

No to 'early harvest' of a decision on mitigation contributions – say developing countries

Bonn, Oct. 24 (Meena Raman and Indrajit Bose)
- A large number of developing countries were opposed to viewing 'intended nationally determined contributions' (INDCs) as only being mitigation-focused, in stark contrast to the position of most developed countries.

[After much wrangling, Parties had in Warsaw last year agreed to a decision under the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Actions (ADP) to "initiate or intensify domestic preparations for their INDCs, without prejudice to the legal nature of the contributions, in the context of the 2015 agreement".]

China said that INDCs cannot be focused only on 'mitigation', isolated from the consideration of the provision of finance, technology transfer and capacity building support. There can be no 'early harvest' by focusing only on mitigation when all elements of the 2015 outcome are "a package". Otherwise, this would lead to a rewriting of the Convention, it stressed. This view was shared by the **Like-minded developing countries (LMDC)**.

Sudan, speaking for the **African Group** said that Parties were working under a "single mandate" as set out in the Durban decision (adopted in 2011) and that work must be captured within "a single undertaking".

Cuba for the **Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of our America (ALBA)**, said that the INDCs are a component of the 2015 agreement and are to be negotiated in the context and in conjunction with all the elements of the agreement, and not separately. It saw this approach "as an attempt by a group of countries to negotiate the outcome of an agreement, which Parties have not yet begun to negotiate, by using

the debate on the information on INDC as a back door, and as a way of diluting the commitments of developed countries under the Convention". It referred to the current situation as "lamentable".

The **LMDC** and **China** were also of the view that the ADP workstream 1 should focus on the agreed task of the identification of information accompanying the INDCs and not go beyond the Warsaw mandate. China could not accept what it perceived as a "changing of goalposts" where the ADP deals with un-mandated issues.

An important exchange also took place on the issue of differentiation among countries. **Singapore** said that the INDC vehicle was the chosen path to resolve many difficult issues, including the most sensitive one of differentiation. It allows Parties to "self-differentiate".

South Africa said that the issue of differentiation has to be cracked. The world has changed but it has also changed not always for the better. It said that there should be no binary division (between Annex I and Non-annex I Parties) but questioned if there could be "self-differentiation without any boundaries". It believed that there should be one decision - the INDCs with the elements of the 2015 agreement as INDCs are an integral part (of the latter).

Brazil also expressed concern about the free for all approach and said that the differentiation aspect has to be very clear to avoid backsliding. The decision has to be clear on what is expected out of developed countries, as it is important for political balance. It clarified that it is not advocating a binary approach, but saw it as a "concentric differentiation" approach.

Most of the developed countries stressed that the INDCs should be focused on mitigation, with some countries like Canada expressing that they should be “unconditional”.

These views were expressed at the contact group meeting held under ADP on 22 and 23 October in Bonn, Germany. Co-chair of the ADP, Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago) drew the attention of Parties to a draft decision text by the Co-Chairs on the INDCs and sought feedback from Parties on how to improve the text.

Speaking for the **Like Minded Developing Countries (LMDC)**, **Argentina** iterated that it had submitted a conference room paper (CRP) in June this year, which deals with information on the INDCs. Preparation of INDCs is not an independent task or another additional process and it is certainly not an end but a means to achieving the end, which is the 2015 agreement, it said. Provisions of the new agreement should focus on enhanced action for the implementation of the Convention after 2020. INDCs should be discussed within the context of elements and the information should be linked to the elements, stressed Argentina.

It said that any outcome in Lima should be consistent with agreed tasks in Warsaw, which is to focus on the information that is needed to be provided. Argentina also commented on the Co-Chairs’ draft decision and asked for the title of the document which was *‘Intended nationally determined contributions of Parties in the context of the 2015 agreement’* to be changed. It said that the title of the draft decision must refer to the information to be provided in relation to the INDCs. The title goes beyond the Warsaw mandate, which referred specifically to information provided by Parties when putting forward their INDCs.

It added that Annex I Parties should give information on their respective mitigation targets as quantified emission limitation and reduction objectives for the post-2020 period; Annex II Parties to give information on their respective commitments for the provision of finance, technology transfer, and capacity building support for both mitigation and adaptation to developing countries for post-2020; and non-Annex I Parties to give information with respect to their nationally-determined contributions with respect to, as appropriate under their national circumstances, the implementation of the Convention, along with information on the

support needed from Annex II Parties with respect to such contributions.

Speaking for the **African Group**, **Sudan** said that the work of Parties is with respect to the mandate of the Durban decision and the chapeau in the Warsaw decision puts in context a negotiations text for the 2015 agreement and INDCs. “We see it as a single mandate,” it said and added that Parties need to engage on how they capture the good work done so far within a single undertaking.

On the draft decision, it said that there is precise and definite language on mitigation (reflected in paragraph 5) whereas adaptation is cited as being optional (in paragraph 4). It said that in the operative paragraphs of the draft decision, there is no reference to finance and technology support, which is a commitment that developed countries are obliged to undertake. It reiterated that adaptation obligations are clear in the Convention. All countries are expected to plan for adaptation as their contribution to the global effort, with developed countries expected to provide support. It said that a clear reference to developed country obligations would be appropriate, which would be in line with the information outlined in the eighth bullet point and the last three bullets of option 1 in the annex on information on adaptation.

(The eighth bullet talks of adaptation needs and the last three bullets are: Delivery mechanism, channel for the support by Annex II Parties; sectors and geographies covered by the various types of support by Annex II Parties; and indicative time line for provision of support).

Referring to the annex of the draft decision on information on means of implementation, Sudan noted that the information listed in option 1 was a useful starting point in reflecting the support dimensions of INDCs (Option 1 has 10 bullets on information on means of implementation). It said that developed countries should therefore communicate INDCs for support outlining the magnitude, type, sectors supported, and timeline on the basis of agreed accounting methodologies. It said that some developed countries have expressed difficulty in communicating financial pledges for the medium term to long term, but it was of the view that representation of indicative metrics such as percentage of or percentage of GDP for climate finance could be useful for the long-term, with

actual dollar amounts for short-term in line with their budget cycles.

Sudan also said that several issues need to be clarified in relation to the process for considering the INDCs, in terms of the communication, consideration and final inscription of the contributions.

Referring to paragraph 7 of the draft decision, it said the aggregation of effort relative to the temperature goal (1.5°C) is appropriate. The paragraph should include an adaptation perspective where the needs and costs associated with the temperature implications of the level of ambition are assessed, which has a relationship with the finance, technology and capacity building needs.

(Paragraph 7 reads: *Requests the secretariat to make publicly available on the UNFCCC website the intended nationally determined contributions as communicated by Parties; compile these contributions into a miscellaneous document; and summarize, in a technical paper, the aggregated effect of the contributions relative to the 2 °C goal, the fairness of their relative efforts and the level of ambition of the contributions for consideration by the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action.*)

It noted that the adaptation contribution of developed countries should be assessed against the needs expressed in the National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) and any other needs assessment processes. It also underscored that Parties' work is under the Convention and said that in addition to equity and common but differentiated responsibility in the chapeau, reference to the Durban decision, including all its elements (mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, transparency of action, and support and capacity-building), would be helpful. Referring to the deadline for INDCs submission by 31 August 2015, it said this posed a challenge to some Parties.

Referring to paragraph 5, Sudan noted the importance of interpreting temperature scenarios to adapt as well as that of means of implementation. That would bring balance to the paragraph, which is not just about mitigation.

(Paragraph 5 reads: *Notes that the information communicated by Parties on their intended nationally determined contributions should enhance the understanding of whether the aggregate effect of all the Parties' efforts is adequate to hold the increase in global average temperature below 2 °C or 1.5 °C above pre-*

industrial levels and also consistent with the latest scientific information as documented in the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, as well as how individual contributions are ambitious, equitable and fair based on Parties' national circumstances and capabilities.)

For paragraph 7, reference to adaptation will be useful in terms of aggregated implications of adaptation needs with respect to the temperature goal, it said.

On the annex, Sudan added that information required by Annex I Parties could be separated from the information required by non-Annex I Parties and they had submitted a proposal to that effect. Sudan also wanted to know how Parties' work would be captured.

Speaking for the **Least Developed Countries (LDCs)**, **Tuvalu** said that reaching a conclusion on INDCs is critical for LDCs. It indicated that INDCs should primarily focus on mitigation and they are looking for certainty that the 2015 agreement would deliver on bridging the mitigation gap. It also sought clarification on how adaptation and means of implementation would be incorporated in the 2015 agreement and this needs to be considered in the INDC process. It said that there were suggestions of cycles for mitigation contributions that could be a precursor to a MRV (measurement, reporting and verification) process in the future. If that is the case, Tuvalu needs assurance that there will be such a process for adaptation too.

"We do not want any new reporting burden," it said, referring to INDCs and called for differentiated reporting requirements. It said that it would be able to produce qualitative INDCs. Tuvalu also wanted to know about INDCs for adaptation and what that would they look like. If LDCs are not able to provide INDCs for adaptation, they would lose out.

Referring to the draft decision of the Co-Chairs, Tuvalu said that the draft decision mentions that Parties "may" produce INDCs. It called for a process that should be clear to say all "shall" do it or not do it. It also said that the draft decision did not provide any specifics on how INDCs would be reviewed before Paris. "We need a facilitative review process that is not threatening," it said. It also wanted to know what would be the next steps if it were found that the contributions are not adequate in meeting the temperature goal. It said that it had

more questions than answers as regards the INDCs.

Tuvalu said further that “if we are going to have INDC on adaptation, it’s an indication of how Parties will contribute to help other countries meet their adaptation needs, not what you are doing in your country”. It called for predictable support for adaptation besides the assurance that adaptation is properly treated in the 2015 agreement. To developed countries’ iteration that adaptation contributions would delay things, Tuvalu suggested a longer-term submission for adaptation. “We need clarity on how we will resolve adaptation so that one train (mitigation) does not reach the station before the others,” it said.

Speaking for the **Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC)**, **Costa Rica** stressed that INDCs should include mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation. Referring to INDCs as vehicles for action, Costa Rica said mitigation, adaptation and MOI are different and this difference must be reflected in the design of INDCs. It called for mitigation contributions to be transparent and comparable, while reflecting equity and CBDR (common but differentiated responsibilities). It added that middle income countries could focus on their own investments to support themselves and others while LDCs, SIDs and other vulnerable countries should be major recipients of support. It added that the presentation of information should not be a burden, but should help enhance domestic action.

On contributions on adaptation, Costa Rica said that these should reflect individual country efforts that contribute to a global goal on adaptation. It said that adaptation is a commitment under the Convention and this should be enhanced. It is not in favour of ex-ante assessment on adaptation.

Speaking for the **Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)**, **Nauru** said while mitigation should be the core of the INDCs, it must be ensured that all elements of the 2015 agreement are addressed in a balanced manner. It called on Parties to submit INDCs in a clear, transparent and measurable manner, in line with the long-term goal. It stressed that the numbers need to be assessed with respect to the global goal and called on developed countries to show leadership.

Cuba for the **Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of our America (ALBA)**, said that the INDCs are a component of the 2015 agreement and are to be negotiated in the context and in conjunction with all the elements of the agreement, and not as a separate piece. It saw an attempt by a group of countries to negotiate the outcome of an agreement, which Parties have not yet begun to negotiate, by using the debate on the information on INDC as a back door, and as a way of diluting the commitments of developed countries under the Convention. It referred to the current situation as “lamentable”.

“Our agreed task from Warsaw was clearly limited to the information INDC could contain, and Parties will provide when putting forward their INDC,” it said. Cuba asked of the Co-Chairs to refrain from controlling the drafting of the outcome and to allow Parties to collectively construct it. It called on Parties to begin immediately a Party-driven negotiation process of the 2015 agreement and to consider INDC in that context. It also asked for the Warsaw mandate to be respected and to negotiate and produce an outcome on the information on INDC that did not go beyond Warsaw and to remove all references to an ex-ante process of evaluation and to any other elements not consistent with the mandate. It stressed that INDCs shall be about all the elements of the agreement, including adaptation and means of implementation (MOI), presented in a differentiated manner according to respective obligations of developed and developing countries as expressed in Article 4 of the Convention. “Particularly, clear and transparent information from developed countries on MOI is key to reach a balanced agreement in 2015,” it said.

China said that INDCs are not an end but a means to an end which is the adoption of the agreed outcome in 2015. The INDCs should be considered in a balanced manner and in the context of the elements of the 2015 agreement. It could not agree on making the INDCs focus on mitigation at first and to deal with other aspects later with very poor prospects, in particular on the provision of finance, technology and capacity building to developing country Parties. There is no “emerging understanding among Parties” in this regard as described in the Co-Chairs’ scenario note, said China. This approach will make mitigation

isolated from the finance, technology and capacity building support, leading to the rewriting of the Convention. There is no 'early harvest' and "they are a package", it stressed.

In contrast, said China, it heard that all developed countries are willing to make financial contributions after 2020 and it is this consensus that should be captured. The INDCs are not a new process beyond the existing workstreams of the ADP. The nature of INDCs is nationally determined, but Parties have to prepare their INDCs in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Convention. The purpose of the information is to facilitate the clarity, transparency and understanding of the contributions. The information is a transparency issue, which could be discussed under the element of transparency. The ADP workstream 1 should focus on the agreed task of the identification of information in line with paragraph 2(c) of the Warsaw decision. The title and content of this outcome should be only related to 'information' and not 'INDCs'. China could not accept the changing of goalposts again, and overburden the work of the ADP with unmandated issues.

Referring to the "so called ex-ante assessment or consultation" or consideration of INDCs, it said that if it's an issue related to ambition, it could be discussed in the context of elaborating the elements for a draft 2015 agreement as Parties had agreed in Durban that the ADP process should raise the level of ambition (referring to para. 6 of decision 1/CP.17).

China said that there is no need to reinvent the wheel on identifying the information, which should be built on the existing reporting arrangements under the Convention and the Bali Action Plan. The contributions should be in accordance with Parties' respective commitments under Article 4 of the Convention, and the information should be in accordance with the CBDR principle between developed and developing countries. It said that the full scope of information in the Co-Chairs' text was in line with its understanding, but the information on finance, technology and capacity building needed to be further elaborated.

It said that some items listed in the annex regarding the information required are difficult for developing countries to provide, such as 'percentage of total emission covered', 'international market' and 'land sector' as well as

'peaking year', which will make their domestic preparations complicated and prolonged.

On the consideration of the INDCs and their ex-ante assessment, China said that besides the mandate problem, there are other reasons why this should not be addressed. It referred to time constraints, given the need to focus on the 2015 agreement. It was also worried that the so-called 'en-ante process' would give Parties a hint that they can provide less ambitious contributions at first and increase or adjust them after this ex-ante period. It was also not practical and inequitable to consider the mitigation ambition merely, without the information on finance and technology support by developed country Parties.

Saudi Arabia referring to the Warsaw decision said that the ADP's mandate is to look at international cooperation and those elements would be top-down type of elements. It highlighted that without completing discussions on all the elements of the 2015 agreement, Parties had moved on to discussing INDCs, which is about nationally driven actions. It added that the scope of INDCs still remains a big question. Parties would not reach ambition if they talk only mitigation, it said, adding that in Lima, Parties are mandated to talk about the information they will provide while putting forward their contributions. It said that Parties have begun national processes in preparing their INDCs and any decision in Lima will have ramifications on the domestic processes. It said that the Warsaw decision did not state that there needs to be a decision on the information to be identified for the INDCs to be in a COP decision.

India said the nationally determined contributions (NDCs) are to be nationally determined according to national circumstances. While all Parties have agreed to put forward the NDCs, the nature of the NDCs has to reflect the fundamental differentiation under the Convention. It added that Parties are mandated to elaborate the information required for the presentation of INDCs. However, it did not agree that Parties could separate the discussions on NDCs from the wider elements and how these elements will be reflected under a post 2020 outcome. It said that an ex ante consultation process is neither mandated nor feasible. Such suggestions are very likely to be counterproductive to their stated aims and

undermine the seriousness of the large scale efforts that are required to be undertaken and are being undertaken by sovereign nations in preparation of their INDCs.

It reminded Parties that the seriousness of action on pre-2020 ambition would undoubtedly impact the mutual trust among Parties even as they draw up their INDCs. “We have also heard references to changed realities in this discussion, a term which keeps cropping up without due explanation. We would like to draw the attention of the delegations, which make these references, to the UN assessments about the worldwide extent of extreme poverty and about the countries that continue to face such serious and massive challenges despite their considerable recent success in bringing growth and development to their peoples. The task of such countries is not made easier by any facilitative international environment as they attempt to alleviate extensive poverty in a matter of a couple of generations,” it said. Such uncomfortable realities do not confront the developed country Parties and that is the reality that led to the nature of the Convention, it said.

“That is the reality that we continue to face in the developing world. We are certainly not here to renegotiate the Convention,” India said firmly. Despite these stark realities, the developing countries are undertaking massive efforts to manage the climate change impacts and building more sustainable development pathways, it told Parties.

India called for a pragmatic, equitable and collaborative approach by Parties in these discussions so that there is genuine forward movement in the global action on mitigating emissions and adapting to climate change. Any outcome will be sustainable over the long-term only if the broad concerns of all Parties are addressed in an equitable manner that incentivizes and encourages universal participation.

South Africa believed that there should be one decision - the INDCs with the elements of the 2015 agreement as INDCs are an integral part (of the latter). It said that the issue of differentiation has to be cracked. The world has changed but it has also changed not always for the better. It said that there should be no binary division (between Annex I and non-Annex I Parties) but questioned if there could be “self-differentiation without any boundaries”. Self-

differentiation would not allow for keeping temperature levels to below 2 degree C. It also said that there is need to understand if the INDC decision is a one-off instrument, never to be used beyond 2020. It asked if the instrument was to kick-start the process to get numbers on mitigation targets on board. The main problem, said South Africa, is the constant refrain that INDCs are only about mitigation and everything else is voluntary.

It also had problems with the Co-Chairs’ draft decision annex on information, which had no format and allows for self-differentiation. There is no (provision for) comparability. It wanted a tabular form. It also stressed that the information for adaptation and mitigation would be different with different time frames. It said that there was a lack of differentiation in the information and seemed like “one size fits all”. South Africa emphasised that there should be no backsliding of commitments.

Brazil said that it sees INDCs as the bottom up element of the work whereas the agreement is top down. “If we take the vehicle analogy, we see INDCs as the train and the agreement as the station. We have the right timing and right passengers to reach on time,” it said. It called for clarity on the idea of what is to be done while working on the elements. INDCs are not a one-off thing and should be given time. It said that Parties should not focus about getting INDCs absolutely right at the first go and Parties should have the ambition of continually improving the INDCs. It added that ambition itself cannot be measured in mitigation alone and called for a broader scope.

On the Co-Chairs’ draft decision text, it suggested adding a paragraph with reference to finance and technology transfer. “Means of Implementation are absolutely important and we should spell them out,” it said.

Brazil also expressed concern about the free for all approach and said that the differentiation aspect has to be very clear to avoid backsliding. The decision has to be clear on what is expected out of developed countries, as it is important for political balance. It clarified that it is not advocating a binary approach, but saw it as a “concentric differentiation” approach. Under the approach, Annex I countries should present absolute targets in relation to base year; non-Annex I countries would choose targets or actions from an array of options. It called for a

concentric approach on finance too, where non-Annex 2 countries could include South-South initiatives. Brazil said this would serve as a base to broaden support while respecting the principles and provisions of the Convention. It said the aggregate contributions process should be strong and based on science and equity. Things should not be done in a rush and Parties must ensure a solid foundation in science, fairness and equity.

Singapore said that the INDC vehicle was the chosen path to resolve many difficult issues, including the most sensitive one of differentiation. It allows Parties to self-differentiate. This is a new approach Parties chose because they wanted to do things better than they did before. “This is the first universal agreement in which all Parties will make a contribution, no matter how small, towards the ambition of our 2°C goal. We need to update our conversation around this uniting factor,” it said and added that while the INDC is the central component of the agreement, the agreement and the ADP mandate are larger than the INDC exercise. It said that it seemed as if Parties are trying to transpose their old demands, onto this new NDC (nationally determined contributions) vehicle.

In Warsaw, Parties recognized that the NDC approach was untested. Then Parties agreed to table these INDCs before finalising the agreement. Parties had decided that their contributions are to be nationally determined. “The insurance that we have is that these NDCs will be scrutinised. If you don’t make your best effort, you live with the consequences of that,” it said. Hence the most important part of this exercise is to get INDCs on the table in 2015. Singapore said its preference lies in making the exercise easier. The exercise to identify upfront information is “without prejudice to the legal form” of the INDCs.

Many developing countries are nervous about their INDC preparations, said Singapore. They do not have clarity to prepare for this. “By arguing about what can or cannot be in an NDC, we are undermining the nationally-determined spirit. More importantly, we are undermining universal participation.” It appealed to Parties that when they made demands, they must consider whether they are perpetuating old differences. It called on Parties to de-politicise

the process of information because the risk was losing the whole agreement.

Venezuela said it is a fact that Parties are working under an internationally agreed Convention, which has Annex, I, Annex II and non-Annex I (Parties). It reminded Parties that no one size fits all, especially when the MOI are meagre or simply not there. Clearly context is important and we need to have a place to examine them, it said.

It stressed the need to grasp that people live in a global ecosystem that has complementary relationships that provide robustness to many natural systems. It said that the sustainable development paradigm can come from the concept of adaptation to climate change. Referring to an embryo that needs to grow from a seed, it said the nurturing of this seed requires funding; funding for mitigation and adaptation. Can our mitigation/adaptation embryo survive, it asked, saying that this complexity is represented by the elements that have been identified in the Convention and further identified in the Warsaw decision, namely the need for finance, transparency of support thereof, capacity building, loss and damage, technology development and transfer. “This allows for strengthening and growth of our embryo. We cannot pull apart our embryo, it needs all its components to live,” said Venezuela.

El Salvador said mitigation should not be the core of the agreement and stressed that capping temperature at 2°C would mean 3-4°C rise in tropical regions, which would have very severe impacts. It added that those who liked to speak about reality must realize that the world has changed since 1992, partly because those who were supposed to comply had not done so. It said that adaptation and finance have to be part of the agreement and said that financing by the private sector will not help in adaptation because the private sector will look for profits at the end of the day. On differentiation, it said that it should be in line with the principles and provisions of the Convention.

Ecuador reiterated that the specific mandate for COP20 needs to be looked into, which only talks of information on INDCs to be presented. It stressed that the CRP by the LMDC must be the basis for negotiations.

For **Solomon Islands**, loss and damage must be anchored in the agreement. It stressed on the

need for the negotiating text to include a section on means of implementation and asked Parties with historical responsibility of causing climate change to show strong leadership. There should be no backsliding, it said. It also stressed the need for developing countries to have financial support, not only for the preparation of the INDCs but also for its implementation.

Supporting the LMDC, **Nicaragua** said developed countries were downgrading adaptation and were reading the COP decision (Warsaw) only to their benefit. Once more, the developed countries are seeing what is their interest and how it will prevail, it said. The INDCs cannot only focus on mitigation; they must focus on all the elements, including adaptation, finance, technology transfer and capacity building. Warsaw mandate them to provide information and Parties should stick to that, it said, adding that the LMDC had made a submission and it would be good to get into formal negotiations mode with further submissions by Parties.

Tanzania said INDCs are important to enhance the implementation of the Convention. It said that INDCs should cover adaptation as well as MOI. It affirmed that without adaptation one could not talk about poverty eradication or sustainable development and thus meet the objective of the Convention. It sought clarity on the next steps after the INDCs are submitted and that it did not want any additional reporting burden. It said that there is a direct relationship to implementation and announcement of INDCs. It reiterated that the LDCs should not be burdened by the draft decision. It also called on the developed country Parties to turn their INDC pledges into commitments and targets for that would send the leadership signal on their part.

Nigeria sought clarification on when Parties would begin to negotiate a text. It added that some of the countries in Africa are still grappling with what should be the contents of INDCs and that only a few members would have started the exercise, if at all.

The **Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)** said that INDCs should not only be mitigation-centric, but should also encompass adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer and capacity building. “The end of the Kyoto Protocol is looming large, giving way to the pre-eminence of a bottom-up mitigation-only

approach on INDCs that, if not managed in a balanced and equitable manner, may result in least-effort mitigation efforts from Annex I Parties and increased pressure on non-Annex I Parties to close the mitigation gap, it said. “However, for developing countries to enhance their mitigation actions without the commensurate means of implementation from developed countries will constrain their sustainable development, poverty reduction and climate adaptation prospects”, according to the DRC. For many African countries, INDCs are currently blurred with a cloud of misinterpretation and lack of clarity. “One way to elucidate that cloud is to get into a formal Party-driven negotiations mode that will allow us to provide, in a transparent and inclusive manner, specific texts reflecting our views and interpretation of INDCs,” it said.

Kenya said that it had similar concerns as China and Saudi Arabia. It said that the draft decision was mitigation-centric and prejudices the scope of the INDCs. It was not useful unless it is comprehensive, it added. Adaptation and mitigation are not interchangeable, said Kenya. It stressed that finance is linked to implementation of the contributions.

Marshall Islands said there is a common commitment to mitigate emissions. When the content of the INDCs are ready to be inscribed in the Paris protocol, they will become a commitment. “We want to know you will do what you say you will do,” it said. Marshall Islands expects major emitters to submit their INDCs by 2015 and informed Parties that they have a strong desire to stick to the timeline. INDCs brought forward must be clear and transparent. The only way to get below 2°C is to address mitigation, it said. Parties have a clear political task for the new agreement and yet Parties are spending too much time on the scope of INDCs, it said. It called for a clear process to measure how the INDCs match up to meeting the 1.5 or 2°C goal.

Bangladesh said it is in favour of a cut-off date on submission of INDCs and sought clarity on which Parties would be the frontrunners in submitting their INDCs by the first quarter of 2015. It also sought clarification on how the contributions would respond to equity and science in relation to the global temperature goal. It said there is a need for adequate ex-ante consultation before the contributions are

finalized and warned that there should not be any backsliding.

Mexico said that while mitigation should be part of INDCs for all Parties, adaptation should figure too. It is necessary to ascertain progress with respect to the temperature goal of 2°C and called for a facilitative consultation process on INDCs. Referring to paragraph 7, which also asks the Secretariat to assess the fairness of efforts, Mexico called for clarity on what criteria should guide these efforts.

For **New Zealand**, INDCs are to meet the Convention's ultimate objective and therefore must address mitigation. The achievement of the ultimate objective of the Convention would be jeopardized if mitigation contributions could be interchanged with adaptation contributions, it said. It called on Parties to submit their INDCs by the first quarter of 2015, adding that submitting INDCs well in advance would leave time for some scrutiny. It said upfront that it did not subscribe to a bifurcated approach and that the Annexes are out of date. It said that Parties had agreed that they would take action based on their "national circumstance". This includes where Parties sit on the "development spectrum". While agreeing that adaptation needs to be dealt with political parity as with mitigation, it said that there were many ways to do this without adaptation being included as an INDC.

It provided detailed comments on the Co-Chairs' proposed draft decision on INDCs. It said that there is no need to recall Articles 4, 7, and 12 of the Convention (these articles correspond to Parties' commitments including CBDR, establishing the COP, establishing the subsidiary body for implementation and communication of information related to implementation). It said it does not support selective quoting of principles, especially that of equity and CBDR. It said it would not accept CBDR without the mention of "respective capabilities" and called for all of these to be substituted with "in accordance with national circumstances".

New Zealand wanted the paragraph on INDCs on adaptation deleted (paragraph 4 of the Co-Chairs' draft decision). Referring to paragraph 5, New Zealand wanted reference to INDCs being quantified or quantifiable. It was also not convinced about use of the word 'equitable' in the paragraph. For New Zealand, equity is not the right concept; it is merely a political assessment of where a country sees itself in the

larger scheme of things. It said fair share should be the principle in putting INDCs forward. In relation to paragraph 7, it said that it was not the role of the Secretariat to address the "fairness of their relative efforts" and wanted this deleted.

Referring to the annexes of the draft decision, New Zealand said that it could stop at information relating to mitigation. (The annexes proposed in the Co-Chairs' draft decision include information related to adaptation and information related to finance, technology and capacity building support as well.) It suggested that there should be information provided regardless of the commitment type and gave examples such as the type of mitigation; time period; quantification where relevant; if applicable could refer to annual reductions in emissions intensity; expected use of international market mechanism; or additional mitigation achieved with additional support. Instead of reference to the peaking year, it suggested use of the words "a long term trajectory". It said that there may be value in having a short narrative on how contributions would contribute to a fair share of effort in context of national circumstances.

New Zealand also asked if Parties could deal with up front information on mitigation only and do so without deciding on the scope of the INDC. In an apparent reference to Saudi Arabia's intervention, it asked if one could look for other sorts of domestic efforts without making mitigation and adaptation fungible.

According to the **European Union**, Parties had said it is central to adopt a decision in Lima on upfront information on INDCs; INDCs are to be brought forward by March 2015 by those with greatest responsibility and capacity according to different commitment types. The upfront information has to ensure that contributions are transparent, quantifiable and comparable. The INDCs should be about mitigation and there should be a process in that allows for increasing the scope in ambition over time. INDCs must be seen as achieving the ultimate objective of the Convention; there should be an international process to consider how INDCs bring us closer to the temperature goal, it said.

On the international process to consider the INDCs next year, the EU said that there would be a very active international debate on the shortfall (in relation to the mitigation ambition) and where Parties need to be, and it is

inconceivable that this is not debated in the UNFCCC. The Secretariat could compile the contributions and have a technical paper and there could be panels or workshops with questions and answers starting with those with the largest emissions. International organisations and non-state actors could present their findings and Parties can be invited to answer questions online. Parties can explain why their contribution is fair and objective indicators can be used. However, these indicators cannot be negotiated but information on the indicators used to formulate the contribution could be provided.

On the differences it saw among Parties, the EU said it had heard that adaptation and finance are key issues, but it had also heard that INDCs do not work well in areas other than mitigation. If there are adaptation contributions, they could become a reporting burden and it would be challenging to prepare anything other than mitigation contributions, given the limited timeframe until the submission date of the contributions. It also said that contributions will become commitments and it did not see adaptation contributions to be international commitments.

The EU said there is a need to sum up information on technical issues for clarity on land use, use of international carbon markets and baselines around business-as-usual emissions. It said one needs upfront information on the approaches to the land sector, the accounting mechanisms, the reference levels etc. On markets, it wanted information on how double counting is avoided and what percentage of total emissions would be covered by international carbon credits. Referring to the Co-Chairs' draft decision, the EU said that all major and emerging economies should stick to the timetable to turn in contributions by the first quarter of 2015.

Canada too said that mitigation must be the focus of INDCs to meet the ultimate objective of the Convention and stressed the importance of "national circumstances". It said that INDCs should be about mitigation, and that Parties must put forward their mitigation contributions that are "unconditional" and in line with their capabilities and circumstances. It also said that contributions are nationally determined and there is therefore no negotiation on the Parties' efforts. It further said that the "world expects that we will demonstrate that we have closed the ambition gap".

Supporting New Zealand's intervention, Canada said that annexes as they exist in the Convention are not reflective of the post-2020 reality and it could not support a "binary approach" (of Annex 1 and non-Annex 1 Parties).

Australia asked what happens when INDCs come forward and how prescriptive they would be. It said that INDCs are a "precursor" or a "pre-process" prior to concluding the 2015 agreement. They are not intended to determine the full scope of the agreement. It agreed with Argentina on the need to progress the INDC elements in tandem with the full 2015 agreement. It said that INDCs are focused on mitigation. There are certain aspects of INDCs that do not fit beyond mitigation. Mitigation is fixed over a period while adaptation plans and investments may be more dynamic. Countries are accountable in relation to mitigation as their efforts are measured, reported and verified (MRV). It questioned if this is the same treatment for adaptation.

On the issue of differentiation, it supported New Zealand, and in response to China, said that no one is saying that there is no differentiation. The question it said was the way differentiation is done. It said there was no logic in differentiating up front information on the contributions. Developing countries may make different types of contributions and the information may therefore differ according to contributions. On what happens after the communication, publication and compilation of the INDCs, Australia said that this will help build understanding of the Parties' overall efforts. Time has to be prioritized for clarification where the emissions are the largest and not where countries have lower capacity or smaller shares of emissions. It was also wary about the Secretariat making a value judgment in interpreting the efforts of countries.

Norway said that INDCs have to be brought forward by early 2015 by major economies and those who have greatest responsibility. The intention of the INDCs is to keep the temperature target to below 2 degree C. The process of INDCs does not prejudice action on adaptation. Finance is also key for both adaptation and mitigation. Including finance in the INDCs is not an effective tool to mobilise more finance, said Norway. It supported New Zealand and the EU and looked forward to a revised version of the decision.

Russia said that INDCs is an endeavour on mitigation. It was also not in favour of the Secretariat doing an analysis of the INDCs.

Japan said that the INDCs should focus on mitigation. While adaptation, finance and capacity building are important, they should be addressed in different places because they play different roles and should not be given the same status as contributions. It added that technically, it is very difficult to set a quantifiable goal for adaptation. Having adaptation in INDCs may cause delay in the submission of INDCs. It called for the Secretariat to make public the INDCs submitted on its website and for other Parties and the private sector to comment on the submitted INDCs. It did not, however, support the Secretariat evaluating the INDCs.

The **United States** said that INDCs must be communicated to reflect the level of effort in action as well as enable Parties to understand the nature of each other's contributions. The US said it would provide its INDC by 31 March 2015, in an effort to make others understand its seriousness for "ambitious action". Referring to the Durban decision, the US said that it was clear on what information should be provided for the INDCs. It should be a straightforward task in that the information should be technical and stressed for it to indicate where it stands with respect to the 2°C goal. Warsaw did not lay out procedures and it found the Co-Chairs' draft decision useful in this regard.

The US said that those not ready with their contributions by March next year should come forth before the ADP meeting in June 2015 and added that the August deadline in the Co-Chairs draft decision might cause confusion. "June will be the time we will start exchanging and understanding information on what we are doing," it said.

On the scope of INDCs, the US said that the Warsaw decision applies to only mitigation and moving to other areas might "complicate" things and result in losing "focus" and "sight" of the "ambition". Also, putting non-mitigation elements would mean undermining their effectiveness in the agreement, it said, adding that adaptation makes it hard to contain specific INDCs in it.

It also said that the INDC process for support is not consistent with the timeframe and the manner in which Parties are able to maximize support. Referring to the train analogy, the US said INDCs are one of the several vehicles Parties have at their disposal to reach the destination. Finance, adaptation and others will be in the agreement, it said.

It reiterated its concern about the level to which differentiation is reflected in the draft decision. "We support differentiation and the concept of INDCs is a strong reflection of differentiation and is consistent with the principles of the Convention," the US said. It, however, added that the clarity with which contributions are contributed should be the same and enable everyone to understand them in a transparent manner. "The notion of a post-2020 agreement set in a 1992 era will not work in the future. We have to find another approach and INDCs provide a sound basis for reflecting Parties' circumstances and capabilities," it said.

Some Parties may want to emphasise their mitigation action in different ways, it said. It also stressed on the need for a common timeframe for the effectiveness of the first period of INDCs. The timeframe ought to be 2025.+