

## **WORK OF THE AWG-LCA CONTACT GROUP**

### **Agenda item 3.2.2**

#### **Nationally appropriate mitigation actions by developing country Parties**

#### **Summary by co-facilitators of discussion on international consultation and analysis (ICA) referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraphs 63 and 64.**

**version of 17 June 2011 @ 09:00**

#### **I. Principles/objectives**

- All Parties acknowledged that ICA process should be implemented in a manner that is non-intrusive, non-punitive, and respectful of national sovereignty.
- Parties also acknowledged that the objective of ICA should be to increase transparency of mitigation actions through a facilitative information sharing process which also seeks to build capacity in developing countries.
- Some Parties stated that ICA is voluntary process, while one other Party stated that under the UNFCCC all countries are required to do mitigation actions that would be subject to ICA.
- Some Parties stated that ICA should not be more onerous than the International Assessment and Review process for Annex I Parties.
- Some Parties also highlighted the distinction between ICA and IAR, stating that ICA does not have compliance implications, no assigned consequences and that it is not a review process.
- Some Parties stated that frequency of ICA is not determined. They stated that though ICA will be based on biennial update reports, it does not necessarily mean that ICA would be conducted biennially as submission of biennial reports depends on availability of support.

#### **II. Input**

- Some Parties identified biennial reports as a basis for conducting ICA whereas some other Parties were of the view that not all components of the biennial reports would be subject to this process and that ICA should focus on providing transparency of domestically funded actions.
- Some Parties stated that only unsupported actions would be subject to ICA, while one other Party found that the scope would not be limited in this way.

#### **III. Process**

- Some Parties saw consultation taking place after a technical analysis process, whereas others were of the view that consultation should come before technical analysis. One Party

mentioned that in their view the technical analysis and consultations would take place at the same time.

- Technical analysis
  - Some Parties were of the view that a small group of Party-nominated technical experts and secretariat staff would conduct the technical analysis of the input mentioned above in consultation with the Party concerned, resulting in an expert analysis report.
- International consultation
  - Some Parties were of the view that expert analysis reports and the biennial reports would be the basis for international consultation under the auspices of the SBI. One Party was of the view that the consultation process would not take place amongst Parties but rather between the expert team and the Party concerned.
  - Some Parties were of the view that an exchange between Parties in the form of a question and answers session would be respectful, non-confrontational, and serve the purpose of facilitating sharing of information
  - Some Parties were of the view that following the consultation under SBI, Parties would be invited to submit written follow-up questions within a specified time period to be answered by the Party concerned shortly thereafter.
  - Some Parties were of the view that this process would result in a report by the secretariat containing objective recording of the proceedings.

#### **IV. Output**

- Some Parties were of the view that the process of ICA would result in a summary report prepared by the secretariat which would contain a technical expert analysis report, a summary of the oral consultations, the written questions and answers, and any observations the Party concerned may wish to include.

#### **V. Summary of ideas on the way forward**

- A number of Parties called for further submission from Parties on ICA, including creative graphics of how the process could potentially take place.
  - Some Parties requested the secretariat to capture areas of convergence and prepare an elements paper that could be forwarded to Durban. Some other Parties were of the view that the elements paper should outline options rather than convergence.
  - Some Parties called for a technical meeting to discuss the modalities and guidelines for conducting ICA. Some Parties stated that any technical work before Durban should be done in conjunction with the AWG session and not inter-sessionally.
  - A group of Parties requested the secretariat to prepare a background paper on the experience of other multilateral processes in conducting facilitative reviews that may share similar goals to ICA. While some other Parties stated this would not be relevant as other international processes do not operate on the same principles as the UNFCCC.
  - Some Parties emphasized the need to have a formal AWG-LCA negotiating session before Durban.
-