


CONTRACTION & CONVERGENCE

C&C AND THE BYRD HAGEL RESOLUTION

Alex Evans, Director of Communications, Global Commons Institute
(alex.r.evans@ic.ac.uk / +44 (0)7958 229 247 / <http://www.gci.org.uk>)

In June 1997, the US Senate passed by 95 votes to 0 the Byrd Hagel Resolution, which stated that, “The US should not be a signatory to any protocol to, or other agreement regarding, the UNFCCC of 1992, at negotiations in December 1997, or thereafter, which would mandate new commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for the Annex I [developed country] Parties, unless the protocol or other agreement also mandates new specific scheduled commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for Developing Country Parties within the same compliance period.” C&C is completely consistent with this Senate Resolution, as shown below.

Past 'EXPANSION & DIVERGENCE' - - - - - Future 'CONTRACTION & CONVERGENCE'



In the resolution, two defining distinctions are maintained. The first is between the Annex One Parties and the Developing Country Parties. The second is between 'limit' ghg emissions and 'reduce' ghg emissions. Limitation of ghg emissions is controlled positive growth of ghg emissions and reductions of ghg emissions is controlled negative growth of emissions. If we put these concepts together "within the same compliance period", the paragraph can only translate into a process of formal "Contraction & Convergence". Annex One Parties will reduce (or contract) their ghg emissions while the Developing Country Parties will limit their ghg emissions (so as to converge with Annex One Country Parties). Technically, not just rhetorically, there has to be a 'convergence factor' to do this. This can only emerge by design and consent, not by accident.

