

- 2 -

Having brokered the deal which led to the Declaration, Canada chose not to register its views on the final text. Yet this left many of our JUSSCANNZ colleagues wondering just where Canada stood.

In his statement to the Plenary on behalf of Canada, **Minister Marchi** chose to focus on the potential health and ecosystem impacts for Canada from climate change, particularly the recent Mackenzie Basin study. He also pointed out that current projections show Canada as falling well short of the stabilization target. Missing from his statement were ideas that had been a feature of past Canadian interventions -- Canada's unique, national circumstances, the challenges of an energy intensive economy, and our interest in a longer timeframe for commitments.

Targets and Timetables and Harmonized Policies and Measures

These are the two most important aspects of the Berlin Mandate from the perspective of Canadian business. Important issues remain with respect to the levels of emissions reductions, whether multi-party obligations should be pursued, and the question of base year and target years.

Little progress was evident in narrowing the gap on **targets and timetables**. The European Union has shifted focus somewhat to the issue of concentration levels in the atmosphere, but this reflects the inability of EU members to agree on a specific reduction target. Nonetheless, their selection of a concentration level of less than 550 ppm is significant, since this would represent an eventual reduction of at least 50% from current levels of emissions. In the absence of an EU-agreed target, Germany and the United Kingdom merely restated their previous positions.

As noted above, it is important to look carefully at the **American statement**. While indicating that the Berlin Mandate process should set a "realistic, verifiable and binding" medium term target, they gave no indication of a reduction goal or a target year, and were vague on the base year of 1990. They pointed to the need to ensure flexibility in implementation, including a longer timeframe for reductions, greater use of joint implementation and global emissions trading, and the ability of countries to choose the approach that best suits their national circumstances. Finally, they specifically rejected the targets proposed to date by Germany and AOSIS.