

Report by

H.E. Ms. Tine Sundtoft, Minister, Ministry of Climate and Environment, Norway, and
H.E. James Fletcher, Minister of Sustainable Development, Energy, Science and
Technology, St Lucia

To the second meeting of the Comité de Paris held on 8 December 2015 on their informal consultations undertaken on Ambition, including long-term goals and periodic review

- This morning, we had three more bilaterals that addressed the same questions that were asked to groups of Parties yesterday. Our teams also met with the co-facilitators that had supported the negotiations on the issues at hand under the ADP. These meetings contributed to deepening our understanding of Parties' perspectives and helped us identify potential landing zones. We now have met with all groups and delegations that had requested time with us.
- This afternoon, we held a Ministerial dialogue on ambition, which was split into two clusters. The first addressed the temperature goal and long-term goals, and the second focused on dynamics and the global stocktake.
- I would like to recall that the COP President had asked us to consider the 2013-2015 review, an item that had not been concluded under the subsidiary bodies last week.
- The discussions were very positive: many Parties came having reflected on the positions of others as expressed over the past few days, actively making proposals on how to formulate possible compromises and landing zones.
- Based on these meetings and those held over the past two days, we have been asked by the COP President to provide drafting guidance on ambition.
- I would like to give you a brief overview of what this guidance will include.
- On the long-term *temperature goal*, we have identified a will by most Parties to somehow reflect the 1.5 °C temperature limit in the Purpose of the Agreement. We see three possibilities:
 - One possibility would reaffirm the below 2 °C limit, but also contain some language recognizing the importance of the 1.5 °C limit.
 - A second would strengthen the below 2 °C limit to *well below* 2 °C, and scale up global efforts to limit warming below 1.5 °C.
 - A third possibility would have below 1.5 °C as the temperature limit, with an accompanying provision related to sustainable development, the means of implementation, equity and food security.
- Some were of the view that it needed to be clear how this temperature goal would be achieved.

- On the global mitigation goal, we have identified two main possibilities . The first would include quantitative elements with short, medium and long-term targets, and the second would include a long-term qualitative goal. In each case, many Parties recognized the need to include a reference to science. A combination of the two is possible.
- A number of Parties stressed the importance of long-term goals being contextualized with reference to equity, science, sustainable development and poverty eradication.
- From our consultations, it has become clear that for many Parties that it will be key to operationalize the long-term temperature goal. Mid-term targets could be paired with the temperature goal. We have noted that some Parties suggested placing specific quantitative numbers with percentages and year ranges. Others raised the possibility of including these numbers in the decision text.
- Parties expressed support for a global stocktake that would take stock of the aggregate progress towards the purpose and/or goals of the agreement in a comprehensive and facilitative manner. It would cover mitigation, adaptation and support. It is also clear that the aim of this exercise should be to take stock and inform, clearly respecting and without impinging on the national deliberations on further efforts on mitigation, adaptation and support. Many delegations provided suggestions to ensure the facilitative nature of the stocktake.
- Parties supported the inclusion of a 5-year cycle in the Agreement for successive communications. Issues remain regarding specific starting years and their placement. We have also heard a reference to allow for enhanced international cooperation.
- Parties stressed that communications should remain nationally determined.
- Most Parties favour a synchronised updating of commitments or contributions on a five-year basis.
- The sequencing could be done in one or two steps. The first would entail the submission of intended commitments or contributions prior to a finalized submission. The second would see commitments or contributions submitted directly.
- Different views were expressed on the need for a formal preparatory process or whether a more informal “sunshine period” is sufficient to facilitate clarity and transparency of the commitments or contributions and to promote greater ambition. Sequencing should provide ample time for synthesis reports to be developed – similar to what has been done in this round of INDCs.

- There is also an emerging trend that, starting in 2030, the timeframes for the submission of commitments or contributions should be harmonized, but views diverge as to when and how to take this decision.
- Some countries underlined that the issues of progression/highest ambition, up-front information, accounting and features are also important for securing ambition in the Paris outcome.
- Thank you.