

Report by

H.E. Ms. Tine Sundtoft, Minister, Ministry of Climate and Environment, Norway, and
H.E. Mr. James Fletcher, Minister of Sustainable Development, Energy, Science and
Technology, St Lucia

To the first meeting of the Comité de Paris held on 7 December 2015

On their informal consultations undertaken on

Ambition, including long-term goals and periodic review

- We held fruitful informal consultations yesterday, which lasted two full hours.
- All countries had the opportunity to express their views, we heard from many and have taken note of their aspirations, as well as their concerns. Rest assured that we heard your views.
- Today we have had extensive consultations. We have met with the groups bilaterally.
- We are available to consult with all Parties that would like to approach us. We will continue consultations with Parties tomorrow.
- The bilaterals we have had today were aimed at scoping the issues at stake, deepening our understanding of Parties' views on various elements under discussion and exploring the possible areas where a compromise could be reached. Several Parties put aside their preferred views to find ways to bridge divergences and move towards consensus, and we are thankful to them.
- We asked all groups the same five questions to gain a more in depth understanding of perspectives and potential convergences, on the following themes:
 - framing of a possible reference to a 1.5 degree limit that would accommodate all positions in an acceptable way;
 - an acceptable long-term goal for mitigation over different timeframes;
 - considering a 'common global moment' every five years for taking stock, as well as informing future nationally determined efforts on mitigation, adaptation and support;
 - providing reassurances that the global stocktake would not impinge on the national determination of commitments;
 - exploring modalities after the first period (post-2030), including for submitting or updating mitigation contributions, and a possible five-year harmonisation of timeframes;

- I am happy to report that we have seen some positive trends emerging from what we have heard; and the emergence of possible areas where we could move forward. But we are also hearing a lot of restating of positions.
- For instance, a significant number of developed and developing country Parties, including the most vulnerable, indicated their willingness to explore language referring to the 1.5 °C limit, for example recognizing that it is essential to the most vulnerable countries, or using language that could serve to operationalize this limit. Others would reaffirm the temperature limit agreed in Cancun. However, views remain divergent on citing the context for the long term goal, with many Parties calling for the contextualization of the 1.5 or 2 degree temperature limit including for example equity and sustainable development.
- There is a general interest to express, in concrete terms, collective long term goals for mitigation which could be expressed in quantitative and/or qualitative terms.
- Many Parties referred to a goal for a long term transformation such as towards climate neutrality or decarbonization in the course of this century. Some called for a goal of zero emissions in the second half of the century. Many said this goal should be linked to the long-term temperature goal. In this context, several Parties stressed the need to be guided by the best available science. Many Parties also referred to the need for short and medium term milestones, such as global peaking and/or pathways or strategies for 2050. Other Parties were of the view that the goal should be referenced to the objective of the Convention.
- Many Parties also indicated support for a common global moment every five years to take stock of and have a collective review of aggregate progress although we need to explore some issues further. Many Parties understood this common moment as an opportunity for Parties to confirm or raise their targets, but not as an obligation. Some Parties insisted on the need to have reassurance that the global stocktake would not impose a burden on countries and that it would be a collective process, not intended to scrutinize countries' efforts but rather encouraging them to do more.
- We have also heard broad support for a request to Parties to communicate their mitigation contributions on a regular basis. In this context, there seems to be growing interest in working towards a common point in time for all Parties to do so every five years. This would be without prejudice to the timeframes selected by Parties for their contributions.

Thank you.