1, Organizer
National Institute for Environmental Studies, Japan (NIES)
2. Title
Dialogue on the agreed outcome by 2015 under the Durban Platform process
3. Theme
Under the Durban Platform which was agreed at COP17, held in Durban in 2011, it has
been decided to "adopt a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties" at its twenty-first
session. It is now two years until the Parties are to arrive at an agreement, but
there is still much uncertainty as to how the agreement should look like.
The aim of this side event was to invite leading experts from around the world to
participate in an active discussion on the items for potential inclusion in a 2015
agreement under the Durban Platform process, focusing in particular on the overall
structure of the agreement; its legal nature and form; and how these aspects could
influence the contents of the agreement.
4. Agenda
(1) Introduction: aim of the event, and explanations about the result of NIES online survey Yasuko Kameyama (NIES)
<ul> <li>(2) Questions to the panelists</li> <li>(3)Possible elements of a 2015 legal agreement on climate change</li> <li>(4) Erik Haites</li> </ul>
(Margaree Consultants) (4)Legal form of the 2015 agreement on climate change Daniel Bodansky
(Arizona State University)
(5)The 2015 agreement; its implications to carbon markets Axel Michaelowa (University of Zurich)
(6) India's perspectives on the 2015 agreement Neha Pahuja (The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI))
(7) Technology development under the new agreement: <i>How can we bring in the long-term perspectives as well as short-term targets?</i> Takashi Hattori (International Energy Agency (IEA))
5. Outline of presentations and discussions
The panelists were asked to delineate their ideas as to what kind of agreement would be agreeable to all Parties while securing effectiveness in terms of climate
protection.
Mr. Haites introduced his co-authored report which was recently published on possible elements of a 2015 legal agreement on climate change. Their proposal included an approach in which each Party propose national commitments, then face technical review and assessment, which may leave the country to raise ambition of the target. Dr. Bodansky discussed the balance among stringency of commitments, level of
participation, and compliance, saying that these three elements are inter-connected. He also explained that the agreement should be considered as dynamic. The agreement

could be first reached among all Parties, then level of commitments could be made more stringent later.

Dr. Michaelowa argued that use of carbon markets are important for countries to commit to more stringent targets, because use of market mechanisms reduces mitigation costs. It was also considered necessary for the 2015 agreement to set out rules to assure transparency, such as rules of MRV (measuring, reporting and verifying) procedures. Dr. Pahuja emphasized importance of a right balance between elements of the 2015 agreement; mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology, capacity building and transparency. She discussed raising level of accountability is important to reach a successful outcome, but the accountability has not been assured mainly due to inaction by the developed countries. She argued that Common but differentiated responsibility and respective capabilities (CBDR & RC) should be the basis of the 2015 agreement.

Dr. Hattori discussed importance of long-term view, particularly in terms of technology development and deployment, establishment of infrastructure in urban planning and transportation. How to integrate long-term goal while committing to short-term targets is the key for the 2015 agreement.

A series of brief presentations from the panelists was followed by a Q&A session, with lively engagement from participants on the floor - in what nevertheless proved to be a meaningful and informative 90 minute session.

6. Photograph

