



Way forward in the negotiations

Lessons learnt and ambition raising through credible MRV

Yamide Dagnet
Senior Associate
WRI



The Context:

Dangerous path of global warming, lack of understanding from the international community of the stakes and opportunities for low carbon economy

- The aggregate ambition of mitigation actions falls short (about 12 billion tonnes of CO₂-equivalent by 2020) of what is required to limit a global temperature increase below a level that prevents irreversible damage to our planet and society.
 - Investment in the high-carbon economy has yet to shift significantly.
- The economic benefits of a global agreement and climate action, both in reducing emissions and building resilience, are not clear to many businesses.
- climate-friendly technology providers do not know how to shape the international agreement to get the policy certainty they need to plan for the long term
- Finally, constituencies of demand (business, civil society, youth...) from across developed and developing countries have not convened effectively to discuss these issues and shape their own narratives and strategies.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

Stalled negotiations

- Lack of political will and leadership nationally and internationally to take the urgent action required on climate change
- Trust in the negotiations is dangerously low
- **Sense of Injustice:** People most affected by the problem did least to cause it. Yet not enough safeguards in place to protect the most vulnerable people.
- Interpretation of the concept of equity and CBDR-RC has been problematic and on collision course of an ambitious outcome in 2015. **Emphasis on differentiation rather than on commonalities.**



(THE SAME BOAT)

Stock Take

General:

- **Firewall : Annex I – non Annex I and KP vs non-KP**
- **Frustration, failed implementation**

Mitigation

KP II adopted in Doha: Robust KP style but covers < 15% global emissions

Under UNFCCC - Transitional global regime - Low ambition – emission gap; different types of pledges

MRV/Accounting

Annex I countries:

- Annual inventories + annual review + common gas/sector coverage, metrics and methodologies.
- Biennial reports + CRF + IAR
- Natcoms every 4 years + review
- Compliance/eligibility only for KP parties
- Full cost support for non-Annex I

Non-Annex I

- Biennial reports + ICA but no CRF
- Natcoms every 4 years + ICA (still to be finalized)
- No compliance

Outstanding issues:

- Finalization of ICA and streamlining of Annex I Verification regime.
- Different accounting metrics for A I and non-A I
- Compliance
- Architecture, MRV/Accounting in the Framework for Various Approaches and clarification of pledges
- Domestic MRV

Vision for 2015?



Vision for 2015?

By 2015, key decision-makers in each identified country will both understand the choices they have to make regarding the international agreement and the implications of choosing various options for the agreement. Stakeholders in the country will be informed and engaged, understand why certain positions have been taken, which will enable them to come to agreement in 2015 which aligns national interest with the international and trans-generational demand.

Outcomes:

- Increased number of pledges and more ambitious pledges submitted by 2015 to reduce the emission gap and get us closer to the 2 degree objective. This will be supported by a review of the offers countries will make.
- Robust enough accounting, MRV frameworks and ratchet up mechanisms are in place to preserve environmental integrity, avoid double counting, improve tracking of emissions, progress towards targets and actions undertaken, allow countries to increase their pledges overtime, resulting in enhancing trust between countries.
- Identification of key elements of an agreement for an equitable outcome (balancing the mitigation ask with adaptation, the legal form of the agreement, its architecture, and securing an enabling environment with adequate support and robust transparency/accountability framework).

ELEMENTS OF A ROAD MAP

Where we are now

Under KP

Robust KP style but covers < 15% global emissions

Under UNFCCC - Transitional global regime

Low ambition – emission gap; different types of pledges

Annex I countries:

- Annual inventories + annual review + common gas/sector coverage, metrics and methodologies.
- Biennial reports + CRF + IAR
- Natcoms every 4 years + review
- Compliance/eligibility only for KP parties
- Full cost support for non-Annex I

Non-Annex I

- Biennial reports + ICA but no CRF
- Natcoms every 4 years + ICA (still to be finalized)
- No compliance

Outstanding issues:

- Finalization of ICA and streamlining of Annex I Verification regime.
- Different accounting metrics for A I and non-A I
- Compliance
- Architecture, MRV/Accounting in the Framework for Various Approaches and clarification of pledges
- Domestic MRV

Vision of what we may want for a Post 2020 Regime

Only 1 Global regime under UNFCCC

What level of commonalities?

- Same gas, sector, coverage and metrics for All
- Transparent and comparable inventory data
- Global Common framework for LULUCF and Use of Offset ? With agreed safeguards?
- At least eligibility criteria for market mechanisms?

What level of differentiation?

- Level of requirements? Or timing to reach the same level of requirements?
- Piloting period before compliance period?

Outcomes

- enhanced trust and implementation
- Increased (number) of pledges/commitments. To reduce emission gap.
- Verification regime that support effective implementation
- Ratchet up mechanism to increase pledges overtime
- Effective incentives and compliance regime

Milestone- Warsaw

- **Verification:** Ensure a cost effective, credible and robust **verification regime by COP19**.
 - Need to finalize and adopt the modalities for ICA. Only part of the modalities was agreed in Doha.
 - Revise the guidelines of the review of Annex I's national reports (especially the inventories and the national communications) and how to rationalize the new verification regime to handle 192 countries in a cost-effective manner.
 - Agree on the mandate of the CGE
 - Adequate support
- Agree a process to adopt **voluntary domestic MRV guidelines** for developing countries. This has been a very sensitive issue. There is a risk that these guidelines end up being very weak.
- **Accounting**
 - By COP 20 need to agree **common accounting elements/safeguards as a means to clarify pledges and Framework for Various Approaches**
- **Guidance for the preparation of pledges**

Elements of Game Plan

Outcomes	Timing and Milestone	Negotiation track	Risk	Way to mitigate risk
Increase pledges (pre-2020 and post 2020 ambition)	By COP20, By 2020	ADP FVA	High <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Too little too late - Initiatives actions are not additional - Lack of (effective) carrots/sticks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National strategies - More research/analysis/options - High Level Political lobby - Get a ratchet up mechanism - Ensure the outcome of the FVA track is consistent with ADP outcome.
Accounting Framework	COP20	SBSTA (clarification of pledges + FVA) ADP – format of countries offers	Medium/ High <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No adoption - Loopholes - Fragmentation of the system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure consistency between SBSTA and ADP tracks) - Need a clause to review and revise the framework
Verification	COP19 (MRV), 2016-2017 (revision of guidelines)	SBI, SBSTA (MRV + REDD)	Medium <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No adoption of CGE nor ICA - Process is not cost-effective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manage outcome under REDD. Ensure consistency, complementarity with ICA. - Clarify role of the CGE - WRI Paper on verification
Enhanced capacity for nAI to meet their MRV requirements	overtime	SBI and SBSTA	High <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No (timely) submissions of national reports - Delayed ICA and IAR. No participation by key emitters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to build trust and hope - Secure sufficient GEF funding - Enhance intuitional arrangements (domestically and internationally; e.g role of the CGE) - Get meaningful domestic MRV guidelines

Questions

1) **ICA: Elements of COP19 deals**

- Recommendations from experts + caveats?
- Guidance to experts for consistent, technical analysis?
- Role of the CGE (composition of team of experts and training +)?

2) **Implication for Verification of 192 countries**

- frequency, experts, type of reviews...

3) **Accounting**

- 1) Common elements?
- 2) How WRI or other standards/approaches can help.

3) **Domestic MRV guidelines**

- Guidelines or no guidelines?

Thanks you

Thanks to
wonderful participants
BMU/GIZ and
The Vietnamese Government

Yamide Dagnet
Ydagnet@wri.org

