



## Durban Platform co-chairs identify areas of ‘common ground’ on 2015 agreement

Geneva, 10 May (Meena Raman) – The Co-chairs of the Ad Hoc Working Group under the Durban Platform (ADP) of the UNFCCC identified what they perceived as some areas of “common ground”, following exchanges among Parties on the agreement to be concluded in 2015 and to come into effect in 2020.

On the last day of the second session of the ADP held on 3 May, a roundtable was held under workstream 1 (on the 2015 agreement) to summarise the work of the session. The ADP session was co-chaired by Mr. Jayant Mauskar (India) and Mr. Harald Dovland (Norway).

Mauskar outlined what the Co-chairs saw as common ground (arrived at during this session) and the topics for further discussion which could be the focus of the June 2013 session when the working group next meets.

The Co-chairs said they perceived the following areas of common ground from the exchanges: The principles of the Convention apply to the new agreement and there is no need for further elaboration; adaptation is a common challenge and integral to the agreement; both adaptation and mitigation are interlinked and need to be enabled with finance, technology transfer and capacity-building; all Parties will cooperate, taking into account national circumstances, and guided by the principles of the Convention, which will underpin the new agreement; there needs to be effective implementation of the existing commitments; the agreement should enable the participation of everyone and ensure environmental integrity; there should be both enhanced national action and

international cooperative action through a variety of nationally determined actions under international rules and guided by principles of the Convention; and a process of consulting, adjusting (of the mitigation efforts), transparency and accountability for delivery of actions and incentives for them and there should be a regular review of overall results based on science.

Mauskar added further that links to the 2015 outcome should be established with existing arrangements and will draw on the on-going work on mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology transfer, capacity building and transparency of action and support and will be strengthened wherever needed. He added that where common grounds existed, there should not be a revisit but wanted Parties to keep moving forward to make progress on issues.

On possible topics for the June session, Mauskar said that from the exchanges, some ideas that arose were as follows: the notion of a variety of enhanced actions including various types of commitments and questions including bottom-up and top-down approaches. He said Parties desired to know what others are able to do, when and why and how bottom-up and top-down elements can be combined in an effective way.

On adaptation, the Co-chairs believed that there is a need to go further into discussions. They heard interest on how provisions of support for adaptation can be enhanced; how to enhance finance, technology transfer and capacity building for adaptation; Parties could benefit with specific examples on concrete plans of action and ways to

ramp up efforts; clarify how the 2015 agreement can add value to existing arrangements such as the Cancun Adaptation Framework and whether a more effective approach through sharing of lessons learnt can be facilitated.

Mauskar added that there are also broader questions as to how the existing arrangements under the Convention will link to the 2015 agreement as they continue to evolve and mature till the 2015 agreement is adopted.

On the next steps, Mauskar said that on the issue of having contact group/groups, the Co-chairs intend to come with a proposal on 3 June (when the ADP meets again). The Co-chairs also stressed the need to start preparing the “deliverables” for the Warsaw Conference of Parties (COP 19).

Parties then reacted to the Co-chairs’ remarks. India did not share the view that there was a convergence of views. Several developing countries were concerned about proposals for bottom-up nationally determined mitigation actions based on national circumstances.

**India** did not share the view that there has been a convergence of views. It is important that the principles of the Convention will apply in the 2015 agreement. It hoped that “convergence” means that the principles as meant in the Convention apply and are not reinterpreted. On mitigation efforts in the post-2020 period, referring to the proposal by the United States that each country defines its actions according to its own national circumstances, it asked how the emissions gap will be bridged. If the pre-2020 ambition is not raised by Annex I countries, the emissions gap will only widen. It wanted the June session of the ADP to provide clarity on the Kyoto Protocol amendments in relation to the second commitment period. India wanted milestones for both the provision of finance and technology transfer for adaptation and mitigation and said that such means of implementation have not been available.

**Nauru** for **AOSIS** said the relationship between workstream 1 and workstream 2 is important and failure to close the ambition gap will have

profound implications. Discussions on the two workstreams should be allocated the same time.

**Uganda** responding to the issue of bottom-up and top-down approach (in determining commitments of countries) referred to the Brazilian proposal of 1997, which was on how to share the burden of mitigation. It wanted the UNFCCC secretariat to make this proposal known.

(The most notable feature of the Brazilian proposal relates to a burden-sharing framework that apportions greenhouse gas emission targets according to each country’s historical responsibility for the global temperature increase.)

**The Philippines** supported Uganda on the issue of the Brazilian proposal and explained that it was submitted before the conclusion of the Kyoto Protocol negotiations. It added further that the second part of the proposal was to set up a ‘compliance fund’ (Clean Development Fund) which eventually became transformed into the Clean Development Mechanism. The Philippines said that the Brazilian proposal was good and provided a scientific view on the historical contributions to emissions of Parties. It could be further updated to add another dimension on the amount of adaptation needed in light of current scientific assessments. It also wanted the secretariat to also provide updated information on the ratification by Parties of the Kyoto Protocol amendments (on the second commitment period). It said there is also a need to look at studies on how much the costs of adaptation will be if the mitigation goal is not reached.

**Ethiopia** said that it had suggestions on what should be a top-down approach. It said emission reductions that are compulsorily required should be based on cumulative per capita emissions. Another top-down approach relates to what finance should be made available which should be based on a per capita GDP of countries. Some countries have billions of people and some only a few thousand and justice should be about a per capita approach.

**Brazil** referred to references to its proposal that “has gained new interest” and said that it is

working to update its proposal. If the goal is to limit temperature rise to below 2 degrees C, the proposal gains new momentum. It said the logic of the proposal is for mitigation efforts to be shared by agreement relative to the historical contribution of Parties for the relative temperature increase and hence, focusing on emission flows misses the issue. It added that it had a recent paper which could be distributed by the secretariat.

**Swaziland** for the **African Group** reiterated its call for a technical paper not only related to the global temperature goal but also related to the means of implementation. It also expressed support for the Brazilian proposal.

**Nepal** for the **LDCs** said that supporting nationally determined mitigation actions did not provide the necessary comfort needed for the protection of the climate system. It wanted legally binding commitments which are fair and in line with the science. It stressed the importance of urgency in taking actions and that the goal is to collectively take charge of the future and not about imposing obligations.

**China** agreed that there had been convergence on a number of issues. In the future work, it wanted a balanced coverage of all the issues following the Durban Platform mandate. It wanted balance in relation to the topics as well as the representation from experts and panelists from Parties. As regards the topics, it suggested discussion on the Brazilian proposal in the context of the post-2020 agreement. It also suggested a workshop in June on equity, including on elements related to the Brazilian proposal. It also proposed a dedicated roundtable on financial resources, technology transfer and capacity-building. There is a need to capture common understandings and convergence of views. The elements of the agreement would include all the Bali building blocks and other elements such as capacity-building and transparency of actions and support.

**Malaysia** also expressed support for the Brazilian proposal.

**Bangladesh** expressed support for the views expressed by developing countries and stressed the

importance of adaptation in the new agreement and the fact that the more there is mitigation, the less the need for adaptation.

**Gambia** said the outcome must be legally binding which is applicable to all and is rules-based. It wanted the work of both workstreams to be linked.

**Timor Leste** stressed the need to discuss the linkage between the new agreement and the mechanism on 'loss and damage'. It said the Adaptation Committee needed to be given more "power" and there is a need to have clear means of implementation in the new agreement.

**Tanzania** wanted a needs-based approach for the means of implementation and not wait for disasters to happen before resources are given. On mitigation, it agreed with other developing countries that a top-down approach is important.

**Singapore** said there was a fair degree of convergence on many aspects. One basket of issues is the need to nationally determine actions but to provide the context and balanced internationally agreed rules. It suggested a clustering of issues on enhancing nationally determined actions and modalities, not just for mitigation but also for adaptation; strengthening internationally agreed rules and modalities; and the means of implementation.

**New Zealand**, referring to the Brazilian proposal, said that it was discussed a decade ago and there was a work programme which was concluded in 2008. It wanted this information to also be made available.

**Switzerland** said that there is a need to advance common understanding on elements on means of implementation for a low-carbon and climate-resilient future.

The **European Union** said it was working on the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol amendments. It said it has started looking at mitigation policies on how to reduce emissions after 2020. It said it was good if all Parties start this work at the home front in parallel with the negotiations.

The **US** said that on transparency issues, there is a need to look at information that has been

developed under the Convention which would be relevant along with the contributions by Parties.

In the afternoon of Friday, 3 May, the Co-chairs convened a brief closing plenary session of the ADP, where they informed Parties that they would

prepare and make available informal summaries of the roundtables and workshops.