

ADP: North-South divide over mandate for pre-2020 climate action

Delhi, 18 June (Indrajit Bose) – During the facilitated session on workstream 2 of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) on 10 June, Parties were divided over the mandate and scope of workstream 2 (pre-2020 action).

The Bonn climate talks convened on 1-11 June.

Developing country Parties were clear that the scope of the workstream 2 extended to all the elements of the Durban Platform mandate, including mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology transfer and capacity building. They referred to decisions taken in the UNFCCC's meetings of Conference of Parties (COP) held in Durban, Warsaw and Lima in 2011, 2013 and 2014 respectively. The developed country Parties, on the other hand, referred to the same decisions to say that workstream 2 is limited in scope to only address the mitigation ambition and nothing more.

Speaking for **G77 and China, Mali** said the Group's approach is to have a comprehensive pre-2020 ambition and it is not just to address the mitigation failure. "The implementation gap has to cover all the elements and has to cover the full outcomes of the Bali Roadmap. The Warsaw decision states how we must advance work concretely. Years are passing and implementation needs to be assessed and reviewed through which we can enhance our work," said Mali.

(The Bali Roadmap refers to decisions taken under the Bali Action Plan adopted in 2007 and matters relating to the Kyoto Protocol's second commitment period.)

China said it was surprised to hear that there is no agreement on the mandate of workstream 2. It called on Parties to revisit the Durban decision (paragraphs 7 and 8). China said that in Durban, Parties agreed that work would be divided into two streams: 1 and 2.

(Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Durban decision read as follows:

7. Decides to launch a workplan on enhancing mitigation ambition to identify and to explore options for a range of actions

that can close the ambition gap with a view to ensuring the highest possible mitigation efforts by all Parties;

8. Requests Parties and observer organizations to submit by 28 February 2012 their views on options and ways for further increasing the level of ambition and decides to hold an in-session workshop at the first negotiating session in 2012 to consider options and ways for increasing ambition and possible further actions.)

"Paragraph 8 speaks to enhancing the level of ambition. The ambition should be comprehensive, not just mitigation but also adaptation, technology transfer and capacity building," said China. Parties should be consistent with the context of the Durban platform, it stressed.

China also recalled paragraphs 3,4 and 5 from the Warsaw decision and paragraphs 17,18 and 19 from the Lima decision.

(Paragraphs 3,4,5 of the Warsaw decision read as follows:

3. Resolves to accelerate the full implementation of the decisions constituting the agreed outcome pursuant to decision 1/CP.13 (Bali Action Plan), in particular in relation to the provision of means of implementation, including technology, finance and capacity building support for developing country Parties, recognizing that such implementation will enhance ambition in the pre-2020 period

4. Also resolves to enhance ambition in the pre-2020 period in order to ensure the highest possible mitigation efforts under the Convention by all Parties by:

(a) Urging each Party that has not yet communicated a quantified economy-wide emission reduction target or nationally appropriate mitigation action, as applicable, to do so;

(b) Urging each developed country Party to implement without delay its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target under the Convention and, if it is also a Party to the Kyoto Protocol, its quantified emission limitation or reduction commitment for

the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, if applicable;

(c) Urging each developed country Party to revisit its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target under the Convention and, if it is also a Party to the Kyoto Protocol, its quantified emission limitation or reduction commitment for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, if applicable, in accordance with decision 1/CMP.8, paragraphs 7–11;

(d) Urging each developed country Party to periodically evaluate the continuing application of any conditions associated with its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target, with a view to adjusting, resolving or removing such conditions;

(e) Urging developed country Parties to increase technology, finance and capacity-building support to enable increased mitigation ambition by developing country Parties;

(f) Urging each developing country Party that has communicated its nationally appropriate mitigation action to implement it and, where appropriate, consider further action, recognizing that nationally appropriate mitigation actions will be taken in the context of sustainable development, supported and enabled by technology, finance and capacity-building;

5. Decides to accelerate activities under the workplan on enhancing mitigation ambition in accordance with decision 1/CP.17, paragraphs 7 and 8, by:

(a) Intensifying, as from 2014, the technical examination of opportunities for actions with high mitigation potential, including those with adaptation and sustainable development co-benefits, with a focus on the implementation of policies, practices and technologies that are substantial, scalable and replicable, with a view to promoting voluntary cooperation on concrete actions in relation to identified mitigation opportunities in accordance with nationally defined development priorities;

(b) Facilitating the sharing among Parties of experiences and best practices of cities and subnational authorities, where appropriate, in identifying and implementing opportunities to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change, with a view to promoting the exchange of information and voluntary cooperation;

(c) Inviting Parties to promote the voluntary cancellation of certified emission reductions, without double counting, as a means of closing the pre-2020 ambition gap;

(d) Considering further activities to be undertaken under that workplan at the twentieth session of the Conference of the Parties.

Paragraphs 17,18,19 of the Lima decision read as follows:

17. Encourages all Parties to the Kyoto Protocol to ratify and implement the Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol;

18. Reiterates its resolve as set out in decision 1/CP.19, paragraphs 3 and 4, to accelerate the full implementation of the

decisions constituting the agreed outcome pursuant to decision 1/CP.13 and enhance ambition in the pre-2020 period in order to ensure the highest possible mitigation efforts under the Convention by all Parties

19. Decides to continue the technical examination of opportunities with high mitigation potential, including those with adaptation, health and sustainable development co-benefits, in the period 2015–2020, by requesting the secretariat to:

(a) Organize a series of in-session technical expert meetings which:

(i) Facilitate Parties in the identification of policy options, practices and technologies and in planning for their implementation in accordance with nationally defined development priorities;

(ii) Build on and utilize the related activities of, and further enhance collaboration and synergies among, the Technology Executive Committee, the Climate Technology Centre and Network, the Durban Forum on capacity-building, the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism and the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism;

(iii) Build on previous technical expert meetings¹ in order to hone and focus on actionable policy options;

(iv) Provide meaningful and regular opportunities for the effective engagement of experts from Parties, relevant international organizations, civil society, indigenous peoples, women, youth, academic institutions, the private sector, and subnational authorities nominated by their respective countries;

(v) Support the accelerated implementation of policy options and enhanced mitigation action, including through international cooperation;

(vi) Facilitate the enhanced engagement of all Parties through the announcement of topics to be addressed, agendas and related materials at least two months in advance of technical expert meetings;

(b) Update, following the technical expert meetings referred to in paragraph 19(a) above, the technical paper on the mitigation benefits of actions, and on initiatives and options to enhance mitigation ambition, compiling information provided in submissions from Parties and observer organizations and the discussions held at the technical expert meetings and drawing on other relevant information on the implementation of policy options at all levels, including through multilateral cooperation;

(c) Disseminate the information referred to in paragraph 19(b) above, including by publishing a summary for policymakers.)

“It is very clear that these (paragraphs) talk of finance, adaptation, capacity building and technology development and transfer, so it should address all the elements. The only difference is in the timeframe. We do pre-2020 in workstream 2 and post-2020 in workstream 1. We are surprised to see the level of

understanding on the mandate,” said China adding that with such understanding it would become very difficult to achieve the task at hand. “We are talking energy mix by the end of the century, but we have no idea about the next five years. This is not helpful for building trust,” said China.

India also expressed surprise with Parties’ questioning the scope and mandate of workstream 2. “We know we are working under the ADP for enhanced action. We are looking at closing the ambition gap. For this, all the possible actions that can be taken up must be taken up. Therefore, limiting the scope of discussion here is very surprising,” said India.

“We need to go back to the Lima decision where paragraphs 17 and 18 relate to implementation issues. There are very clear mentions of paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Warsaw decision. Paragraph 3 talks of accelerated implementation pursuant to the Bali Action Plan. Paragraph 4 resolves to enhance ambition in the pre-2020 period and for that Parties have to communicate their QELROs (Quantified Emission Limitation and Reduction Objective) or Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) at an early date, and other segments reflect what kind of action is envisaged. We should not get into a debate on what kind of action,” said India.

(QELROs apply to developed countries and NAMAs to developing countries.)

The **United States (US)** stressed that a number of discussions were outside of the scope of workstream 2. Presenting its interpretation of previous decisions, the US said, “We heard ambition reflects on all the elements. Paragraph 7 of the Durban decision launches the work plan on mitigation and the next paragraph calls out for ambition. While the next paragraph does not spell out mitigation, it is in relation to the paragraph above which is focused on mitigation. Therefore, it should not be about all the elements. Our interpretation is it is just mitigation. Then, paragraph 5 of the Warsaw decision focuses on mitigation efforts. That is our view on the scope and we have discussed this through last year,” said the US.

The European Union said it agreed with much of what the US said on the mandate. “The focus of the work should be drawing on mandates from Durban and Lima. The time is best spent not focusing on the mandate,” it said and added that it “appreciates China’s passion in promoting UNFCCC and Kyoto Protocol to enhance ambition”.

Canada expressed “strong concerns” to responding to what they felt was beyond the Durban and Lima mandates. **Japan** too was hesitant about revisiting the

scope and mandate of workstream 2 since it had already been decided upon in Lima.

Following these interventions, **China** raised its flag again expressing deep concern about the conversation that was going on. “We need to reach a common mandate and scope and how we go to more details of thematic areas. The key work for workstream 2 is action, implementation and enhanced action. Yes, existing institutions are operating but they are not enough to close the gap that exists. The core spirit of Durban Platform is let us speed up, accelerate and fill in the gap,” it said.

China added that the gap is not just there in mitigation. “It is a systematic gap. The question is why do we have a gap in mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology transfer and capacity building. Different Parties have expressed through different submissions and the way to enhance the ambition level to close the gap. Remember, many Parties have expressed the understanding that the ambition has to be comprehensive and include all the elements. Many Parties mentioned mitigation, adaptation, technology, finance, capacity building. There are lot of views and options, but some Parties said that they don’t share these views. No matter what options you share or not, all these issues are on the table. These issues are unresolved and we need to continue to work on these,” said China.

Emphasizing on the adaptation aspect, China said the Warsaw decision talks of linkages in terms of co-benefits. Paragraph 4(e) and 4(f) are also related to adaptation, it said.

“Let us take paragraph 4(f), which refers to NAMAs. In developing countries when we do NAMAs, it is a systematic strategy. It is hard for us to focus on just mitigation. So we come up with a strategy to balance the costs. In the more profound understanding, you cannot separate adaptation from mitigation. If we cannot show we did a good job before 2020 to develop a systematic and efficient programme and strategy, how are we to believe that we can do a good job post-2020?” asked China.

Malaysia added there is need to convert conversations on the ground to actions. “What we don’t want is between now and 2020 we know everything but have nothing to build on. We need actions. We need implementation. Workstream 2 should be inclusive. Do we have enough information to dismiss any concepts? If we truly address the spirit, we cannot narrowly interpret the mandate because doing so would be denying the obvious links,” said Malaysia.

In response, **Switzerland** said that the mandate of workstream 2 is about mitigation. It added that if Parties came to Switzerland, they would see several summits in the country (referring to the Swiss mountains). “It would be good to focus on one to hike,” it said.

In response to Switzerland, **Mali** said many from the G77 and China come from different geographies, two-thirds of which is desert. “You could focus on one point and still get lost,” said Mali and added, “We are

not talking adaptation just to get a kick on adaptation. The fact is to go for mitigation you have to go through adaptation. We looked at mitigation and we could look at adaptation with mitigation co-benefits. We have to broaden the discussion to reflect the reality,” said Mali.

The north-south divide and intense debate over the mandate and scope of work under workstream 2 is expected to continue well into the Paris COP later this year.