

## **Negotiations on Climate Change: Debates on Commitments of Developing Countries and Possible Responses**

*Kim Chan-woo*

### **INTRODUCTION**

**I**n March 2001, U.S. President George W. Bush publicized his opposition to the Kyoto Protocol, citing as the reasons the Protocol's exemption of developing countries such as China and India from the list of countries that should reduce greenhouse gases and its possible harm to the U.S. economy.<sup>1)</sup> The announcement shocked all Parties which had been involved in the negotiations on climate change aimed at the prevention of global warming.

Opposition from the United States, the largest greenhouse-gas emitting country in the world, became a stumbling block in the negotiations on the Kyoto Protocol. Yet the ensuing sense of crisis prompted both developed and developing countries to reach a

---

1) President George W. Bush expressed his opposition to the Kyoto Protocol in a letter dated March 13, 2001 to Senators Chuck Hagel, Jesse Helms, Larry Craig, Pat Roberts, "..., I oppose the Kyoto Protocol because it exempts 80 percent of the world, including major population centers such as China, and India, from compliance, and would cause serious harm to the U.S. economy..."

compromise on the operational details of the Protocol without the participation of Washington. As a result, the Marrakesh Accords on the operational details of the Kyoto Protocol was adopted through the Conference of the Parties (COP) held in Bonn, Germany in July 2001, and in Marrakesh, Morocco in November of the same year.<sup>2)</sup>

However, the participation of the U.S. is still essential to implementing the Kyoto Protocol. U.S. participation is important not only to curb its greenhouse gas emissions, but also to allay the concerns of the developed countries such as EU member countries about their possibly weakened industrial competitiveness.

As part of the effort to induce the United States to participate in the Protocol, the issue of commitments by developing countries is expected to be addressed in future negotiations among the Parties. Such a development signifies increased pressure on Korea, a member of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), to take an obligation to reduce greenhouse gases. It is therefore necessary for Korea to prepare for the difficult situation in the foreseeable future, when a decision should be made.

## PRINCIPLES OF COMMITMENT AND KOREA

### *Principles of Commitment Regarding Greenhouse Gas Reduction*

#### The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

---

2) At COP-4 in Buenos Aires, in 1998, an action plan called the 'Buenos Aires Plan of Action' was adopted to set a timeframe for the adoption of the operational details of the Kyoto Protocol. The original deadline for these negotiations was COP-6, which took place in The Hague, The Netherlands, at the end of 2000. However, these negotiations failed and were suspended. COP-6 bis, in Bonn, July 2001, secured a political agreement, the Bonn Agreement, despite the US withdrawal in the Spring of 2001. Finally, COP-7 in Marrakesh in November 2001 reached agreement, the Marrakesh Accords clarifying the remaining issues in the Kyoto Protocol.

(UNFCCC) and the Kyoto Protocol impose obligations on developed countries, namely the Annex I Parties, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions for the “stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere.”<sup>3)</sup> Even though the selection and the degree of obligations of the Annex I Parties are the outcomes of political negotiations, the concept of equity, common but differentiated responsibilities, and respective capabilities under Article 3, Paragraph 1 of the UNFCCC are often referred to as the guiding principles.

The principle of “equity” is the core issue with respect to the commitment among the Parties, but in the process of ensuring equity it is difficult for the Parties to agree on a formula that takes all factors into account. This is well reflected in the fact that although the Parties discussed many factors for commitment during the process of negotiations on the Kyoto Protocol, for example, per capita greenhouse gas emissions, they failed to reach a consensus on a number of factors.<sup>4)</sup> “The common but differentiated responsibilities” and “respective capabilities” are being discussed as parts of the

---

3) The Annex B countries appearing in the Kyoto Protocol are generally based on the concept of the Annex I Parties. The Article 3 Paragraph 1 of the Protocol demands the Annex I Parties to implement the reduction obligations (or targets) stated in the Annex B, and the overall content of the Protocol imposes obligations on the Annex I Parties. The only difference is that the Annex I Parties are made up of 40 countries including the OECD member countries (except Korea and Mexico), Economies in Transition (the Central and Eastern European countries), Leichtenstein and Monaco, while the Annex B countries exclude Turkey and Belarus from the Annex I Parties. At COP-7, a decision was made confirming that Turkey is an Annex I party but not an Annex II Party. Turkey will be included in Annex B in due course.

4) During the negotiations on the Kyoto Protocol, the following factors were considered: per capita greenhouse gas emissions; greenhouse gas emissions per GDP; per capita GDP; per capita GDP growth rate; degree of contribution to the surface temperature rise; population growth; emission intensity of GDP; emission intensity of exports; fossil fuel intensity of exports; share of renewable energy in energy supply, etc. (FCCC/CP/1997/2; FCCC/CP/1997/2/Add.1; FCCC/CP/1997/CRP.2).

<Table 1> Emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> (in Mt) from Fuel Combustion

Emissions	Total CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (Mt)			CO <sub>2</sub> emissions per capita (t/inhabitant)
	1990	1998		1998
World	21,290	22,726	+6.7%	3.9
Non-Annex I Parties	6,826	8,622	+26.3%	1.9
Annex I Parties	13,826	13,383	-3.2%	11.0
Annex II Parties	9,957	10,972	+10.2%	12.0
Economies in Transition	3,868	2,592	-33.0%	8.2

Source: IEA CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fuel combustion 1971-1998, Paris, 2000 (compiled by UNFCCC).

principle of equity, or as a separate principle, and can be applied in a more practical way than the principle of equity. The principle of common but differentiated responsibilities holds that even though the nature of the problem is universal the developed countries should take the lead in combating climate change, as they are mainly responsible for greenhouse gas emission since the industrial revolution. While bearing historical responsibility for the phenomenon, developed countries strongly argue that climate change cannot be curbed by their efforts alone, so that the participation of developing countries is required.

The developed countries are well equipped to deal with climate change, so the principle of “respective capabilities” draws little attention when it comes to their commitments. Yet, “respective capabilities” will be counted heavily in the cases of countries that should shoulder large responsibility with low capability and, also, countries that do not hold as much responsibility yet have the capability to act.

#### *Application to Korea of the Principle of Commitment*

The application to Korea of the aforementioned principles of commitment has various implications. The Pew Center on Global

**<Table 2> Top 20 Countries (Based on 1998 Emissions Level) Plus EU**

Emissions Year	Total CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions (Mt)			CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions Per Capita (t/inhabitant)
	1990	1998		1998
United States of America	4,844	5,410	+11.7%	20.1
China (including Hong Kong)	2,389	2,893	+21.1%	2.3
Russian Federation	2,308	1,416	-38.7%	9.6
Japan	1,048	1,128	+7.6%	8.9
India	595	908	+52.7%	0.9
Germany	967	857	-11.4%	10.4
United Kingdom	572	550	-4.0%	9.3
Canada	421	477	+13.3%	15.8
Italy	402	426	+6.1%	7.5
France	369	376	+1.9%	6.4
Republic of Korea	232	370	+59.4%	8.0
Ukraine	675	359	-46.8%	7.1
Mexico	297	356	+20.0%	3.7
South Africa	291	354	+21.5%	8.5
Poland	348	320	-8.1%	8.3
Australia	259	311	+20.1%	16.6
Brazil	201	296	+47.2%	1.8
Saudi Arabia	160	271	+68.8%	13.1
Islamic Republic of Iran	197	260	+31.9%	4.2
Spain	212	254	+20.1%	6.5
European Union	3,152	3,171	+0.6%	8.5

Source: IEA CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fuel combustion 1971-1998, Paris, 2000 (compiled by UNFCCC).

Climate Change reports that South Korea ranked 25th in terms of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the energy sector during the period of 1950 to 1995—higher than Argentina, a country which publicly committed

itself to greenhouse gas reduction.<sup>5)</sup> Another report similarly indicates that historical emissions by Korea accounts for 0.6 percent of the world total emissions and it ranked Korea at or below 25th place.<sup>6)</sup>

With regard to current emissions, statistics by the International Energy Agency (IEA) indicate that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by the Korean energy sector in 1998 were the 11th largest in the world, accounting for 1.6 percent.<sup>7)</sup> And from 1990 to 1998, the rate of increase for CO<sub>2</sub> was 6 percent per annum, much higher than the 1.1 percent average figure for other OECD member countries. The per capita emission of CO<sub>2</sub> was 7.97 TonCO<sub>2</sub>—lower than the OECD average of 10.92 but still higher than the global average of 3.86.

In measuring a country's capabilities to deal with climate change, per capita gross domestic product (GDP) is frequently used. As for South Korea, the per capita GDP in 2000 was \$9,675, ranking 36th in the world. But when the figure is translated, factoring in purchasing power parity (PPP), Korea is placed higher. In addition, Korea's GDP is \$457.4 billion or 12th in the world, with its amount of exports and imports standing in 12th and 13th place, respectively.

## EXPECTATIONS FROM THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

### *Expectations from the OECD on Korea*

During deliberations on the admission into the OECD, Korea was under strong pressure from OECD member countries to participate

---

5) Eileen Claussen and Lisa McNeilly, *The Complex Elements of Global Fairness* (Pew Center on Global Climate Change, 1998), p. 28.

6) Gregg Marland, *et al.*, *National CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from Fossil-fuel Burning, Cement Manufacture, and Gas Flaring: 1751-1998* (Carbon dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, 2001).

7) IEA, *CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from Fuel Combustion, 1971-1998 Highlights* (2000).

in the Annex I Parties. Korea proposed that it should be included in the non-Annex I Parties to the Protocol that were being negotiated at that time, but would be prepared to proactively implement the Convention, establish a long-term energy management policy, participate in the activities of the OECD/IEA related to climate change, and come up with a national report comparable to those by the Annex I Parties.

In the end, the OECD assessed the 5-point proposals made by Korea to be positive, and made concessions for Korea's participation in the negotiations on the Protocol as one of the non-Annex I countries, or the group of developing countries. Yet the OECD envisaged that Korea would be included in the Annex I Parties along with most other OECD members in future commitments regarding the Convention.<sup>8)</sup>

All OECD members, excluding Korea and Mexico, are included among the Annex I Parties that share the burden of reducing greenhouse gases. Among the Annex I Parties, the OECD countries, except for the economies-in-transition (EITs) and Turkey for special reasons, are included in the Annex II Parties that assume the burden of providing financial and technical support for developing countries. It can be said that the international community has high expectations for the OECD member countries with respect to climate change negotiations.

#### *Meaningful Participation by Developing Countries*

It is expected that "the meaningful participation" by developing countries will be a main topic in the follow-up negotiations to the

---

8) OECD document C (96) 184, paragraph 33 (vi), September 24, 1996. "..., the Committee [Environmental Policy Committee] envisages that the Republic of Korea will associate itself with other OECD Members, most of whom are listed in Annex I, in relation to future commitments under the Convention [Climate Change Convention]."

Kyoto Protocol from now on. The issue of “the meaningful participation” will classify developing countries into more specific groups based on responsibility, respective capabilities, and vulnerability. In the process, Korea will also be re-classified.

Among developing countries, China, India, South Africa, Mexico, Brazil, Iran, North Korea, South Korea, Saudi Arabia, Argentina, Indonesia, and Venezuela are at higher historical emission level of greenhouse gases. As of 1998, developing countries that have larger current emissions are China, India, South Korea, Mexico, South Africa, Brazil, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Indonesia, North Korea, Thailand, Argentina, and Venezuela. In fact, emissions from these countries and from the Annex I Parties combined, account for 80-90 percent of the total historical and current emissions of the world.<sup>9)</sup>

Certain of the aforementioned developing countries, namely, China, India, Mexico, Brazil, and South Korea, are given attention to as they are specifically mentioned in the Byrd-Hagel resolution adopted by the U.S. Senate in July 1997. China and India’s per capita emissions are less than the global average but their historical and current emissions as of 1998 are among the ten highest in the world. Now, perhaps they are even larger, since emissions by these two countries have been rapidly increasing. It is, therefore, imperative that they make contributions in some form toward international efforts aimed at preventing global climate change.

Meanwhile, South Korea and Mexico are recognized as countries that should contribute to the international efforts of combating climate change since their emissions have been noticeable, in terms of both historical and current levels, and besides, they are considered to have the economic capabilities to fight climate change as members of the OECD.<sup>10)</sup> In particular, there is a possibility that Korea and Mexico will be asked to make commitments comparable to those from the Annex I

---

9) Eileen Claussen, and Lisa McNeilly, *op. cit.*, p. 28; Gregg Marland, *et al.*, *op. cit.*

10) Per capita greenhouse emissions of South Korea in the energy sector in 1998 were 7.97 TonCO<sub>2</sub>. The figure for Mexico was far lower at 3.72 TonCO<sub>2</sub>.

countries, unlike China and India, which have relatively small per capita emissions as well as a low per capita GDP.<sup>11)</sup>

### IMPLEMENTING COMMITMENT OF THE KYOTO PROTOCOL

In accordance with the Convention, the Annex I Parties should lower their greenhouse gas emissions to the level of 1990 by 2000 (Article 4, paragraph 2 (a) and (b), of the Convention). Specifically, at Kyoto, these Parties agreed to ensure that their aggregate greenhouse gas emissions do not exceed their assigned amounts, “with a view to reducing their overall emissions of such gases by at least 5 percent below 1990 levels in the commitment period 2008 to 2012” (Article 3, paragraph 1, of the Protocol).

At the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol, the Annex I Parties negotiated respective emission targets for implementing their commitments stated in the Protocol and agreed to different targets that allowed a negative 8 to positive 10 percent range from the emission levels of 1990. As for the EU, the so-called “EU bubble” was allowed to serve as a mechanism to be used to achieve the negative 8 percent target as a whole. Thus the EU member countries held consultations and agreed to assign targets ranging from negative 28 to positive 27 percent to achieve the common EU goal.

In South Korea, the energy sector emits most of the greenhouse gases (90%). Specifically, the greenhouse gas emissions from the energy sector in 1990 in Korea were 65.2 million tons of carbon

---

11) The report by the Pew Center uses three variables, namely responsibility, standard of living, and opportunity for greenhouse gas reduction to classify all countries of the world into the following groups: “Must Act Now” (30 countries) group that must start reduction efforts immediately; the group of “Should Act Now, But Differently” (48 countries); and the group of “Could Act Now” (75 countries). South Korea and Mexico are included in the group of “Must Act Now” countries. Eileen Claussen, and Lisa McNeilly, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

(MtC), and that figure had increased by 71 percent by 1999. In the year 2010, it is expected to increase to 162 percent.<sup>12)</sup> In light of the Annex I Parties' maximum growth target of around 30 percent of the 1990 level, the Kyoto Protocol's formula to reduce or limit greenhouse gas emissions against the base year level does not fit in with Korea's special circumstances.<sup>13)</sup>

### VARIOUS FORMS OF COMMITMENT

#### *Commitment Types under Discussion*<sup>14)</sup>

##### (a) Fixed Targets and Dynamic Targets

Fixed targets have currently been adopted by the Kyoto Protocol: they determine in advance the emission targets by countries before the commitment period, and control the emissions so as not to exceed the targets during that commitment period. The dynamic targets, on the other hand, link the greenhouse gas emissions to agreed variables—for example, GDP. In this case, it is called a GDP-indexed target.

The dynamic targets allow for an increase or decrease in greenhouse gas emissions according to the GDP growth during the commitment period, relieving the concerns of developing countries that their economic growth might be hampered if greenhouse gas

12) Forecasts for greenhouse gas emissions in the energy sector (standard growth, unit: MTC)

Year	1990	1997	1999	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020
Emissions	65.2	118.3	111.3	121.3	146.4	170.6	188.8	205.3

Source: Reports co-authored by the Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Energy, Korea, and Korea Energy Economics Institute (December 2000).

13) The Kyoto Protocol gives a certain degree of flexibility to the EITs of the Annex I Parties (3:6), and allows them to choose between historical year or period other than 1990 in terms of the base year (3:5).

14) Cedric Philibert, and Jonathan Pershing, "Considering the Options: Climate Targets for All Countries," *Climate Policy*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (2001).

emission targets are quantitatively determined beforehand. A case in point was the GDP-indexed emission target of Argentina announced in the 5th Conference of the Parties (COP-5) to the Convention in November 1999.<sup>15)</sup>

(b) Country-wide Targets and Sectoral Targets

The Kyoto Protocol binds the Annex I countries to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. When a country fails to implement its commitment, that is, its country-wide targets, it has to accept responsibility. Another type is to select one or more sectors of a country, for example, the steel manufacturing, cement, and petrochemical sectors, and impose targets on sectors. The targets by sector can be used before imposing the country-wide targets.

(c) Quantitative Targets and Qualitative Targets

The Kyoto Protocol can quantify the amount of greenhouse gases that can be emitted by the Annex I Parties. The commitment formula that Argentina has chosen is also a quantitative target and allows the emission amount to be decided later. On the other hand, the Convention requires all Parties, developed and developing countries alike, to implement policies and measures to cope with climate change, which is an example of a qualitative target (Article 4, paragraph 1 and 2, of the Convention).

As for good examples of the policies and measures, the scrapping of energy subsidies and the introduction of the carbon tax are frequently mentioned, but not all Parties can adopt them, given their different situations. The fact that the International Energy Agency (IEA) has been trying unsuccessfully to abolish the energy subsidy,

---

15) The method of Argentina is  $E=I \times \sqrt{P}$ , E: Greenhouse gas emissions (restated in carbon ton), I = Targets of greenhouse gas emission intensity, P = GDP (invariable price peso in the year of 1993). The root of GDP is used because greenhouse gas emissions by the agricultural and livestock industry take up a large portion (40% of the aggregate greenhouse gas emissions).

and there are sharp differences in opinion among developed countries regarding the introduction of the carbon tax, indicates that the policies and measures are more difficult to achieve than the quantitative targets.

(d) Binding Targets and Non-binding Targets

The judgment whether the emission targets should be binding or non-binding is not related to the types of the targets (fixed or dynamic targets, for instance), rather it is contingent on negotiations by the Parties. In other words, to gain international recognition of the targets, negotiations among Parties are needed, and it would be decided during the process whether or not the targets should be binding. The nature of the dynamic targets adopted by Argentina will also be clarified in future negotiations.<sup>16)</sup>

*Prospects for the Types of Commitment*

The types of developing countries' commitments are expected to be fully discussed after the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol. While developed countries have placed top priority on the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol, they have refrained from addressing any issues regarding developing countries' commitments that might hinder its enactment. Within the OECD, the issue of commitments by developing countries is being discussed informally among a group of experts from the member countries.

Even among developing countries, a wide disparity exists in terms of the responsibility, capabilities, vulnerability, and the degree to which they can reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Consequently, a single type for commitment that covers all developing countries is not

---

16) When a developing country intends to commit itself, the action itself can be voluntary but whether it is binding or not will be decided by negotiations. It can be understood as a voluntary commitment, voluntary target, or voluntary participation.

realistic. Therefore, various types of commitments, including the formula applied to the Annex I Parties, could be explored while taking into account the unique characteristics of each developing country.<sup>17)</sup>

However, the developing countries will be categorized into two different groups: one group that needs monitoring of its implementation of the commitment and another group that does not need such oversight. The former will be given a very limited array of choices in terms of the types of commitment. This reasoning seems appropriate, considering the fact that the formula of “the Draft Protocol Article 10” for developing countries, that was deliberated up to the last minute but was not adopted, was actually based on the Annex I formula.

### THE KYOTO PROTOCOL AND A NEW WAY

#### *Precedents for the Negotiations of the Kyoto Protocol*

During the process of the negotiations for the Kyoto Protocol, there were many suggestions pertaining to the voluntary commitments of developing countries. Yet only “the Draft Protocol Article 10” that Chairman Raul Estrada-Oyuela suggested in the 8th Ad Hoc Group on the Berlin Mandate (AGBM-8) meeting in October 1997 was in the negotiation text.

Chairman Estrada suggested the introduction of a flexible commitment method for developing countries, recognizing that developing countries are required to assume the same burdens as developed countries when they participate in the commitment according to the Convention Article 4, Paragraph 2 (g).<sup>18)</sup> For this, the concept of “the Parties acting under Article 10” was introduced, falling between the Annex I and non-Annex I Parties, to allow

---

17) Cedric Philibert, and Jonathan Pershing, *op. cit.*, pp. 211 and 225.

18) UNFCCC, FCCC/TP/2000/2, “Tracing the Origins of the Kyoto Protocol: An Article-by-Article Textual History,” (November 25, 2000), pp. 102-105.

differentiated commitments. Chairman Estrada's proposal allows for the Article 10 countries to select the historical base year (or period) and independently determine the level of lowering or reduction on condition that it should be approved by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties (COP/MOP) to the Protocol. And the commitments for the Article 10 countries were to be inscribed in the same Annex as the ones for the Annex I Parties.

#### *Revision Procedures for the Kyoto Protocol*

The Kyoto Protocol is expected to enter into force in 2002, considering the unified efforts of the international community demonstrated in Bonn, Germany in July 2001 and in Marrakesh, Morocco in November of the same year.<sup>19)</sup> The year 2002 is the 10th anniversary of the Convention and the 5th anniversary of the Kyoto Protocol. At the same time, this is the 10th year of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, also referred to as the Earth Summit. The countries are expected to capitalize on these occasions to ensure that the Protocol enters into force.

After the Protocol goes into effect, legal measures must be taken to allow for those countries that wish to adopt a third type of commitment, a new way in the Convention and Protocol. For the third type of commitment to be accepted, not only the revision of the main text of the Protocol, but also the revision of Annex B or even the creation of a new Annex are required like the case of the "Draft Protocol Article 10."

In both cases, whether it involves the creation of a new Annex or the revision of the existing one, the procedure stipulated in the Article

---

19) The entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol needs ratification by not less than 55 countries and by the Annex I Parties that account for 55% of the total greenhouse gas emissions of the Annex I Parties (Article 25, paragraph 1, of the Protocol).

20) The revision of the Kyoto Protocol is either adopted by consensus or by a 3/4 majority vote of the Parties present and voting, when there is no consensus. The revision takes effect 90 days after the instrument of acceptance by at least 3/4 of the Parties (Article 20 of the Protocol).

20 of the Protocol should be followed.<sup>20)</sup> The Kyoto Protocol confines a new Annex to technical contents, not to substantive ones. Thus the creation of a new list of countries making commitments should follow the Article 20 procedure, and the revision of the existing list of countries that have already made Commitments, that is, the Annex B, should also do so (Article 21, paragraph 1 and 7, of the Protocol).

### CONCLUSION

Until the Kyoto Protocol was adopted in December 1997, the Republic of Korea had worked hard to maintain the status of a developing country and was rewarded for its efforts. Since the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol, however, developed countries have continued to demand that Korea give up the status of a developing country and assume the same obligations as developed countries'. In response to this, Korea tried to adopt a forward-looking attitude to accommodate the demands of developed countries.

In an Inter-Ministerial Meeting on Climate Change in June 1998, Korea decided to consider assuming an obligation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the third commitment period (2018-2022), ten years after developed countries begin implementing their commitments, but nevertheless, seek different types of commitment. In addition, at the 5th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Climate Change in November 1999, Korea made a speech to the effect that it is willing to participate in the international dialogue for exploring various options with a voluntary and non-binding nature for global participation.<sup>21)</sup>

Basically Seoul's position is that the timing of the implementation of its commitment, the formula of its choice, the binding or non-binding nature of its commitment, should be different from those applied to developed countries. Yet further examination is merited on

---

21) Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Delegation Report to the 5th Conference of the Parties to the Convention, December 1999, pp. 19 and 213-215.

whether this position can harmonize well with expectations by developed countries and the international community regarding Korea. In particular, the issue of the timing of the implementation of its commitment and the nature thereof should be reviewed.

In upcoming negotiations, alternative methods, which differ from the one applied to developed countries, can be discussed, since there are examples of the "Draft Protocol Article 10" and the dynamic target chosen by Argentina.<sup>22)</sup> Pursuing an alternative method is a possible solution to the difficult situation faced by Seoul as it can neither accept the Annex I method in view of its current emission projections, nor can it provide financial and technical support for developing countries as the Annex II Parties do.<sup>23)</sup>

Korea's stance on commitment is taking shape as it pursues a differentiated commitment from that of developed countries. Considering the international debates on the developing countries' commitments, at this stage, Korea needs to establish a more specific position that can be pursued and eventually bear fruit. In addition, it has to devise medium- and long-term negotiation strategies to implement its position. It is therefore clear that the next several years will be a decisive period for Korea.

---

22) It is forecasted that Argentina will be unable to implement its dynamic target for greenhouse gas emissions reduction as it faces a default crisis. The dynamic target chosen by Argentina, however, can be examined as a way for developing countries to share burdens regardless of the actual implementation by Argentina.

23) The Annex II Parties are composed of the OECD members that are also the Annex I Parties, excluding the EITs. The concept of the 'Draft Protocol Article 10,' one of the alternative methods, is that it does not impose on the countries to choose the alternative method financial obligations, and compensatory fines for non-compliance with commitments. And Argentina announced that it would assume the burden according to the dynamic target but demanded the status of non-Annex I Parties or developing countries, which implies that it would not assume the burden of providing financial and technical assistance.