



IPI SPEAKER SERIES

CLIMATE CHANGE NEGOTIATIONS: IMPROVING THE CURRENT DYNAMIC

New York, June 25, 2009

Speaker

BRICE LALONDE

Special Ambassador of France for the Climate Change Negotiation

Moderator

WARREN HOGE

Vice President and Director of External Relations at IPI

Transcript edited by IPI

Warren Hoge: Welcome to the International Peace Institute, I'm Warren Hoge, the Vice President and Director of External Relations at IPI. The topic of our talk this morning is "Climate Change Negotiations: Improving the Current Dynamic."

We are delighted to welcome Brice Lalonde, Special Ambassador of France for the Climate Change Negotiation.

Ambassador, thank you for being with us, it's a great honor to welcome you as our speaker on this subject which is rapidly becoming topic number one at the UN as we approach the upcoming talks in Copenhagen. You are one of the key actors in France and in Europe in the field of the environment. You were minister for the environment in France from 1988-1992 at a time of intense international negotiations, both at the United Nations, with the Rio Earth Summit, and the Rio Conventions on climate and on biodiversity, and also in Europe with the development of a European policy for the environment. You've also been an advisor on environmental and energy issues to the OECD, to the Global Environment Fund, as well as to developing countries. At the same time, you have been very active as an elected official in Brittany in promoting environmental policies at the local level.

You once explained the roots of your commitment to environmental protection. It was in the aftermath of the May 1968 students' revolt in

Paris and in other parts of the world. You felt disillusioned and disoriented. At that time, in July 1969, you saw the pictures of the earth that the American astronauts sent back from their trip to the moon, and this was when the protection of our planet became for you the most important cause to serve.

You have been serving this cause for more than forty years now. And we can see that the most recent years have been particularly active, since your appointment as France's special ambassador for climate almost two years ago, you have been involved in every meeting of the climate change negotiation starting with the Bali Conference. At the beginning of this month, you were in Bonn for the latest negotiating session on climate change, and you are now just coming back from the meeting of the Major Economies Forum in Mexico.

So we're delighted to discuss with you the current state of play of these negotiations, and to hear your views on the next steps before Copenhagen. And we have particularly in mind two questions. One, how ambitious can we be for a successful outcome in Copenhagen in December. And a real international community question, how can we harness support from all quarters for an effective agreement? I remind you that this meeting is on the record. After your presentation, I will open the floor for questions from the public. Ambassador?

Brice Lalonde: Thank you very much, Warren... After forty years of environmental activism, I would say that things are not so bad, and things work by paces of twenty years. In 1972, the first international conference in Stockholm set the stage for environmental policies in each country, so the environmental ministers, the environmental tools were invented then. In 1992 it was Rio, and we came to the core of the planetary problems: climate change and biodiversity. So, in 2012, it's going to be twenty years after Rio, and that's the moment when we'll see if we really have achieved something.

But, of course, we're having the Copenhagen meeting first. It's a huge task, as you know, because we understand it's completely reshuffling the world economy. It's very technical, very complex, and it's left to negotiators, which is a mistake. So heads of state have to [grab hold] of it, because the negotiators otherwise are going to steal the whole process and make it too complicated.

There is no center in this negotiation. That's one of the problems we have, and coming from Mexico—where we had a Major Economies Forum—it was quite interesting to see [how we may look] for a center to find order from chaos. For instance, one delegation said, for the long-term goal, "Let's ask the scientists." So there is that sort of confusion: where

politicians don't know how to handle the scientific data, and, in fact, it's not up to the scientists to tell people what to do. Rather, it's the politicians who have the responsibility to say, "Okay, this is what we're going to do." And then we have no center in the sense that we don't have a benevolent, neutral body, which would set a road map for every country and say, "This is what I suggest, I'm neutral." No, it comes from each country, 190 countries which would give submissions, and we hope that the truth or the real thing will come out from that.

We have some hurdles we have to overcome. First, some countries still believe that they will only act if they are paid to act, which of course is not the way to see things. Everybody has to do something [to counter] climate change, and once everybody does (because everybody's threatened by climate change), we will see how we can help each other. It's not a situation where developed countries would be asking other countries to do something. Everybody has to do something, and slowly, this idea has trickled down.

Now, most of the countries understand that adaptation, for instance, is going to be three times more expensive than mitigation. Why? Because adaptation involves all sectors of activities, all sectors of an economy. While mitigation involves essentially the energy sector. Some countries are more afraid of climate-change policy than of climate change itself, and that is something very important we have to always keep in mind. Why is that? Because a lot of people, still—and I think that's the core of the problem—believe you cannot grow without emitting emissions, without emitting greenhouse gases. Why? Because people don't see how to grow or develop or have an economy without fossil fuels, and so in the negotiations, they would be in a position to say, "Give me five more minutes, please, and if you believe you can go and develop without fossil fuels, do it first, and we'll see how it works."

And this brings me to what I think is one of the most difficult problems: we don't have an image of the future. We don't have an image of a desirable, low-carbon future. How would it be? What would the day of Mr. Jones in the UK, or somebody in Africa, in 2060 living in a low-carbon society look like? How would we be living? How would we be producing? Nobody knows. This is very important in my view, because in history, all movements, all big steps, were always taken by people who thought that tomorrow would be better than today, and that you could accept some difficulties today because it's going to be better tomorrow, and they had an image of how it would be tomorrow. We don't have that.

And as I said, we are in a very complicated negotiation with two tracks, and, of course, we should probably agree amongst us to have only one track in the end. This means, if I go back to, if I go to the details, what we

need is some sort of committee of the whole. The committee of the whole, the center, the leadership—that's what's lacking still in our negotiations. So, we have very, very scattered, diversified negotiations, which make it very, very difficult for countries that don't have enough resources to go to bat and negotiate. I mean, you have some big countries which have two teams: Team A, Team B. At 11:00 in the evening, Team A goes to bed and Team B comes in, and in the front, we have some countries who have only one negotiator, [which is impractical]... I mean, it's physically impossible just to follow all that's happening everywhere. That's a very difficult thing. We have to try and help them.

We don't have a shared vision. That's incredible! Look, we've been discussing [this issue] for, I don't know how many years, and we don't even have a shared vision. I mean, we know roughly, but we don't dare [act] yet, because some people think the shared vision should only be agreed in the end.

The goal, and the vision, in my view, is not only a reduction of greenhouse gases, it [concerns] planet policies. We are trying to invent planet policies that don't exist yet. We have national policies and international policies. And we don't know how to invent these planet policies. It's coming slowly. Planet policy would [be] to not only reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases, [but to] to invent a cooperative system by which we all help each other to diffuse climate-friendly development. That's what we need. The tools of a climate friendly development, and I must say that we, we the European Union, or we, I'm not allowed to talk on behalf of the European Union today, but I mean, we are quite happy because we have made a very strong decision by adopting a climate energy package. Twenty-seven countries, very different, some twice as rich as others, some completely coal dependent, some, I would say, nuclear dependent, and nevertheless, we got it, and we have the solidarity systems, money flowing from rich countries to less rich countries: different systems, which in our view, can be a model.

We know what the goal should be. Everybody knows, in 2050, we have to reduce by 50 percent globally all our emissions, and we know that for developed countries, it must be 80 percent. The task is 80 percent reduction by 2050 for all developed countries, which would mean a global reduction of 50 percent. This is exactly what we've been discussing for two days in Mexico right now, and it's not, of course, easy to do, but this is what we have to do, and this means that we have to agree on peaks. That means that in 2025, for instance, in all countries of the world, emissions have to decline. Everybody sort of agrees with that. We had a very interesting meeting with Mr. Holdren [Science Adviser to President Obama]. He explained that, peaks for the developed countries should start

roughly now, and for the developing countries in 2025 at the latest. So this is what is in front of us.

We need to have credible pathways to show what's going to happen. It's easy to say, okay, we agree for 80 percent in 2050, because I won't be here to be responsible for it, or accountable for it. So what's important is the short term, the milestones, the credible milestones for that pathway, and everybody should do that exercise. It's very important. So the confidence will be built. For instance, the [US] Congress is afraid of China. Competitors! Okay, so if the lawmakers in the United States have a view of what China's pathway for 2050 is, it will be easier, it will be more comfortable, and so the United States agrees to 80 percent reduction compared to 1990, but we're not quite sure how to get there. It's not so easy. How do you start? And I would say that the United States lost eight years, so it's not so easy right now.

We need early action. And we need to stop thinking that everything is going to come out of our Copenhagen negotiation process, like we're going to build a huge tower or skyscraper in Bonn, which is going to regulate the whole world. It's silly. Come on, it's not going to happen that way. Lots of things are happening everywhere. Lots of bilateral things. What's so important is that we have to build, I wouldn't say a "coalition of the willing," but lots of countries are already agreeing on things, recognizing what they are doing, because what's so important, and what's so difficult in these negotiations, is that a lot of things are happening. A lot of things are happening on the ground, a lot of things are happening in different countries, but these different countries do not want, or are reluctant to have, what they are doing encapsulated in an agreement, because they are afraid that suddenly the price of fossil fuel moves, or that they cannot achieve it, et cetera. So the problem is that we have to have this early [recognition] of actions. We need that system. This is what we're trying to do with some countries. This is how we're going to sort of build trust and move.

We have to build bridges, we have to face it. The truth is that we have a classification of nations in our negotiations, which comes from 1992. At that moment, [we had] a dual political system, with some rich countries, and some countries who were not so rich, but now we are, of course, in 2009 and the situation has changed. Some countries which were not so important have become superpowers. And we have a system which is not consistent with the reality, and we have a track with the Kyoto Protocol where the United States is not where it should be. I mean it's a real problem, because the easiest thing to do would be to have an amendment to the Kyoto Protocol. Very simple. Okay, Copenhagen would be an amendment to the Kyoto Protocol. But we can't have the amendment to the Kyoto Protocol, because United States has not recognized the Kyoto

Protocol and could not accept an amendment. It's complicated, so we've got lots of stupid problems, like that, that we have to face, and we have to overcome.

Right now, we've got a very good proposal coming, slowly moving in, and slowly having consensus. Slowly. I should not speak so fast. It's called the Mexican Proposal of Funding. The Mexicans [came] out two years ago with a proposal of universal contribution by each country, which would be founded on established criteria, which have to be negotiated, GDP per inhabitant, emissions per inhabitant, share of the emissions compared to the global emissions, et cetera, et cetera. Everybody will pay. And what's interesting is it's a universal contribution, like United Nations system. Of course, some countries are still reluctant, but it's the negotiation. That's what I believe in any case. This proposal, and how it could work, could be the backbone of the Copenhagen agreement, in my view, and it's not the only proposal for funding. You have a Norwegian proposal, and in fact, in my view, we're going to have different sources of funding for adaptation and for mitigation. Why should it be one? It's again a syndrome of the big tower somewhere which will take all the money and diffuse it. It's not going to happen that way.

In the end, we have very major players, that Major Economies Forum, sixteen countries roughly, 80 percent of the emissions. But you don't have the others. For instance, you don't have the small islands. Small islands are threatened, and while the European Union, for instance, which is considered to be the radical group, is asking for two, not more than two degrees Celsius, of the increase in temperature, as a goal, the small island states are not asking for not more than 1.5, and nobody's listening to that. So it's very important to introduce the voice of those who are not heard. How do you adapt in small islands if the sea level rises? The sea level is going to rise, we know, it's already starting, you cannot stop that. So that's a real huge problem of survival, I would say. And Africa. What's going to happen in Africa? These countries are not the culprits. They don't emit. But they're going to suffer more than others.

So we try in France to build some sort of an alliance, to bring the voice of Africa and of the small islands into the negotiation and to try to help them, because that's the main problem which is also going to face us: food security and survival, in countries that are going to become much more arid.

The other problems are not problems. Technology: well, that's going to be solved. It's not a problem, except that you must understand that technology will probably not come alone. Technology, to be diffused, needs policies, so we have to invent policies to spread and diffuse the technologies, and especially, for instance, the price of carbon. If you don't

have national policies, if you don't set the price on carbon, I mean the price of dumping your waste in the atmosphere, that's exactly what it is, you'll never get investments going to the other, to the alternative sources. So you have to have policies, and that's very important.

Last, but not least, we won't avoid discussions about ways of living. We won't avoid it. I mean, adaptation is not only for the poor. Adaptation is for everybody. We have to adapt to a planet which is imperiled, which is threatened by climate change. How are we going to do it? This is also something which we don't talk about enough. You know, when you go to some countries in Africa, they watch TV, and they watch "Desperate Housewives." So in their view, that's the way you should live. And in lots of countries, Los Angeles is the model of a city. Model of the city? Not for us in France. We like where we're walking and having small cities. It's the image of how you want to live, or how it could be, how you could design cities, et cetera. The fact that the demand side is as important or probably more important as the supply side, is very important. In China, for instance, when you go to China, or look at Hong Kong, the huge density, it's fantastic, but Hong Kong in China is not popular, because it comes from the British, and you prefer the Beijing, but what's so incredible is that in Beijing and Shanghai, the energy efficiency is much less than in Paris. You have more density in Paris than in Shanghai or Beijing, so there's a real discussion, you know. That's very important.

How can we diffuse that low-carbon future? If we don't do that, we're going to be in trouble. The situation in front of us, in my view, is like passing from the hunter-gatherers to the agriculturalists. You must imagine the way it was at that time. You had a crisis. Nothing to eat. No more mammoths. No more of these huge animals because we had overhunted. And of course, at that time, you must have imagined the IPCC [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change], the game, saying, "Oh we have to have quotas, quotas of everything." And actually, humanity, mankind, invented agriculture, the alphabet, cities, that sort of stuff. This is what's going to happen right now, and I was just coming from Chile, and in Chile, they have the Easter Island, and the model of the Easter Island is, if you don't adapt, that's going to happen. See, we're going to adapt, no problem. Thank you!

[applause]

Hoge: Brice, thank you so much. I can't tell you how much I enjoyed the robustness and directness of that speech. It is the first time, I have been here a year now, and it's the first reference to "Desperate Housewives" that I've heard at IPI. I think it's the first time I've heard people laugh at a morning session here. It also is the first time I've heard use of the word "stupid," and I've thought of many times when it would have been an

appropriate word to use. So thank you very, very much for that. You were promised to me as a lively, robust speaker, and you certainly live up to that. I would like to ask if there were question from the floor, and please, just, if you wait for the microphone, please introduce yourself.

Dessima Williams: Thank you, good morning, my name is Dessima Williams. I'm the Permanent Representative of Grenada here at the United Nations. Grenada holds the chair of AOSIS [Alliance of Small Island States] and therefore, we have been, we have tried to be a bit active around the AOSIS agenda on the climate change agenda. My Prime Minister is across the street at the UN having breakfast while I camp out here. So I'm going to leave you shortly which is why I took the floor first.

I want to respond to what has really been one of the most important presentations I've heard on the subject so far. It's important, because it's cultural, as well as it is technical. It is political as well as it is economic, and that encompasses the real nature, as you said so accurately, of the climate change initiative, and maybe, I don't know, maybe some people call it the climate change crisis, the climate change challenge, I would say. I have a lot of responses, but I won't, first of all, I want to go back to 1968. When you were becoming disillusioned in '68, I think that is when the problem was starting, and it is marvelous that you recovered in '69! And if we could use that short time span for what we need to do now, we have to recover very quickly to what is the challenge. You put your finger on it when you say that, perhaps the most threatened are the small island states and Africa, partly from the sea level rising or from drought, and everything else in between.

I think we do not have a problem of leadership. We have a problem of power dynamics, because the small island states, and the African countries, have been there, not disillusioned, but panicked, and have for the last year, at least, been trying to capture the international attention to the emergency that is unfolding under the rubric of climate change, but as long as the discussion or the conversation is, excuse me, I'm speaking frankly this morning, as long as it is controlled, you see, in the West, on CNN, in the MEF, and so on, that perspective, that sense of urgency, and the survivability that is threatened, that message has not yet gotten out.

So I think that is the first response that I want to say to you. If in fact you, as France, you as MEF, you as climate change international guru, can put on the agenda the emergency, and I know you have invited Leon Charles [Climate Change Negotiator for Grenada] and others to MEF meetings at the dinner parties and so on. We want to get in front of the microphone. We want to get in front of the television cameras, because I think the initiative really is with industry, with private and individual lifestyle changes, and so on, and we want to get that message out.

I want to say, secondly, that this, you speak about the center. Maybe what we have is a bit of a convergence now, because I think both France and Germany, and maybe Norway and some other countries are coming closer to the AOSIS position, and I want to reiterate our position. We want that 1.5. We cannot have a 2 degree Celsius increase. 1.5 is the maximum to safeguard the level of sea level rise that will devastate. But Kiribati already has lost its fresh water supply because of sea level rise. Maldives, and so they may be in the room, have bought land elsewhere to relocate their populations. In the Caribbean, we had two hurricanes in Grenada; it destroyed over 200 percent of our GDP. Four years later, we are not yet recovered. It's urgent, it's real, it's here, so when we call for the 45 percent reduction by 2020 on our way to 80 or 95 percent for 2050. I think that's the, if you want to call it, that's the center, that's the agenda.

I want to close by saying, we have three critical proposals that I repeat, that we think we can work with. I just came back from Bonn, we have listed it there, we are going to list it right through Barcelona on to Copenhagen. The first one is we want enforceable, high, measurable reduction standards. Reduction levels. And there are three parts to that. The first part is to control emissions reduction of no more than 350 million parts, parts per million, ppm. 350, not 450. The second part to that is we are proposing reductions of, to keep the temperature rise to 1.5 rather than 2 percent Centigrade, and our third proposal is we want a 45 percent reduction by 2020 on our way to 80, to 95 percent. That's our first proposal. High, enforceable, reduction. The second one is scaled up financing, particularly for adaptation. You say so correctly, adaptation covers everything. Yes, we are doing mitigation, and we are supporting the renewable energy campaign vigorously. But adaptation funding is our need. And our third position is we need an enforceable series of mechanisms, so that we can monitor ourselves on the way to 2050. I wanted to respond to all of them. Thank you very much.

Lalonde: Ambassador, such a pleasure to see you, because we had the exchange, we're trying to discuss and work with the AOSIS. Sorry, I couldn't say it better than you. As you said, "Take the floor!" We'll try to give you the floor to help to set the stage so you can speak and then the public opinion listens to you. The problem is all this will not succeed if it stays in the negotiation [room] with the negotiators. The negotiators are very nice people. But the problem is, you have to shift from national interests to planetary interest. Only leaders can do that. Only leaders can [consent] to give things. Otherwise, negotiators cannot do it. They have no instructions, they defend national interests, and it's very difficult.

So what you said, the drama of the islands, "la tragédie" of the islands, has to be known and put to the public opinion, so they understand what's

happening. Otherwise, people will not understand. Oh, yes, the sea level is rising. And there we are. So that's the problem we face. So thank you very much, we are on the track to 4°C, okay, we're not at all even on two, we are on four, and perhaps more. That's the problem right now. Emissions, while everybody's speaking, emissions are rising. That's the problem we face. It's very urgent, and it's very difficult, and all the "please, five minutes more, five minutes more;" it's going to be very difficult, and we have a race, a race of who's going to go more slowly.

Let's talk frankly, because you've got two tracks: Kyoto, and not Kyoto. So Kyoto is the people who have already agreed on Kyoto, [and] have to negotiate the next commitment period. What are we going to do after 2012? But wait until we see what's going to happen with the other track. The United States is in the other track. What is the United States going to do? We have to wait for the Congress. And what is India going to do? And what is Brazil going to do? And what is China going to do? And let's wait. And so in the other track convention, lots of developed [countries], all the same countries I have listed, are saying, "Ooh, let's wait to see what the Kyoto countries are going to do first before we commit, because we don't want to be alone." So that's one of the problems.

That's why we need the committee of the whole, or the center, or the leadership. The Nelson Mandela of climate change: we don't have it. It could be you, Ambassador, we need to get to the public opinion, and I must say, there's a huge change in the negotiations since we have the new administration in the United States, and that's very, very, very important, and in Bali, we had [unintelligible] Australia, standing ovation for Australia, because the ovations were exactly centered on climate change, et cetera. So more and more countries are coming to it, and to say China is probably already the first producer of wind energy, solar energy? Incredible! So things are moving, but it's not going strongly enough, and people do not understand that, what we have to invent is the fact, the fact that what we're doing together, together is more than the sum, the addition of each country. The addition of each country is not enough. We have to invent something which is more than the addition. Thus, for instance, carbon market is more [likely], because we have a global common market. Indeed, like that, [we could adopt] planet policies. That's what we have to invent. So thank you, Ambassador. I mean, I couldn't say it better than you, but I am afraid to say, that 45 percent in 2020, no, it's not on the table.

Hoge: Ambassador, thank you very much for that question. And if you do have to leave early, nobody will hold you responsible. I'm glad you came and raised your hand and raised that very important issue. I have a questioner here.

Paul Kavanagh: Thank you very much, my name is Paul Kavanagh, and I'm the Permanent Representative of Ireland to the UN, and a very warm welcome, Ambassador. Thank you for a very stimulating presentation, and we heard loud and clear, also, the message from the AOSIS from the colleague from Grenada, and we've all been trying to work very closely with AOSIS, because we know that for so many of them. We're an island, a small island ourselves. We know that, in their circumstances, often, it's a question of survival.

I think the climate change issue is a tailor made one to demonstrate that the important questions at the UN need not be defined and analyzed in a North-South cleavage. It's very interesting that when the most vulnerable developing states on the climate change side were trying to assert recently the security dimension of this for them, that some of the slowest member states to come around and accept that logic, were, in fact, larger developing countries. And I think what we have to do is try to underline the fact that this is not a North-South issue. We should resist efforts to define it in that way. I'd like also to agree very much with Ambassador Lalonde about the need to get the leadership, political leadership involved directly. I heard a great comment recently about the nonproliferation regime in advance of the review conference of the NPT next year, taking a page from the tourist board of the state of Nevada: "what happens in Conference Room 4 stays in Conference Room 4". I think we don't want that to happen as regards climate change.

But on that very point, I have a question for Ambassador Lalonde. The Secretary-General has encouraged global leadership to attend the summit on the 22nd of September. How do you assess the potential of that to impact the negotiation towards Copenhagen, knowing, as you said, that Copenhagen is not going to solve every problem? But we do have to invest a high level of ambition for it. What is the potential of the 22nd of September in the course of the negotiation and how do you see it? Presumably President Sarkozy's paying very close attention to this as all our leaders are. Thank you so much.

Lalonde: I think it's been difficult for the Secretary-General to focus exactly on how his input would be the most useful and the most efficient. It's not so easy to do, because you have all these countries which are trying to do things in their own way, and you know how it is, the United Nations is strong if countries agree to make it strong. And I think the main input would be to ask for personal involvement of all the leaders to explain how important it is politically, for all leaders of each country, to engage, to discuss with the public. If President Obama were not so committed to explain, to raise the onus of the American public, each leader has to do the same in each country, to explain. Leaders are there to lead, so the Secretary-General

must explain that to the leaders. “You are here to lead. In each of your countries, please lead,” because that’s the main input.

Now in my view, as I said, why did we succeed in the European Union’s energy climate package, which is four incredible pieces of legislation? It’s the strongest decision the European Union has taken since the common currency, because, [on] first reading, it’s because we had a center. That center was neutral, benevolent, and scientifically competent, and that center proposed a road map for each of the twenty-seven countries. So after that, the negotiation was simple. We just discussed, “I don’t agree,” “I want a bit of this,” “I want a bit of that.” It’s normal.

We don’t have that, so the Secretary-General could, perhaps, but it’s a bit late right now, work in that way. You have some heads of states which are not considered as having ambitions of invading other countries, or their neighbors, or things like that. You have some people like [unintelligible], I know you have quite a few of them from, for instance, island states. They could be that. And you have very strong analysts, you have the catalyst project, and the IPCC, of course. You have a strong expertise which could be used to propose these road maps which don’t exist right now for everybody. But, it’s his decision.

Hoge: I have a question in the back. I just wanted to say one thing beforehand. Ambassador Kavanagh, you mentioned in passing, climate change and security. That’s a particular aspect that we here at IPI have been looking at, and we’ve been doing, we have some meetings coming up in the fall, in particular, in collaboration with the Permanent Mission of Denmark, but I want to mention one other thing on that point.

Two weeks ago, John Kerry, the senator from Massachusetts, and also chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, (and I learned this morning, cousin of Brice Lalonde,) gave a very powerful speech at the Council on Foreign Relations, on that very point, saying he had just been in China, and he said that he thought that the aspect of climate change that was most ignored, most neglected, was the national security aspect.

Now I understand, Brice, you’re saying that the real goal is to come up with some sort of centered, unified position that wouldn’t depend upon national positions, but unfortunately, the world, and we learn this every day through United Nations, is made up of nation states with a deep sense of sovereignty and national interest. I just found his emphasis, John Kerry’s emphasis, on that particular point, that it, one way to engage some of the powerful countries in the world in the climate change debate is to point out that it has national security implications. The ambassador of Grenada mentioned islands like Kiribati and the Maldives, which are threatened, their existence is threatened, that provokes immense

migrations, it provokes a desertification, all kinds of things, that when you introduce them into already conflicted environments, they actually aggravate and produce conflicts of their own. Just wanted to make that quick speech, that's something that we here are exploring. I had a question in the back, if you would wait, there's a microphone.

Donatus Keith St. Aimee: Thank you very much, my name is St. Aimee, I'm the Ambassador from St. Lucia. I just want to sing in the choir with what my colleague from Grenada just said. If anybody has any doubts that it is supported by the entire Caribbean region and the Pacific, this is to reinforce those points.

I also want to bring up another point, and that is, when we're discussing climate change, sometimes we compartmentalize the issues so much. We have to be very careful. We have to have a means of bringing all the elements together. I'm saying that because, a month or so ago, there was this big meeting at the UN on the UN Forum on Forests. Somehow, we could not get some of our partners to understand that the reforestation, the afforestation, the return of trees back on the earth is as important as carbon trading. They did not want to put in any more money into the whole question of a fund for forestry. That is part of the problem that we face with this compartmentalization. Different people go to different meetings representing the different interests at the national level, and we have not been able to put it together. This is why I agree totally with my good friend in terms of getting this umbrella, not organization, but this umbrella concept that we are not, we may not necessarily be discussing Kyoto, but we may be discussing forestry, we may be discussing security, but they all come under the same rubric of climate change.

So that is a message that we also need to get across, and I think we can do it, it took twenty-something years for the world to recognize that the seed, there was a common heritage of mankind, more than twenty years. I remember when Rajendra Pachauri started it, and everybody was, "well, maybe, maybe." Now, I think it's pretty much understood and agreed that we need to take better care of the ocean. So with time, with the singing, but we have to sing in unison, we can't have any discordant notes, we have to be singing in unison with a good song, and I think we will make it eventually. Thank you very much.

Lalonde: Was there any comment? I mean, I agree completely, Ambassador, and the forest issue is very important, because deforestation contributes about 20 percent of world emissions, because of course, trees are made of carbon, so when you take the trees down, the carbon goes back to the atmosphere. So reduc[ing] emissions from deforestation and degradation is part of the negotiations. It's difficult because some very important forest countries are sort of waiting. You know the problem in this negotiation is that it's a

package. And so nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. So the [unintelligible] is a vestige of that, I'm afraid, because people don't agree on forests, and find a way, I would say, to reward avoiding deforestation.

We think, in France, because we have, of course, lots of friends in the Congo basin, and we are working it out with Indonesia, and with Brazil, and we are the only Annex I country to have a big chunk of tropical forest in French Guiana, so we are working a lot. We believe that the best way to protect forests is to generate revenue from forests, so you have sustainable management. Sustainable management is probably the best answer you can have. Now there's very sophisticated technology with satellites: you monitor with satellites, you have ground and field teams which see what the image corresponds to, and management plans and schemes on thirty years or more. Incredible. In the end, for instance, modern logging companies will certify the wood products and would only harvest one tree by hectare, for instance. It's incredibly well done. But of course, it's €3-4 more by hectare, so that's the price of avoiding deforestation, and that's what the international community should see if it could fund or subsidize in one way or another.

Hoge: Brice, Erik Solheim, who is the Norwegian Minister of the Environment and International Development, came here about two months ago and talked to us about a forestation project that Norway has. You mentioned in passing that the Norwegians have a proposal. Were you talking about that, or were you talking about something else?

Lalonde: Well, the Norwegians are probably the only oil country which is benefiting from oil, very wise[ly], and they have some money, so that's great. They are trying to help by having two things: first they put a lot of money on forests, they contributed to the Brazilian fund, they contributed to the British, Wangari Maathai and Paul Martin fund for forests in the Congo basin, and so it's very interesting to work with the Norwegians.

They are generous for the forests, but besides, they had another proposal, which is different from the Mexican proposal. This proposal is to raise money by auctioning 2 percent, for instance, of the National Allocations of States under the Kyoto Protocol, or under the next Copenhagen protocol, because perhaps this means some more countries than the countries that are actually bound by the Kyoto Protocol would have allocations. Two percent of these allocations would be auctioned [off] to give revenue which would fund adaptation. In my view, this is complementary to the Mexican proposal, and it's very interesting to work with both proposals. So it's different.

Hoge: Yes, one second.

Daniel Hirsch: Thank you. Daniel Hirsch, from the Norwegian Mission. I just thought I'd say something since you went into our proposal, and some of the thinking behind it is that we need also financing that actually is not so much dependent on national governments as the Mexican proposal, which in fact may result. We don't know how it's going to work, but many governments already are not fulfilling their commitments on regular ODA, and the Mexican proposal may, it's not supposed to, but we don't know how it will affect finance ministries and how it will take money from other places.

So I think it's very important that, in Copenhagen, we can have some kind of more innovative financing mechanism, where money will somehow automatically end up in adaptation fund or wherever we decide to put that money. That's some of the reasoning behind our proposal. And there was also some mentioning of our investment in forests, and this is also, of course, not only because we have money from oil, but because we recognize the investment in forests as, what we can see from the IPCC report, that is, actually, it could be potentially the fastest and cheapest way to reduce emissions, so we think this is a good investment and hope that more nations will follow us, so thank you.

Lalonde: Thank you. There are quite a lot of proposals on the table for financing, but in the end, what's going to fly is going to be what's pragmatic and accepted by all countries. I agree with you that it would be better to find innovative [ways of] financing of things. We in France, for instance, we were very happy to work on airplane tickets for fighting AIDS, and so on, but not all countries have agreed, and it is true that if we get to planet policies, we should have international taxes. I beg your pardon, that's a bad word to say, but that's the way it should be one day, and actually, you do have an international tax which has been created by the climate negotiations. It's the levy on Clean Development Mechanisms. It's a 2 percent levy to the Adaptation Fund. That 2 percent levy is in fact the first international tax ever created in the world. I mean, say it the way you want to say it, but it's true, but nobody sort of figured that, but when they decided it, may not be the best decision, though, but we can discuss that.

A proposal has been set, put on the table, to have a levy on airplanes, to have a levy on maritime transportation and things like that, and so, and the best proposal ever made was made by the Swiss, of course, but is it going to fly ever? It was to put \$1 tax on each ton of carbon emitted. That's great on paper. It's very, very fair. Is it going to happen? I don't know. We have experience in twenty-seven countries over the European Union, we could never agree on the European tax, so I mean, I don't know if it's going to be possible with 190 countries.

Financing. Most of the finance needed for climate change is going to come from the normal investment flows. Normal money which is invested every day, that's the main source. But this money will only go to climate change if we have the national policies to channel the investments to the right place. For instance, look at the World Bank. I like the World Bank a lot. But the World Bank is also financing coal plants because the client's asking for it, so at one point, you have to be brave and to decide what you should do. If you put a price on carbon and carbon dioxide emissions, you're going to help solar energy, you're going to help alternative sources of energy.

So that perhaps, the first is normal national policies with normal investment and normal money. Second is the carbon market. You create a carbon market, you link carbon markets together, we offer extra money. And the third stage is public money, and the public money is, as you said, a Mexican proposal or Norwegian proposal. It's not going to be the most important, it's going to be the catalyst, the trigger. It's going to probably fund things that the market cannot fund and things like that, and probably mostly adaptation, and it's going to fund probably the first part of the forest policy we need.

But after, when the demand is going to be strong, and the demand will be strong when the cuts, the deep cuts, the targets will be agreed by each country, then you will need credits, forest credits, for instance, credits for avoiding deforestation, and the market could help finance [unintelligible] deforestation. So that's the process on which we are working. It's not going to be done in one day, so what's important is to start it. You start it, and it's going to increase. What's important is to create tools which are going to spread, which are going to expand, which are going to be enhanced, and which do not have, as much as possible, perverse effects.

Modest Mero: Thank you very much for a very interesting presentation. I'm Mr. Mero from the Tanzania Mission here in New York. I listened to you, you talked about the tragedy of negotiators and their ambitious modeling, and what it can constitute to the final failure. And I also listened to the Permanent Representative of Ireland, Grenada, and St. Lucia about how we have to see the big picture all together, and the fact that we are not about North and South [unintelligible]. We are about a common interest for all of us. What are the mechanisms in place to make sure that that goal is achieved, because we don't want to see another WTO nosing kind of calculations, talking about tariff levels and all that kind of stuff. Is there anything being done now before December? Thank you.

Lalonde: I'm not sure I got the question, but "mechanism," that's one of the main words. Because once you have an agreement, it takes a few years to get all the details set. Negotiators have invented something called a Clean

Development Mechanism. It's a mechanism. It is an incredible innovation. It's very intelligent. It's sort of a win-win situation where some countries, or some companies from some countries, which are bound to reduce their emissions, are allowed to fulfill one part of their obligations by investing in developing countries to reduce emissions in that developing country. So it's very intelligent, because it helps the planet, it helps the developing country, and it helps the company or the state in the developed country.

So that sort of mechanism is, I think, very good. We have to improve it, because the problem of the market is the market goes where you have money and where you have customers and clients. So it doesn't go where people don't pay or can't pay, that's a more difficult thing. We have to probably have some politics inside of that, but it's very intelligent. Nevertheless, there was a discussion about the moral value of these mechanisms. Some people say, "Oh, but you don't, you're not doing things in your own country domestically. It's in your own country that you have to do 100 percent of the efforts and reduce emissions." There are people who want us all to bicycle, and we have to suffer to be good, you know? So it's better not to suffer as much if you can do things without suffering too much, why not? So that question is, how much? I suppose you have to limit the use to these mechanisms, you have to have 5 percent, 10 percent, I don't know, 40 percent, so you have that sort of discussion, so you have sort of a share with domestic efforts and mechanisms to help other countries. So this is what we do now.

These mechanisms are often called offsets, and I call them reductions elsewhere, because offsets can be compensation: you increase your emissions, and you buy your virtue by planting trees somewhere else. You see that? You buy your salute, "indulgence," we say in French. So, I mean, the mechanism is what we have to invent, you're quite right, probably we have to invent new mechanisms. I mean, negotiators on that subject work a lot. They're working on defining targets, win-win situations, and we try to get to more sectoral, and not project by project, but real, sectoral crediting and mechanisms. It's slowly improving.

Hoge: Brice, I can't resist having a Frenchman here asking you a question about nuclear energy. Nuclear reactors, extremely costly to build, relatively inexpensive to run, emission free, is this part of the answer for the developing world?

Lalonde: It's part of the answer, sure, yes. The problem with the nuclear is you have to have a sort of planning system where first, you start by the security or the safety, so you have to create your safety body, you have to have students learning about nuclear [energy]. It's an organization. You have to want to do it, you have to have public acceptance, you have to take care of the waste, the safety, et cetera. This means you don't just bring a nuclear

plant. It's a policy decision, and I must admit that when I was young, I was demonstrating against nuclear power, and now I'm quite happy, actually. I must say that I thought it would be very dangerous, and finally, it's working quite well, and now my view is that we have to improve nuclear [energy].

No technology is perfect, no technology is beautiful or demonized. Renewable energy has lots of hurdles, it is "intermittent," "*sporadique*," it is small, and it takes a huge space. You will see, one day, the number of hectares taken by renewable energy. Nothing's perfect. You have these long-living bulbs, they've got mercury inside. So you must always be careful and trade off the lesser of two evils, that's life. Life, it's in your personal life, it's in everybody's life, you have to choose. It's not the good against the bad, it's the lesser of two evils.

So nuclear has it's problems, and I've been working with nuclear engineers to see if we can solve the question of the waste by breaking long-living waste and only having short-living waste. Short-living waste in nuclear means, nevertheless, 300 years, but there we are. It's not millions of years. So things are possible with nuclear, improved, you can improve all the time, and let's work on everything.

Part of the answer, the first part of the answer is energy efficiency. Dull and boring, systematic, dull, and boring. There we are. Energy efficiency. That's the first source. It's about 40 percent of the solution. Energy efficiency. And everybody's talking about energy efficiency, and not much is being done on energy efficiency. Why? Because it's boring. It's not sexy. But you have to work on it. And it's regulation for the time being. Regulation and financial kits or tools to help people, because the money returns in eight years, or more than five, let's say, and you have all these obstacles, the landlord doesn't invest because he's not going to pay the bills for energy, etc., so you have to find things like that and work on it and have standards and work really tough on energy efficiency and stop talking about it. And second it's renewables, third it's nuclear, fourth it's carbon capture and storage, because, unfortunately, of coal, which is the first culprit in the world. Generating electricity from coal is one-third of the world emissions, probably. That's the main problem.

What do we do with coal? There's lots of coal still left, so we have to find a way of having "clean" coal. For the time being, there's no such thing as clean coal, but we have to invent it. And in the end, you have forests.

So there we are. You know, we have learned some English in these negotiations, so now we have learned some expression which is, "there's no silver bullet." Well there's no silver bullet now, I can repeat that one. There's no silver bullet, but you have some good technologies

nevertheless. Nuclear is part of it, but it's not for everybody. It's for concentrated consumption centers. It's a huge amount of energy, and it needs to have grids. The problem of the grid is a very important problem, because the grid is as expensive as the plant, as the power plant, whatever power plant it is.

Second, with, renewable sources of energy, it's a completely new paradigm, it's a completely new way of seeing energy, because oil is fantastic. Nothing is better than oil! Oil, fantastic! Look how convenient it is! Look, you can put it in the jerrycan, you can move with it, you can transport it, and it's such a density of power, it gives so much energy in such a small...it's fantastic! Nothing is better than oil! Huge, it's a present from nature, or from the Lord, I don't know. And now we've got what? We've got the sun, but the problem of the sun is the night! The night! No sun in the night. And the problem of the wind is the day you don't have wind!

So you have to *store* energy. The storage of energy is one of the big problems we have to face right now, and we don't know how to do it. And as we have these, how do you say "intermittent," sporadic, suddenly, the wind blows, and it's very difficult for the meteorologist to just tell you when it's going to blow! Suddenly the grid, you get all the windmills which are suddenly flowing with energy, and so the grid has to absorb the shock, and suddenly there's no wind. So you have to invent what is called a smart grid, and the smart grid is to absorb this, to have computers at the same time as the power, and to give energy to people. People will be able to sell energy also, so it goes both ways. I know people in California, they're producing their own hydrogen in their garage and having the fuel car, the cell car to produce electricity, and they sell it to the grid. It goes both ways. You have to have the system where the grid, the utility sells you electricity, and you can also, in your little solar or cell fuel device, when you don't need it, sell electricity to the grid, etc. This needs to have a very innovative, very intelligent smart grid. This is in front of us, we're working on that, we have corporations on that, it's very interesting. There is lots of juice in all these stories.

Hoge: I have two questions, and I'm going to take them both at once in the interest of time, and they will be our last questions, so the gentleman raised his hand first, but I think we'll go to the woman first, if you don't mind, and then ask you to come second. Ask both of the questions back to back, and then Brice, you can answer them both at once.

Suhayfa Zia: Thank you very much, and thank you for a very interesting and lively discussion. I am Suhayfa Zia from the mission of South Africa, and I couldn't resist, especially with your reference to Nelson Mandela. You know, during the time of Mandela in South Africa, we always talked

about, what after Mandela? And at the moment, we are all talking about Copenhagen. We are faced with two tracks, there are no figures on the Kyoto track, 200 pages in the LCA, we're talking about a possible committee of the whole, and no center. So I don't want to go towards an African reference that we usually use about things falling apart, but my question is, what after Copenhagen? Because the indicators are such that the agenda for climate change is burdened to such an extent that Copenhagen, with six months to go, could be a very short time, or a very long time. Your thoughts on that, please? Thank you.

Mame Baba Cisse: Thank you, I am Mr. Cisse from the Senegal mission. [Speaking in French] *Many thanks again Ambassador. I listened with much enthusiasm to your speech about the environment. You are truly an expert on the topic. [inaudible] You are also an expert on what will happen if we do nothing today. I must also say that I am glad to hear you say that the question of climate change is, today, also a question of basic survival. When we think about the question of survival, we often think of small developing countries. But it's also true for the African countries. I offer again the example of Senegal. If we do nothing, in 25 years, the capital of my country, Dakar, will become an island. In effect, Dakar will be cut off from Senegal itself. This is certainly a timely issue for many countries today and I would be very glad to hear your ideas for action.*

I would like to ask one question very quickly in English, to say that, Mr. Ambassador, we fully agree with you when you said that it's very important that major economies agree on a set of targets. But I think we all recognize that another key component of what will go in the package is the funding. And we also address that. But there is something which we do not think of very often when talking about funding. We all see the shortage of funding, and we think that the Commission on Sustainable Development talked about the funding caps to address in Copenhagen.

But another important aspect to address is the imbalances in the existing funding mechanism. Just to give an example, the CDM [Clean Development Mechanism], we talked about it. In 2008, around \$5 billion spent for developing countries. Africa only \$150 million. This is a huge imbalance. And if you go deep into the figure, you realize that, if you are not a major economy in the developing world, emitting a lot of CO₂ into the atmosphere, if you are not a high forest-covered country, if you are not a mega-biodiverse country, you are completely out of the funding picture. [unintelligible] And we listen very carefully, and with great interest, to the new proposals from Mexico, from Norway, but even in those proposals, those imbalances may remain. If we are out of the three categories, we may be left out. So my question is, how really do you see those fourth category countries being taken on board by Copenhagen discussion on funding? Thank you very much.

Lalonde: [Speaking in French] *Merci! It's such a pleasure to have the chance to speak in French – I so rarely have the opportunity to do so.*

Well, I want to pay tribute to two African countries, which are very active in the negotiations. South Africa has been playing a major role, and for a long time has been speaking very bluntly, what we need—that sort of language we need—and sending bridges, saying, “Okay, we can do this this way.” It was very, very useful, so South Africa, thank you for all your involvement in all this, and especially, thank you for having been the first emerging country to say, “Okay, we shall try to peak in 2020-2025, stay on a plateau, and decline in 2050,” so you’re the first developing, emerging country to have already pledged to peak! I mean, that’s very important, and it was sort of a landmark, so that’s very important. And Senegal! Africa is more active than one would expect, and not only South Africa.

I believe in politics. I’m from that generation, May ’68. The message has gone and said, did I recover from May ’68? No, I never recovered from May ’68. I believe in enlightenment. Sometimes I’m afraid of some “*obscurantisme*” in the environmental movement. They don’t believe enough in science. I believe in progress, I believe in man, I believe in political will. I believe in that.

I believe that, if we want, well, we can help Africa. We can help, and there are lots of things to be done, lots of things also that we can learn. One of the major [emissions generators created by] living in poor conditions is the household cooking system with charcoal and wood and all that, which is terribly polluting. You suffocate, you have lots of illness with the children, the women have to go far away to get wood, and more and more, further and further, and all the soot and carbon, black carbon, all that are greenhouse gases. But of course, when we talk of energy, we usually talk about electricity, because it’s more fancy, and we forget the cooking, the very simple, basic thing.

So we should have major programs, and we are trying to work with African countries on these major programs for also, the Sahelian desertification process, to try to fight that one in the negotiations. We are slowly getting to understand the role of carbon in soils, and how can we help not only the forest, but also the soils, to capture the carbon, to store the carbon, et cetera. This could probably also find a mechanism to help your countries which are confronted with drought and desertification, so now we are working very closely with African countries, trying to have an initiative which we have started with your minister and others in South Africa, to try to come to Copenhagen with a special African program, and to say, “Okay you guys, climate change. This is what’s happening in

Africa, and please help us to solve the problem.” These programs, these projects, etc. We will share that with all the countries as much as we can, and we know that lots of countries would agree to help Africa on this subject.

Now, what’s going to happen after Copenhagen? Well, it’s already set. It’s going to be either Mexico or Lima, and that is for GRULAC countries to decide, and after it’s going to be—where, where, where?—it’s going to be in Pretoria or Cape Town, I don’t know. After the football cup, after the World Cup.

Hoge: World Cup first.

Lalonde: The World Cup is going to be in your country. We’ll be very happy to be there. I was in Pretoria not long ago for the inauguration of President Zuma, and there we are. It’s going to be great to be there again!

Hoge: Well, Brice Lalonde, if you’ll forgive me this metaphor, you have been a very welcome breath of fresh air. Thank you very much for being here.

[applause]