

Divergence over scope of review of long-term emissions reduction goal

Bangkok, 1 Sept (Hilary Chiew) – There is continuing divergence over the scope of the first review of the adequacy of the long-term global goal for emissions reduction as evident from the informal group meeting on *Review: Further definition of its scope and development of its modalities* held on 31 August.

Many developing countries insisted that Parties must discuss the review of the global goal for emissions reduction by 2050, taking into account all decisions made at the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) in Cancun in 2010 and not be selective. Developed countries and a group of developing countries led by the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) prefer a narrow scope.

In the Cancun decision 1/CP.16, Parties recognise that *“deep cuts in global greenhouse gas emissions are required according to science, and as documented in the Forth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, with a view to reducing global greenhouse gas emissions so as to hold the increase in global average temperature below 2°C above preindustrial levels, and that Parties should take urgent action to meet this long-term goal, consistent with science and on the basis of equity; also recognizes the need to consider, in the context of the first review, as referred to in paragraph 138 below, strengthening the long-term global goal on the basis of the best available scientific knowledge, including in relation to a global average temperature rise of 1.5°C”* (paragraph 4).

At the beginning of the 31 August meeting, Parties were provided with a matrix of the relevant COP decisions and an informal note on the points of discussion on the matter from the 15th session of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the UNFCCC (AWG-LCA). These were prepared by the Chair of the AWG-LCA, Mr. Aysar Tayeb.

It was clarified to the Parties that the informal note is not a negotiating text but a guide for discussion and Parties are to develop their own negotiating text for the next COP at Doha that will take place at year’s end.

Using the informal note as a guide, Parties discussed the five options for the review process:

Option 1: Maintain the scope of the review to what was contained in paragraph 138 of Decision 1/CP.16;

Option 2: Extend the scope of the review to include an assessment of the implementation of the Convention;

Option 3: Maintain the scope of the review to what was contained in paragraph 138 of decision 1/CP.16, and agree that, to assess the overall progress towards the 1/1.5°C goal, there needs to be an assessment of the provision of the means of implementation (finance, technology and capacity-building) to developing country Parties;

Option 4: Carry out the first review with a narrow scope and then consider a wider scope for the second review;

Option 5: Start the review with the scope as defined in Option 1 above and to take up other aspects, if this proves necessary in the course of the review, based on the information contained in the agreed inputs for the review.

India welcomed the informal note as a useful starting point. It said linking the review to only paragraph 138 of decision 1/CP.16 may be too narrow while decision 1/CP.16 gives Parties the expressed mandate to further define the scope of review as illustrated by paragraph 140.

Paragraph 138 reads: *“Decides to periodically review the adequacy of the long-term global goal referred to in*

paragraph 4 above, in the light of the ultimate objective of the Convention, and overall progress towards achieving it, in accordance with the relevant principles and provisions of the Convention;”

Paragraph 140 reads: “Requests the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention to further define the scope of this review and develop its modalities, including the required inputs, with a view to their adoption by the Conference of the Parties at its seventeenth session.”

India said Option 3 limits the assessment only to the means of implementation while Option 2 will include implementation of the Convention principles and suggested merging the two options.

It was supported by Bangladesh, Uganda, China, Brazil, Saudi Arabia and the Philippines.

Uganda felt that the scope should include more than the issue of temperature goal of 1.5°C but more importantly the adequacy of the means of implementation and the adequacy of the reduction of Annex 1 (developed countries) Parties.

China pointed out the inconsistency of Parties that cited urgency to get the review underway quickly but preferred postponing the broadening of the scope of review to the second round of review when paragraph 140 makes no such reference.

It insisted that the scope of review must cover the means of implementation as well as those commitments by Annex 1 Parties on their mitigation targets.

The **United States** said it is important for the review to get underway and does not believe that further discussion on scope will be constructive, adding that the first review should maintain the scope as set out in paragraph 138 so that the review can start on time.

Japan said for now Parties should stick to paragraph 138 but for the second phase can explore paragraph 140.

Citing the COP 17 Durban decisions on this matter, **Brazil** said the decisions clearly illustrate the elements contained in Options 2 and 3.

Saudi Arabia urged Parties not to be selective of the COP mandate; taking one paragraph and not the other. It said paragraphs 138, 139 and 140 of 1/CP.16 should all be considered and urgency is no excuse to push Parties to carry out premature

work. Parties need to work on a complete package and not do half of the job only.

Bangladesh said since it was felt that paragraph 138 was inadequate, hence paragraph 140 was added. Therefore, it cannot be ignored and Parties need to define the scope further in order to go for a wider review.

Agreeing with Bangladesh, **the Philippines** said if Parties have to do this review, it is imperative to get it on the right footing and in a complete manner. Therefore, merger of Options 2 and 3 is the way to go. It will allow Parties to include paragraph 138 and look at how the other Bali Action Plan pillars are being implemented and mitigation undertaken by developed countries put forward under the Cancun (COP 16) and Durban (COP 17) decisions.

It also questioned the rationale for delay in expanding the scope instead of ensuring there will be continuity of the review going into the future, and that the review must not only consider mitigation as adaptation, finance and technology transfer are all part of the consideration, adding that it is sticking to the mandates of both Cancun and Durban.

Speaking on behalf of the AOSIS, Trinidad and Tobago believed that Option 1 is the legitimate interpretation according to paragraph 138, while permutations were included in Option 2 and 3.

Colombia said its preference is for Option 1 as it is the most coherent and what it thought to be as it was. The review is an urgent matter and must start by 2013, adding that by including review of the provision of the Convention would be exceeding the mandate given by ministers (at Cancun).

Belize said broadening the scope will jeopardise the time line and undermine the review process.

Others like Antigua and Barbuda, Singapore, Norway, the European Union, Japan and Australia supported the AOSIS position to postpone widening of the review to another time.

India said it has issue with Parties that tend to pick and choose mandates and is bemused by the debate of a “second review”. It said Parties have mandate to review the scope and India agreed that there is urgency to start quickly but it cannot accept a narrow scope now and a wider scope later.

Saudi Arabia highlighted that while Parties are trying to close the AWG-LCA track, they refused to recognise the relevancy of paragraph 140 to complete the work of the AWG-LCA. It said Parties are not doing justice to the AWG-LCA by dropping paragraph 140. It further said there is no basis for Option 1 as it ignores the mandate of the AWG-LCA while Option 4 and 5 are incomprehensive and Parties should limit the review to Option 2 and 3.

The Philippines said Options 4 and 5 are non-starters and should be deleted. It said if Parties want to get the review going by 2013 and to make it effective, the mandates in paragraph 140 (1/CP.16) and paragraph 159 of 2/CP.17 must be followed to have a full scope so that when the subsidiary bodies start work next year, they will have all those elements as part of their Terms of

Reference.

(Paragraph 159 reads: *Agrees that Parties will continue working on the scope of the review and considering its further definition, with a view to taking a decision at the Conference of the Parties at its eighteenth session;*)

If they are not ready by Doha, Parties may not get the review going, adding that the review must be full and comprehensive.

China said besides paragraph 159 of 2/CP.17, another relevant decision is paragraph 6 of 1/CP.17 in which Parties agreed that the process of an agreed outcome will be informed by the review which is not limited to temperature goal but also other elements. It warned that if Parties deploy a narrow scope to the review, it will cause severe problems for the other processes.