Focusing on What Unites Us Rather Than What Divides Us
Developed Countries Failing

Principal/Analysis

• Efforts of developed countries insufficient by all measures, as a result we are headed to 3.5° and beyond

• Developed countries have a moral obligation to repay a climate debt by 1) scaling up their reductions to 40-50% on 1990 levels by 2020, in financing developing country mitigation, adaptation, climate resilient development.

Strategic Implications

• Financial crisis leading to austerity budgets in most developed countries and increasingly to social upheaval. Prioritizing climate finance only politically feasible if there is a strong public mandate for climate action. This is currently not generally the case – climate is not at the top of the list of electoral issues.
The Blame Game

Principal/Analysis

• The greatest blame for the failure of the UN climate regime to keep us on track to 1.5-2° lies with the US, and those who stand with and behind them.
• China was unfairly blamed for the failure of Copenhagen.
• If the US were to take its full responsibility, it would unlock greater flexibility by others.

Strategic Implications

• At the same time, we must recognize that EVERY govt has its own national agenda, which at times will lead to obstruction in the climate negotiations. We should call them out, but when appropriate place criticism within the broader context of who is really to blame. Apart from LDCs, every country should be asked to do more.
Urgency

Principal/Analysis

• 1.5° to stay alive
• 2° threshold between catastrophic locally and catastrophic globally
• 80% (Carbon Tracker)/2/3rds (IEA) fossils must be left in the ground
• We are all in the same boat

Strategic Implications

• Every country must pull out all the stops, and we must demand it of them.
• There are no technical barriers – but we have not yet catalyzed sufficient political will in the major economies.
• “I’ll move when you move” is leading to a race to the bottom.
• Even with political will, could developed countries actually transform their economies fast enough?
UNFCCC is Failing

Principal/Analysis
- The UNFCCC process is failing to deliver the necessary scale of action.

Strategic Implications
- What’s the alternative? Imagine if Bolivia had succeeded in collapsing Cancun? Would we be better off now?
Principal/Analysis

• It is wrong for the US to argue that they shouldn’t do more unless China does more.
• But all countries, including large developing countries, could do more.
• And some developing countries (Saudis, Qatar, etc.) could do MUCH more.

Strategic Implications

• Who should be held account for the emissions resulting from overconsumption? The consumer or producer country?
• Unless BASIC calls the US bluff, commits to greater ambition and unlocks higher EU ambition, we will continue the race to the bottom.
• Do BASICs actually want a stronger agreement, or are they happy hiding behind US intransigence?
• G-77 solidarity – does it help or hurt? What about the role played by the OPECs? LMG, many of whom have not put forward NAMAs?
A Fair International Agreement

Principal/Analysis
• A fair agreement would take account of historical and per capita emissions.

Strategic Implications
• See questions in relation to financial crisis and urgency. How do we change the politics (including public mandate) in the time frame we have available? What would it take in practice?
Principal/Analysis
• CBDRRC must be maintained

Strategic Implications
• But should countries have the right to remain on the Annex 2 (or Annex 1) forever?
Polluters Should Pay

Principal/Analysis

• Polluters should not get a free ride.
• Major fossil polluters have deliberately distorted the facts and manipulated countries.

Strategic Implications

• Does this imply we need to put a price on carbon? Cap and trade? A carbon tax? Market-based solutions?
Kyoto Must be Preserved

Principal/Analysis
• It’s the only legally binding agreement we have requiring developed countries to cut their emissions. We therefore need to build on it.

Strategic Implications
• Fewer countries participating, lowering the total percentage of emissions covered under the agreement.
• Do we need a comprehensive and legally binding replacement by 2015? Do we agree that all countries should be legally bound to take action (whether in the form of absolute cuts or major rejection on projected increases)?
• One of Kyoto’s major features if the carbon market it has created. How do we on the one hand support Kyoto, and on the other hand oppose the carbon market?