



A PLANETARY CITIZEN'S GUIDE TO THE GLOBAL CLIMATE NEGOTIATIONS

COP 12 – NAIROBI



www.sierraclub.ca

Table of Contents

1. Introduction:	2
2. Global climate treaties:	2
a. In general	2
b. The Climate Agreements – in particular	4
c. UNFCCC Enters into Force	6
d. The Kyoto Protocol	7
e. Kyoto’s Rocky Road	10
3. Successes in Montreal, 2005	11
4. Canada’s Changing Tune:	13
5. The scientific backdrop to the Nairobi global climate negotiations:	13
6. Why the 2006 Kenyan negotiations are important:	15
7. Key issues at the Nairobi global climate negotiations:	16

1. Introduction:

From November 6th – 17th, 2006, Kenya will host the 12th Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the 2nd Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol. Veteran activists from previous negotiations (“climate junkies”) call these meetings “COP12/MOP2.”

If you are walking into a United Nations negotiation for the first time, you are likely wondering what to expect. If you are staying home, but want to make a difference through local activism, you may want a more detailed briefing on the issues and the terminology of all the different concepts.

This Guide is to help you prepare to make the 2006 Global Climate Negotiations in Nairobi as effective as possible and encourage the global community to move towards greater greenhouse gas reductions!

Sierra Club of Canada’s *Planetary Citizen’s Guide to the Global Climate Negotiations* will give you an easy to understand review of the history, science and critical issues that lie ahead.

2. Global climate treaties:

a. In general

There are a lot of different words for binding legal agreements between countries: *treaties, conventions and protocols*.

Environmental agreements generally start as “*conventions*.” A Convention, such as the Vienna Convention to protect the ozone layer, is a broad statement of principles and objectives without binding targets. Every convention has its own formula for *entry into force*

(abbreviated in many UN documents as EIF). The EIF formula is determined in the negotiations. Governments often sign a new convention as soon as it is negotiated, but it also needs to be approved domestically -- through national parliaments and legislatures. That process is called "*ratification*." It is particularly difficult to achieve in the US, where under the Constitution, international treaties require a 2/3 majority in the Senate.

Whenever a country ratifies a convention, that country is known as a "*party*" to the convention. Once the convention has been signed and ratified by enough countries, it *enters into force*.

Every environmental convention is much more than a piece of paper. Each Convention launches a living process. All the countries that have signed and ratified (the *Parties*) meet regularly in a mini-Parliament to make sure the convention meets its goals. These mini-Parliaments are called "*Conferences of the Parties*," or "COPs." The Parties often decide that the vague statement of principles, the Framework Convention, is not enough. Then they negotiate a more meaningful and specific agreement. Any binding legal agreement negotiated by Parties to an existing Convention is called a "*protocol*."

A good example is the progress of the U.N. Framework Convention to Protect the Ozone Layer, known as the Vienna Convention. After a few years, it was very clear that the threat to the ozone layer was urgent and that without specific targets and timelines to eliminate ozone-depleting chemicals, the results would be catastrophic. The countries began working in scientific meetings and diplomatic sessions to develop an approach to real reductions. Those meetings culminated in a meeting in Montreal in September, 1987. The resulting treaty, the *Montreal Protocol*, was the first agreement to set out mandatory reductions of ozone-depleting substances.

The Montreal Protocol is an important agreement to have in mind as we go to Nairobi. For one thing, the Montreal Protocol worked! It is likely the most effective of all global environmental treaties.

The Kyoto Protocol was designed along the same principles and the Montreal Protocol. It embraced the principle that the agreement would be "science-driven" and responsive to new

information of the scale and scope of the threat as it emerged. It also established the principle that industrialized countries should take the first steps. In order to ensure fairness between rich countries and poor countries, the two groups were treated differently under the Montreal Protocol and the same is true for the Kyoto Protocol. There were several reasons for this. For one thing, the problem had been created by the rich countries. For another, the rich countries had better resources to develop technologies to replace the ozone depleters. As well, developing countries had urgent need of better refrigeration and wanted to expand use of ozone depleting refrigerants. And finally, the negotiators wanted to ensure all countries were in the agreement, so developing countries could join in the reduction targets later. So, the successful Montreal Protocol of 1987 called on rich countries to reduce manufacture and use of ozone depleters by 50%, while allowing developing countries to increase, initially.

b. The Climate Agreements – in particular

The beginning of work to limit greenhouse gases by international treaty can be traced to the 1987 Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development (often known simply as “The Brundtland Report,” after its chair, then Norwegian Prime Minister, now head of the World Health Organization., Dr. Gro Harlem Brundtland.) The WCED’s final report, “Our Common Future,” identified three global crises -- a development crisis, an environment crisis and a crisis of militarism.¹ The Brundtland Report called for a major global summit to be held in 1992 to address the most pressing threats, of which climate change was seen as urgent.

Another relevant milestone was the first international public scientific conference, hosted by Canada, in Toronto in June, 1988. “Our Changing Atmosphere: Implications for Global Security” developed a call for a 20% reduction in greenhouse gases against 1988 levels, to be reached by 2005, as an interim step. The conference consensus statement began,

“Humanity is conducting an unintended, uncontrolled, globally pervasive experiment whose ultimate consequences are second only to global nuclear war.”

¹ The issue of militarism was dropped from the “sustainable development” challenge when the U.N. General Assembly approved an agenda for the 1992 Summit on Environment and Development.

Following the Second World Climate Conference in Geneva in 1990, the United Nations General Assembly mandated negotiations in advance of the 1992 Summit, which took place in Rio de Janeiro. The gathering became the largest summit of heads of government, to that point, in world history. The Earth Summit, as it became known, succeeded in approving two global conventions - one to protect biodiversity and the other, the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

The Framework Convention established several important points that have served as foundation for later action. The UNFCCC committed all Parties to a shared commitment to action. It acknowledged that climate change is real, that human activities, from land use changes (deforestation) and burning of fossil fuels were the major sources of the problem, and accepted that awaiting 100% scientific certainty would be to ask for a *post mortem*. The Convention adopted the Precautionary Principle – that a lack of scientific certainty should not be used as an excuse for inaction.

The Convention’s “ultimate objective” is to stabilize “greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.” In other words, the build up of greenhouse gases (GHGs) due to human activity should be stopped before it can become dangerous.

The key word here is “dangerous.” It is a subjective word. If you were in France in the heat wave of 2003, watching the ice melt in the Western Canadian Arctic, or the waters sweep New Orleans in August 2005, or in British Columbia during the fires of 2004, you might well conclude that things are already pretty dangerous. To ensure a science based approach, the Convention relies on an expert group of scientists, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to translate complex science into “advice for policy makers.” The IPCC was created in 1988 and is comprised of scientists from government agencies, universities and private sector, appointed by governments, which review all the peer-reviewed published scientific literature. It is essentially the world’s largest peer review system.

The convention committed the parties to “aim towards” stabilization of GHGs in the atmosphere. It set out two large areas for work:

- Reduction of GHGs, called “*mitigation*” in convention-speak; and,
- *Adaptation* to those levels of climate change that cannot be avoided.

“Mitigation” is a funny term for reducing emissions. To many people, mitigation sounds more like adapting, in the way that projects “mitigate:” an environmental impact through modifications in design. In UNFCCC-speak, “mitigation” means one thing: reducing GHG emissions.

“Adaptation” refers to those policies and practices, such as land-use planning and engineering designs that change to anticipate that level of climatic disruption that can no longer be avoided. Examples of adaptation strategies include drought-resistant cropping, higher levees and dykes in low-lying areas, and not re-building in flood plains. Virtually all aspects of human activity, as well as biological systems and species, will need some kind of adaptive response to the coming impacts of climate change. The poorer countries will have a much harder time than the wealthy industrialized world. (Although with images of Hurricane Katrina victims fresh in our minds, it’s clear the wealthy countries also need far better preparation and adaptive strategies.)

c. UNFCCC Enters into Force

The UNFCCC was signed within two years by over 165 countries. Over 100 ratified, including the United States, Canada and all the Annex 1 (industrialized) countries, so that by March 1994, the convention had entered into force (EIF). By now, almost all countries in the world have ratified. Once legally binding on the parties, the Conference of the Parties (COP) process began. The first COP was in Berlin in 1995. It was at this first and critical negotiating session that a mandate was developed for a way forward. Building on the precedent of the successful Montreal Protocol, the Parties agreed that they should :

“protect the climate system for the benefit of present and future generations of humankind, on the basis of equity and in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities. Accordingly, the developed country Parties should take the lead in combating climate change and the adverse threats thereof.”

COP2 in Geneva in 1996 advanced the work toward a protocol.

COP3 was in Kyoto, Japan in December, 1997. One is tempted to say, “and the rest is history...”

d. The Kyoto Protocol

The Kyoto Protocol followed the principles established in the ozone agreement, the Montreal Protocol. It listed the wealthy industrialized nations in an Annex, called “Annex B.” Quite often discussions about Kyoto will refer to “*Annex I countries*,” because Annex I of the Convention is almost identical to Annex B of the Protocol. Annex I includes the European Union (27 countries as of January 1, 2007), the United States, Canada, Japan, Sweden, Norway, New Zealand, Australia, Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Turkey, Iceland and Switzerland. Annex II is also another relevant group, consisting of Annex I minus the former Soviet Bloc countries, referred to as “*Economies in Transition*” or EIT. Developing countries are also separate. They can be part of the protocol, but do not have emission reduction targets.

The Annex I countries (except for Belarus and Turkey) accepted binding targets for emissions reductions. The greenhouse gases covered by the protocol are:

- Carbon dioxide (CO₂)
- Methane (CH₄)
- Nitrous Oxide (N₂O)
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
- Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
- Sulphur hexafluoride (SF₆)

Based on the 1992 agreement at Rio to allow for “common but differentiated responsibilities,” Annex I countries took on different targets at Kyoto. The European Union, with a negotiating position going into Kyoto demanding 15% global reductions, accepted an overall 8% target. The United States adopted a 7% goal. Canada came in with a 6% promise. All of these reductions were to occur against a 1990 base year. The reductions were to be achieved between 2008 and 2012. This five year time frame is referred to under Kyoto as “*the first commitment period.*”

The Kyoto negotiations were not easy. Most global negotiations are a challenge. Even the successful Montreal Protocol negotiations nearly ended in a dead-lock. Everything fell apart that September week eighteen years ago. The same two groups that so often have been at logger-heads on Kyoto, the United States and the European Union, were not talking. President Reagan had not really wanted to curtail ozone depleting chemicals, and even the Netherlands became unhelpful. New Zealand’s Environment Minister came up with a compromise and thank goodness for it.

By any standard, Kyoto was worse.

It is, of course, the style of U.N. negotiations to achieve agreement by attrition. Negotiations can go into the wee hours of the morning. There is often no food. Vending machine pop and chips keep bleary eyed negotiators at their microphones so long as the translators are willing to make things work in eight official languages. It is a grim and uninspiring spectacle.

While late nights and cliff-hangers are routine, Kyoto’s sleep-deprived brinkmanship remains unsurpassed. The negotiations exceeded the allowable time for the meeting itself. The last round went for an incredible, uninterrupted 36 hour marathon. By the end, the Kyoto convention facility was being dismantled to make room for a trade show. The deal was agreed upon, the ink was still wet as delegates rushed for planes home.

In order to get a deal, Kyoto had emerged with a complex set of brand new concepts. These concepts were generally called “*flexibility mechanisms*.” Many environmentalists called them “loopholes.” Based on the understanding that the global atmosphere is well mixed and it does not matter where emissions are released, three basic kinds of flexibility mechanisms were adopted:

- 1) ***Joint Implementation*** (under which Annex I countries can get credits for funding projects that reduce GHG emissions in other Annex I countries, principally those in the former Soviet Bloc (EIT);
- 2) ***The Clean Development Mechanism*** through which Annex I countries can get credits for funding projects in developing countries that reduce GHG emissions; and
- 3) ***International Emissions trading*** through which Annex I countries can buy and sell carbon credits where one country has exceeded its target and can “sell” its reductions by tonne to another country.

This third element has been the most controversial. It is Russia that has always been seen as the main beneficiary of this provision. As the base year is 1990, when the USSR existed with a large and highly polluting economy, Russia can get credit for the collapse of its economy and resulting decline in GHG. Russia has met and exceeded its Kyoto targets. Trading in the former pollution of the former USSR is generally called trading in “Russian hot air.”

As well, Kyoto included in article 3 the idea that Annex I countries can get credit for enhancing “*sinks*.” In convention-speak, a sink is any natural ecosystem that sequesters carbon, holding it out of the atmosphere. The sinks are generally agricultural and forest sinks under Kyoto, with credits available for projects in farming, afforestation, and reforestation. In other words, if you plant a forest where one was not before, you can get credits under Kyoto. This does not apply to commercial logging. You cannot get credit for cutting down a forest only to plant one.

In order for the Kyoto Protocol to enter into force (EIF) the negotiators came up with a complex formula. The Kyoto Protocol would have to be ratified by at least 55 countries,

but, in addition, those 55 countries would have to be equivalent to 55% of the GHG emissions in 1990.

e. Kyoto's Rocky Road

In 2001, within a few months of President George W. Bush taking office, he pulled the U.S. out of the Protocol, announcing the US would not ratify. President Bush did this without even a pretense of Cabinet consideration and without so much as a conversation with the head of his environmental agency.²

When Bush pulled the US out of Kyoto, he did more than walk away with one vote out of 55. Bush walked away with 25% of global emissions, and 36% of Annex I CO₂ emissions, making the challenge of reaching 55% of Annex I emissions from 1990 far more difficult. Then the US exerted pressure on Russia not to ratify. The Kyoto Protocol was in trouble.

Actually, negotiations had fallen apart even while Bill Clinton was in the White House. In the fall of 2000, at the height of the US Presidential race, the 6th COP took place in The Hague.³ The EU and the US reached an impasse on the rules to make Kyoto work. The President of the COP chose not to end the meeting, but to take a pause of over six months and resume in Bonn at what was known as COP 6 (*bis*). COP6 resumed with Bush denouncing Kyoto, but still sending a US delegation to the COP (as the US was and still is a party to the UNFCCC) and pushed countries to abandon the treaty. The Bonn COP managed to salvage global resolve to keep Kyoto alive. **The world decided it did not and could not afford to wait for George W. Bush.** The effort to develop intricate, detailed, fair and transparent rules continued, while pursuing the up-hill work of achieving ratification.

COP 7 in Marrakech (2001) achieved a breakthrough on key rules for the flexibility mechanisms. By COP 8 in New Delhi (2002), the US was overtly pressing India *not* to accept GHG emission reduction targets. As Bush had used the rationale that Kyoto was not fair

² See Suskind, *The Price of Loyalty*, the story of Bush's first term Secretary of the Treasury, Paul O'Neil who had favoured the Kyoto Protocol.

³ COP 4 had been in Buenos Aires, Argentina in 1998; COP 5 in Bonn Germany in 1999.

because it did not require developing countries to reduce emissions, Bush had an incentive to keep the developing countries from doing what Bush refused to do.

COP 9 in Milan was held while there was still uncertainty about when or even whether Kyoto would come into force. Those difficulties were removed when Putin announced that Russia would ratify. The Russian Duma had ratified by the December 2004 COP 10 meeting in Buenos Aires, but the required waiting period under the formula for EIF meant that the Kyoto Protocol would not officially come into the world as a fully binding instrument until February 16th, 2005.

3. Successes in Montreal, 2005

With ratification by Russia, the Kyoto Protocol officially entered into force as international law on February 16th, 2005. This meant that at the 11th COP in Montreal, the climate negotiations had their first “MOP” or “*Meeting of the Parties*” under Kyoto. Just as the COP series of meetings governs actions under the Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Kyoto Protocol has its own process under MOP. COP and MOP meeting are held in tandem.

This was the first time such a meeting took place in North America, and Canada played a crucial role as President of the negotiations. Volunteers and delegates from around the world, including the United States, showed up in force, making it one of the largest climate negotiations in history with over 10,000 people in attendance. The stakes were high: this meeting could either launch negotiations for a second commitment period after 2012 under the Kyoto Protocol or Kyoto could fall victim to the Bush administration’s strategy of sabotage and die in 2012. Throughout the two weeks, involved citizens kept up the pressure on their delegations and turned up 40,000 strong in the freezing December streets of Montreal to support the continuation of the Kyoto Protocol. Canada’s environment Minister, Stéphane Dion, was presiding the negotiations and worked around the clock (despite being in the midst of a federal election) to make sure the Kyoto Protocol did not die. The outcome of these negotiations was a reinvigorated international community, respect

for Canada's commitment to the Kyoto process, isolation of the anti-Kyoto Bush stance, and the launch of negotiations for a second Kyoto phase beginning in 2013.

“Looking back, I think this is one of the most productive climate change conferences ever. Negotiations were very difficult, but that shouldn't obscure the fact that a great deal was accomplished here.”

- Richard Kinley, acting head of the UN climate change secretariat.

In summary here is what was accomplished in Montreal:

- Kyoto Phase II was launched: Under Article 3.9, delegates agreed that an “ad hoc working group” would be created to complete negotiations to set emission targets for industrialized countries for the next Kyoto phase beginning in 2013. Delegates agreed there would be no “no gap” between the two commitment periods, meaning negotiations for the post-2012 must finish by 2008, or at the very least 2009, to allow countries the time to ratify the new agreement.
- The Marrakech Accords were passed. This is the “rule book” for the Kyoto Protocol.
- It was decided to prepare seriously for COP 12/MOP 2 under Article 9, which requires a review of the protocol and opens the door for both industrialized and developing countries to make commitments further down the Kyoto road.
- The Clean Development Mechanism got a facelift : \$8 million (US) was pledged to help pay for the Secretariat and Executive Board that helps the CDM function properly.
- The Municipal Leaders Summit adopted targets of 30% greenhouse gas reduction below 1990 levels by 2020, and 80% by 2050.
- The US media caught onto the fact that Kyoto had survived Bush administration attempts to kill it. The world realized that the US is moving forward without Bush at the state, city, business, and grass-roots levels.
- Grassroots organizations including youth were highly involved and their enthusiasm and persistence influenced the positive outcome of the negotiations.

4. Canada's Changing Tune:

Little more than a month after Stéphane Dion hammered down the gavel and successfully launched negotiations for Kyoto Phase II, the Liberal government under Paul Martin was defeated and replaced by a minority Conservative government under Stephen Harper. While the new Environment Minister, Rona Ambrose, accepted the position of President of the UNFCCC negotiations (a position the Environment Minister of the country hosting the conference holds for a full year), she and her government wasted no time to trash the Kyoto Protocol and its flexible mechanisms as vehicles for corruption, denounce the Montreal conference as a waste of money, and abandon Canada's Kyoto target. Although it has not officially withdrawn from the Kyoto Protocol, Canada is increasingly aligning itself with the Bush administration. In May 2006, during a two-week session of negotiations in Bonn, Canada's negotiators were instructed to delay negotiations, push for the abandonment of the Kyoto Protocol after 2012 and block discussion of tougher targets for industrialized countries, according to documents leaked to the Globe and Mail and La Presse. Instead of disrupting negotiations, the Canadian delegation should heed scientists' warnings and recognize the need to limit global warming to less than 2°C.

5. The scientific backdrop to the Nairobi global climate negotiations:

Climate change has arrived. Through erratic weather patterns, forest fires and glacier melt we are already experiencing the effects of climate change. Worse, the process of climate change, based on the levels of greenhouse gases we have already put in the atmosphere, is likely to increase the severity and frequency of severe weather events. If we allow levels of greenhouse gases to continue to rise, the disasters of today will be dwarfed by future catastrophic impacts.

Humans have become addicted to fossil fuels for energy, a principal cause of human-generated climate change. The ongoing assault on the world's forests through burning and cutting contribute approximately 20% to the climate change crisis.

Clearly, humanity's principal challenge this century will be to avoid catastrophic levels of anthropogenic climate change. To do this, we must drastically reduce our emissions of GHGs such as carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide that trap heat in the atmosphere, raising global temperature and thereby spurring climate change. We can no longer avoid a significant level of climatic disruption, as atmospheric levels of CO₂ have increased from the pre-Industrial Revolution level of 280 parts per million (ppm) to a current level of 379 ppm -- or more than 30% in the last century, largely due to the burning of fossil fuels. This increase is, in human time frames, irreversible. Our goal must be to avoid even more dangerous levels.

Increasingly, scientists worry that climate change may operate more as a switch than as a dial. Sudden, abrupt and catastrophic impacts may occur at a "tipping point." If we allow global average temperature to exceed 2 degrees Celsius increase over pre-Industrial Revolution levels, then we run an unacceptable risk of reaching a tipping point.

The sorts of sudden and abrupt changes that are now top of mind for many scientists include loss of the Gulf Stream, the collapse of the Western Antarctic Ice Shelf or runaway melting of the Greenland Ice sheet. Any one of these events represents a devastating signal of abrupt climate change with global and catastrophic consequences.

The Gulf Stream could slow and stop due to the changing salt content of the oceans. As the ice in the Arctic melts, fresh water is released. The impact of fresh water at the surface of the ocean could depress the Gulf Stream's warm current. If the Gulf Stream should stall, the impacts are severe for Europe, which would get colder, for China and India, which would lose rainfall and as a result see serious food production crises, all the way around the globe to Texas where dry conditions and higher winds would result in loss of soil. The relationship between a warming atmosphere and a warming ocean include the likelihood of more intense and powerful hurricanes. The US Department of Defence study on climate change (one commissioned by Andrew Marshall and reported in *Fortune* magazine in January 2004), concluded that it was a "plausible scenario for abrupt climate change" that the Gulf Stream could stall in 2010.

The World Meteorological Organization reports that “retreating glaciers in Greenland have revealed patches of land exposed for the first time in millions of years”. The Western Antarctic Ice Sheet is enormous. It contains a mind-boggling 3.2 million cubic kilometres of ice, about 10% of the world's total ice. It appears to be weakened by warmer water eroding its base. No one knows why the water under the sheet is warming or where the water is coming from. It is not expected, but possible that the Western Antarctic Ice Sheet could collapse. The impact would be to change the current IPCC consensus that sea level will rise by up to 0.88 metres by 2100, to a staggering 4-5 metres. The impacts on coastal cities worldwide would be devastating.

What is dangerous? 400 ppm? 550ppm? 700 ppm?

Kyoto was always seen as only a small first step. Avoiding reaching a 2 degree Celsius warming requires far greater reductions in emissions. To avoid 2 degrees C, we need to hold long-term atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases at no more than 400ppm. This requires reductions in global emissions of 30-50% by 2050, relative to the 1990 level, and reductions in industrialized countries' emissions of 80-90% by 2050 below the 1990. By 2020, industrialized countries' emissions need to be 25-30% below the 1990 level.

6. Why the 2006 Kenyan negotiations are important:

The Review of the Kyoto Protocol as mandated under article 9 will officially be launched in Nairobi. Article 9 is among other things, a forum to discuss how to deepen the involvement of developing countries such as China in reducing emissions under Kyoto Phase II. Another important element at Nairobi will be the second meeting of the “Ad Hoc Working Group” under article 3.9 mandated to negotiate national GHG targets for industrialized countries in a post-2012 regime. This group will need to set a course for much deeper reductions than those of the first phase of the Kyoto Protocol.

Going into Nairobi, we need to keep in mind that Kyoto Phase II needs to be agreed on by 2009 at the latest so progress in extending and strengthening the Kyoto Protocol needs to be swift. The negotiations in Kenya will be crucial on several fronts because they should set the world on course towards deep reductions of GHG emissions.

Nairobi will also be an opportunity for African delegations to show up in force and express to the world the catastrophic consequences that climate change caused by the world's richest countries is already wreaking on the world's poorest continent. Over the past thirty years, the African Sahel region has already experienced an average 25% decrease in rainfall.

Throughout the continent, it is not uncommon for some countries to experience both drought and floods in the same year, such as Ethiopia in 2006 when it suffered drought early on in the year, then severe floods leading to the death of more than 200 people, and 250 people still missing. Droughts in Africa can often lead to famine and widespread disruption of socio-economic wellbeing and with further climate change, extreme weather events are predicted to become more frequent and severe. Climatic variation is the main cause of droughts in Kenya. Projected climate change by the year 2025 will exacerbate agricultural losses already experienced due to drought⁴. The Kenyan Minister who will be presiding over the negotiations has clearly stated that Adaptation and African participation in Clean Development Mechanism projects are high priorities on the agenda.

Canadians will have to keep a close eye on their delegation. For the first time in fourteen years, the Canadian government has refused to have environmental organizations be a part of the delegation. Canada needs to play a constructive role in the negotiations and recognize its historical responsibility as an industrialized country to make the first step towards emissions reductions. It is perfectly possible to envision Canada pushing for a complete review of the Kyoto Protocol under Article 9, and use the review to avoid new targets under article 3.9. They have already indicated that they could push for targets for developing countries, which is a hard line for a country that isn't even trying to meet its own existing target under Kyoto. The most critical issue before the negotiators in Nairobi will be to move forward in negotiating deep reductions for industrialized countries.

7. Key issues at the Nairobi global climate negotiations:

The International Climate Action Network has identified several key outcomes from Nairobi that would allow the global community to reach an agreement by 2008-2009 on Kyoto Phase II:

⁴ UNFCCC; "Background paper on Impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change in Africa", September 2006

- **Agreement to continue the processes under article 9 and 3.9 beyond Nairobi.**
This must include frequent meetings, close linkage of the two in order to move quickly and efficiently in order to reach agreement on amendments to the Kyoto Protocol for Phase II;
- **A detailed and adequate workplan for article 9 review** which would lead to increased participation in mitigation by large polluters of the developing world. Article 9 review should also include an analysis of the science lasting no longer than one year. The analysis would include:
 - Emission reductions needed to prevent a 2 degree rise in global temperatures (we have already experienced 0.8 degrees rise);
 - Dividing commitments equitably between industrialized and developing countries;
- Adaptation strategies should be expanded and funded by industrialized countries in the Kyoto Phase II;

Other things to watch out for:

- Geological Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS): The Clean Development Mechanism will be discussed in several discussions forums. It's important that carbon capture and storage *not* be included under CDM as it is not a sustainable method of addressing climate change.
- Some parties may push for discussion on further commitments to occur under the Convention "dialogue" launched in Montreal, because it would include the US and Australia. The pressure to develop some sort of deal which might get Bush into the tent could be significant. Clearly, anything that Bush would sign would be worse than useless; it would be dangerous. We should continue to build on the successes of Montreal, and make sure negotiations for future commitments remain under the Kyoto Protocol.

APPENDIX 1

Emission Reduction Chart

Countries included in Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol and their emissions targets.

Country	Target (1990** - 2008/2012)
EU-15*, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Monaco, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland	-8%
US***	-7%
Canada, Hungary, Japan, Poland	-6%
Croatia	-5%
New Zealand, Russian Federation, Ukraine	0
Norway	+1%
Australia	+8%
Iceland	+10%

* The EU's 15 member States will redistribute their targets among themselves, taking advantage of a scheme under the Protocol known as a "bubble". The EU has already reached agreement on how its targets will be redistributed.

** Some EITs have a baseline other than 1990.

*** The US has indicated its intention not to ratify the Kyoto Protocol.