TWN
Bonn News Update 10
www.twn.my
Published by Third World Network
10 June 2014

ADP: Divergences continue over issue of differentiation

Bonn 10 June (Indrajit Bose) — The contact group of the UNFCCC's Ad hoc Working Group for Enhanced Action under the Durban Platform (ADP) met on 8 June to elaborate on the elements for the post-2015 agreement with a focus on 'mitigation'. Differences over how the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC) should apply to the new agreement to be signed in Paris in 2015 took precedence over other issues at the contact group discussions.

While Switzerland said that the contributions should be self-determined, the US added that self-differentiation is the pragmatic way to reflect CBDR-RC and that Parties must "self differentiate" according to their own circumstances and capabilities. Such interpretations drew a sharp response from Brazil and Marshall Islands, which said that self-differentiation did not mean developed countries could backslide on their previous commitments.

On differentiation between developed and developing countries, Switzerland said that differentiation must reflect present-day realities rather than of 1992, when the UN Framework Convention was signed. Developing counties on the other hand said the premise of the ADP negotiations is that the new agreement would be under the Convention and that its provisions and principles would apply. Developing countries quoted different articles of the Convention to prove their point but it was lost on the developed countries. They wanted CBDR-RC to be operationalized in a "dynamic" context.

Another area of divergence was on the elements of the intended nationally determined contributions (INDCs). For the developed countries, the INDCs is only about mitigation commitments, whereas for the developing countries the elements cover not only mitigation, but also adaptation, finance, technology transfer and capacity building.

Developing countries also made it clear that their submission of INDCs was contingent to the support they receive for the INDCs. But here too, developed countries gave a deaf ear to such statements. Japan and US made it amply clear that developing countries should not expect any financial support for their INDCs.

Speaking for **Like Minded Developing Countries (LMDC), Ecuador** referred to the LMDC's conference room paper (CRP) and explained its' position through a slide which was projected on the screen for all Parties to see. It said that enhanced mitigation action should focus on five broad areas in the new agreement. The areas are: Equity and CBDR in mitigation: comparable top-down QELRCs (Quantified Economy wide Limitation and Reduction Commitments) for Annex I Parties and for developing countries, nationally-determined nationally appropriate mitigation action (NAMAs) subject to, enabled, and supported by finance, technology development and transfer, and capacity building from Annex II Parties

Response measures: A provision shall be included to enhance the implementation by Annex II Parties of their commitments for the provision of financing, technology, and technical services to address impacts on developing countries of the implementation of response measures under Articles 4.8, 4.9, and 4.10 of the Convention. Enhanced national and international actions shall give full consideration to what actions are necessary under the Convention, including actions related to funding, insurance and the transfer of technology to meet the specific needs and concerns of developing country Parties arising from the impact of the implementation of response measures, in accordance with Article 4.8. Parties should work effectively to avoid or minimize the effects of mitigation response measures on developing countries under Art. 4.1(g) and (h), financed in accordance with Article 4.3, and Articles 4.8, and 4.10.

Prohibition on unilateral measures under Article 3.5 of the Convention: (Article 3.5 reads: *The Parties should cooperate to promote a supportive and open international economic system that would lead to sustainable economic growth and development in all Parties, particularly developing country Parties, thus enabling them better to address the problems of climate change. Measures taken to combat climate change, including unilateral ones, should not constitute a means of arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination or a disguised restriction on international trade.)*

Mitigation and adaptation to achieve net decrease of emission levels under UNFCCC: Based on the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, the mitigation mechanisms shall promote and finance mitigation and adaptation actions to avoid or prevent greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in order to achieve a net decrease in overall emission levels in the context of the UNFCCC.

Strengthening measurement, reporting, and verification (MRV) of the provision of means of implementation to developing countries: Provisions for the MRV of financing, meeting costs of adaptation, development and transfer of technology, and capacity-building provided by developed county Parties to developing country Parties for all climate change activities shall be strengthened.

Speaking for the **Least Developed Countries (LDCs), Tuvalu** said it is important that every country makes an effort to produce their INDCs under the theme of mitigation. For LDCs, the ability to produce INDCs would be contingent on the level of support they receive to produce these contributions. They wanted their particular circumstances to be reflected in this respect. Tuvalu also called for the need to establish clear milestones to ensure that work leads to a comprehensive outcome in Paris (in 2015). There should be a review process to assess the adequacy of the aggregate proposals and a process to adjust the contribution as appropriate to achieve the ultimate objective of the Convention and be in line with the latest available science.

It outlined some core elements, which it felt, should be considered in the context of outcomes relating to mitigation: the level of mitigation effort required should be based on the latest science; it should be based on multilateral oversight to ensure that the ambition gap is bridged legally, leading the world to a pathway that would deliver an overall global temperature below 1.5°C, relative to pre-industrial levels; it called for a review mechanism within the agreement; the LDCs support differentiation of commitments on a fair categorization of countries; for some countries, the future climate regime should require nothing less than targets for economy-wide emissions reductions, while for the most vulnerable countries it should allow options for other approaches. All developed countries should take absolute economy-wide emission targets.

The LDCs believe that developing country Parties have an important mitigation role, while respecting CBDR-RC. Possible types of targets that developing country Parties might propose include both result-based commitments focusing on different target dimensions and activity-based commitments, including energy intensity targets, renewable energy targets, for example capacity or share of electricity generation and technology targets. Some developing countries should take relative economy-wide emission targets, Tuvalu said.

The 2015 agreement should be a flexible outcome so that the system can accommodate changes in circumstances. Hence, there should be a process to increase the level of contributions on a regular basis. To ensure contributions are consistent with science, short commitment periods of no more than five years are needed, Tuvalu said. Also required is a clear process to define the subsequent five-year periods built into the 2015 agreement and linked to Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) assessments, which would also be placed on five-year cycle. A periodic review should be undertaken to feed into the five-year commitment cycle, which should flow on from the 2013-2015 review and be firmly embedded in the scientific assessment of the adequacy of commitments in meeting the long-term global goal.

An ex-ante review mechanism should be developed to ensure that the targets set are consistent with a global goal of ensuring a temperature stabilisation level below 1.5° C above pre-industrial levels. The 2015 agreement should ensure comparability of efforts among developed country Parties and include provisions to ensure that these Parties would undertake their commitments in a measureable, reportable and verifiable manner, so that international review processes can assess such contributions. Tuvalu also called for a robust compliance regime in the new agreement.

Speaking for **Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)**, **Nauru** said that work under the ADP should be guided by science. The new protocol must strengthen the multilateral rules based regime and ensure universality in accordance with CBDR-RC. There should be no backsliding on commitments and all developed countries must undertake quantified economy wide targets. Mitigation under the ADP is to ensure long-term temperature is arrested below 1.5°C. It said that agriculture is a very important issue and that it is concerned about the issue being framed under mitigation. The agreement must enhance mitigation ambition by securing highest possible mitigation effort by all Parties and ensuring effective delivery of finance and technology transfer.

Speaking for the **African group, Sudan** said that the agreement must see high mitigation ambition based on adequacy and fairness, counting and accounting rules and compliance. It reiterated that negotiations are under the Convention and for the developed countries, Articles 3.1, 4.2 and 4.3 of the Convention are crucial and for the Non-Annex I countries, Articles 4.1 and 4.7 of the Convention are important. Sudan said that they saw the agreement reflecting absolute economy wide targets covering all sectors and gases and zero emission pathways for developed countries. Developing countries must ensure emissions reduction through Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs). On counting, developed countries should make use of the latest IPCC inventory guideline and developing countries should use the guideline as appropriate. On markets, it said that there should be no double counting. It also called for the development of a framework of assessment of information and communication technologies consistent with targets and rules under the Convention. It also set that offset and joint implementation rules would have to be agreed. For adequacy, the carbon budget must be quantified at the start of any commitment period and the second aspect of focus should be the individual assessment of contribution. On compliance, they saw facilitative compliance, international assessment and review, with mitigation numbers as part of the agreement.

Colombia, speaking for the **Independent Association for Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC)** said that the future agreement should include a long-term mitigation goal through the effort of all Parties. The goal should be guided by science and based on the principle of CBDR-RC. The world needs a carbon neutral economy by mid century and therefore the mitigation commitments to keep temperature increase to below 2°C. The agreement must put in place incentives for those in a position to take action to do so. Colombia iterated that market and non-market mechanisms would play a role in global mitigation action and that there should be reference to REDD-plus (reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation). It also called for a review mechanism of the contributions which would allow ambition to be updated on the basis of science and cost efficiency opportunities to keep temperature rise below 1.5 or 2°C. Colombia said that it must be clear to everyone that the universality of application does not mean uniformity of action and to ensure equity would be the basis of differentiation. It also called the developed countries with higher capacity to show leadership and be ambitious, especially those with higher capacity and responsibility.

Bolivia said climate change poses the urgent need to create effective linkages between mitigation, adaptation, sustainable development and poverty eradication. Climate resilience must be at the centre of climate change actions in the future according to the IPCC in the context of the sustainable development and poverty eradication framework. Bolivia reiterated the IPCC working group II and III reports' conclusions and said a first step towards adapting to future climate change is reducing vulnerability and exposure to present climate variability. Resilience helps to improve human health, livelihoods, social and economic well-being, and environmental quality. In this context there is the need to establish new institutional arrangement to move the old paradigm of separate silos between mitigation and adaptation to enhance the new paradigm of creating synergies between mitigation, adaptation, sustainable development and poverty eradication.

Bolivia suggested the establishing of a mechanism for climate resilience and sustainable development in order to enhance mitigation, adaptation, and sustainable development in a more holistic, comprehensive and integrated way in the context of climate change, and in the context of strengthening the principles and provisions of the Convention equity and CBDR.

The general objective of the mechanism should be to promote the support of Parties for the protection of the integrity of Mother Earth through international assistance and cooperation among developed and developing countries through the provision of adequate means of implementation. This implies promoting the effective provision of public finance and technology transfer from Annex II parties to developing country parties through the financial mechanism of the Convention. This must be undertaken reaffirming the principle of sovereignty of states in international cooperation to address climate change.

The main outcomes of the mechanism should be related to the generation of quantified reduction of emissions jointly with adaptation co-benefits addressing issues of sustainable development and poverty eradication in a comprehensive manner. The mitigation and adaptation outcomes could be monitored through proxies, indicators and standards as appropriate. The mechanism is oriented to support developing country parties to enhance mitigation and adaptation actions depending on the financial and technological support they can obtain. Therefore, developing countries can prepare various levels of enhanced action (adaptation, mitigation, capacity building and sustainable development) in line with the various levels of support they can anticipate. The mechanism will develop its work in a sectoral and programmatic approach considering all sectors of economy, and including energy, industry, human settlements and infrastructure, among others, in accordance with national circumstances and priorities of Parties. Towards this, the mechanism must articulate different instruments and means of implementation developed or under development in the Convention, to strengthen issues related to the provision of finance, technology transfer and capacity building from developed to developing country Parties.

The IPCC WGII and III reports have established that significant co-benefits, synergies, and tradeoffs exist between mitigation and adaptation and among different adaptation responses. Examples of actions with co-benefits include sustainable forestry; among the most cost effective mitigation options are sustainable forest management; and that indigenous, local, and traditional knowledge systems and practices, including indigenous peoples' holistic view of community and environment, are a major resource for adapting to climate change, but these have not been used consistently in existing adaptation efforts. In this context, for addressing reduction of emissions in a cooperative effort by developed and developing country parties in the forestry sector, Bolivia proposed the development of the Joint Mitigation and Adaptation Mechanism for the integral and sustainable management of forests as an alternative policy approach to results-based payments.

China reminded Parties of the context under which negotiations are taking place—under the principles and provisions of the Convention and at the outset clarified that elements that are not in this context should not be discussed in the ADP. China said that the long-term perspective related to the 2°C target could be captured in the 2015 agreement. The world doesn't need more goals, it needs concrete action. All developed countries should put forth quantified emissions reduction targets without any conditions. Developing countries should continue diversified actions, and these should be supported through finance and technology by developed countries. Reiterating that ADP is under the Convention, China said the new agreement must have provisions for commitments based on the historical responsibility and that there should be a provision on response measures.

China said that review process is a new idea outside the mandate of the ADP and one should be very cautious about rewriting the Convention. It urged Parties not to prejudge the process. There are two different arrangements—one for emissions reduction targets and the other on increasing provision of finance, technology. China said there is no need to reinvent the wheel. It said developed countries should revisit their mitigation commitments and increase the ambition and said funding support to developing countries is crucial.

India reiterated that the Convention provides for a wide participation from all Parties on mitigation efforts and the Bali Action Plan too enabled such efforts consistent with the principles and provisions of the Convention. It is not enough to say collective mitigation efforts need to be adequate and science based. Developed countries must take the lead with high and ambitious mitigation targets and provide the means of implementation to developing countries to enable them to have higher mitigation ambition.

India said it is not surprising that emissions in developing countries are growing because it is recognised and anticipated by the Convention in the context of sustainable social and economic development. India also said the human dimension needs to be looked at. It gave the example that even with a sixth of the world population, India's emission per capita is still about a fourth of the global average. "Rapid and inclusive economic growth in developing countries in the last decade has resulted in reducing the percentage of extreme poverty globally. Millions have been lifted out of poverty. At the same time hundreds of millions still live in poverty in developing countries including those with growing economies such as ours. Our governments are working hard to provide access to energy, water to vast sections of our population who still do not have the access to these basic necessities," India said. It added that the situation is no way comparable to "the wasteful and unsustainable patterns of consumptions and production" in the developed world.

India said firmly that the legitimate aspirations of the people of developing countries need to be catered to and any arrangement that lacks equity would not be acceptable. "We can't just exhort the developing countries to reduce their emissions without providing finance and technology and capacity building support. This support has not materialised in any meaningful manner in the last 20 years and that's the crux of the problem."

On the way forward India said that mitigation commitments must be differentiated. Annex 1 Parties, in accordance with Article 3.1 of the Convention, should take the lead through emission reductions undertaken domestically so that it would not result in developing countries taking mitigation action on behalf of developed countries. There must be comparability of efforts among all Annex I Parties with respect to their mitigation commitments. These should be in the form of specific enhanced comparable QELRCs, in the context of a top-down, historical responsibility- and science-based aggregate Annex 1 target that go beyond the Kyoto Protocol 2nd commitment period targets for Annex 1 Kyoto Protocol Parties.

India underlined that mitigation targets must be comparable and undertaken domestically so that developing countries do not undertake mitigation on their behalf. For developing countries, enhanced mitigation actions would be subject to, enabled and supported by finance and technology by Parties included in Annex II to the Convention.

On the contributions from non-Annex I Parties, India said that in addition to differentiation, there must be appropriate sequencing in terms of mitigation under the Convention. Enhanced mitigation actions should be determined nationally by non-Annex I Parties, and subject to, enabled and supported by finance and technology from Annex 2 Parties under the Convention. The differentiation would also extend to MRV as pre existing practices. There should be suitable provisions in the new agreement that strengthen Article 3.5 of the Convention that prevents the use by Parties of unilateral climate change-related response and trade measures that constitute arbitrary, unjustified, or disguised trade restriction.

Saudi Arabia said that mitigation action should take into account social and economic consequences of response measures. It reminded the Parties about the need to reflect on Article 2 of the Convention and reiterated the three elements there—food security, adaptation and sustainable development. The goal here is not to redefine the mandate. The mandate is clear from since Durban, Doha and Warsaw Conference of Parties (COPs). Mitigation and adaptation are interlinked and should be treated similarly, Saudi Arabia said.

Kuwait said the idea of the 2015 outcome is to further enhance the fully effective and sustained implementation of the Convention. It reiterated that mitigation action should take into account social and economic consequences of response measures.

Egypt said that it sought a regime that is balanced, fair and the outcome should build on Article 4 of the Convention. It underlined that the Convention has differentiated processes for Annex I and non-Annex I, which must be followed in the new agreement.

Brazil said mitigation is essential and no collective effort will be successful unless it is based on science and the principles of fairness and legitimacy. Brazil has initiated broad national consultations and they see this as a very important aspect in their determination of their INDCs. Brazil said that contributions must be transparent and a rules based approach must be used towards the contribution design. On differentiation, Brazil said that they could not accept a situation where developing countries do more. "Self-differentiation does not mean Annex I Parties can forego previous commitments," said Brazil. Self-differentiation would have to translate down to accountability, it said. Developed countries must fulfill their financial pledges and undertake absolute economy wide emissions reduction. Developing countries must include quantified emissions reduction targets.

South Africa said a decision text needs to be developed for adoption at the Lima COP that contains minimum information that Parties should use as basis for their INDCs; a process of communication of these contributions; a process of ex-ante assessment of the INDCs and elements of the agreement for further discussion in 2015. It reminded Parties that Warsaw agreed to a formulation where the INDCs should refer to all the elements of the new agreement, and that it would be nationally determined. Contributions need to be communicated to make them more understandable. South Africa also called for clear format for the INDCs in which the contributions would have to be presented.

The 2015 agreement must commit collectively to limit temperature rise to 2°C and include reference to global goal of 50 per cent reduction by 2015, with a qualification that science requires the world to do more. South Africa said there should be an equitable sharing paradigm in which there is a need to reflect differentiation on mitigation and not adopt a one size fits all approach. While all Parties must take action, South Africa reiterated that developed countries should do more. All Parties must implement emissions reduction based on Article 4.1(a) of the Convention and all targets should be subject to MRV. South Africa said that developed countries need to take additional commitments, and that they must be absolute economy wide targets against the 1990 base year. Targets for economies in transition must be flexible.

It also iterated that the world must adopt a zero emissions pathway by mid century and define the long-term goal of zero emissions by 2050. The commitments should be comparable among developed countries and information on mitigation should be across sectors and gases. Parties must also provide information on why they think their contributions are fair. New-market mechanisms should be subject to environmental integrity and additionality, and that accounting rules should be under the Convention.

South Africa proposed a multilateral ex-ante assessment for the consideration of the INDCs. In preparation for this ex-ante assessment, the secretariat should compile a technical paper on the aggregate effect of Parties' contributions, the fairness of their relative efforts, the level of ambition and the gap. Parties' intended INDCs should then be referred to technical body that would assess the adequacy and fairness of the contributions. The assessment would be carried out through joint sessions of the subsidiary bodies, which should submit recommendations to the COP on the outcome of the assessment. The recommendations should be finalized by July 2016 latest. It also called for an ex-post review process of implementation and adequacy of the common goal commitment.

Bangladesh said that as regards INDCs, countries should provide information in a timely manner about proposed contributions in a clear, consistent and comparable manner and that developed countries must take the lead in this. They should be tailored in absolute and relative terms for international assessment and review. INDCs should be accompanied with sufficient information on how it is ambitious and fair in the light of CBDR-RC and equity. Common accounting rules should be set up.

Iran said the future agreement should be in the context of the Convention and not beyond the Convention. Highlighting the importance of equity and CBDR, it said that developing countries should undertake diversified action with support from developed countries. It also said that Annex I Parties must take on absolute economy wide commitment and take the lead in reducing emissions.

Algeria reiterated that mitigation is an important issue and the new agreement should adhere to the principles and provisions of the Convention and the principles of equity, historical responsibility and CBDR should not be forgotten. Developed countries should take the lead and undertake comparable economy wide emissions reduction target. Developing countries should receive financial and technological support and undertake action as per their national priorities.

Kenya said that the agreement should deliver enhanced mitigation action in line with science and principles and provisions of the Convention. The agreement should also inscribe a global temperature goal, in line with what is required by science. INDCs should be the clear entry point for commitments and Parties must put in information in line with the principles and provisions of the Convention. There should not be any backsliding on commitments and they expect developed countries to take lead in raising mitigation ambition. Developing countries could undertake relative mitigation action, such as NAMAs. It supports an ex-ante process and also saw the role for ex post reporting through biennial reports and greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory mechanism. It also called for the strengthening of multilateral rules based regime on markets, non-markets, land-use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF) and REDD+. The review process should make sure mechanisms for mitigation ambition are ratcheted and the compliance mechanism must be facilitative rather than punitive.

Jamaica added that INDCs should be nationally determined and the main focus should be action on mitigation. It said for members with very low levels of emissions, joint proposals for INDCs could be considered as it would be more cost effective for actions that are similar in nature.

Antigua and Barbuda said that the 2015 agreement must recognize that the SIDs and the LDCs require special treatment because of their vulnerability. It said that the agreement must reflect strong global mitigation ambition to ensure that it is in line with science. Mitigation is related to adaptation and critical thresholds exist beyond which adaptation is not possible, it said. It also called for the agreement to be legally binding and fair for all the Parties, with a strong MRV provision, which should avoid placing onerous burden on the SIDs. On INDCs, it said that the information to be submitted should have sufficient data to allow them to calculate what targets the INDCs would achieve.

Marshall Islands reiterated the need to adopt the pathway leading up to zero emissions by mid century. It said that the 2015 agreement should be legally binding for all. The agreement must reflect new scientific understanding where each Party brings forward its INDCs in the form of proposed mitigation commitment in line with CBDR-RC. There must be ground rules for countries; otherwise pure self-differentiation would be a free for all exercise. The first ground rule is there should be no backsliding on the type and scope of commitment. Developed countries must take on absolute economy wide targets. Developing countries must take on from business as usual to intensity targets. The timeframe for mitigation is important. Without a common index, it would be difficult to compare targets and Parties must come back regularly to what science says. It said that it prefers the commitment period to be of five years with the first commitment period ending in 2025. It said there was no point locking in ambition 15 years away. It said it does not have faith that mid-term reviews will produce more ambition on commitment periods therefore it suggested that commitments should be inscribed one year after the arrival of new science and tied to the IPCC assessment reports. It also suggested that one of the ideas could be to look at a streamlined report every five years, and a full assessment report every 10 years.

Papua New Guinea said that developed countries should show leadership, and support developing countries through finance and technology, a common methodological framework for reporting of achieved mitigation goals should be included in the 2015 agreement and be based on good practices as per IPCC guidelines, and the new agreement must comprise a compliance mechanism. REDD+ should be fully integrated in the 2015 agreement as one of its key elements and coastal marine ecosystems as adaptation and mitigation strategies should be given priority. Papua New Guinea also called for broader AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector contribution to climate change mitigation.

Guyana said that the agreement should include a long-term temperature goal, which should be determined by science and an ex-ante review process must be established. The agreement must update commitments periodically. Developed countries must take the lead in raising their quantified emissions reduction targets that allow broad participation and the focus should be on prioritizing solutions in sectors such as renewable energy and energy efficiency. Guyana also called for the Warsaw REDD+ Framework to be anchored in the agreement. It underlined that mitigation provisions must reflect differentiation in some way, not because of the principles of the Convention, but because "we did not contribute to the problem". It called on developed countries to undertake economy wide targets.

Dominica expressed surprise that there was so much discussion happening when the elements of enhanced action on mitigation were already contained in the articles of the Convention. It asked Parties to go over the Articles of the Convention. "Since we left Durban, we have been talking. In the spirit of talkshop and workshop, we should do a workshop on the Articles of the Convention," Dominica said. It added that while new elements are being looked at, Parties seemed to have forgotten what they signed long ago. Amidst all this, people are dying, the country said.

Singapore said the 2015 agreement must contain an overarching element that the agreement is under the Convention and that there should be no attempt to reinterpret or rewrite the Convention. With reference to the INDC, it said that the type of contribution may vary, but there must be an obligation on all to submit INDCs. All Parties must include mitigation component in their INDCs. Each Party should make clear in their INDC what they are prepared to contribute unconditionally. Developing countries must add what they can do with support from developed countries. Consistent with Article 3.1 of the Convention, Parties should come forth with ambitious INDCs. The agreement must affirm and emphasise the need for universal participation, which is a key driver of ambition.

Mexico said every Party should commit to mitigate and that these commitments should be part of the 2015 agreement as an annex. The NDC is already a form of differentiation, it said. Developed countries must take lead and others who could take the lead, should do so, Mexico said. The world needs to agree on a dynamic process and draw on the experience of other UN bodies and instruments.

Referring to INDCs as the major building blocks, **Korea** said that the type of mitigation would depend on the type of targets put forth in accordance with the principles of the Convention. Each Party should provide clear information on the contribution and the information should not be prescriptive but be clear and concise.

EU reiterated that all Parties should put forth their INDCs and the key point is the bottom up approach to INDCs may not be enough. The world needs to look at a hybrid approach for equity and ambition and stressed that the INDCs should reflect the current capacities of a country rather than what it was in 1992. INDCs should reflect the responsibilities and capabilities of the Party concerned. Those with the greatest responsibilities and capabilities should come forward with INDCs in the form of economy wide absolute targets, including those Parties that currently have such commitments pre-2020 to ensure that there is no backsliding. INDCs should be accompanied with up front information to ensure they are transparent, quantifiable and comparable. EU also called for an international process to consider how all the INDCs submitted brings the world closer to achieving the below 2°C objective, and added that objective indicators could have a role to play here. EU referred that the civil society had some thoughts on this regard and these could be taken up. The EU also said that INDC should be included in the 2015 agreement in the form of legally binding mitigation commitments. EU also said that the world should set out a long-term goal on emissions pathway in the form of a legally binding agreement.

Switzerland said the objective of the Convention has to be referred to in the light of present day realities. It added that while it shares the same view as other Parties on the long-term vision and objective, it added that the objective has to be common for all. On differentiation, Switzerland said that it must reflect current reality and contributions should be self-determined. Also, they must be transparent in that they must contain all relevant information; they should be understandable to assess if the aggregate contributions leads to achievement of the long-term goal; and that they should be unconditional. Parties should begin with the preparation of INDCs, urgent information that is to be included must be identified by the Lima COP and that INDCs should be submitted well before COP21 in Paris. All developed countries and major economies should submit their INDCs by the first quarter of 2015. Switzerland also added that the institutional arrangement should include incentive mechanisms such as the markets.

Stressing on long-term mitigation goal, **Norway** said it would help in the review of national mitigation commitments. Referring to the 2015 agreement as something that should be long-lasting, it said that the agreement should have an inbuilt principle to go with higher ambition.

Australia said all countries, especially major economies, need to take coordinated action to restrain emissions. Parties should submit INDCs for common consideration and their idea of differentiation is to allow countries to act based on their national circumstances. It is not in favour of a "ceiling" on what countries can do and how responsibility and capacity can change. On the question of accounting rules, Australia said that the agreement should include some provisions on land sector and markets. It should facilitate mitigation effort and not be too onerous.

New Zealand said that differentiation cannot be a fixed concept and that sustained effort is required to meet the long-term goal. It said that the agreement needs to set up broad parameters within agreed limits and that it foresees a default setting where Parties can opt-out within the parameters. It called for a common commitment period for all. It said that the outcomes from mitigation should be measurable and verifiable in a quantified manner. It said in the Paris agreement, the INDCs should be formalized in the national schedules of every Party, and that common accounting rules should be selected from a menu of approaches.

Calling the 2015 agreement to be a durable one, **Japan** said that the principle of CBDR-RC should be operationalized in a dynamic context. It said that one of the main elements of the 2015 agreement would be for all Parties to submit INDCs and that mitigation should be put at the centre of the INDCs in a manner that the contribution of each Party can be compared. Japan called on the major economies to submit quantified economy wide targets and said that INDCs should not be made conditional to the provision of support. Japan also said that Parties should clarify its methodology and common accounting rules on avoiding double counting should be developed internationally.

Claiming it is working hard on domestic mitigation, the **US** said that quantifiability is key to comparability. Countries with low emissions could submit qualitative contributions. It said that self-differentiation is the pragmatic way to reflect CBDR-RC and that Parties must self differentiate according to their own circumstances and capabilities. On the timeframe of the first contribution, the US said there should be a common end date but it is not firm about when that should be because it would be dependent on the domestic policy of Parties. On conditionality of developing countries turning in information on contributions, the US said that even though finance would continue to flow, but Parties core contribution in the first instance should not be conditional to international finance.

Canada said that mitigation should capture common legal obligation for each Party to put forth its INDC, to periodically update its schedule and for the contributions to be quantifiable, they must be accompanied with sufficient information, be clear and transparent.