

WORK OF THE AWG-LCA CONTACT GROUP

Agenda item 3.2.2

Nationally appropriate mitigation actions by developing country Parties

Summary by co-facilitators of issues raised by Parties on Registry

version of 15 June 2011 @ 16:00

Oral presentation by the secretariat

- Outlined areas where further clarifications are needed in order to allow the registry to meet its objective in terms of content, input and modalities for the facilitation of support.
- Invited Parties to provide guidance to the secretariat through a COP decision and welcomed views on what would be useful for the process in terms of action by the secretariat this year.

Summary of the discussion

- Some Parties stated that the nationally appropriate mitigation action (NAMA) pledges contained in the document FCCC/AWGLCA/2011/INF.1 could be recorded in a separate section of the registry. They also stated that NAMAs would be indicative until they are matched with support after which they would be recorded in the main section of the registry.
- Parties expressed the need to have further detailed discussion on the scope of modalities for facilitation of support through the registry, including discussion on various sources of funds, including those outside the Convention, access to which would be facilitated by the registry.
- Some Parties stated that the registry would not have executive or decision making role in terms of provision of support and that the actual matching of action and support would take place via the financial mechanism, technology mechanism and any future arrangements for capacity building. A Party mentioned that the registry would be part of the Green Climate Fund.
- Some Parties mentioned that support would need to be facilitated for both preparation (a Party mentioned that this support would be provided through the Global Environment Facility), and implementation of NAMAs, and that the registry would also assist in the assessment of any support gap.
- Some Parties mentioned that developing country Parties would submit individual actions (projects, programmes, policies etc) to the registry and the deliverable would be implementation of these actions rather than emissions reduction per se, although information on emission reduction could be presented in the registry.
- Some Parties stated that registry as a voluntary tool would not preclude Parties from seeking support elsewhere. As a voluntary tool it would not replace reporting requirements and the need for inscription of pledges.
- Some Parties expressed the view that the separate section of the registry referred to in paragraph 59 of Decision 1/CP.16 performs a qualitatively different function from facilitation, however the latter is defined.

- Some Parties pointed out the need for further discussion on the important role of the registry as a MRV mechanism, particularly with regard to MRV of support.
- Some Parties mentioned the usefulness of having simple template for submission of information to the registry on NAMAs seeking support. On the support side, information could include, amount and type of support available and types of actions that would be supported. In this context, a common reporting format for reporting information on finance, technology and capacity building would be needed.
- A Party stressed the importance of encouraging Annex II Parties to present concrete information on support available as this would encourage developing countries to submit concrete proposals, thus making the registry another avenue for recording information on fast start finance.
- A Party mentioned that registry rather than having a “process” for recognition, should recognize actions automatically upon their submission.
- Some Parties mentioned that the registry could be a web-based database, whereas a Party stated that it shouldn’t be seen as a mere database.

Summary of the ideas on the way forward

- Parties requested the secretariat to prepare a prototype of the registry as soon as practicable to facilitate in-depth discussion by Parties;
 - Parties expressed the need to convene a technical expert meeting before COP 17.
 - A Party mentioned that it will be useful to request input from the secretariat on lessons learned from the process of preparation of technology needs assessment, provision of support for adaptation and regional distribution of CDM projects to allow exchange of views among Parties.
-