



**Fourteenth Session of the Conference of the Parties to the  
United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change  
and  
Fourth Session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol**

December 1-12, 2008  
Poznań, Poland

Governments meeting at the U.N. Climate Change Conference in Poznań, Poland, resolved to shift into “full negotiating mode” next year in hopes of delivering on their goal of a comprehensive new climate change agreement in December 2009 in Copenhagen. Major outcomes of the two-week conference focused largely on the negotiating process itself, but delegates from some 190 nations also engaged in a number of substantive skirmishes that previewed some of the difficult issues ahead.

The conference – known formally as the as the Fourteenth Session of the Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP 14) and, in parallel, the Fourth Session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (COP/MOP 4) – marked the midpoint between the 2007 Bali conference that launched a new negotiating round and next year’s highly anticipated conference in Copenhagen.

While lacking the tension and drama of the Bali conference, the Poznań meeting was marked by a sense of anticipation as delegates looked toward the inauguration of Barack Obama as U.S. president to inject new momentum into the long-stalled climate negotiations. Eyes also were on Brussels, where European Union leaders were simultaneously concluding their own difficult negotiations on rules for implementing the EU’s 2020 emissions target.

Among the key outcomes were “work programs” for 2009 for the two parallel negotiating tracks – one under the Framework Convention, the other under the Kyoto Protocol – which are expected to converge in a package deal in Copenhagen. Governments also presented and debated a number of concrete proposals for potential elements of a new agreement, which were compiled in a lengthy “assembly document” that will be a starting point for next year’s negotiations. At least four negotiating sessions are planned over the coming year, with the possibility of a fifth to be decided later.

During the high-level segment of the conference, Ministers delivered statements and participated in a roundtable discussion laying out their expectations for Copenhagen. The European Union called on developed countries as a group to reduce their emissions 30 percent below 1990 levels by 2020, and developing countries to reduce theirs 15 percent to 30 percent below business as usual. Developing countries, meanwhile, emphasized actions

they are already taking to reduce emissions, and the need for stronger support from developed countries if they are to go further. Many Ministers stressed that the global economic crisis should be seen not as a deterrent, but rather as an opportunity to advance efforts that simultaneously address climate change and contribute to economic recovery. Some also expressly welcomed President-elect Obama's recent statements on climate change.

Among the areas of divergence that began to emerge was the potential legal form of a Copenhagen agreement. South Africa, for instance, suggested that what may be needed is a new instrument with legally binding elements alongside the Kyoto Protocol. When parties were asked to approve a chair's summary of the Ministers' roundtable discussion, however, China and India objected that the document referred to a Copenhagen outcome that "can be ratified by all," language that implies a new legal instrument.

On the closing day of the conference, talks ran well into the night as negotiators wrangled over two issues relating to finance for developing countries: institutional arrangements for the Kyoto Protocol's Adaptation Fund, and a proposal by developing countries to raise additional adaptation funding through a broader levy on international emissions trading mechanisms. While the United States did not engage directly on either issue because it is not a party to the Kyoto Protocol, U.S. negotiators watched closely, as both seemed to preview broader issues likely to come into play on the road to Copenhagen.

Following is a summary of key outcomes of the Poznań conference (the full text of decisions is available at [http://unfccc.int/meetings/cop\\_14/items/4481.php](http://unfccc.int/meetings/cop_14/items/4481.php)):

### **Ad Hoc Working Group – Kyoto Protocol**

At COP/MOP 1 in Montreal, Kyoto parties launched an Ad Hoc Working Group to negotiate new commitments for Annex I (developed country) parties for the period beyond 2012, when the existing Kyoto emission targets expire. In the three years since, the group, dubbed the AWG-KP, has delved deeply into a wide range of technical issues but stopped short of a direct discussion of new emission targets. While developing countries have continually tried to push the discussion in that direction, many if not all of the Annex I parties remain unprepared to negotiate new targets without the United States, which is not a Kyoto party and therefore not part of the AWG-KP.

In Poznań, the AWG-KP held a workshop on mitigation potentials but again reached no conclusions on the range of emission reductions to be undertaken by developed countries. It adopted a work programme reaffirming its intent to conclude its work in Copenhagen and listing issues to be considered in the target-setting.

### **Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-Term Cooperative Action**

At COP 13 in Bali, recognizing the need for a parallel process under the Framework Convention to consider action by the United States and developing countries, parties adopted the Bali Action Plan forming an Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-Term

Cooperative Action (AWG-LCA) with the goal of an “agreed outcome” in 2009. Key elements under the Bali Action Plan include a shared long-term vision; developed country mitigation actions or commitments; developing country mitigation actions, supported by technology, finance and capacity-building; adaptation; technology; and finance. Mitigation action and mitigation support for developing countries are to be “measurable, reportable, and verifiable.” Although the AWG-LCA is not formally linked to the AWG-KP, the expectation among most parties is that the two AWGs will converge in a package deal in Copenhagen.

Since Bali, parties have submitted proposals on various elements of the Bali Action Plan, which were assembled in a single document in advance of the Poznań conference. Parties filed more than 100 additional submissions in Poznań, and these were incorporated into the master document.

In conclusions presented to the COP, the AWG-LCA resolved to “shift into full negotiating mode in 2009” and called for additional proposals from parties on the “content and form of the agreed outcome” to be reached in Copenhagen. The AWG-LCA also adopted a work program authorizing its chair to draft the documents needed to carry its work forward. The first is to be a document “describing areas of convergence in the ideas and proposals of Parties, exploring options for dealing with areas of divergence and identifying any gaps that might need to be filled in reaching an agreed outcome.” The second will be a negotiating text for consideration at the AWG-LCA’s second session next year, in June.

The AWG-LCA will be chaired in 2009 by Michael Zammit Cutajar, the former executive secretary of the UNFCCC secretariat, who served as vice-chair in 2008.

### **Review of the Kyoto Protocol**

The major conflict in Poznań arose in the context of a review of the Kyoto Protocol, which parties are required to undertake periodically under Article 9. The issue was whether to generate additional funding for adaptation efforts in developing countries through a broader levy on the Protocol’s emissions trading mechanisms.

The Protocol established an Adaptation Fund supported by a 2 percent levy on projects generating emission credits under the Clean Development Mechanism. In Poznań, developing countries pushed strenuously to extend the levy to the Protocol’s other two trading mechanisms – joint implementation and international emissions trading. Developed countries, however, argued that the issue should be taken up as part of a comprehensive agreement in Copenhagen, and instead proposed a process to consider the full range of options for generating new funding. Other approaches to finance that have been proposed include a levy on fossil fuels or emissions-generating activities, an auction of international emission allowances, and funding commitments based on agreed assessment criteria. No agreement was reached, and developing countries expressed bitter disappointment at the outcome.

## **Adaptation Fund**

A second conflict that extended until the closing hours of the conference also centered on the Adaptation Fund. It, too, appeared to preview an issue likely to figure in next year's negotiations – in this case, whether any new funding mechanisms established will be managed by existing institutions or more directly under the Convention.

Governance of the Adaptation Fund has been a long-standing issue. Because the fund is supported by a levy on projects in developing countries – not by developed country contributions, as is the case with other funds under the Convention and Protocol – developing countries have pushed for a stronger role in its administration. In Bali, the COP/MOP addressed the issue by creating a 16-member Adaptation Fund Board with balanced representation to manage the fund. It also, on an interim basis, designated the World Bank as the fund's trustee and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) as its secretariat.

Many developing countries have long been critical of the GEF's operations, however, and in Poznań they argued for "direct access" to the Adaptation Fund so that funds could be disbursed by the fund board rather than by the GEF. Developed countries said it would be better to rely on existing capacities at the GEF, but in the end consented, and the COP/MOP granted the adaptation board the necessary legal standing.

## **Dates and Venues of Future Meetings**

Parties decided to shift the dates of the Copenhagen conference to December 7-18, 2009, in order to avoid a conflict with the Muslim holiday of Eid. They also tentatively accepted South Africa's offer to host COP 17/MOP 7 in 2011. The host country for COP 16/MOP 6 will be from the Group of Latin America and the Caribbean, but has not yet been selected.