

## ***Oral report to the Contact Group***

### **Review (agenda item 4)**

*Contact group meeting, 24 May 2012*

#### *Framing elements of the discussion*

- There was a general understanding among Parties that the work this year is to further consider the definition of the scope of the review and the expert consideration of the inputs;
- Parties agreed in Cancun, Mexico, that the review is to assess the 2/1.5°C goal and the overall progress towards 2/1.5°C as well as to continue the work on the scope of the review. In Durban, South Africa, Parties agreed to further consider the scope;
- Parties also agreed in Durban that the Conference of the Parties (COP) will conduct the review with the assistance of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation. They also agreed that the work shall be supported by the expert consideration of inputs. Regarding the expert consideration of inputs, views converge that this consideration should: allow for a prompt start, be efficient and transparent, avoid duplication, have Party ownership and minimize costs. However, views diverged with regard to how this could be done, including for in-session and intersessional activities.

#### *Issues discussed*

- Regarding the scope of the review, there were divergent views, including the following:
  - Two options are being considered: to limit the scope of the review to what was contained in paragraph 138 of decision 1/CP.16, or extend the scope of the review to include an assessment of the implementation of the Convention;
  - A view was that to assess the overall progress towards the 2/1.5°C goal, there needs to be an assessment of the provision of the means of implementation (finance, technology and capacity-building) to Parties not included in the Annex I to the Convention (non-Annex I Parties). Therefore, the extended scope is already part of what was agreed in Cancun;
  - Another view was that there is no need to discuss the scope as it is defined by the inputs;
  - Two alternative options were suggested by Parties:
    - To carry out a first review with a narrow scope and then use a wider scope for later reviews;
    - To start the review with the scope as defined with the option to take up other aspects if this proves necessary in the course of the review;
- Regarding how to conduct the expert consideration of inputs, Parties discussed the following options:
  - A new body should be established to provide guidance to the review (in addition to the subsidiary bodies). The body should meet back to back with the sessions of the subsidiary bodies and intersessionally, if needed. The timeline for the work of this body will be set by the COP. Another view was that the body could provide technical support to the subsidiary bodies;
  - A joint subsidiary bodies contact group should be used, because such a group would have Party ownership, ensure transparency and incur no additional costs. According to their mandates, the subsidiary bodies already have a mandate to carry out work relevant for the review (Articles 9 and 10 of the Convention) and are composed of experts from Parties. Other views were that additional funds will be needed for bringing additional experts from non-Annex I Parties to the meetings of the contact group;
  - Workshops or expert meetings should be held, as needed. More such meetings may be required towards the end of the review period. One view was that such meetings should be held in conjunction with the subsidiary bodies. Another view was that they could also be held intersessionally;

- General guidance for conducting the expert consideration included the following:
  - Hold meetings or workshops during, or back to back with, sessions of the subsidiary bodies;
  - Avoid intersessional activities due to their high cost;
  - Meetings should be open-ended;
  - No duplication of work;
  - During the information gathering phase, the need for expert consideration might be limited;
  - The need for technical assistance will intensify towards 2014, when most inputs will become available. Hence, during the period 2013–2014, most work could be carried out in-session. From 2014, intersessional activities might be required;
  - For intersessional workshops, adequate provision for participation by non-Annex I Parties should be made;
  
- Regarding further steps, the following suggestions were made:
  - To organize an in-session workshop on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change *Special Reports on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation* and on *Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation* at the thirty-eighth sessions of the subsidiary bodies;
  - To invite Parties to submit their views on the reasons and benefits of the options for conducting the expert consideration of inputs;
  - To request the secretariat to prepare a technical paper on the interlinkage between science and decision-making.