wills**, Chief Negotiator UNFCCC COP 17/CMP7 Department Environmental Affairs, Republic of South Africa  
**David Burwell**, Director of the Energy and Climate Program, Carnegie Endowment, Washington D.C.  
**Prof. Qin Tianbao**, Assistant Director, Research Institute of Environmental Law, Wuhan University, Wuhan, China
- 10:30**      **Discussion**
- 11:00**      **Break**
- 11:15**      **The different approaches of the BASIC countries and possibilities to find a common ground. Are greenhouse gas reductions and economic growth mutually exclusive in emerging economies?**
- Duncan Freeman**, Research Fellow, Brussels Institute of Contemporary China Studies  
**David Canassa**, President of the thematic chamber on Energy and Climate Change at the Brazilian Business Council for Sustainable Development (CTClima/CEBDS) and executive manager of sustainability at Votorantim Industrial, Brazil  
**Samuel Dotse (tbc)**, Chief Executive Officer, HATOF Foundation, Ghana
- 11:45      Discussion
- 12:15      lunch
- 13:30**      **The new Green Climate Fund: Support to adaptation and its significance in development cooperation**
- Stefan Agne**, Policy Officer, Unit Climate Finance and Deforestation, DG Climate Action, European Commission/ **Paul Renier**, Deputy Head of Unit Climate Change, Environment, Natural Resources, Water DG DEVCO, European Commission  
**Thomas Hirsch**, Development Policy Representative, "Brot für die Welt"/Bread for the World  
**Lies Craeynest**, EU climate change policy advisor Oxfam International

- 14:15 Discussion
- 14:45 Concluding remarks, **Andrea E. Ostheimer de Sosa**  
Programme Director Multinational Dialogue on Development Policy, Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, Brussels