



*Ministry of Environment, Forests and Tourism  
Madagascar*

**Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the  
Convention (AWG LCA)**

**Submission for a Shared Vision on Long-term Cooperative Action**

December the 6<sup>th</sup>, 2008

Madagascar, one of the least developed countries on earth, centre of mega diversity, is also one of the most vulnerable to and less responsible for climate change. Since it becomes urgent to engage the negotiation phase on the international system now, up to and beyond 2012, Madagascar would like to raise a few concerns that will, hopefully, contribute to building a fair and efficient climate future.

The amounts of funding necessary to adapt and to mitigate climate change are huge. Let's remind that we are talking about an overall US\$ 300 billion to 600 billion per year for the coming decades. For Madagascar only, a first rough analysis sets the figure of USD 360 million a year, which represents about 7% of our national GDP. But we can't consider it as a traditional financial transfer from the North to support the development in the South. US\$ 360 million is the cost that Madagascar will be supporting every year as a drag to its development and a constant pressure to the degradation of the well-being of its people.

*Thus, we suggest there should be two priorities for countries like Madagascar. First, how can we make sure that the climate change remains within 2°C? Then, how do we secure the financial flows and related institutional system to effectively support our countries' adaptation and mitigation efforts.*

### ***Long-term global goal for emission reductions: do not press the red button***

If developed countries undoubtedly hold major responsibility in creating the climate bomb, a major issue is currently to make sure that no one presses the red button. With all the uncertainties and dark consequences stressed by the IPCC, moving beyond 2°C is like pressing the red button. Madagascar is committed in finding compromise to ensure that this point of no return won't be passed.

To this extent, the world community must soon reach an agreement on two collective objectives. First, the world emissions must be reduced by at least 50% by 2050 compared to 1990. Also, the world emissions must peak between 2015 and 2020. Beyond those common objectives, developed countries must take responsibility for their leading role by reducing their emissions by 25% to 40% by 2020 compared to 1990, and by 75% to 85% by 2050 compared to 1990.

Mathematically, those objectives also put responsibilities to the developing countries, and non Annex I countries must take the challenge under the leadership of the big growing economies that hold the keys to such subsequent goals. According to the level of commitment from the Annex I, the developing world may have to reduce collectively its emissions by 15% up to 30% compared to its business as usual baseline by 2020. On a longer term, by 2050, figures suggest that Non Annex I countries will have to reduce by 25%\* their global emission compared to the year 2000 (absolute reduction). The fact that there must be reductions from developed as well as developing countries will certainly have important consequences in the future international regime. For instance, the offset mechanisms like CDM must make it clear whether they are alleviating the developed or the developing countries burden, and so prevent double accountability.

We, developing countries, are doomed to bear our own objectives, and we must respond to this necessity in respect to our national circumstances. Moreover, the more ambitious the developed countries objectives are, the smaller the burden we will have to bear ourselves. So it is of crucial interest for developing countries to support the leading developed countries in fixing ambitious targets. The carbon equation of our future is obviously collective.

We call out for all countries to ensure that the shared vision, as well as its international institutional and financial translation, brings clear answers to this major concern for a vulnerable country like Madagascar. To this regard, we invite Annex I countries to follow and reach consensus on the basis of courageous and leading proposals put by Norway or the European Union. We also invite the major and growing economies in Non Annex I countries to move towards inspiring and ambitious diplomatic positions at the image of the efforts those countries are already making on their national scale. Differentiation may represent a fair solution in the long run and should be seriously considered in the agenda toward a third engagement period.

Until then, we press the international community to advance on concrete solutions to ensure that the Least Developed Countries and SIDS are given differentiated responses according to their national circumstances. Every developing country should soon be expected to provide a national strategy to adapt to and to mitigate climate change on its own scale. But systems of priorities or quotas under the Convention should be applied for our countries. Other alternatives could be explored as the enlargement of the scope of programs and projects prone to receive international funding, eased conditionality and fasten processes of selection and

disbursement, reduction of co-financing prerequisite, extension of public financial flows to projects that could eventually produce carbon offsets etc.

Madagascar is ready to support any option that could lead to such agreement in Copenhagen.

***Secure the financial resources to meet the needs and galvanize the developing countries***

The financial flows required to address climate change in Madagascar is of unprecedented scale in this arena of international negotiation. We invite the UNFCCC to organise the urgent and necessary space for discussions on this matter. Beyond insufficient market-based instruments, we urge Parties to lead the debate toward additional and ambitious sources of funding, like the commitment by developed countries to dedicate 0,5% of their GDP to climate change in developing countries, an international tax on global monetary transactions or on fossil fuels, or by the use of change reserves. We must go beyond old theories and dogmas that often proved to be debatable, as the current financial crisis reminds us every day. We face an historical situation, and we must consider historical solutions.

Building on the summary by the chair of the workshop on a shared vision for long-term cooperative action, we believe that a shared vision must “provide guidance on the scale of finance and investment needed. Enhanced action on the provision of finance demands predictable, new and additional funding, to which the most vulnerable countries are given simplified and prioritised access”.

Least developed country concerns must be eased on this matter to allow us to move on toward Copenhagen with a dispassionate and wise attitude. We need clear and ambitious signals to engage this historical challenge, to galvanize our own national forces. Developing countries are confronted to constant urgency, to numerous and deep barriers to our development. Sound strategic planning is often a luxury, while as regard climate change, it is a must. From this perspective, we invite the LDC to follow enlightened examples of Parties like Papua New Guinea on the way toward planning ambitious objectives on this matter.

Madagascar calls out for an agreement in early 2009 regarding orders of magnitude for both emissions reductions, and the financial support - covering technological and capacity building needs, and based on sufficient and predictable sources. Both categories of objectives will be measurable, reportable and verifiable. We believe that it can be a strong starting point for a fast agreement on institutional architecture and further technical arrangements within each pillar of the Bali Action Plan.

Madagascar invites each Party to the negotiation, according to its common but differentiated responsibility, its respective capacities and its national circumstances, to make a decisive move to answer those two core concerns. We also invite the UNFCCC secretariat to provide the space for such a move.

*\* the IPCC figures show that the global emissions in 2000 were 44,7GteqCO<sub>2</sub>, with 20,6Gt from AI countries (46%) and 24,1Gt from NAI countries. Emission reductions by 50% by 2050 suggest bringing global annual emissions down to 22,3Gt. An 80% decrease in AI countries means a AI annual emission of 4,1Gt by 2050, leaving a carbon space of an annual 18,2Gt for NAI countries. The absolute reduction of emissions in NAI countries by 2050 is 5,9Gt, about 25% of 2000 levels.*