

**AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON LONG-TERM COOPERATIVE ACTION
UNDER THE CONVENTION**

Fourteenth session (third part)

Panama City, 1.7 October 2011

WORK OF THE AWG-LCA CONTACT GROUP

Agenda item 3.2.1

**Nationally appropriate mitigation commitments or actions by developed country Parties
Discussion on matters relating to paragraphs 36.38 of the Cancun Agreements
version of 14 October 2011 @ 6PM**

Co-facilitator.s summary

[General]

1. Parties had a constructive discussion on the matters relating to paragraphs 36-38 of the Cancun Agreements¹, including the quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets put forward by developed country Parties which are currently compiled in document FCCC/SB/2011/INF.1/Rev.1, and also the level of ambition of efforts by developed country Parties.

2. Many Parties recognize the existence of an “ambition gap” and reiterated the importance of the level of ambition of efforts. Views on the context of consideration of this issue differed among Parties. [Some Parties preferred to frame the consideration of this issue in a broader context and on the basis of the best available scientific knowledge as referred to in paragraph 4 of decision 1/CP.16, encompassing all Parties with a significant share of emissions, whereas] others preferred to contain this consideration for the developed country Parties alone. Some Parties noted that the overall level of ambition and accounting is central to any outcome in Durban.

3. A few Parties noted that the discussion on the level of ambition is linked to the discussion on the review process which is being considered separately under the AWGLCA.

[Quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets]

4. Many Parties welcomed the workshops organized by the secretariat to clarify the assumptions and the conditions related to the attainment of quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets of developed county Parties. Parties also welcomed the reports by the Co-Chairs of the workshops.

5. There were a number of proposals on how to take forward the quantified economy-wide

¹ FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1.

emission reduction targets currently referred to in document FCCC/SB/2011/INF.1/Rev.1. The list below is not an attempt to identify areas of convergence or divergence as there was no convergence of views by Parties on this matter, nor is it intended to be an exhaustive list, but rather a compilation of proposals that Parties submitted during the discussions:

- (a) Understanding better the targets already put forward, including nonconditional domestic targets by developed country Parties; this could be accomplished by establishing a process which could include a call for submission of information, including on accounting, in a structured format that could feed into updating the technical paper on developed country targets;²
- (b) [Understanding the aggregate effects of actions of both developed country Parties and developing country Parties;]
- (c) Establishing a process to update document FCCC/SB/2011/INF.1/Rev.1;
- (d) Establishing a common template based approach for recording the pledges and assumptions as well as accounting elements.
- (e) [Transforming, for developed country Parties [that are Parties to the Kyoto Protocol,] the pledges into quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets (QELROs) for the second commitment under the Kyoto Protocol; and establishing a strong comparability framework and compliance system for those mitigation commitments presented outside of the Kyoto Protocol;]
- (f) Transforming pledges into assigned amount/carbon budget under the Convention for [developed country Parties only][both developed and developing country Parties];
- (g) Setting “non-conditional domestic targets”

[Level of ambition]

6. Views and proposals made by Parties on how to increase the level of ambition are listed below. The list below is not an attempt to identify areas of convergence or divergence, nor is it intended to be an exhaustive list, but rather a compilation of proposals that Parties submitted during the discussion:

- (a) Enhancing domestic efforts by developed country Parties;
- (b) Removing conditionalities around the pledges and moving to the upper range of the pledges;
- (c) Establishing a common accounting framework;
- (d) Establishing a compliance and international assessment and review (IAR) process;
- (e) Developing a framework and criteria for the formulation of low emissions development strategy;
- (f) [Further developing the global [carbon] market but ensuring the environmental integrity];

² FCCC/TP/2011/1.

- (g) Addressing the surplus AAUs in the context of the Kyoto Protocol and establishing stricter LULUCF rules;
- (h) [Removing fossil fuel subsidies and/or reporting thereof];
- (i) [Pursuing “green growth” domestically and enhancing investment in green sectors by developed country Parties;]
- (j) [Setting renewable targets for developed country Parties;]
- (k) Demonstrating that enhancing the level of ambition is economically feasible;
- (l) Development and implementation of low carbon development strategies;
- (m) [Supporting implementation of NAMAs by developing countries;]
- (n) Addressing emissions of hydrofluorocarbons, and emissions from international aviation and maritime transport[, and asking related international organizations to implement this];
- (o) Updating the technical papers;
- (p) Establishing fair and effective legally binding framework in which all major emitters including major developing country Parties participate.

[Accounting framework]

7. Many Parties highlighted the importance of a common accounting framework, the need to ensure comprehensive coverage of all sources and all sinks across all sectors addressing metrics, coverage and rules, and how such an accounting framework could relate to transparency and the understanding of targets.

8. Other Parties emphasized that the accounting framework could depend on the national circumstances so long as there is a transparent and rigorous reporting framework. Some Parties pointed that accounting framework has to be applicable to all major emitters, including both developed and developing country Parties. Overall, there was no convergence of views on the common accounting rules and framework.

[Way forward]

9. A number of views and proposals were made by Parties on how to take forward the discussions on matters relating to paragraphs 36-38 in the lead up to Durban. The list below is not an attempt to identify areas of convergence or divergence, nor is it intended to be an exhaustive list, but rather a compilation of proposals that Parties submitted during the discussions:

- (a) Establishing a process, in the form of organizing workshops and updating technical papers in a structured manner, to understand better the overall effects of mitigation commitments or actions by developed country Parties and national appropriate mitigation actions by developing country Parties;
- (b) Understanding the scale of the “ambition gap” and identifying options to address it; this

could be achieved through process/workprogramme including preparing technical papers by the secretariat and organizing workshops;

(c) Establishing a process to develop a common accounting rules and framework applicable for all major emitters including major developing country Parties in Durban;

(d) Creating a common space to discussion the level of ambition covering both developed and developing country Parties;

(e) Converting the summary by co-facilitators on paragraphs 36-38 of decision 1/CP.16 into decision text as soon as possible