

**Comparability of Mitigation Efforts
of Annex I Parties
SBSTA Workshop, Bonn 6 June 2013**

**Martin Khor
South Centre**

Comparability of Annex I Parties: Mandate

- Bali Action Plan para 1 (b) (i) – enhanced mitigation action by developed countries, ensuring comparability of efforts
- COP18 (Doha) Decision 1/CP.18 Para 8 on SBSTA work program, to identify common elements and ensure comparability of efforts among developed countries
- Convention Art 4.2(a) – “Equitable and appropriate contributions” by developed countries to the global effort to achieve Convention objective.
 - (a) Comparable (equitable) efforts among them
 - (b) Appropriate/adequate effort/ambition to meet Objective

Method for Comparability

- Current pledges can be compared using a common base year and what amount (in tons CO₂eq) of emissions are reduced by each Party (and consequently total emission reduction of developed countries).
- Pledges can be reduced to a common metric (tonnes CO₂eq) and common base year (1990);
- These metrics can be evaluated against indicators including responsibility (e.g. per-person historical emissions) and capability (per-person GDP);
- Other relevant measures or metrics can supplement but should not replace these.

Efforts needed by A1 Parties

The following efforts by A1 Parties are required:

- Each Party to meet Art. 4.2 (a) commitment to reduce emissions
- Annex I Parties individually and collectively **to take the lead** to meet Convention objectives. Comparable effort is the main principle; relevant national circumstances can be taken into account but not be an excuse to make comparable, adequate effort.
- At present this means increasing ambition to close ambition gap to 2020. Many studies show Annex I as a group and most individual countries have fallen far short of the 2020 target -- i.e. 25-40% attributed to IPCC-AR4 and even more so the minimum 40-45% demanded by most developing countries.

New development: KP track

An important development – KP decision in CMP8 (Doha) on 2nd commitment period (CP2):

- It clarified that Russia, Japan, Canada and New Zealand would not take commitments in CP2; Canada then withdrew from KP; in addition the US is not a KP Party.
- The KP-A1 Parties in CP2 made individual commitments . Also KP was amended with new Article 3 para 1bis that Parties shall ensure their emissions do not exceed their assigned amounts....”with a view to reducing their **overall emissions of such gases by at least 18 per cent below 1990 levels in the commitment period 2013 to 2020.**

KP track: Review of CP2 targets to address inadequate ambition

- CMP 8 also recognized that the 18% overall target is an inadequate level of aggregate commitment
- Para 7 of CMP decision -- each Party will revisit its emission commitment for CP2 by 2014.
- In order to increase ambition, Parties may decrease the percentage inscribed of its QELRO, in line with an aggregate emissions reduction by KP A1 Parties “of at least 25 to 40 per cent below 1990 levels by 2020.” (Para 7, CMP decision)

Implications of KP development for comparing developed country efforts

- Useful for purpose of comparability to recognize the KP development & its reduction of aggregate emission of at least 18% below 1990 level by 2020.
- This 18% (though inadequate) can for the time being be a reference for comparison with pledges of non-KP and non-CP2 Annex I parties as part of the exercise of ensuring comparability of efforts of developed countries
- The revisit by KP-CP2 Parties of present commitments should be an important component for raising Annex I mitigation ambition. The outcome of that KP exercise should be recognized in the subsidiary bodies addressing developed countries' mitigation (including comparable) efforts.
- Non KP, non KP-CP2 developed country Parties should (1) have their pledges compared with the 18% aggregate commitment made in CP2; and (2) have their pledges re-visited in 2014 in light of the KP re-visit exercise
- Also recognise that developed countries' aggregate commitments towards 2020 have to be much higher, to bridge the ambition gap.

Time for decision on figures and conditions on A1 pledges

- **As result of greater clarity on the commitments of developed countries in CP2 in KP, it is now time for all developed country Parties to decide regarding the conditions and final figure in their Cancun pledges.**
- **New Zealand submission states it will announce a binding unconditional emission target to apply during the transition to new Durban Platform agreement. Other countries should also make similar statements.**
- **Making a good decision is however even more important than making a decision.**

Conclusion

- **Vital that Annex I parties make commitments that are adequate in line with the science and with equity, and each of them making a comparable and adequate effort.**
- **This is a requisite for developing countries to play their roles in the global mitigation effort, and within the sustainable development context.**
- **The commitment towards finance and technology transfer is of course most relevant here, and Annex I countries' efforts in this should likewise be comparable and adequate.**
- **The work programme on developed country mitigation efforts is thus a crucial component of the present work in the UNFCCC, which will have clear implications for the ADP's Workstream 2.**