

## **Advancing the work of the ADP**

### **Submission of the United States**

- The United States refers to its earlier submission on the ADP and welcomes the opportunity to provide additional input on furthering the two ADP workstreams in Bangkok and through 2012. We focus in this submission on advancing work on the 2015 agreement.
- Like many others, we see the early stages of the ADP process as providing a valuable opportunity to lay the conceptual groundwork for the agreement. While the FCCC Parties have experience in developing a legal agreement applicable to some Parties (Kyoto) and a non-legal agreement applicable to all Parties (Cancún), they do not have experience developing a legal agreement applicable to all Parties. The successful development of such an agreement is perhaps the greatest challenge that the Parties have faced to date.
- Given the challenges, we think “progress” in the negotiations should be measured not by whether treaty texts have been put on the table but by whether we are exploring the key issues, testing ideas, deepening our understanding of each other’s perspectives, and narrowing differences.
  - Using the time in this manner will be far more productive than engaging in textual negotiations and “battles of the brackets” right from the start.
  - Text can easily be written once conceptual agreement is reached or close at hand.
- The Bangkok meeting could be very useful in promoting conceptual exploration if it employs the right formats and focuses on the right issues.
- In terms of format, it should provide for informal, moderated discussions. Sessions based around planned interventions without time for responses are likely to involve repetitions of positions and are of limited utility at this stage. An informal format, where Parties can ask questions of one another and respond in real time, would promote better understanding of positions. For example, when one Party says in an intervention that the new agreement must include or reflect a particular element, and another Party says that it should not, not much is accomplished. During an informal discussion, a moderator might press proponents and opponents to articulate the concerns underlying their positions and toward an exploration of whether it is possible to reconcile the two views.

- In terms of substance, there are a number of key issues that should be addressed at this early stage:
  - How should the agreement be designed so as to recognize the economic development and emissions realities of the time period in question, i.e., post-2020? While all Parties cannot be expected to undertake the same type/level of mitigation action, much more commonality will be necessary not only for actions themselves but also for measurement, reporting, review, and other forms of accountability. What are the implications for the approach to the Annexes?
  - How should the agreement be designed so as to be “applicable to all Parties” (and attract their participation in fact) while also promoting ambition?
  - To what extent can we avoid re-inventing the wheel by relying on institutional arrangements and procedures already launched in Cancun/Durban? Would refinements be necessary to address the new time period? Do all elements listed in paragraph 5 of the Durban Platform need to be part of the agreement per se or just part of the 2015 package?
  - How can the agreement be designed so as to be a living, breathing instrument that can capture changing circumstances and evolving commitments?
- Doha should continue the process of informal discussions, for example, through ministerial-level roundtables. Bangkok could recommend topics for such roundtables. There could also be further submissions from Parties prior to Doha.
- The ADP’s work on the agreement in 2012 could be captured in a summary by the ADP chairs. It could pull together views expressed and note key issues for further discussion, setting the stage for more detailed work in 2013.