

## **Drafting group on enhanced action on mitigation**

**9 October 2010@16.00 hrs**

**Note by the co-facilitator**

### **Facilitator's reflections on the issues discussed at the meetings on 1 (b) (ii) of the Bali Action Plan**

#### **I. Discussions relating to Registry/Mitigation mechanism**

In their interventions, Parties referred to the following paragraphs in Chapter 1 of document FCCC/AWGLCA/2010/14: 29ter to 33, 44–46 and 49–50. The facilitator noted the following points raised by Parties:

With regard to **registry/mitigation mechanism**:

- Two proposals with regard to the registry: registry as a stand-alone mechanism; and registry as one of the functions of the proposed mitigation mechanism.
- The mitigation mechanism would have the following functions:
  - (a) To provide technical support for the preparation of nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs);
  - (b) To record mitigation actions seeking support, to facilitate the provision of such support and to record support provided;
  - (c) To give international recognition.
- The act of registering NAMAs in a registry should be voluntary, the other view was that all NAMAs should be registered.
- There are differences in processing the supported and the domestically-supported NAMAs.

With regard to **support for the design, preparation and implementation of nationally appropriate mitigation actions**:

- Technical support will be needed to build the capacity of developing countries for the design and preparation of NAMAs;
- Technical support applies not only to the design and preparation of NAMAs but also to their implementation. Support should cover a broader set of activities, including technology, to aid the development of a NAMA until it reaches the funding stage;
- Part of the purpose of the technical support is to assist developing countries to guide the development of the NAMA proposals through the funding process;

- 
- Funding for the design and preparation of NAMAs should be on an agreed full cost basis. Financial support for such activity may also come from different sources, for example, Global Environment Facility, and bilateral, multilateral and other sources, in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 5, of the Convention.

With regard to **recording mitigation actions seeking support and facilitate provision of and record support:**

*On matching function*

- “Matching” between mitigation actions seeking support and support to be provided is one of the functions of the registry. Views on the meaning of ‘matching’ include an advisory role, ‘match-making’ between NAMAs and support, and as a means to ensure the provision of finance.
- “Matching” should take place in the registry. Another view is that this should be done under the financial mechanism or the executive bodies of funding institutions.

*On Registry function*

- Registry is a public database where NAMAs seeking support are posted and that it has the advisory function of structuring proposals for NAMAs. It may also serve as a platform for information of NAMAs seeking support.
- The registry will have the function of recording NAMAs seeking support, the support available and the support provided. The registry is only one of the avenues for seeking support for NAMAs.
- Autonomous and supported NAMAs recorded in the registry will receive international recognition. It is also proposed that the “appendix” may serve as means of gaining this recognition. The registry is distinct from the proposed ‘appendix’ where supported mitigation actions and actions committed are listed.
- The registry should conduct a technical assessment of NAMAs to ensure that they deliver actual mitigation.
- The registry provides information but the actual conduct of measuring, reporting and verifying of support should take place elsewhere, such as through the national communications.

## **II. Discussions relating to measurement, reporting and verification of nationally appropriate mitigation actions by developing country Parties**

In their interventions, Parties referred to the following paragraphs in Chapter 1 of document FCCC/AWGLCA/2010/14: 38 to 43septies. The facilitator noted the following points raised by Parties:

With regard to **non-Annex I national communications:**

- The current reporting framework for non-Annex I Parties is not adequate or transparent and hence needs to be enhanced. On the other hand, it was mentioned that there is also the need for improved transparency in reporting by Annex I Parties on the provision of support, particularly with regard to whether the support provided is new and additional.
- The proposed new reporting framework for non-Annex I Parties is not meant for compliance purposes or to be punitive or to question the level of ambition of

---

actions, but rather to be a facilitative process that respects national sovereignty and recognizes progress.

- The proposed new reporting requirement for non-Annex I Parties is different from the reporting requirement of Annex I Parties in the following ways:
  - (a) Different frequency for greenhouse gas inventories and national communications;
  - (b) Different content – the content of national communications from Annex I Parties would be more extensive because they would be reporting on the implementation of economy-wide targets;
  - (c) Analysis – The implementation of economy-wide targets by Annex I Parties would be subject to broader examination by the panel of experts;
  - (d) Facilitative role, particularly in helping to identify needs;
  - (e) Financing – scaled-up financing to support non-Annex I Parties' enhanced reporting in accordance with Article 4, paragraph 3, of the Convention.
- Proposal on non-Annex I reporting makes reporting requirement for non-Annex I Parties similar or more stringent compared with the reporting requirement for Annex I Parties and the new reporting requirement for non-Annex I Parties will need to respect the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities.
- There is the need to improve the content and frequency of national communications from non-Annex I Parties, but this discussion should take place under the SBI where such deliberation is already taking place.
- Owing to multiple limitations, non-Annex I Parties are not in a position to prepare more frequent national communications.
- With regard to support for the preparation of non-Annex I national communications, as currently outlined in the Convention, full cost for their preparation is not being met. Along with content and frequency of reporting, discussion on enhanced support for the preparation of non-Annex I national communications is critical.
- Non-Annex I national communications provide space for reporting all mitigation actions by developing countries.

With regard to **international consultation and analysis:**

- Flexibility in terms of discussing whether international consultation and analysis would be conducted at individual country level or whether it would be the analysis of the national communications of a group of Parties were expressed.
- There is challenge of conducting international consultation and analysis of national communications of non-Annex I Parties on individual level.
- International consultation and analysis applies to all mitigation actions and would involve process of expert review, consultation under the SBI and production of a record that includes summary of analysis and consultation.
- Flexibility on many variables, including on frequency and content of reporting and whether some Parties would go through international consultation and analysis was expressed.
- International consultation and analysis as a confidence-building process to better understand collective efforts in addressing climate change is acceptable.
- National communications can be presented for consideration of Parties as per article 10 paragraph 2 of the Convention.

- 
- International consultation and analysis is not in line with the Bali Action Plan (decision 1/CP.13).

With regard to **measurement, reporting and verification**:

- National communications and greenhouse gas inventories form the basis for “M” and “R” of MRV. The issues that need further clarification in this context are: (1) content of the reporting, (2) international consultation and analysis and its relation to the measurement, reporting and verification system; and (3) various guidelines.
- “M” and “R” of MRV for supported NAMAs is done on a domestic level while “verification” is carried out at international level. What needs to be discussed here is the guideline for undertaking international verification.
- There is a need to elaborate on operational details of measurement, reporting and verification
- A work programme to elaborate operation details of MRV needs to be adopted.

---