



**CAN intervention
AI mitigation Informal
Panama, October 2, 2011**

Thank you Chair for giving me the floor.

My name is Tara Rao and I speak on behalf of the Climate Action Network.

In our view, a MRV system needs to have the capability to account, track, assess progress and impact as well as increase ambition and momentum.

In order to get such a robust MRV system operational that also generates sufficient and reliable information for the 2013-2015 Review, many of the guidelines of the MRV system should be adopted by COP17 with any outstanding elements by COP18, so that governments may begin implementation in earnest.

On BIENNIAL REPORTS, specifically....

Guidelines on the content, timing, structure of biennial reports for developed countries need to be approved by COP17, so that Parties can prepare them and feed into the 2013-2015 1.5° C review and the process of International Assessment and Review (IAR).

We believe the following elements should be included within the structure of these reports:

- Information on mitigation targets, and clarification of the assumptions underpinning the accounting rules used.
- Emissions projections, on decadal intervals.
- Information on mitigation actions.
- Information on the use of flexible mechanisms that are being used or will be used to achieve the target.
- Update on the country's Low Carbon Development Strategy.
- Information on finance, technology and capacity building support to developing countries, employing an enhanced common reporting format.

In the case of the INTERNATIONAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW (IAR), we believe....

In Durban, Parties should agree on modalities, timeline and the inclusion of any outcomes of the IAR process as input to the 2013-2015 Review.

As decided in Cancún, the current National Communications review process for Annex I countries ought to be enhanced covering achievement of emission reductions and the provision of support to developing countries.

In Durban, Parties should mandate SBSTA to revise the review guidelines for adoption by COP18, expanding the mandate of the Expert Review Teams (ERT) to review the biennial reports, taking into account the agreed common accounting rules for emission reduction targets and the enhanced common reporting format on finance, in addition to existing inventory review. The Expert Review Teams should be empowered to flag early-warning

signals of non-compliance, adjust emissions reductions data, identify double counting in the provision of support and evaluate its adequacy.

We support those parties who have indicated that IAR should be compliance-oriented. The compliance mechanism established under the Kyoto Protocol is a step in the right direction. Compliance mechanisms should build on that existing model.

We urge you in your technical deliberations about biennial reporting and IAR, not to lose sight of the elephant in the room: the pathetically low level of ambition that developed countries are showing in cutting their emissions.

There are developed country Parties that have put forward pledges that are below their business-as-usual path, in a few cases even below their Kyoto 1 targets. Almost all developed country pledges are below the 25-40% range developed countries, agreed as the aggregate range for their reductions. Do not call your pledges ambitious, for they are not. Instead, please give us a clear picture of what your net domestic emissions will be in 2020, when you will move to the high end of your pledged ranges, and most importantly, when will you move beyond even the high end of your current pledges in line with your fair share in the globally needed mitigation effort.

Thank you for your attention.