

## 2013-2015 Review

### *Submission on behalf of New Zealand, Australia, Canada, the United States, Norway and Japan*

- This submission responds to the joint message from the Chairs of the SBSTA and the SBI regarding the 2013-2015 Review ('the Review'). That message invited Parties to submit their views on *what available information should be considered* at the in-session workshop being held in June in Bonn.
- The original Cancun decisions mandate a Review to assess the adequacy of the long-term global goal<sup>1</sup>, in light of the ultimate objective of the Convention, and overall (aggregate) progress towards achieving it.
- We view the Review as a clear and well-defined platform for reinforcing a science and evidence-based approach to addressing climate change. The IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) is a foundation of the Review, particularly given the role of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in providing a holistic and balanced assessment of climate change science and the fact that IPCC Working Group drafts will be issued before the various SBI and SBSTA sessions.
- The Review will inform the consideration by the Ad hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) of options to enhance mitigation ambition between now and 2020. It also sets the stage for addressing climate change based on sound, credible and evolving scientific and economic findings in the post-2020 world. The reporting by the Review to COP19 and COP20 will provide important input to the post 2020 agreement to be concluded under the ADP in 2015.
- To instill confidence among Parties and the broader global community of the outcomes and findings, the assessment of the adequacy of the long-term global goal must be grounded in scientifically robust information. The first workshop should clearly establish this process by setting standards, and possibly criteria, for determining relevant scientific and economic inputs that will be considered under the review. In particular, scientific inputs should be relevant to the objectives of the Review and drawn from peer reviewed sources.
- An up-to-date assessment of global emissions and aggregate actions towards the 2°C goal will need to be informed by inputs from all countries, including biennial reports and biennial update reports. Information on economic factors, including GDP projections (IMF, World Bank), population and mitigation costs (IPCC, IEA) will also be important for assessing progress and feasibility towards the global goal.
- We suggest the Review consider:
  - Adequacy of the global goal and the emissions reductions required to achieve this global goal;
  - In light of the above, the adequacy and feasibility of any alternative global goal, including in relation to temperature rises of 1,5° C;

---

<sup>1</sup> To reduce greenhouse gas emissions so as to hold the increase in global average temperature below 2°C above pre-industrial levels

- Economic circumstances and capabilities of the Parties;
  - Effectiveness of mitigation actions undertaken by all Parties;
  - Expected GHG emissions trends and estimated global GHG emissions projections;
  - Aggregate mitigation commitments of Parties and progress towards achieving those commitments; and
  - Clean energy technology and energy efficiency potentials.
  - Reports from Parties to the UNFCCC such as Biennial (Update) Reports and National GHG inventories.
- The following reports could usefully begin the conversation on the Review in June:
    - [IPCC Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation \(2011\)](#)
    - [IPCC Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation \(SREX\) \(2012\)](#)
    - [IPCC Mitigation of Climate Change \(2007\)](#)
    - [World Economic Forum Global Risks \(2013\)](#)
    - [UNEP Emissions Gap Report \(2012\)](#)
    - [UNEP Policy Implications of warming permafrost](#)
    - [IEA's Energy Technology Perspectives \(2012\)](#)
  - We note the importance of allocating sufficient time in workshops for discussion between Parties. To guide discussions, lead authors of reports could be invited to workshops to explain their conclusions.
  - We would provide further views, including on other information to consider in subsequent workshops after the June 2013 session, in future submissions.