



Ministry of Environment and Forests
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

STATEMENT OF
MR JAIRAM RAMESH,
MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT & FORESTS (INDEPENDENT CHARGE)
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
AT THE 7TH MEF MEETING, ROME, ITALY

JUNE 29TH/30TH, 2010

I am delighted to be able to attend this MEF meeting.

[I] MRV

I was able to participate in the previous meeting only by video conference and I hope the suggestions I had made on operationalising Paras 4 and 5 of the Copenhagen Accord relating to MRV for both developed and developing countries were found useful by MEF participants. I wish to reiterate the main points that I had made.

Para 4 of the Accord enjoins the COP to develop appropriate guidelines for MRV of actions of developed country Parties. This is important to recall and stress since the entire focus in the MRV debate over the past year has been on developing country mitigation actions. It is also important that such an MRV regime includes not only MRV of emission reduction commitments but also MRV of the targets, timeframes and regimes related to the transfer of finance and technology to developing countries. The MRV on finance assumes urgent importance for all of us need to know very clearly how much of the additional \$ 30 billion pledged by the developed countries during 2010, 2011 and 2012 has materialised so far, how precisely are disbursements to take place, what the mix between bilateral and multilateral assistance is and to which countries and for what purposes are the funds going to flow. The one area where there is some clarity is REDD+ where \$4.5 billion has been pledged.

Four crucial action points are embedded in Para 5 of the Accord:

1. Mitigation actions of non-Annex I Parties to be communicated to UNFCCC Secretariat through NATCOM consistent with Article 12.1(b), every two years, **on the basis of guidelines to be adopted by COP.**
2. Mitigation actions taken by Non-Annex I Parties will be subject to their domestic measurement, reporting and verification (DMRV), the result of which will be reported through their NATCOMs every two years.
3. Non-Annex I Parties will communicate information on the implementation of their actions (NAMAs) through NATCOMs, with provisions for **international consultations and analysis under clearly defined guidelines that will ensure that national sovereignty is respected.**
4. NAMAs seeking international support will be recorded in a registry along with relevant technology, finance and capacity building support. They will be subject to international measurement, reporting and verification **in accordance with guidelines adopted by COP.**

I had made the following suggestions to put these four action points into practice:

- International consultations and analysis as envisaged in action point # 3. above must be based on country implementation reports (derived from the respective NATCOM) prepared by the individual countries themselves so as to fulfil the “respect for national sovereignty” promise contained within action point # 3. itself. A chapter/issue format for such reports can be agreed to by the COP.
- The frequency of international consultations and analysis can be somewhat akin to the graded system adopted by the WTO for its trade policy reviews—some countries get reviewed once every two years, some others once every four years and most others once every six years or more depending on share of world trade.
- There has to be a multilateral anchor for the international consultations and analysis process. The Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI) of the UNFCCC should consider, sooner rather than later, how this process should be set in motion. SBI functions under the Convention to perform this kind of work and has fairly well laid out procedures in respect of reports of both Annex I and Non Annex I countries. We should allow SBI to get on with this task and fulfil the expectations resulting from our current state of negotiations.

It bears repetition that the regime for MRV for Non-Annex I countries cannot be more onerous than that for the Annex I countries either in form or content or the consideration of their actions. Non-Annex I countries should have a regime that is subject to consideration in terms of Article 10. 2 (a) of the UNFCCC.

[III] EQUITY

I want to emphasise that the issue of MRV cannot be seen in the absence of another critical issue in the climate change discussions – the issue of equity. Without a working paradigm of equitable access to carbon space, what exactly will be the role and nature of MRV is far from clear and cannot be agreed.

Therefore I also want to take this opportunity to bring the issue of **equity, equitable access to the carbon space / equitable burden sharing**, which seems to be sliding out of the negotiating discourse, back into the mainstream.

MRV must include a determination of an allocative principle and an equitable allocation of carbon space. This is particularly relevant in the context of the adequacy of actions of developed countries. This is critical if we are to have an international agreement at Cancun.

The June 10, 2010 text of the AWG-LCA text, that was rejected by most Parties, had this to say in Para 2: *Deep cuts in global emissions are required according to science, and as documented in the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC, with a view to reducing global emissions so as to maintain the increase in global temperature below [1.5][2] degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels, and that Parties should take action to meet this objective consistent with science and on the basis of equity, taking into account historical responsibilities and access to global atmospheric resources.*

I have two observations on this formulation.

First, this Para has **no reference to the foundational principle of CBDR and respective capabilities**, which is enshrined in UNFCCC. This is unacceptable. Incidentally, in this context, I must mention I have read Todd Stern's speech at Brookings some weeks back where he has given a completely new interpretation to CBDR—new to the rest of the world, that is. I think we need to understand this interpretation in some detail

Second, this Para **omits the need for a paradigm for equitable access to precede any agreement**. This is unacceptable. Any discussion on a global goal – whether for limiting temperature increase or emissions reduction – is incomplete, meaningless and impossible in the absence of such a paradigm. **There is no substitute for the equitable access paradigm**. Unilateral pledges, for example, do not and cannot substitute for this paradigm.

Equitable access has been an integral part of previous texts in the AWG-LCA, for example in the LCA Chair's text in Copenhagen that was adopted in Copenhagen and was also in the present Chair's May 2010 text. The previous text said in two places: (1) that a goal for emissions reduction as part of the shared vision must include "taking into account historical responsibilities and an equitable share in the atmospheric space" and (2) that Parties recognise the broad scientific view that the temperature increase should not exceed 2 or 1.5 or 1 degree, "preceded by a paradigm for equal access to global atmospheric resources. **I therefore strongly propose that all of us agree to restore these texts in the relevant two places and send the message to our negotiators.**

Moreover, **it is vital that these principles be operationalised** so that the equity paradigm in sharing atmospheric space is spelt out in practical terms. Carbon space is development space and therefore we must agree on an appropriate methodology to determine carbon space that has been used up and that can be used in future, the rights and allocations for this space between developed and developing countries, including the implications for finance and technology transfers to developing countries.

It is critical that we arrive at an operational set of formulae on equity based primarily on cumulative per capita emissions. Some scholars have also suggested that allocation of per capita emissions must be supplemented with the fact that the level of development of a country is important in determining what level of per capita emission may be appropriate. A country with low per capita income, with little infrastructure, few climate-friendly technologies and little organisational capacity requires a higher per capita emissions entitlement compared to a developed country with well developed infrastructure, technology and capacity. Thus the carbon space concept also means that poorer countries need more carbon space in order to achieve the same level of per capita income than richer countries.

The **carbon budgets approach**, made explicit by think tanks in Germany, UK, Brazil, China, India and other countries as well as the South Centre, Geneva, provides a useful basis for conceptualising and operationalising equity, and must be brought to the mainstream of our discussions and negotiations.

I am just coming for attending an international conference on “Global Carbon Budgets and Equity in Climate Change” that India hosted. We had participants from Germany, UK, Brazil and Malaysia, and the proposals on equity and carbon budgets were discussed in great detail. The BASIC Group is meeting in Rio de Janeiro in late-July and we have set aside a day to have a technical workshop on equity related issues. These are important discussions and we must now bring these concrete proposals from the margins into the core of our negotiations. **If only lip service continues to get paid to equity, and if we pay obeisance to it only in words and think we have addressed the issue, I am afraid that no international agreement will be possible.** Therefore after the workshop in Rio, the BASIC and other developing countries would like to bring our concrete proposals to the other members in the UNFCCC. We hope that a workshop can be organised so that negotiators can discuss how to integrate these concepts and how to operationalise the equity principles into the negotiations and the negotiating text. **India would be delighted to host a meeting before Cancun to enable this discussion.** Hopefully we can make tangible progress on this by Cancun and in Cancun. **Let us work together collectively to ensure that Cancun becomes an equity-based conference and not one that gives a burial to it.**