

## **New Zealand submission to the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action**

### **Views on the work plan and suggested workshops for the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action**

**July 2012**

#### **Context**

1. The co-chairs of the ADP have requested additional input on how the ADP can advance its work in Bangkok and for the remainder of 2012 under the two work streams of decision 1/CP.17. This submission responds to that request and is written in the context of the discussions and agreed agenda which took place during the May negotiation sessions in Bonn.

2. This submission builds on, and should be read alongside, New Zealand's May submission on the ADP.

#### **Characteristics of the Durban Platform**

3. The Durban Platform needs to balance twin objectives: (a) achieve full participation on an equal legal footing; and (b) encourage high levels of ambition. Both are essential if we are to meet our collective global goal of holding the increase in global temperature below 2°C.

4. New Zealand's aim is for a global agreement that is rules-based, but dynamic and flexible enough to cover the great diversity of national circumstances and changing global economic and environmental realities. The agreement needs to provide incentives for mitigation, incorporate new and innovative approaches, and facilitate partnerships between governments and the private sector.

5. New Zealand believes that the Durban Platform should lead to an agreement with the following characteristics:

- a. Maximum participation;
- b. Applicable to all;
- c. Future-focussed and durable;
- d. Focussed on key elements;
- e. Ambitious mitigation;
- f. Founded on transparency; and
- g. An effective global carbon market enabled by a common framework of rules or standards.

#### **Work Plan**

6. The Durban decisions call for a complex new agreement to be formed in a relatively short timeframe. Time constraints need to be acknowledged and negotiation sessions conducted expeditiously, but at the same time we must be cautious to avoid skipping critical

foundation steps and prejudging outcomes in other fora and processes that have already been established.

7. As previously noted, New Zealand supports a phased approach to the work of the Durban Platform consisting of an initial “concept” phase, moving to discussions on “content”, and lastly negotiations on “form” and drafting the agreement. New Zealand sees this work structured in a sequenced but flexible way that allows for some overlap between phases where this would help advance work in a constructive manner.

8. The negotiations in Bonn focused on important process issues including agreeing the agenda and electing co-chairs. Some time in Bangkok will need to be devoted to “process” issues, such as discussing how we will work to ensure we have common understandings about the pathway forward.

9. The ‘conceptual’ phase is crucial to identify and build a shared understanding of the key elements that should be included in the new agreement. New Zealand sees this as a foundational building block of the Durban Platform that needs sufficient time devoted to it. It is essential that substantive work on this conceptual phase begin immediately in Bangkok and Doha, extending into early 2013 if needed.

10. New Zealand sees Doha as a chance to generate creative ideas about the future. Entering into a detailed work programme or multiple work streams at this early stage would discourage the innovation and fresh thinking New Zealand sees as crucial in constructing a new agreement that meets the twin objectives and therefore is effective.

11. The Doha decision on the Durban Platform needs to map out the process for concluding conceptual discussions as soon as possible, with a phased approach through to the eventual new instrument. The Doha decisions will need to respect the consensus and the fine balance achieved at Durban. Specifically the Durban decision (1/CP.17) to close the two ad-hoc working groups will need to be implemented, and there will need to be a clear perspective of progress on the ADP.

### **Suggested Workshops**

12. New Zealand suggests three workshops in Bangkok and Doha could usefully begin discussions in this critical ‘concept’ phase. The workshops should focus on the key characteristics to form the basis of the future agreement and consider how they can be practically implemented:

- a. Discussing **Parties’ domestic drivers and constraints** could help identify the key parameters essential to maximizing participation in an inclusive future agreement. Parties' domestic policy and political drivers may not be directly relevant to climate change, but form the context in which their climate change policies are developed. Discussion of these drivers would be instructive, together with the rationale for climate change policy instruments, and what is required to gain domestic public support in their country for climate change action. Drawing these concepts out could be done through presentations and case studies from both developed and developing countries, highlighting their domestic climate initiatives and analysing any challenges and opportunities.

- b. **Future Focus:** As the next climate change agreement will need to endure into 2020, 2030 and hopefully 2050, New Zealand sees value in thinking about what the world will look like in the future. A range of presenters from both developed and developing countries, the private sector, think tanks and organisations (such as the OECD and the IPCC) could present on topics such as emissions trends and cumulative emissions, economic trends, population projections, and technology availability. Presentations by Parties on their long-term development plans could usefully identify how they see their country in 2020, 2030 and 2050.
  
- c. **Learning from the Past.** A workshop could discuss what has and has not worked in the current climate change architecture, including *inter alia* the Kyoto Protocol, finance mechanisms, approach to adaptation, GHG inventories, and MRV. Parties could also discuss how parts of the current architecture would affect them if it were applied to them in the new agreement. Parties may also want consider which elements from other international agreements have worked well, and whether these might be imported into the UNFCCC process.