

Norway

Submission to the ADP.

6 March 2014

Building the 2015 agreement – mitigation and transparency elements

- Norway is pleased to present views on the 2015 agreement. The process up to Paris in 2015 demands that we identify concise and workable solutions in order to build an ambitious and durable agreement.
- Our starting point is that the 2015 agreement should be guided by the two degree target, and be based on the most recent scientific knowledge. The agreement needs to build in a science-based approach and allow adjustments over time.
- To meet the two degree target, the 2015 agreement needs to capture and promote ambitious and broad participation for global climate change mitigation. The necessary ambition can only be achieved if all Parties take part in the global effort to limit and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- In this submission, we provide some views on necessary elements for the mitigation and transparency elements of the 2015 agreement, and on how to build on the preparatory work on mitigation contributions up to 2015. Further views on other parts of the agreement will be addressed elsewhere. We also refer to our submission from September on how adaptation could be framed in a new agreement.
- We believe that the general concept for mitigation in the 2015 agreement should be:
 - Commitments for all Parties to limit and reduce GHG emissions
 - Governed by common multilateral rules, with appropriate flexibility for implementation
 - Differentiated according to national circumstances
 - Contributing to the global effort.
- An international agreement should promote more action collectively than the Parties can deliver individually. A good way to achieve this is through the use of national, regional and international carbon markets. The use of carbon markets allows more ambitious contributions than would otherwise be possible.
- National circumstances vary and Parties have different responsibilities and capabilities. We fully subscribe to the view that we need an equitable and effective agreement. There is a need to differentiate according to the actual differences between Parties, and not on the basis of fixed categories of Parties. We believe the Convention itself gives good guidance, which allows for full participation as well as due respect for national circumstances. An approach to this is to ask Parties in their submissions to clarify how their contribution is ambitious and equitable.

- In our view, the end point of the mitigation contributions should be to formulate these as firm commitments in the final agreement.

Preparing mitigation contributions and up front information

- Contributions should be developed according to national circumstances and in a way that is appropriate to Parties' responsibilities and capabilities. For Parties with lower capabilities and small emissions, contributions could be quantified at a later stage.
- How the up front information needed to provide clarity, transparency and understanding is defined, is crucial. The up front information about the nationally determined contributions, will to a large extent determine our ability to hold Parties accountable later. The choices we make regarding up front information will pave the way for a robust and effective agreement in 2015.
- The guidance on information provided should include some common metrics for quantification, to be able to measure progress and sum up the overall effort. A ton of CO₂-equivalent is the best way to measure mitigation efforts. It is an established and tested approach. If possible, both emissions by sources and removals by sinks should be specified.
- It is important to clarify information guidance on nationally determined contributions as early as possible, and we look forward to starting this discussion in March. In this regard, there is a lot to build on from the work of clarifying 2020 pledges. As a minimum, the up front information should include the information asked for in the 2020 pledges, such as base year, scope (coverage of gases and sectors, percentage of national emissions covered), global warming potential values, the role of land use, land-use change and forestry and of carbon credits. The up front information should provide clarity on assumptions and methodologies. This information will be essential in order to be able to estimate the expected emission reduction effect in a consistent manner.
- A stock-take of progress in Parties' preparations at the June meeting could be useful to build trust and share experiences.

Based on national ownership

- National ownership is crucial for fulfilling commitments. All Parties are responsible for establishing appropriate policies and programmes to prevent or minimize the causes of climate change. Without national ownership and appropriate policies, implementation of low emission measures is likely to fail even if they are supported internationally.
- The mitigation part of the 2015 agreement should be based on the common obligation of all Parties to reduce or limit emissions of greenhouse gases. This basic obligation should be the starting point for developing operational and quantified, comparable and predictable

commitments in the agreement. The agreement should be designed in a way that allows for adjustment of the ambition levels.

Quantified and quantifiable emission reductions

- Emission reduction or limitation commitments should as a main rule be quantified in the final agreement.
- The best case for the climate is if Parties that representing a significant proportion of global emissions all have economy-wide emission reduction or emission limitation commitments. We would expect all Parties with reasonable capacity and significant responsibility for global emissions, to develop their contributions in this format. For Parties that choose a different approach, it is important that all assumptions and methodologies are clear, and that the contribution can be fixed over the time period established for the commitment.
- A stepwise or phased approach to step up mitigation efforts over time could be considered. In accordance with national circumstances and respective capabilities Parties could gradually increase the scope and depth of their mitigation efforts over time.
- Parties should put forward an emission reduction or limitation ambition unconditional of financial support. This does not mean that Parties cannot seek support, but it would reflect the responsibility of all Parties. Any other conditions should be limited and transparent, with clarity on what the unconditional offer would be.

Provisions for transparency and accountability

- An important added value of an international agreement is that it demonstrates participation by all and builds necessary trust that others are acting. In that regard, it is crucial that the agreement has scientifically sound and robust provisions for monitoring, reporting and verifying how Parties fulfil and meet their commitments.
- An added value of an international agreement is to have one common system. However, Parties will have different kinds of mitigation commitments, with different scope and depth. Therefore, there is a need for flexibility to allow for appropriate reporting and measurement of progress, according to the kind of mitigation commitment in question.
- There are three areas where common international approaches should be elaborated:
 - How to estimate and report emissions, to ensure that a ton is a ton. Here, we can build on the national greenhouse gas inventories and the current system, but develop it into one common rule set.
 - A common framework for how to account for emissions and removals from forest and land use. In our view, we should take an approach where all emissions and removals of GHG are treated as equally as possible based on the best available scientific knowledge, while being flexible, transparent and predictable.

- Rules and frameworks to keep track of the use of market based mechanisms, and qualify international carbon credits used to meet commitments. The international setup must ensure that there is no double claiming of credits.

Include the use of carbon markets

- The agreement should allow Parties to use international carbon credits to meet their commitments, under conditions that ensure no double claiming, real emission reductions and sound governance.
- Carbon markets can also be an effective instrument for providing international support to countries with limited capabilities.

A collective international assessment/consultation process

- We envisage two kinds of joint international consultation process for the new agreement:
 - An initial process to take place as part of the development of the agreement towards Paris.
 - A regular assessment/review process built into the agreement itself, to be conducted at regular intervals to update and measure progress at the global level.
- On the initial process: Before the agreement is finalized in Paris, there is a need to ensure a good understanding of the contributions that have been submitted. A review process could be to look at the contributions and the information collectively, how they fit together and how that information is used as a way to further improve the agreement. This could help in for instance framing how market mechanisms should be included in the agreement, or the consideration of time periods /target years. It will also provide the basis for a credible agreement where it's possible to estimate what it will deliver.
- Once the agreement has taken effect, we believe it is necessary to have regular assessments of the overall progress made towards the two degree target, in light of new scientific knowledge. The agreement should thus have provisions for such a regular review or assessment.