

SBSTA 44 Item 11 a – Guidance on Cooperative Approaches referred to in Article 6, paragraph 2, of the Paris Agreement

Version of 21 May 2016 at 08:00

Co-facilitators' note

Through the three meetings on 17, 18 and 19 May, Parties provided reflections on the guidance on cooperative approaches. Parties also expressed views on the specific elements contained in the Paris Agreement and decision 1/CP.21. This note attempts to capture both these general views and views specific to particular elements. The note further attempts to capture the initial views of Parties on the appropriate process required to arrive at a common understanding by SBSTA 45 on the issues to be addressed in elaborating the required draft guidance.

Views expressed on substance

General views

- Parties expressed their views on the importance of the obligations (“shalls”) stemming from Article 6.2 of the Paris Agreement.
- Parties explored the following concepts:
 - The nature of internationally transferred mitigation outcomes (ITMOs),
 - Governance,
 - The implications of different forms and types of NDCs,
 - How the guidance would be applied,
- The point of application of the guidance (at the point of generation of the ITMO, at the point of transfer or only when the ITMO is used towards a NDC). Some Parties identified linkages between Article 6 paragraph 2 and other Articles of the Agreement. Specifically:
 - That operationalization should be guided by Article 2 of the Agreement;
 - With the guidance referred to in Article 4 paragraph 13 and Article 13 paragraph 13;
 - That the provisions of Articles 13 and 15 would provide a basis for the implementation of some provisions of Article 6 paragraph 2.

Views on specific elements arising from Article 6 paragraph 2 of the Agreement

- Parties noted the relevance of the obligations in Article 6 paragraph 3 to the obligations in Article 6 paragraph 2.
- Some Parties expressed the view that the accounting guidance would apply to the generation, transfer and use of an ITMO to achieve an NDC. Other Parties considered that it would only apply to the use of an ITMO to achieve an NDC.
- Parties identified issues to consider in determining the nature of ITMOs, including whether they are units or other outcomes or both and whether they would provide for the reduction, removal and avoidance of emissions.
- Parties emphasized the importance of the “shall” provisions.
- Parties expressed their views that the obligations in Article 6 paragraph 2 on accounting, including ensuring, inter alia, the avoidance of double counting, would be met through the guidance from this agenda item.

- Some Parties shared their views that other obligations in Article 6 paragraph 2 (namely promoting sustainable development, ensuring environmental integrity and transparency) would be met through development of domestic arrangements and reported either through reporting arrangements or through other processes under the Paris Agreement.
- Other Parties shared their views that all obligations in Article 6 paragraph 2 would require guidance developed under this mandate to the SBSTA. One Party expressed that paragraph 36 may be limited to issues related to accounting but that this limitation did not remove the need for guidance to be developed for the other obligations.
- Some Parties expressed the view that quantification of the NDC would be necessary in the context of Article 6 paragraph 2.
- Some Parties identified a need to assess the implications for different forms and types of NDCs for the guidance with some Parties expressing that these differences may affect the creation of ITMOs, and their accounting (i.e. corresponding adjustment) possibly necessitating preconditions.

Views on specific elements arising from decision 1/CP. 21, paragraph 36

- In the development of guidance referred to in paragraph 36 of decision 1/CP.21, some Parties considered that it would be useful to draw upon Article 17 of the Kyoto Protocol. Other Parties noted that there are important distinctions from Article 17 of the Kyoto Protocol.
- Some Parties expressed that it would be important to examine how the corresponding adjustment specified in paragraph 36 of decision 1/CP.21 would be conducted. Some Parties expressed the view that the “corresponding adjustment” would necessitate quantification of an NDC. A Party highlighted that corresponding adjustments may not be possible from some types of NDCs.
- A Party highlighted the need to explore the scope of the “inter alia” in Article 6, paragraph 2, including how differing timeframes (single/multi-year) would impact on the guidance and in this context, one Party raised the issue of timeframes for the corresponding adjustments to be undertaken.
- A Party identified that double counting includes double creation, double transfer and double claiming, and that these aspects would all need to be addressed by the guidance.

Views on Process to SBSTA 45

- Parties considered that there should be a call for submissions from Parties and observers.
- Some Parties expressed the view that a technical paper would be premature and further exchanges of views between Parties were needed while other Parties saw a benefit to requesting a technical paper from the secretariat.
- Some Parties expressed support for a workshop.