<< Expectations for COP21 in Paris >>

First of all, I would like to express my sincere condolence and deep sympathy for victims and their families and friends, who have lost their lives by brutal attack of extremists, here in France and other countries of Europe.

I am going to speak on Expectations for COP21 in Paris, and Japanese situation of energy and climate tackling.
I am not an expert on climate change issues, but I am one of the members who are expecting a great progress on the COP21 meeting in Paris.

Regarding the next international framework for climate change tackling, it is important to consider how to ensure the participation of all major greenhouse gas-emitting countries around the world.

I believe that when designing the new framework, we must take into consideration the changes that have occurred since the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol and c***o***nsequently change our own mindset.

The global economy has changed considerably since 1992, when the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change was agreed.
The changes since the adoption of the Kyoto Protocol in 1997 are also significant.
The most remarkable change is the replacement of major greenhouse gas emitters, as you are well aware.

Before going further, once again, let us look at the changes that occ***u***rred during the 20-years from 1993 to 2013.
According to the BP Statistical Review of World Energy 2014, global emissions of CO2 increased by 12.4 billion tons (22.7⇒ 35.1), which was 55% increase over the 20 years between 1993 and 2013.
Of this increase, 11.1 billion tons are from non-OECD countries.
This Non-OECD countries' increase was amazingly 90 % of total increase of whole globe.
The OECD countries as a whole contributed only 10% to the increase.

When we see by region, the Asia-Pacific region contributed 81% to the increase.
The Middle East contributed 10%, while Central and South America contributed 5%.
North America's contribution was also 5%.
Emissions in Europe decreased, helping to curb the increase in global emissions.
On the map of energy-derived CO2 emissions, a revolutionary change is occ*u*rring. This is a structural change.

This structural big change means that it would be impossible to reduce total global emissions unless non-OECD countries, who are Non-Annex I Parties of Kyoto protocol, make serious efforts to reduce their emissions.

I believe there are limits to what can be done through an arrangement like the Kyoto Protocol under which developed and developing countries are stipulated differently.
I understand we need a very new way of doing.

Allow me to look back briefly, past COP negotiations.
At COP15：Copenhagen meeting in 2009, it became clear that the debates and del*i*berations under the United Nations were deadlocked.
I recall that at that time, one newspaper described the situation as a collapse of the U.N. debate.

Meanwhile, we know in the international trade negotiations on bilateral and multilateral free trade agreements between the involved countries and regions are signed in parallel with negotiations on a global agreement under the WTO.
At the climate change negotiations, something can be learned from this approach.

For example, an agreement by the willing countries may be formed to tackle climate change issues.
Or, cross-border industries may work together, and countries within the same region may tackle

together.
Cities across the world may form united activities in these issues.
It would be desirable if various initiatives like these are implemented simultaneously.
There is no border line in the air.

What's important is ensuring that all major emitting countries participate in the international framework.
I believe that the only way to do so – to ensure participation by all major emitting countries – is to create a framework based on the bottom-up approach, rather than the top-down approach.

We know that the issue of "historical responsibility" has been discussed over and over in the context of the past greenhouse gas emissions.
From now on, it is also important that developing countries realize their responsibility for the future of our planet, I am expecting.
At the same time, developed countries should adopt a stance of understanding and tolerance.

If all these issues are taken into consideration, I believe that the new international framework should be a flexible and pragmatic one under which, countries recognize each other's differences.

The framework must also be a fair and effective one, under which all major emitting countries make efforts to reduce their emissions according to their reduction capability.

Eighteen years ago, the principle of Common but Differentiated Responsibilities, or, CBDR principle, was adopted under the Kyoto Protocol.
In Article 10 of the protocol, after the CBDR principle is mentioned or written, it is stated that individual countries' "specific national and regional development priorities, objectives and circumstances" should be taken into account.
A joint declaration issued by U.S. President Obama and Chinese President Xi on November 11 last year, stated that the two leaders are "committed to reaching an ambitious 2015 agreement that reflects the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in light of different national circumstances."

It is noteworthy that renewed emphasis has been placed recently on taking into account individual countries' different circumstances.

This practical and flexible idea is already seen in Lima, I understand.

Now, I am moving to next theme; Japanese situation of energy and climate change tackling policy.

I am going to speak Japanese present situation of energy and climate policy.

It is for me just like to tell you my complaints to Japanese society.
But, I am hoping that there must be something meaningful for you to know as a lesson from my explanation.
Japanese situation is just a puzzle rings.

Needless to say, we are asked to submit our "Intended Nationally Determined Contributions: INDC" to UNFCCC as soon as possible.
Every Japanese hopes to submit an ambitious and pride-worthy INDC.

But, present situation of Japan is far from such Japanese hope.

At present, Japan depends heavily on fossil fuels because of lack of nuclear power generation.
In my view, without nuclear generation, we cannot have a good target of GHG emission cut in 2030.

Talking on nuclear power, please allow me to get off the subject.
Yesterday, March 11, was the fourth anniversary of the Great East Japan Earthquake and the Tsunami that followed it.
This disaster took the lives of more than 18,000 people.

Furthermore, the tsunami triggered an accident at Tokyo Electric Power Company's Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station, damaging fatally four reactors, there.
I would like to thank you, once again, for the support and words of encouragement that you offered to Japan at that time.
This accident affected various countries' energy policies, and its impact is still remaining. I feel that is regrettable.

Let me back to main stream.
We understand without a view or a plan of energy mixture in future, GHG emission in 2030 cannot be estimated.

For past four years, Japan is in its worst ever energy situation.
Due to the impact of Fukushima accident, operations at all nuclear reactors in Japan have been suspended for around one and a half years.

Before the earthquake disaster, nuclear power generation accounted for nearly 30% of Japan's overall electricity supply, so the nuclear blackout has had a considerable negative impact, hurting the economy and increasing CO2 emissions.

In 2013, energy-derived CO2 emissions in Japan, which is approximately 90 % of Japanese total GHG, increased by 81 million tons, or 6% increase, compared with 2010, just before the Fukushima nuclear accident, despite a decrease in energy demand.

At this moment Japan depends almost of all energy supply on foreign oil, gas and coal, these fossil fuels from abroad are counted 94 % of total Japanese energy supply.
Although Japan has oil reserves equivalent to around six months' needs, the loss of nuclear power has made the country so vulnerable in terms of energy security.

Under such situation, the Japanese government has started discussions at an energy-related advisory council to decide on an energy mixture goal for 2030 and climate policy; which reflects to INDC submission

However, the government faces two major challenges before the decision. These two difficulties are not "Energy and climate" issues but very Japanese societal situation.

One is restarting nuclear reactors operations.
And, another is whether government can have favorable results or not in big local elections to be held across the country in this April.

This coming local election is in two rounds of votes, the heads of local governments and local assembly members of prefectures and municipalities will be elected in around 1000 members totally.

Japanese political leaders will be keeping a close watch on the results of the elections, while the bureaucracy is waiting for instructions from its political masters.

But, basically, these two challenges have the same root.
The same root is public thought or public acceptance of nuclear power.

Let me explain Japanese situation of public acceptance of nuclear power.
According to two nation-wide opinion polls, in August and November last year, nearly 60% of voters oppose the restart of nuclear reactors, while just over 30% support it.

The percentage of people who are willing to accept **raises** in electricity rates resulting from the loss of nuclear power, came to 60%, which is double the percentage of people supporting the restart of nuclear reactors.
These results of public poll remind us of the serious impact of the loss of confidence or loss of trust in nuclear power.

But, I would like to tell you a slightly bright signal.
In surrounding area of nuclear power station, public poll shows rather favor than nation-wide.

In case of Sendai Nuclear Power Station's area in Kyushu, 49 % local people showed favor for restart. Opposition was 44%.
Favorable people is mainly young and middle aged, less 50, habitants.
Two units of this Sendai nuclear power station are first candidates of restarting operation. Of course, they got already Authority approval.

The current government led by the Liberal Democratic Party determined the outline of the New Basic Energy Plan in last year.

This new plan contains apparently conflicting elements: while it is proclaiming the goal of minimizing Japan's dependence on nuclear power, at the same time, it is emphasizing the important role of nuclear power.
The plan also calls for promotion of renewable energy and energy conservation.
This is the reality which is reflected public thought.

But, I can say that it is also true, the current government led by the Liberal Democratic Party is rather favor on nuclear.
I understand the current government has adopted a wait-and-see stance.

Lastly, I would like take up one example.
The chairman, who is private company's top, of a governmental advisory council on energy policy made the following remarks at a meeting on an energy mixture plan.

"The starting point of our discussion is how far we can pursue energy conservation and how far we can promote renewable energy."
He also said that regarding nuclear power, "committee members are already mentioning a share ranging from 15% to 25% in the energy mixture in 2030."

These remarks appear to indicate what the energy mixture goal for 2030, which is expected to be finalized in coming several months, will be like.

After the finalization of the energy mix goal, a draft of Japan's commitment to emission reduction will be written and submitted to the United Nations.
I expect the figure of 2030 Japan submits in INDC must be challengeable one.

Thank you so much for your kind attention!