

## Guest commentary

***The dark before the dawn***

*By Liz Bossley, chief executive, Consilience Energy Advisory Group (CEAG)*

After last week's UN meeting in Bangkok, the chances of deadlock over a climate deal at the Copenhagen summit in December are high because the positions of the 'big three' - China, India and the US - remain firmly entrenched.

The US will not agree a UN cap unless the major developing countries agree to limit their emissions. China and India are highly unlikely to sign up for UN cap that may limit their economic growth.

To break the deadlock we should not be afraid of considering completely new mechanisms or refinements of the old ones.

For example, could large developing countries be encouraged to accept a quota of offset projects under the clean development mechanism (CDM), rather than a cap on their absolute emissions?

This approach would place an obligation on some of the larger developing economies to meet a mandatory quota by hosting projects within their own economies and generating primary CERs.

If a country were to fail to fill its quota domestically it would have the option of buying its shortfall of CER allowances in the international secondary market.

These CERs would be surrendered to the UN for retirement at the end of the compliance cycle in the same way that assigned amount units are surrendered and retired under the current Kyoto protocol.

Hence, although an increased CDM project pipeline would add to the sum total of the supply of allowances in the market, it would also boost the demand for CERs from developing economies for compliance purposes.

Primary CERs issued to CDM investors would remain theirs to sell in the market as a reward for their investment. But they could be taken into account by the UN in assessing whether or not a developing country had fulfilled its CDM quota.

Such a quota would provide some reassurance that every unit of investment in the developing nations would be tested for its environmental integrity. It could not be interpreted as a back-door attempt to limit their economic growth.

It would sharpen discussions between project investors and host countries, the latter needing foreign investment to generate primary CERs to avoid spending money on buying secondary CERs.

Would this meet the US's criteria for signing up to a Kyoto cap? Possibly not. But does that really matter? Whatever UN cap the US accepts is not going to be lower than the cap suggested by the Boxer-Kerry bill in the US Senate: 20 per cent below 2005 levels by 2020.

It may even be higher, depending on what happens at the November Senate vote. In fact, if the Senate wants a high cap it might be better to have it outside the Kyoto framework so it does not add hot air to the market for Kyoto allowances.

If the worst happens and no deal is agreed at Copenhagen, countries, including the USA, would still be bound by the commitments they made when they agreed to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change back in 1992. It would only be the Kyoto Protocol method of achieving it that would expire.

The national and regional emissions trading schemes that are being set up by developed countries would not necessarily die with the Kyoto Protocol. The EU emissions trading system, for example, would continue to operate, because it is now enshrined in European law.

If Copenhagen collapses, our best hope for an international carbon price would lie with the CDM. If we can salvage and improve the CDM mechanism, the CER could act as a fungibility link amongst the allowances traded in disparate European, US, Australian, New Zealand, Swiss and other emissions trading schemes.

The best outcome from a climate mitigation viewpoint would be a robust agreement on low caps for a wider range of developed and developing countries. But we should be prepared for the worst. A collapse at Copenhagen cannot be the end of the road. We must have a back-up plan at the ready and that plan has to involve a strengthened CDM mechanism.

---

**Do you want to write a guest commentary for Carbon Market Europe?** Contact [news@pointcarbon.com](mailto:news@pointcarbon.com).