

United Nations

Framework Convention on Climate Change

Distr.: Limited 5 December 2014

Original: English

Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice Forty-first session Lima, 1–6 December 2014

Agenda item 13 Work programme on clarification of quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets of developed country Parties

Work programme on clarification of quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets of developed country Parties

Draft conclusions proposed by the Chair

1. The Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) concluded the work programme on clarification of quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets of developed country Parties, established by decision 1/CP.18, paragraph 8 (hereinafter referred to as the work programme).

2. The SBSTA recognized the importance of shared information and transparency in the clarification of the quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets of developed country Parties for gaining a better understanding of the elements contained in decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 5. In that regard, the SBSTA noted that the activities undertaken under the work programme since SBSTA 38 have provided a platform for Parties to share information and have helped to improve the transparency of developed country Party targets. This includes the following shared information and activities:

(a) The submissions from Parties contained in document FCCC/SBSTA/2013/MISC.3 and Add.1 and on the web page for the work programme;¹

(b) The in-session events² on quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets of developed country Parties that were held in conjunction with SBSTA 38-40 and included technical briefings and expert discussions on:

(i) Measuring the progress towards the achievement of developed country Party targets;

(ii) Comparability of mitigation efforts and assumptions and conditions related to developed country Party targets;



¹ <http://unfccc.int/7884.php>.

² The reports on these events are contained in documents FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.10 and FCCC/SBSTA/2014/INF.16.

(iii) The clarification of the role of land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) and the use of carbon credits from market-based mechanisms relating to targets of developed country Parties;

(c) The update of document FCCC/SB/2011/INF.1/Rev.1, as contained in document FCCC/SBSTA/2014/INF.6, and the updates of document FCCC/TP/2012/5, as contained in documents FCCC/TP/2013/7 and FCCC/TP/2014/8, by the secretariat, reflecting Parties' submissions and information exchanged during the in-session events.

3. With regard to the identification of common elements as referred to in decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 5, the SBSTA acknowledged that there is a limited number of approaches among developed country Parties for measuring the progress made towards the achievement of the targets. The SBSTA acknowledged the importance of convergence in the coverage of sectors and gases as well as in the use of global warming potential values among developed country Parties.

4. The SBSTA acknowledged that the additional information provided by developed country Parties, during the activities referred to in paragraph 2 above, regarding the clarification of their targets and associated assumptions and conditions related to the ambition of the pledges as outlined in decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 5, increased the transparency of the targets and helped to facilitate the consideration of the comparability of efforts among developed country Parties.

5. The SBSTA also acknowledged the discussions on the transparency of, and reporting on, the use of carbon credits from market-based mechanisms.

6. The SBSTA noted that there is more than one approach to account for the role of LULUCF in achieving developed country Party targets. Developed country Parties are mainly using two approaches: the activity-based approach and the land-based approach. Regarding the comparability of the efforts among developed country Parties, the SBSTA acknowledged that comprehensive, complete and consistent coverage of the reported information is more significant than the choice of approach.