

Pembina Institute Delegation Report

Ad-Hoc Group on the Berlin Mandate (March 5-8, 1996)

The following four issues were the main ones addressed by the AGBM at its third session:

- quantified emission and limitation reduction objectives,
- policies and measures,
- features of a protocol or other legal instrument, and
- continuing to advance the commitments of developing countries.

This report will only address the first two of these issues.

1. Quantified Emission and Limitation Reduction Objectives

In the view of the Climate Action Network, the most important outcome of the AGBM process must be that industrialized countries make a legally binding commitment at COP-3 to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions 20% below 1990 levels by the year 2005. At the moment, the proposal submitted before COP-1 by AOSIS remains the only one that approaches this target.

While no industrialized country has yet signed on to the AOSIS proposal, Germany did make a new proposal at AGBM 3 that calls on industrialized countries to EACH reduce their carbon dioxide emissions 10% below 1990 levels by 2005, and 15-20% below 1990 levels by 2010. While the EU did not attach itself to this proposal, they made it clear that COP-3 must produce emission reduction commitments for the years 2005 and 2010.

If Canada is to respond to these European initiatives, it must decide what level of emission reductions it would be willing to commit to for the years 2005 and 2010.

At this time, no specific proposals have been made by JUSCANZ members, but there were signs in Geneva that it may become increasingly difficult to develop common positions within the JUSCANZ membership. In particular, the United States and Australia appear to be moving in opposite directions. For example, while the United States clearly signalled a willingness to discuss 'targets and timetables' in the AGBM process, Australia suggested that COP-3 might also produce non-binding instruments like 'resolutions' and 'declarations' in addition to a legal instrument.

If the strains in JUSCANZ increase in the months ahead, Canada must decide whether it is in the Canadian interest to side with the United States or Australia on this issue. We assume it will be important, as many have suggested in the past, to move in 'lock step' with the U.S.