

**“Work by Annex I Parties on the scientific basis for determining their further commitments, including on scenarios for stabilization of atmospheric concentrations of GHG and on the implications of these scenarios”**  
**First in-session workshop of the AWG on Further Commitment for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol**  
**Nairobi, 6-14 November 2006/10/28**  
**Presentation of Japan**

**A. Climate stabilization and Japan’s commitment**

First, let me talk about how Japan looks at the scientific basis for determining its own commitments in the next commitment period.

The first thing I have to discuss is the need for us and for Japan to address the stabilization objective of the Convention. There is no more compelling objective than this one.

As usual, our theory is simple.

Kyoto is a first step reducing GHG by 5% overall from 1990 level. It is hardly a relevance to any stabilization requirement.

Next commitment period must deliver more in order for it to be relevant and consistent to the stabilization requirement.

Next commitment period must establish, therefore, a credible pathway to achieve climate stabilization.

If we don’t discuss climate stabilization in the context of the next commitment period, then I just wonder when we are going to discuss it? Are we going to discuss it at the end of the next commitment period which will be somewhere around 2025 or 2030? Can we really afford it?

Let us suppose that we are to address climate stabilization in the context of the next commitment period. For that, we need common understanding amongst all of us about the level of global efforts required for climate stabilization.

We hope we come to a consensus soon on this, based primarily on the IPCC information and its scientific data.

Once we come to establish a good robust scientific basis, a solid consensus amongst us, and once we come to know who are coming to share the burden, Japan will begin deliberating on its own share of responsibilities.

Now, on climate stabilization, there are debates and diverse views.

Our European friends have established less than 2 degree C as their global target. They

maintain that stabilization at 400-450 ppmv CO<sub>2</sub> eq is consistent with that targeting.

Japan, whilst not disagreeing with our European friends, now offers different perspective and maintains that the balance of the global carbon circulation must be restored quickly enough for climate stabilization.

Annual global GHG emissions amount to 6.3 Gt, which is twice as large as natural absorptive capacity of the earth. A balance between emissions and absorptive capacity must be established as quickly as possible as a first step. Global GHG emissions must therefore be reduced to less than half the current level soon enough.

New scientific evidence abounds and some of them are quite alarming. We vaguely believe we have to do more, yet we can get easily lost in the sea of diverse information.

Therefore, we need to have a common metrics. We need to have a most expert and most authoritative information about the level of actions necessary for climate stabilization.

For this reason, we welcome IPCC action to provide us with their latest findings.

It is on the basis of their information and scientific data that we have to proceed in our deliberation of AWG.

#### B. Diversity of strategies based on national circumstances

As bleak scientific evidence amounts, as the global anxiety amounts, so does the discussion about how to cope with the problem.

Japan, like all other countries, genuinely wishes to be a part of a good, effective framework capable of responding to this global challenge. I like to see Japan's further commitment be a part of good effective system which is sure to beat the challenge.

So the next question I have to ask is; are we really right to say that we've established in Kyoto all the right answer to this challenge?

Aren't we a little too self-righteous to pretend that all strategy is here in the tool box of Kyoto, where there are only numerical target, timeline, some flexible mechanisms and detailed punishment plan ?

Shouldn't we be a little more humble to the awesome might of nature and human action and start exploring many more tools and strategies on top of the Kyoto's tool box?

Simply, we feel we cannot accept that we can win this colossal planetary battle by numericals, timeline, flexible mechanisms and punishment. I simply cannot accept that strategies we invented in 97 are all valid and effective in years and decades to come and nothing should be added.

Mind you, I say this not because I hate numerical target. We are not going to walk away

from numericals. Besides, we will definitely achieve our numerical target anyway.

Yet, I say this because we are actually learning that we can achieve more by adding other tools and strategies.

Asia Pacific Partnership is a case in point. Sectoral approach with private sector involvement is making difference in enhancing energy efficiency. Japanese business is working on sectoral basis. Some firms are doing well by adopting intensity target.

In the real world, “learning by doing” process is more effective than just preaching mantra on general terms. Hands-on cooperation for technical innovation through Public Private Partnership is more effective than just a generalized discussion on TT.

By talking about things like sector approach, intensity and business involvement, I am not suggesting any serious surgery on Kyoto. All what I am suggesting is for us to take a rather down to earth attitude and learn from our experiences in the field and add those new tools to our tool box only to make our system really effective and capable.

Here is another case where we have to be really down to earth.

We all know “common but differentiated responsibilities”. We are aware that the Convention says that the developed countries should take the lead in combating climate change.

Well, we accept all this and as a matter of fact, in many meaningful ways, the developed countries are actually taking the lead in combating climate change.

Yet, we also recognize that we are in a long-term process which will last decades and decade and may be centuries, and that for this process to be durable and effective, fairness and equity on burden sharing must be ensured.

Otherwise it will collapse if not today, but certainly it will collapse the day after tomorrow. We all must join hands and strive together in a fair sense of solidarity and partnership.

### C. Conclusion

And of course I am sure we can have a new solidarity and partnership because we all agree and firmly believe that climate challenge can only be dealt with by pushing forward sustainable development of each and everyone of us.

Our dear friend and respected professor of South Africa, Prof. Winkler says in his Indaba paper as follows. “Climate policy on its own will not solve the climate problem.” Well said indeed.

More than half of the world population is fighting against poverty, fighting for food security, for access to basic energy supply, for health care, water supply... We cannot

overcome climate change without addressing to those problems.

So, here is another question we have to ask. Are we really in the business of stifling economy only for the sake of environment?

Definitely not. We are in fact in the business of achieving both.

Climate action does have co-benefits, like access to the basic energy service, better living standard, better competitiveness, improved energy security, new jobs, new opportunities, new business, new lifestyle.

In short, climate action pays. Climate action will enhance, not harm, sustainable development.

I like to share all these concepts with you all, as Japan will start thinking about our next commitment.

[End]