

ICAO HIGH LEVEL MEETING ON CLIMATE CHANGE
MONTREAL CANADA 7-9 OCTOBER 2009
REPORT BY CAPTAIN MARY SCHAFFER, US ALPA

1. The three-day meeting in Montreal was supposed to adopt the recommendations of the GIACC. Several working papers were presented from different countries and the United States presented with Mexico. The working papers are available at: <http://www.icao.int/Highlevel2009/Documentation.htm>. The GIACC recommendations suggest a 2% reduction in CO2 levels in the coming years. Cap and Trade was not adopted in the GIACC.
2. The second day of the meeting quickly descended into the familiar bickering between developing nations and those nations that want to move forward with aggressive reductions in emissions. China, India and Brazil added comments that threatened the ability of the group to come to a consensus to move forward to COP15 (Conference of Parties) in Copenhagen in December.
3. During the open meeting, the Chairman requested a group of 17 countries join him for a lunch meeting. This group included a cross section of countries including the United States. During this first meeting of the 'friend's of the chairman' the developing nations apparently attempted to pull back from even the goals that were set in GIACC. On day three, the open meeting was delayed until late afternoon when an agreement was reached in the form of a declaration.
4. The following details of the declaration are a summary provided by ATA.
 - --Reaffirms ICAO leadership;
 - --Acknowledges the principle of Common But Differentiated Responsibilities (CBDR) -- but does not adopt that as an ICAO principle (basically, kicks the can down the road on this issue);
 - --Acknowledges aviation vital to global economic and social development;
 - --Acknowledges that while aviation accounts for only 2% of the world's CO2 emissions, the sector's emissions are projected to grow;
 - --Notes "the collective commitments announced by ACI, CANSO, IATA and ICCAIA on behalf of the international air transport industry to continuously improve CO2 efficiency by an average of 1.5% per annum from 2009 until 2020, achieve carbon neutral growth from 2020 and reduce its CO2 emissions by 50% by 2050 compared to 2005 levels;
 - --Endorses GIACC Program of Action -- specifically including the goal to "achieve a global annual average fuel efficiency improvement of 2 percent" through 2020 and also between 2021 and 2050, but noting that these goals are not enough to offset expected increases in aviation emissions;
 - --Agree to work more on goals of greater ambition, possibly including carbon neutral growth in the medium term and emissions reductions in the long term, taking into account the industry targets;
 - --Agree to expeditiously "establish a process to develop a framework for market-based measures in international aviation";
 - --States to submit action plans on their measures to contribute to emissions improvements and report their emissions (though very small States exempt);

- --Encourage support of and more work on sustainable alternative aviation fuels;
 - --Endorse work and adoption of a global CO2 standard for new type design aircraft through ICAO's Committee on Aviation Environmental Protection; [note - we support this, for new type design aircraft only, as specified]
 - --Continue to work on understanding non-CO2 climate impacts of aviation;
 - --Work with industry to foster the development of more energy efficient aircraft, sustainable alternative fuels and operational measures, ATM improvements and airport improvements to reduce emissions;
 - --Keep in mind interdependencies of noise and emissions;
 - --More work on how States should monitor and report aviation emissions;
 - --Explore technical and financial assistance for developing states;
 - --"Invite the international air transport industry to further elaborate the implementation framework and strategies for the collective commitment of the international air transport industry." [Obviously, this will require significant work by the airlines, through IATA]
5. Generally, this declaration is reasonable for aviation and the US interests were able to keep market measures from taking root in the proposal. While we interacted with many of the associations present and were able to discuss our views on market measures and keeping safety a priority, because of the many private meetings our interaction with the country representatives was minimal. If Copenhagen will be much of the same it will not be cost effective for us to attend. Attending the other industry groups and events will be much more cost effective.