

**Norway**  
**Submission to the AWG-LCA**  
**Clarification of mitigation pledges**

**November 2011**

- When Parties associated themselves with the Copenhagen Accord, a large number of Parties submitted letters containing information on the mitigation actions and targets that they will implement. The information was submitted in January 2010, in the context of paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Copenhagen Accord and compiled in two INF. documents. Decisions 1/CP.16 takes note of the same INF. Documents and includes provisions for follow up.
- The pledges for mitigation action and targets, from both developed and developing countries, are a cornerstone of the Cancún agreement. These pledges were put forward by national governments up to and after COP15. They represent considerable political will and commitment to combat climate change.
- They provide a starting point for mitigation action up to 2020. As such, they are crucial in forming a basis for knowing how global emissions will develop. However, there is a need for further clarification of the mitigation actions and targets that have been put forward. We need basic information related to scope and coverage, as well as factors related to actual implementation.
- A better understanding of what these pledges mean is important for two reasons:
  - It will increase trust through better knowledge about what Parties will implement.
  - It can promote further mitigation actions and thus be a stepping stone for increased ambition, in two ways: better knowledge will constitute a better basis for cooperation on implementation, and it will facilitate more efficient provision of targeted support to developing countries.
- The Cancún agreement refers to clarification of these mitigation pledges through workshops. The workshops that have been completed during 2011 have been very useful. However, participation has been unpredictable and only a limited number of Parties have presented information on their mitigation actions and targets. Also, there has been no common basis for which type of information should be presented. The workshops have thus been inadequate in providing complete information on basic metrics of the foreseen mitigation action, as well as information on any conditionalities regarding implementation.
- Norway therefore supports proposals that the outcome in Durban should include a decision to start a structured process of collecting basic and structured information about all mitigation pledges put forward, based on the different main types of pledges included in the INF. Documents. This process should be separate from the process of establishing common accounting rules, and should focus on basic and factual information about the pledges. Completing such a process will give us a common platform for knowing where we are. This can be followed up in the first and subsequent round of biennial reports, where more detailed information on individual actions and overall implementation can be given.
- We suggest that the collection of this information should be structured according to the main types of mitigation pledges that have been put forward. Below, we have outlined the relevant information which should be collected as a priority, according to the most common types of mitigation targets and actions.
- The process of collecting information should be completed in mid-2012. The main clarification we call for is about the actual assumptions and conditions for the pledges made

by Parties. This is a bottom-up process for the purpose of informing other Parties. It is distinct from developing a common accounting framework.

- Parties that have put forward targets for absolute economy-wide emission reductions in 2020 relative to a historic base year should provide the same information. This includes, among others, the overall emission reduction, base year or reference year, as well as metrics related to coverage of gases and sectors, and aspects of implementation. Parties should also provide information on how they define the form of the commitment over time; their averaging period or pathway towards 2020. A suggested format is found in table 1.
- Parties that have put forward targets for emission reductions relative to a business-as-usual trajectory should, among other things, provide information on the coverage of gases and metrics, assumptions on the business-as-usual trajectory of emissions and aspects of implementation. A suggested format is outlined in table 2.
- Parties that have put forward targets for reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per unit of GDP (intensity target) should, among other things, provide information on the base year parameters, the inclusion of gases and sectors, assumptions on the GDP trajectory and aspects of implementation. This is outlined in table 3.

**Table 1, collection of information for clarification of mitigation pledges; economy-wide emission reductions relative to a base year**

Country	
Emission reduction for 2020 (%)	
Emission reduction for 2020 (million tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> -eq)	
Base year or reference year	
Reduction relative to 1990	
Sectors included	
Gases included	
GWP values assumed	
Intended inclusion of LULUCF activities (which)	
Assumed accounting approaches	
Intention of using flexible mechanisms (which)	
Assumed averaging period or pathway towards 2020, if relevant	
Assumptions on domestic implementation, if relevant	
Assumptions on international support for implementation, if relevant	

**Table 2. Clarification of mitigation pledges; Emission reduction relative to a business-as-usual trajectory**

Country	
Emission reduction for 2020 (%)	
Emission reduction for 2020 (million tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> -eq), if available	
Business-as-usual projection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assumptions on BAU trajectory emissions</li> <li>- Baseline or reference level</li> <li>- Permanence of BAU</li> </ul>	
Sectors included (which)	
Gases included (which)	
GWP values assumed	
Intended inclusion of LULUCF or REDD+ activities	
Assumed accounting approaches	
Intention of using flexible mechanisms (which)	
Assumptions on domestic implementation	
Assumptions on international support for implementation	

<b>Table 3. Clarification of mitigation pledges; Reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> per unit of GDP relative to a base year</b>	
Country	
Intensity reduction 2020 (%)	
Base year	
GDP reference level from base year	
CO2 reference level from base year	
Assumptions on GDP trajectory	
Sectors included (which)	
Gases included (which)	
GWP values assumed	
Intended inclusion of LULUCF or REDD+ activities	
Assumed accounting approaches	
Intention of using flexible mechanisms (which)	
Assumptions on domestic implementation	
Assumptions on international support for implementation	