



Council of the
European Union

070299/EU XXV. GP
Eingelangt am 23/06/15

Brussels, 22 June 2015
(OR. en)

10205/15

CLIMA 75
ENV 431
ONU 90
DEVGEN 111
ECOFIN 535
ENER 262
FORETS 20
AGRI 347
MAR 74
AVIATION 74
MI 413

NOTE

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Delegations
No. prev. doc.:	9257/15 CLIMA 57 ENV 355 ONU 72 DEVGEN 83 ECOFIN 398 ENER 212 FORETS 11 AGRI 287 MAR 68 AVIATION 59 MI 349
No. Cion doc.:	6588/15 CLIMA 19 ENV 94 ONU 25 DEVGEN 25 ECOFIN 140 ENER 49 FORETS 6 MAR 21 AVIATION 32 MI 117 COM(2015) 81 final
Subject:	<p>The road to the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties in Paris</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Communication from the Commission: The Paris Protocol - A blueprint for tackling global climate change beyond 2030- State of play of the negotiations under the UNFCCC= Delegations' contributions to the policy debate

Delegations will find in Annex the contributions from DE, FR and SK to the policy debate, during the Council (Environment) on 15 June 2015.

GERMANY

Several points in the EU position need to be reviewed and further developed before the Paris COP. The questions raised by the Presidency are a suitable starting point for this.

Regarding the legal framework:

- The ideal result from Paris would be a new climate protocol with ambitious and legally binding mitigation targets for all Parties, especially the major emitters.
- However, we must acknowledge the fact that some of the key players are not prepared to take on internationally binding mitigation targets.
- The EU should continue to campaign for an ambitious Paris Protocol. Ultimately, the main thing is that the framework we establish in Paris is the right one. It is vital that in Paris we take the fundamental decision in favour of a climate-neutral global economy and that the Parties are obligated to set themselves targets. We must be able to follow what each country is actually doing and we must be able to review and raise the level of ambition.
- If we include binding rules on this in an agreement, the question of whether the mitigation targets themselves are internationally or nationally binding becomes less important.

Regarding dynamic design of the new agreement:

- It is important that in Paris already a mechanism to review and if necessary raise the level of ambition is provided. We should use this mechanism to review – say every five years – whether we need to adjust our targets and which Parties, if any, need to contribute more.
- Many of our partners are also calling for the joint and individual contributions in the fields of adaptation and finance to be communicated and updated regularly.
- However, mitigation, market mechanisms, adaptation and finance differ from each other and have their own characteristics. If we agree to communicate and update our finance and adaptation contributions, this should be done in keeping with the specific nature of the respective area:

- For adaptation, we support a qualitative adaptation target and working to achieve climate-resilient sustainable development. As a dynamic element for adaptation, a qualitative synopsis could be compiled periodically (for instance, every five years by, e.g. the UNFCCC Adaptation Committee) from national reports, IPCC Assessments and reports by multilateral institutions; the synopsis should identify progress towards the qualitative adaptation target and formulate recommendations to the UNFCCC for further action. We should underpin this dynamic element with a concrete qualitative commitment. We therefore propose a commitment that by 2020 all Parties are to take climate impacts into consideration for all development activities and investments. This is a clear principle for multilateral banks and public and private development financing. The necessary planning steps should be taken universally by all countries.
- The G7 have agreed that “climate finance is already flowing at higher levels and we will continue our efforts to provide and mobilise increased finance from public and private sources.” Climate finance is a means to an end to help increase the level of ambition in recipient countries with regard to greenhouse gas mitigation and adaptation to climate change. Communication and updating must take this into account. We still need to clarify what precisely is meant by communication and updating in the context of the Paris agreement, and how it should be implemented. Any consequent rules for the Paris agreement must take EU interests into consideration. This also means that all countries must contribute to the implementation and/or mobilisation of climate finance both nationally and internationally, in accordance with their respective capabilities and responsibilities. As part of this, we expect more countries to contribute to climate finance in future.
- Market mechanisms can play an important role in mitigation which goes beyond the agreed targets by using cost-efficient private sector measures.

One important area where we should review our EU position is the question of a global long-term goal.

- Paris must send a clear signal: sustainable, low-carbon development worldwide is imperative and all countries are determined to pursue this path.
- The Commission proposes anchoring in the agreement the global goal of cutting emissions by at least 60 percent by 2050 compared to 2010. This goal is compatible with the G7 communiqué.
- We should complement this with a more long-term objective: Current knowledge indicates that full decarbonisation as early as possible in the second half of this century is necessary if we are to have a realistic prospect of keeping below the 2 degree limit.

FRANCE

(Courtesy translation)

Minister, dear colleague,

I regret that I will not be able to participate in the Council today, as I must stay in Paris for the Paris Air Show at Le Bourget as Minister also in charge the aviation sector. Given the importance of the topics discussed in the Council today, I wish to provide this written contribution to our work.

The European Union and its Member States have a decisive role to play in mobilizing stakeholders for the 2015 Paris Climate Conference. Several key steps in this mobilization are being taken.

The mobilization around a carbon price is growing. The spring meetings of the IMF and the World Bank were an opportunity to structure this momentum. On 20-21 May in Paris, during the Climate Business Summit, the leaders of 59 companies called for the establishment of a carbon price. Soon after, several companies signed a declaration to support the signing of a global international agreement in Paris to achieve "zero emissions" by the end of the century.

The world of finance is also being mobilized. Seven months after the summit in New York, these actors came together on May 22 in Paris to reinforce and structure their commitments. Their commitments concerning exit from coal and decarbonisation of portfolios should be commended.

Cities and territories are not left out, as shown by the Conference of European capitals and cities on the climate of 26 March where European capitals pledged to reduce GHG emissions by at least 40% by 2030. The Lyon territories Summit on July 1-2 will allow cities and territories around the world to commit to climate action.

Regarding employment, France and Peru signed on 10 June in Geneva, as part of the International Labour Conference, a joint call on climate change and decent employment. The objective of this declaration is to encourage Parties to better integrate the dimensions of decent work in the fight against climate change, because action on climate change can also help create jobs.

Finally, at the global public debate held on 6 June, 10 000 citizens from 75 countries spoke about the challenges of the CoP, emphasizing the seriousness of climate issues and their willingness to act in seizing opportunities offered by green growth. Thus, a universal consciousness, enriched through national sensitivities, can bring this Conference to success.

We, the EU Member States with the Commission, can help mobilize sectors:

Regarding adaptation and resilience, substantial international cooperation must be implemented. The world water forum in Korea in April showed that water stakeholders are willing to engage actively to integrate climate change in their actions.

- Renewable energies, which are rapidly expanding within our energy mix, need strengthened collaboration to accelerate the spread of new energies: marine energy, geothermal energy (a meeting of the global Alliance on geothermal is being held in Nairobi), and their insertion into grids. These partnerships should also involve developing countries so that they can access these clean energy sources by leapfrogging carbon transition. We must welcome the G7 statement under the German Presidency calling on an acceleration of access to renewable energy in Africa.
- The energy efficiency of buildings should be made a priority, considering its central role in the reduction of our energy dependence. I will propose in Paris an alliance of States, cities and businesses mobilized on these issues.
- Regarding transport, we could collectively illustrate the tremendous growth of electric vehicles thanks to our own commitments as well as those of large companies and local authorities planning to convert their fleets. We would thus give a clear signal of our willingness to support the rapid expansion of this future market.
- Regarding forests and carbon sequestration, we must now give new impetus to the New York Declaration on Forests. France is considering an initiative on carbon sequestration in soils, echoing the ongoing work within the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification on the mobilizing goal of stopping land degradation.

All EU Member States could each showcase a good practice implemented at national level to demonstrate the richness of their commitments. Each could put forward a strong idea, a realization to share, to show their partners that all these actions put together open a new world of opportunities.

Be assured of my willingness to move forward with you on all these initiatives.

Best regards,

(signed)

Ségolène Royal

SLOVAK REPUBLIC

1. The Communication from the Commission is a very good basis for further development and focus of the EU position towards new agreement. We believe it helps to further fine tune our views on various technical issues and that the final position of the EU to be taken by the Council, will be greatly assisted by this Communication.

As far as the legal framework and architecture of the new agreement are concerned, as broad participation as possible is highly desirable. Without the participation of all major economies the new agreement will only have insignificant effect on the climate change and as such will be useless. We have to bear that in mind when negotiating and try to find the balance between strictness of the agreement and the coverage. It might be worth to compromise some of the details when it comes to up-front information required, not to “scare off” parties who are preparing to submit their nationally determined contributions. On the other hand, we should be strict on the participation – without commitment, there is no sense to be a part of this new agreement. Some alleviations can be considered for least developed countries, but more in the sense of delaying action than to forgive the commitment.

2. At this point of time, it is hard to say what the most crucial issues are and where our attention is mostly needed. However, we believe that Parties (including the EU) should set aside their differences, self-interests and suspicions, and work together towards getting the text of the new agreement in Paris, which – while not being perfect – is acceptable, provides sound basis for future global climate regime and would set the world towards sustainable low-economy and climate resilient future. For that, we need a strong leadership from the co-chairs, solid support from the Secretariat, trust amongst Parties and willingness to work hard in remaining time.

The new agreement should be durable. We see that the process of agreeing on new commitments is lengthy, difficult and very, very demanding in terms of time, capacities and resources. Therefore, the dynamism should be built-in and not to be re-negotiated very often. 5-years cycle for assessment is acceptable however commitments should be subject of 10-years cycle. It gives more certainty to planning process and if any new technological break-through occurs, there is always a chance to react accordingly to this new development.