

JULY 29, 2008

Secretary General John Podesta
Day 2 Remarks: Summit on Managing Long-Term Climate Change
Washington, D.C., October, 2015

Welcome back to our second day of discussions – I am greatly encouraged by our work yesterday and believe we will successfully move together today toward a Framework Agreement.

- At the end of the day yesterday, I identified areas of particular concern I found in your discussions—I recommend that those areas be the focus of your negotiations today.
- We are also handing out all of your proposals from yesterday; you are welcome to consider proposals other than those I specify.
- But the areas I've identified are the ones I believe are crucial to reaching a successful Framework Agreement.
- I recommend that we break into four groups for further discussion and elaboration. The issue teams looking at my recommendations will be:
 - Country Team Leaders;
 - Migration;
 - Resource scarcity and disaster relief (we felt there was sufficient overlap and commonality to warrant combining these two);
 - And emissions reductions.
- Before I present my recommendations, I'd like you to look at the Issue Team Assignments we've distributed – please take 5 minutes to discuss your issue team assignments with your delegation and make sure that you are in agreement, and notify us of any changes.
- Now, let me present my proposal for what should be addressed in the Framework Agreement.

JULY 29, 2008

COUNTRY TEAM LEADERS

- 1) Based on yesterday's discussion, you have a great deal of common ground in the principles that should guide a Framework Agreement. First, I ask Country Team leaders to focus on developing shared, overarching principles for the Framework Agreement.
- 2) Of course, your teams will also be looking to your for guidance in their deliberations, and I ask that you keep in mind your charge to lead us all to an agreement.

MIGRATION

- 1) On migration, I suggest you start your negotiations by working to develop a common definition of "climate refugee" or "environmental refugee."
 - The EU proposed: "One who is displaced from his or her homeland and cannot return due to a) short term issues (natural disaster, etc) or b) long term effects of climate change (deforestation, water shortages)."
- 2) I recommend you also discuss how to share and improve information on refugee movements and best practices for dealing with internally displaced people and cross-border migrants.
- 3) Finally, there was a great deal of discussion yesterday about institutional arrangements – I hope you may be able to reach an agreement on whether we need a new international institution, a new mandate for old institutions including the UNHCR, regional organizations, bilateral treaties, or national policies – or perhaps even all of these?

NATURAL RESOURCES/DISASTERS

- 1) In natural resources and disasters, I ask you to attempt to reach an agreement on whether and how to expand development assistance.
- 2) In a related concern, consider focusing on whether and how to promote a new "green revolution" – or the technologies and practices that will allow agricultural productivity to

JULY 29, 2008

continue or increase even in difficult climate conditions. Saltwater and drought resistant seeds, for example. Dr. Pachauri mentioned this yesterday.

- 3) Next, although it was not a major part of your deliberations, I recommend you discuss how to clarify rights and responsibilities on water resources, especially for headwaters and strategic watersheds and for contested territorial rights.
- 4) Finally, I ask that you consider the establishment of a new international disaster relief organization; alternatively, consider whether the mandate of UN Peacekeeping Operations can be expanded or used as a model – some of you called it “Green Helmets.”
 - a. Not to prejudice the outcome of your discussions, but as I indicated yesterday, I am skeptical of this proposal, simply because of how difficult it is to get resources to fully staff peacekeeping operations. I would like you to take that reality into account as you consider this proposal.

EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS

The fourth issue team, emissions reduction, will focus on a difficult area for discussion. The fact is that you all want your economies to grow and your futures to be secure, and that is completely reasonable -- but it will be difficult to achieve both if we continue to fuel our growth the way we are today.

Let's review what happened yesterday:

- 1) India offered a bold proposal: they pledged a 30% CO₂ reduction by 2025 and reaffirmed the 80% reduction by 2050; BUT this was conditional on developed nations reducing their emissions, according to historical and per capita contributions, and on developed nations transferring clean energy and end use technologies that will make India's reductions feasible.
- 2) China wants a road map, the transfer of clean technologies and other assistance, incremental progress, and also asks for conditionality on action from the developed nations.
- 3) The U.S. and EU offered to reduce near-term emissions (in the case of the EU, specifically by putting a global price on carbon), push innovation, provide aid, and

JULY 29, 2008

engage in technology transfers, with some conditions, including enforcement mechanisms.

There is a high degree of overlap here. At first glance, it would appear that India and China want what the EU and United States have to give -- but the difficulty truly is in the details. I would like to invite Drew Jones and his team to present to you their assessment of the potential outcome of your discussions yesterday.

[Jones makes presentation]

So you can see, we have a problem. Ideally, I'd like to see if you can work together to move toward real emission targets for developed and developing countries alike, perhaps based on a roadmap approach.

But I want to be honest with you, because there is so much at stake. The bottom line is that this isn't really about targets. Sometimes, I suspect the focus on targets has long been a way to avoid the larger question.

We all -- China, India, the United States, and the countries of Europe -- we all need to do everything it is possible to do right now to cut emissions as much as possible. For India and China, I believe that will have to mean using energy far more efficiently than you now do. For the United States, you must bring down per capita energy consumption as well as massive movement to carbon-free sources. For the EU, your gains must be more uniform across your member states.

But even if we do all it is possible to do, it won't be enough. It will not get us an 80 percent reduction by 2050 -- certainly not with our economic growth intact.

We are going to have to find new ways to grow our economies; we are going to have to use energy other than fossil fuels, or find a way to remove the carbon. That will require far more innovation and commercialization of new technologies, far faster than we're achieving today.

In your negotiations, I hope you will be able to have a more honest conversation about what you think you need in order to make these things happen. What do you need from each other and what are you prepared to give? Before you break into our groups, do we have any questions?