

No matter what targets are ultimately agreed to at COP-3, a number of countries argued at AGBM 3 that it was necessary to find a mechanism for differentiating commitments across industrialized countries. The Climate Action Network believes that negotiations on differentiation will significantly slow down the AGBM process and are unlikely to succeed. Indeed, the problematic nature of such negotiations was made clear by the fact that all countries that spoke of differentiation described how it should be structured to benefit them.

To avoid a lengthy and fractious debate on differentiated commitments, Canada must determine if concerns about 'equity' can be addressed through other mechanisms that grant 'flexibility'. For example, could common targets in each country or a single target that applies across all Annex I Parties, implemented in conjunction with joint implementation within Annex I Parties, address equity concerns?

Finally, the Netherlands put the debate on targets and timetables into context by stating that the recent findings of the IPCC make it clear that a doubling of carbon dioxide equivalent concentrations in the atmosphere is dangerous and must be avoided. This view is shared by the Climate Action Network.

Canada, as a leader in the area of climate change science, must decide if it supports the Netherlands' position and if it can support a statement by Ministers at COP-2 that this objective must guide the AGBM negotiations.

## 2. Policies and Measures

The Climate Action Network believes that the AGBM process should only address those policies and measures that would result in significant greenhouse gas emission reductions and require international cooperation or coordination to be implemented. Environmental groups are completely opposed to wasting the AGBM's time on the development of a 'menu' of policies and measures from which countries could voluntarily pick and choose - every country already has a menu of policies and measures it can choose from.

It was clear at AGBM 3 that a number of countries believe that there are some policies and measures that would benefit from international cooperation/coordination. Examples provided include measures to reduce HFC emissions, improve fuel economy in automobiles, or reduce emissions from aircraft fuel. While no solid proposals are yet on the table, the EU did identify four initial areas with potential for international policy coordination.

On the other hand, both the United States and Japan stated clearly that they were not interested in discussing international cooperation/coordination of any measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions - they support the 'menu' approach. In their view, countries must design and implement greenhouse gas emission reduction measures on a unilateral basis.