

**Delhi High Level Conference on
'Climate Change: Technology Development and Transfer'**

23.10.2009

Chair's Summary

Dear Colleagues,

1. This brings us to the conclusion of the Delhi Conference on Climate Change: Technology Development and Transfer 2009. Before I close the conference, may I share the joint impressions of Ambassador Sha Zukang and myself as the co-hosts of the conference, on what we have learned during the last two days?
2. First, I am sure you will agree with us that this was a highly successful conference. This was largely because of your sustained and thoughtful engagement. We have had the pleasure of hosting 58 delegations, of which 30 were at the ministerial or vice ministerial level. Their Excellencies, the Prime Minister of India and the President of the Maldives graced the inaugural session with their presence and gave us much to consider. The Finance Minister of India also graciously joined us to inaugurate the Clean Technology Exhibition organized by CII with the involvement of 148 companies from around the world. We were joined by around 30 experts who shared their knowledge of key aspects of technology transfer and deployment. More importantly, the discussions and engagement by the participants were consistently of a high order. This has enabled

us to agree on a Delhi Statement, which I hope would help advance the discussions at Barcelona and later at Copenhagen.

3. On substance we have also learned a few things, reiterated a few things, and disagreed on a few things.
4. Perhaps the most important lesson we will take away from this conference is that there is no point in talking about technology development and transfer in the abstract. We must become more specific, with regard to place, with regard to technologies and with regard to mechanisms. We need to think concretely how we can join our hands together to put in place international cooperative mechanism for technology development and transfer. We have to address the concerns regarding technology transfer and development, insufficient R&D, and the barriers arising from inadequate funding, weak capacity, market failure, and policy distortions.
5. I want to mention first the message of his Excellency President Nasheed as well as the Distinguished Minister from Mauritius, both of whom reminded us of the vulnerability of the small island developing states. Speaking for myself, I am greatly moved by their statements. It should reinforce our commitment to take rapid action on climate change, both on mitigation and adaptation, not only to enable vulnerable countries to cope, but to ensure that they will not be confronted with the most tragic of choices.

6. On specific technologies, as you know, the last two days heavily emphasized renewable energy technologies. More importantly, a consistent theme, which got repeated several times, was that the only sure way of addressing the climate challenge is to make such technologies affordable by poor countries and poor communities. These technologies are currently too expensive, and although many developing countries, including India, are investing heavily in them, the urgent need is to speed up this process through far more extensive international cooperation and technology transfer.
7. We have also learned, and this idea was also repeated by several speakers, including experts as well as Ministers or other delegation members, is that the quickest way of lowering the cost of many renewable options is to scale up their rate of deployment and diffusion in developing countries, the green technology accelerator, as one delegate called it, or the quantum leap in renewable energy deployment, as another one phrased it. This will require international cooperation and international financing, something like a global Marshall Plan for renewable technology.
8. Dear Colleagues, we should consider seriously whether the technology agreement in Copenhagen should have a dispensation for renewable energy options. The goal of such a dispensation would be simultaneously to ramp up their deployment and diffusion in developing countries and to bring down their costs.

9. The second lesson we will take away from here is what President Nasheed called a Green Power Revolution, learning from the lessons of the Green Revolution in which India led the way, with international cooperation, in the 1960s and 1970s, to address what was then the most formidable threat faced by developing countries, the threat of famine and food insecurity. Several speakers alluded to the CGIAR network as a model for addressing the challenge of climate change as well as energy poverty. As you are aware, the Green Revolution relied on an elaborate mosaic of interlocking institutions for research, education, credit, marketing, inputs provision, and most importantly, extension—getting the knowledge into the hands of those who needed it. Within 10 years we had transferred knowledge from a few hundred scientists to millions of farmers, the vast majority of whom were illiterate. The CGIAR network provided international support and cooperation in research and education.
10. India has already proposed the idea of technology innovation centers, which build regional, national and local capacities, identify measures to overcome barriers to adoption and diffusion, and enable cross fertilization and sharing of ideas. As one delegate put it, however, these must be centers of excellence, for otherwise they have no meaning. A CGIAR type of global network could provide international support for research and cooperation and ensure that they become centers of excellence. In many areas, the technologies

and solutions are well known; we need to find a way of getting them to people who can use them.

11. Dear Colleagues, we should also consider whether the technology decision in Copenhagen should have a dedicated plank on a CGIAR type system intended to promote the diffusion and deployment of climate friendly technologies.

12. Third, while there will continue to be a need for further consultation on the role of IPRs, I was happy to note that all delegations and experts in this meeting approached this question seriously. In the context of IPRs, we have to discuss some of the details of the ideal regime, and especially how to provide broader and more universal access to intellectual property and knowledge, how to democratize access to technologies that would determine whether or not we will successfully address the climate crisis while pursuing sustainable development and poverty eradication, how to make sure that IPRs do not become a barrier to the achievement of common global goals. There is a broad agreement that governments must create the right kind of incentives, the necessary level of predictability and transparency, and the appropriate level of protection to stimulate creativity as well as learning, innovation as well as diffusion, growth as well as equity, in particular the access of developing countries to technology and knowledge at the most affordable cost. We heard many interesting recommendations on how these goals could be achieved, and I hope these discussions have brought us one step

closer to a consensus in the climate negotiations. We have recognized that there are different views on the subject. Yet, this remains a central issue in our discussion. We need to evolve a common understanding on the issue and reflect the central concern in the statement.

13. Fourth, many of us urged for accelerated investment in research and development, including collaboration in research between advanced and developing countries, and support for capacity building in the latter countries.

14. Fifth, we also need to move towards specificity in the global mechanisms for technology development, deployment, and transfer. What I have said up to now is of the nature of a bottom up approach, and this needs to be combined with a top down approach. Here too, we have learned several lessons from your comments, and at two different levels. At the first level, there was a welcome set of references to practical experiences, to models that have worked in practice, to success stories. I have mentioned the reference to the Green Energy and CGIAR model, as well as the Marshall Plan. There were also references to the Montreal Protocol, the growth of the Internet, and others.

15. Beyond this, we heard several specific proposals for such a global mechanism. Our distinguished colleague from Poland was the most eloquent, in the context of Poland's generous commitment to provide its share of global financial and other resources, to challenge

us to ensure that we work out a burden sharing formula based on emissions as well as ability to pay, so that this formula can continue to be used transparently and predictably in the future.

16. Finally, there was a wide recognition of the need for a special mechanism under the UNFCCC for technology transfer, development, and deployment, supported by a special fund, with periodic assessment of performance, and a mechanism to oversee the functioning of the IPR regime for climate and development goals. This could take the form of a specific subsidiary body on technology of the Conference of Parties under the UNFCCC. This subsidiary body could have specific dedicated programs, including the two I mentioned earlier, namely one on renewable energy, and another on a CGIAR-type model. Such a platform could support and receive support from the CGIAR type system described earlier. For instance, and this is another concrete proposal, that the special mechanism should include a technology assessment panel, a verification panel, and a strategic planning council.

17. In the end, we would like to thank all the country party delegations and representatives of various stakeholders, like academia, trade and industry, and civil society, from India and abroad for their extremely valuable contributions without which this conference would not have been successful. We hope that discussions will prove to be an important input to the forthcoming negotiations at Barcelona and Copenhagen and help us in reaching an agreed outcome.