

CMP: No agreement on “revisit mechanism” contact group to increase Annex I ambition

Lima, 8 Dec (Hilary Chiew) – By the end of the first week of the climate talks, developed and developing country Parties still could not agree on the way forward on the issue of the ‘revisit mechanism’ for the ambition of Annex I Parties in the second commitment period (CP2) of the Kyoto Protocol (KP).

COP President Manuel Pulgar-Vidal convened a plenary meeting of the 10th session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 10) that lasted for 30 minutes from 5:30 pm on 6 December, informing Parties that he had undertaken informal consultations with various Parties on the matter on Friday (5 December).

On 3 December, the Group of 77 and China (G77-China) had proposed a contact group for the CMP 10 agenda item 8: *Report on the high-level ministerial roundtable on increased ambition of Kyoto Protocol commitments*. However, developed country Parties disagreed, citing confusion and lack of clarity of the scope and purpose of the contact group but were ready to consult further.

Bolivia representing G77-China reiterated its request for the contact group and said it is confident that the wisdom and leadership of

the COP President will guide Parties to find an agreement.

It said the Group had repeatedly explained its proposal for creating a contact group to consider ways and means to ensure commitments by Annex I Parties will happen before it is too late. It underscored that the decision to be made in the proposed contact group is important in order to have certainty to address the mitigation gap in the pre-2020 period.

China believed that the COP President’s consultation was helpful. However, it noted that neither has it changed G77-China’s request nor led to the agreement for the contact group. It stressed that establishing a contact group is still necessary.

It said in the consultation, China had further explained that the ministerial roundtable in June has not led to the further increase of ambition of Annex I Parties. It heard some Annex I Parties saying that their increased ambitions are conditional and China find those conditions extremely unsatisfactory. It would like to know the political analysis of their conditions.

China said it is extremely worried that if there is no political solution to the issue there would

be no increase in Annex I emission reduction. Hence, it said, this is precisely the issue that needs to be solved through the contact group.

Australia speaking for the Umbrella Group recognised the importance of reducing emission in the pre-2020 period but it cannot support the idea for a contact group. It considered that the on-going discussion of the pre-2020 ambition is being addressed in the multilateral assessment (MA). The MA is taking place on 6 and 8 December under the working group session of the Subsidiary Body of Implementation (SBI).

On the part of Australia, it said the country has participated in the high-level ministerial and presented a submission approved by its minister indicating its 2020 targets following the KP's rules, and it intends to continue doing so.

Switzerland said it shared the concern of Parties that ambition for the pre-2020 period has to be increased globally and it is fully committed to that common objective.

However, it said Parties should recall what was decided in Doha (venue of COP 18 in 2012).

Referring to paragraph 7 of the Doha Amendment, it said Switzerland, like the other Annex B countries has done its part and has shared the conclusion at the high-level ministerial in June.

Paragraph 7 of decision 1/CMP.8 reads: *“Decides that each Party included in Annex I will revisit its quantified emission limitation and reduction commitment (QELRC) for the second commitment period at the latest by 2014. In order to increase the ambition of its*

commitment, such Party may decrease the percentage inscribed in the third column of Annex B of its quantified emission limitation and controlled by the Montreal Protocol by Parties included in Annex I of at least 25 to 40 per cent below 1990 levels by 2020; ...”

It said Switzerland had reflected the context under which circumstances it will be ready to look at higher ambition of the KP as contained in the footnote number 11 which reads:

The QELRC presented in the third column of this table refers to a reduction target of 20 per cent by 2020 compared to 1990 levels. Switzerland would consider a higher reduction target up to 30 per cent by 2020 compared to 1990 levels subject to comparable emission reduction commitments from other developed countries and adequate contribution from developing countries according to their responsibilities and capabilities in line with the 2° C target. This reference retains the status of the pledge made under the Cancun Agreements and does not amount to a new legally binding commitment under this Protocol or its associated rules and modalities.”

It reckoned that no further work is needed for this agenda item but remained concerned over the lack of global ambition. Therefore, it said it is important that Parties look at this issue in a cooperative spirit and it looked forward to discuss the issue under workstream 2 of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) that was established for that purpose.

The European Union said it has heard the views of other Parties but it cannot support the establishment of the contact group. It said the issue is taken up by the MA, workstream 2 of the ADP and the June ministerial in Bonn. In

those discussion groups, it has explained how the bloc is in the process of ratifying those commitments both domestically and regionally, and the legislation put in place to increase its pre-2020 ambition.

It is, therefore, not necessary to create another process to review, noting that there are already so many contact groups being set up in the Lima talks.

Norway said it has submitted its instrument of ratification and is eagerly awaiting other

Parties to ratify so that the CP2 can enter into force. It too does not see the need for a contact group.

In conclusion, Pulgar-Vidal said he heard the divergence of views and he would continue to undertake consultations and is confident of more constructive dialogue to see a way forward and hoped to find a way to solve the impasse.+