Purpose and Outline

• Purpose of presentation
  – To review the current status of international negotiations on MRV for developing countries’ mitigation actions
  – To put the side-event presentations into the context

• Outline
  • Brief history of MRV
  • Divergence after COP15
  • Observation
  • Way Forward (linking today’s presentations)
**Brief History of MRV**

- **MRV**
  - BAP 1(b)i
  - BAP 1(b)ii
  - Developed countries
    - Nationally appropriate mitigation commitments or actions
  - Developing countries
    - Nationally appropriate mitigation actions supported and enabled (by support)
  - Support
    - Technology, financing and capacity-building

- CHA para 4
  - Developed countries
  - Quantified economy-wide emissions targets for 2020

- CHA para 5
  - Developing countries
  - (Unsupported) mitigation actions → domestic MRV
  - Results of implementation → biennial NATCOM with provisions for Int’l Analysis and Consultation (ICA)
  - NAMAs seeking int’l support → registry
  - Supported NAMAs → int’l MRV

- CHA para 4
  - Delivery of financing by developed countries

---

**Divergence after COP15: Two Fundamental Questions**

- Should mitigation actions by developing countries, whether supported or unsupported, undergo some form of MRV?
  - Some Parties put the negotiation text’s paragraphs related to MRV/ICA in brackets.
  - Others support the language of CHA.
  - Others propose more concrete framework for MRV/ICA.
  - The split of views does not fall along developing and developed country lines.

- What are NAMAs and “mitigation actions” concerned?
  - Negotiation Text (FCCC/AWGLCA/2010/14) → no consensus
    - [...]voluntarily] undertake nationally appropriate mitigation actions [(NAMAs)] [REDD programme], enabled and supported by finance, technology and capacity building...
    - [Nationally appropriate] [M][m]itigation actions supported by ....
    - ...[voluntary] domestically funded [nationally appropriate] mitigation actions...
  - What are relations between NAMAs and those actions listed in the Appendix II of the Copenhagen Accord?
Divergence after COP15: MRV Process

**Int’l MRV**
- Some parties argue that supported NAMAs shall **not** be subject to int’l MRV.
- Majority of Parties favour int’l MRV of supported NAMAs
  - What should be measured, and how?
  - What kind of information should be reported, by which media, and how often?
  - Who should verify?
  - What is the role/function of registry in MRV?

**Domestic MRV**
- Some Parities put the paragraph related to domestic MRV in brackets.
- Majority of Parties favour domestic MRV of domestically-funded mitigation actions. But, to what extent should domestic MRV follow international rules?
  - Need to address elements which are requested to report biennially
  - Verification: Reviewers meeting int’l standards of independence
  - With provisions for facilitative ICA

Divergence after COP15: ICA Process

- Proposed process for ICA (Negotiating Text, para. 41-43)

**Int’l analysis**
- Who conducts?
  - Independent panel of experts
    - representing all regions
    - rotating experts selected
- What to analyse?
  - Correct application of methodologies
  - Implementation status
  - Effectiveness
- How to conduct?
  - In-country visit
  - Mtg. with Party representatives

**Int’l consultation**
- By what form?
  - Exchange of views under SBI
    - Among Parties
    - Between Parties and experts
- What to consider?
  - Pledges and implemented actions
  - Emissions trends
  - Areas for capacity building
- What would be outcome?
  - Technical recommendations
  - Identification of areas for improvement
  - Policy recommendations, if requested
Observation

• Step-back from the Copenhagen Accord
  – Developed country Parties made detailed proposals for MRV/ICA procedures, while being largely silent about MRV for their commitments (mitigation and support).
  – Some developing country Parties fiercely reacted to such proposals.
  – Some Parties tried to ignore the Copenhagen Accord, while others favour building upon the Accord.
→ Mutual distrust
→ Erosion of constructive atmosphere

Way Forward

• More balanced discussion on MRV issues
  – MRV for developed countries’ commitments and actions (mitigation and finance)
  – MRV for developing countries’ mitigation actions

• For MRV of developing countries’ mitigation actions to be effectively designed, it is important to:
  – Improve understanding of the existing domestic monitoring, reporting and evaluating procedures in developing countries
  – Improve understanding of the contents and characteristics of mitigation actions by developing countries
    • Mr Fukuda’s presentation will look at actual pledges listed in Appendix II of the Copenhagen Accord.
  – Examine lessons learnt from international processes, such as CDM and other treaties
    • Dr Mizuno’s presentation will focus on MRV in CDM.