

1 May 2018
SB 48, SBI Agenda item 8 (common timeframes)
12:00-13:00, Wien
Jennifer Huang, C2ES

Next steps: The CFs will make a room available for informal informals (none after 19:00) and will send an email with information. Three broad topics to cover: what's agreed; applicability of timing; advantages/disadvantages and options.

My shorthand/acronyms:

GROUП/Country intervening on behalf of group: (other group/party statements supported by group/country) AGN = African Group of Negotiators CF = co-facilitator ID = identify [I]CTU = [information for] clarity, transparency, and understanding MPGs = modalities, procedures, and guidelines PA = Paris Agreement PAWP = Paris Agreement Work Program § = section ¶ = paragraph Art = article Re = regarding ... = missed intervention (sorry)
--

CF (Norway): 12 submissions received. Organize work and continue discussions.

Colombia (AILAC):

- We've read submissions; some convergence. We're still waiting for inputs, but let's identify common points.
- Common timeframes affect:
 - Periodicity and effectiveness: Paris timeframe based on cycle and critical for us to understand what's going on with NDCs. Reduce risk of free-riders while avoiding locking in ambition.
 - Transparency and tracking of progress: common timeframes part of ICTU and should be communicated together with NDCs.
 - Long-term vision: each NDC should be a step towards long-term vision/goal.

Zimbabwe (AGN)

- Critical for CTU and aggregation of NDCs; single common timeframe necessary for work to proceed. Submitted in 2025, applicable post-2030 because it will allow for parties to synchronize timeframes.

South Africa (associated with AGN)

- Need to reduce to clear text; we have submitted textual recommendation
- 5 year common timeframes, starting with submission in 2025 and to be implemented from 2030
- Clear preference for 5 year periods of implementation
- Need for more time (informal informals?)

China

- We're not clear on what we will be reporting back to CMA: issues and options. We need clear options, eg 5 year period of implementation from January 1, 2030 to December 31, 2035. Let's focus only on 5 v 10 year periods and talk about pro and cons.
- No submissions on the history of this issue; developed from 2013 debate on whether to put numbers on the table before the text of the PA or table them after Paris arrangements. But ¶¶ 23 and 24 of Paris decision resolves; by 2020, all parties will have some kind of NDC with timeframe up to 2030 on table.
- Sub-items:
 - applied to NDCs to be implemented from 2031-??
 - Advantages/disadvantages for 5 v 10 year implementation periods

Ethiopia (LDCs)

- Common timeframes provide framework for determining whether we're on the right path
- 5+5 NDCs (the latter being indicative)

NZ

- Issues like biennial reports and accessibility to public
- 5 year NDCs allow for greater predictability and aligned with 5 year heartbeat driving Paris Agreement
- Good to narrow down variety around submission of indicative (or not) NDCs

Brazil

- Common timeframes to future NDCs communicated in 2025 and then to all thereafter
- Lack of common timeframes a problem with successive NDCs
- NDCs need to be linked with GST process
- 5 year common timeframes between end points of two NDCs (can allow for 10 year NDC)
- 5+5: how different from old idea of mid-term reviews of NDCs that was dismissed pre-Paris and how it would not negatively impact ambition?

Norway

- Economic and political reasons for different time frames; tough sell to squeeze everyone into the same time frames. Maybe after 2030 may need to have ability to choose a different time frame. Some countries extensively use economic instruments and they take time to work. Maybe allow leaders to use longer timeframes for their NDCs.
- Eg Norway, we've been trying to electrify transport sector; 5 year timeframe far too short.

Bangladesh

- Mandate to consider common time frame and consider in context of Art 4.9 and 4.10.
- 5 year common time frame avoids locking in ambition; most effective way to address issues around implementation; start 2030
- ¶ 25: submission 12 mo's before relevant CMA

Switzerland

- Applicable from 2031, from communication in 2025
- Important to look at advantages, disadvantages of 5 v 10; need to look at domestic processes

- First NDC formulated as 10 year NDC; domestic process to anchor target in domestic policies, but looking at options to revise policy to allow for formulation of 5 year targets

Japan

- Single timeframe applicable to all parties for all NDCs. Same endpoint to help for stocktake.
- 15 years? 10 year NDC plus 5 year review?

RMI

- Issue of when countries come back to table and whether they come back in same political position.
- Agree that whatever we agree here applies from what's put forward from 2025 and active from after 2030
- Interesting for proposal of 5 year target and indicative 5 year; different from mid-term review because review risks country doing nothing (new)
- Squaring domestic certainty for stakeholders with 5 year international climate target

Indonesia: ...

Colombia

- A lot of interlinkages, but we're not negotiating them here, but if no common timeframes, other items will be difficult to implement, e.g. GST.
- How to move forward on these issues?

Canada: Decisions that need to be made: to be implemented 2031 onwards; first of NDCs communicated in 2025; 5 v 10 year discussion. Bridging proposals.

CF

- We'll make room available for informal informals (none after 19:00); will send email
- Three broad topics: what agreed; applicability of timing; advantages/disadvantages and options