

<p>1. Organizer</p> <p>Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)</p> <p>World Resources Institute (WRI)</p>
<p>2. Title</p> <p>Making Nationally-determined Contributions Operational and More Ambitious</p>
<p>3. Theme</p> <p>Many Parties support the idea of “nationally-determined contributions” to mitigate climate change with some form of international consultation. This event discusses specific steps and time frames that aim to add ex-ante clarity to nationally-determined mitigation contributions and enhance their levels of ambition.</p>
<p>4. Agenda and speakers</p> <p>Speakers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yamide Dagnet, Senior Associate, Climate and Energy Program, WRI <p>A Pathway to a Climate Change Agreement in 2015: Options for Setting and Reviewing GHG Emission Reduction Offers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kentaro Tamura, Area Leader, Climate and Energy Area, IGES <p>Mainstreaming Scientific Knowledge into the Process for Nationally-determining Contributions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kelly Levin, Senior Associate, WRI <p>Designing National Commitments to Drive Measurable Emissions Reductions after 2020</p> <p>Comments on the presentations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jurgen Lefevre, EC - Bert Metz, European Climate Foundation - Niklas Höhne, Ecofys - Neha Pahuja, The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) <p>General discussion and closing remarks</p>
<p>5. Outline of presentations and discussions</p> <p>Kelly Levin, WRI, discussed a paper on the comparability and measurability of nationally-determined commitments, including the extent to which these can be measured, reported and verified (“MRVed”). She concluded with recommendations, inter alia, to: use economy-wide goals to maximize measurable emissions reductions; target the highest-emitting sector if sectoral goals are set; frame goals from a base-year or a fixed level since these are more measurable; and use intensity goals, when countries are deciding between baseline and</p>

intensity goals, and consider setting a peak and decline pathway.

Yamide Dagnet, WRI, outlined a matrix of options on international guidance for submissions of offers by parties, including: basic reporting guidance; additional reporting on factors such as equity, emissions projections and costs; detailed reporting on assumptions methodologies and criteria; and reporting obligations plus prescriptions on how parties carry out various aspects of target design.

Kentaro Tamura, IGES, proposed the establishment of a consortium of research institutes to assess and review the targets of UNFCCC parties that are members of the G20 on the basis of a common template. He outlined advantages including that it: builds on existing initiatives; can be integrated into existing institutional arrangements through additional COP decisions; and contributes to mainstreaming existing mitigation science into target setting processes.

Bert Metz, European Climate Foundation, emphasized the importance of keeping the architecture of such a system simple. Niklas Höhne, Ecofys, highlighted the ClimateActionTracker. Reflecting on that experience, he said that: a common template could be useful; once offers are on the table they hardly change. Neha Pahuja, The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI), said the suggestion of a common framework is very good, but she fears that the post-Copenhagen dynamics in the negotiations will continue, stressing the importance of agreement on an equity framework to prevent this.

6. Photograph



Source: IISD