

After 2020, the same game or what?

(All personal views)

Can **national reduction obligation system** achieve temperature targets and keep economies thriving?

KP is for 5% reduction and barely fitting to awesome efforts needed for targets like 2°C
KP is ambition driven and not science driven,
KP throws responsibility to governments; governments busy doing interventionist PAM. KP lets true beneficiaries (polluters) stay idle and pollute Commons free of charge.
“Market failure” (Nick Stern and W. Nordhaus etc). There is no market...
China and India, joining KP, would demand AI countries cut even more deeply
KP is entirely reduction system and climate financing is a separate business
...Despite genuine intentions, raising a large climate funding seems unlikely...yet...

...The AI **governments** almost inevitably must cut even more and pay more. Is this tenable?
And, can we achieve any target?

Not because AI governments don't like to cut more and pay more, **but because...**

The world is totally different by 2020, 2030, 2050 from 1960s...
Without sure solutions, people get bored, tired, deserted and breed denialism
Without easy and cheap solutions, int'l bureaucracies prosper and governments perish
Without easy and cheap solutions, Americans won't come on board..EU, JPN either.
Without taking aim at the true responsables and make them pay, no durable solutions
Half solutions (bottom-up attitude), despite huge investment, not achieving decent targets...Is this tenable for tax payers of today and those of 2050-2100 who suffer the consequences? Is this at all tenable politically, economically and morally?

Should paradigm changes and radical departure takes place, it is possible to:

---stop it before 2C or any agreed temperature targets
---make polluters accountable and let them pay, the most cost effective solution...
---let market succeed and relieve governments from unjustified duty to intervene...
---provide last chance for the poorer to get out of energy poverty and poverty writ large
---shift from age-old North-South binary to the New United World for the poorest.

How paradigm should be changed?Assembly of Governments would legally :

---cap global emissions with the target (like 2°C) ensuring carbon budget,
---put collective property right on such budget,
---establish an upstream global carbon market,
---sell by auction the limited carbon budget as allowances,
---enforce global CO2 emissions to be done with allowances,
---earn new revenue from such sales,
---send them to governments in need, i.e., poorer countries (new built-in financing),
---establish a simple and effective compliance system to eliminate frauds.

It's simply like an upstream ETS extended from national to global context. ETS excels and benefits all players if done globally... → **Global cap and global market**...easy to manage...effective price signal based on supply & demand...no price manipulations...

A quote: definitely we need “*fresh, outside-of-the-box ideas...This is a time for new proposals for future international climate policy architecture, not for incremental adjustments to the old pathway..*”. Robert Stavins of Harvard...