

Norway

Views on the work of the ADP, Workstream 1

March 2013

1. Introduction

The ADP negotiations are of key importance and represent a cornerstone in international cooperation to combat man-made climate change. Norway welcomes the agreement in Doha and is looking forward to continue the work under the Durban Platform in 2013. Our initial views on the Durban platform, perspectives on the new agreement and on the workplan on enhanced mitigation ambition have also been presented in submissions from Norway in March, May and November 2012.

The two workstreams under the ADP have different characteristics, but are interlinked. Early action on mitigation will greatly increase the probability of limiting global warming to below two degrees. Workstream 2 should help build a common understanding of how large the emissions gap is and what the uncertainties are around the size of the gap. The knowledge from workstream 2 can help us in setting the ambition level for the 2015 agreement. We will need good exchange and dynamics between the two workstreams.

2. Suggestions on working arrangements and how to take work forward

Work under the ADP needs to move from conceptual discussions into a more focused mode, exploring the substantial issues. We see the need to maintain an open and flexible way of working. In our view, we should spend the first half of 2013 on open discussions, aiming at finding common ground on main elements. Successively recording progress as Parties' discussions mature in clarity and depth, would be useful.

For the April meeting, we suggest the following:

- To maintain a flexible organization of work. We see no need at this stage to establish contact groups.
- To hold 1-2 dedicated in-session workshops during the meeting, use the remaining time on roundtable or spin-off discussions.
- To launch specific in-session spin-off discussions from an introductory roundtable, and that spinoffs report back to the larger group. The two Co- Chairs are encouraged to identify issues that spin-offs could address/elaborate more.
- To invite experts/scientists/leaders of international voluntary initiatives as well as other organisations to present:
 - experiences and examples from other international agreements
 - plans and achievements for enhanced mitigation through international collaborative initiatives.

Follow-up work: The chairs are encouraged to develop a synthesis of main views from submissions, on issues under WS1 and WS2, before the June meeting.

3. Views on the further work of the ADP workstream 1: the 2015 agreement

For the April meeting, Norway suggests to start discussing the scope, structure and design of the 2015 agreement.

This would allow Parties to address in an integrated way, and in context, the other topics identified in Doha:

- Ways of defining and reflecting enhanced action
- The application of the principles of the Convention
- Experiences and lessons learned from the Convention and from other multilateral processes.

It is our view that the application of the principles of the Convention should be in the context of achieving stabilization of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere at levels that reduce the risk of dangerous climate change, and take into account that we are about to create a framework that shall work in a post-2020 reality. As we see it, the best way forward is not to treat the principles as separate issues, but to integrate them in a practical manner in our work on framing and formulating operative provisions and commitments.

The period up to 2020 should be viewed as a transition period. Through the decisions in Cancún, Durban and Doha, we have established institutions and processes that will deliver climate action, and also build preparedness and capacity for new commitments after 2020. Implementation of current mitigation pledges and full participation in the international MRV processes up to 2020 is of key importance to build capacity and preparedness in the transition period. However, the MRV framework of the new agreement will need to be more robust and fit for purpose – under the ADP, we will need to develop more specific provisions for transparency and accounting, which target post 2020-commitments.

Good information exchange from other processes under the Convention is important. This relates in particular to the 2013-15 review, the transparency processes and the work programmes on mitigation, as well as experiences and lessons learnt from the Nairobi work programme on adaptation and the processes of national adaptation planning.

Other multilateral agreements can provide valuable insights into how we can build an effective and fair agreement. Our discussion could gain from presentations and examples on how to build a durable framework that is ambitious as well as flexible and differentiated. Furthermore, examples on how to link support mechanisms to implementation of commitments would be useful.

Further views on the scope, structure and design of the 2015 agreement

Norway is of the view that a future agreement needs to be broad in scope and coverage, covering in principle 100% of global emissions.

Important design features would in our opinion be: A set of basic responsibilities and provisions, in line with the spirit of the Convention, and with common multilateral rules. On this basis, differentiation - in degree and/or types of commitments, and in provisions for international support that effectively deliver climate action – is important. A basic design issue is therefore how differentiation should be captured, in form and content. For all countries, commitments and obligations must be based on national circumstances,

responsibilities and capabilities. Another design quality would be to establish a lasting framework that has the flexibility to evolve over time and capture developments in emission patterns, effects of climate change and national circumstances. A further important design feature would be ways to incentivize full participation and sufficient ambition by Parties. The latter is a fundamental challenge that needs in-depth discussions.

Further work could be organized around the following basic challenges:

- How to ensure broad participation? What are Parties` interests in a common global framework?
- Differentiation:
 - o Understanding respective national circumstances and different capabilities: which elements are important to Parties?
 - o How to formulate and frame the different contributions from Parties?
 - o How to enhance ambition and reflect changes in national circumstances over time?
- How to ensure that support to action on mitigation and adaptation is effective and delivers genuine achievements?
- How to ensure the environmental integrity of carbon markets and allow for broad participation in carbon markets?

Further views on ways of defining and reflecting enhanced action

In our view, the April session should in particular focus on the ways of defining and reflecting enhanced action. The 2015 agreement should be flexible, but needs to maintain environmental integrity. While all Parties must be included in the agreement, the scope and depth of mitigation commitment must vary according to capabilities, responsibilities and national circumstances.

In order to be applicable to all, the agreement should include a range of options for mitigation commitments. The options should be easy to formulate and easy to understand. For clarity, transparency and environmental integrity, we also believe that there should be a limited number of options. These varied commitments must be tied together in a common accounting framework that sets out how to account for emission reductions, including through the carbon market. MRV provisions that can effectively track and sum up the overall mitigation effort are necessary, using a flexible learning-by-doing approach that fits the different options for mitigation commitments.

A range of options for mitigation commitments should be explored, from economy wide absolute emission reductions, to commitments covering key sectors or source categories in countries. A basic starting point could be a low emission development strategy.

Questions for discussion and further work:

- What should be the content and format of options for mitigation commitments?
- What level of common rules and approaches will be necessary to preserve environmental integrity of the agreement?

- How to incentivize enhanced action and a gradual increase of scope and depth of mitigation commitments? Discussing best practices in national climate policies can be an approach to address broader participation. National targets and development plans can also play a role. How to enhance climate and sustainable development co-benefits?
- How to include and enhance climate and sustainable development co-benefits as part of ambitious mitigation action over time?