

BILLET DE BLOG 3 septembre 2015

Négociations sur le climat à Bonn : qu'en est-il de la revue stratégique ?

Auteur

Alexandra Deprez

Chercheuse, Gouvernance internationale du climat

 Temps de lecture: 7 min

Les journées de négociations avant la COP21 sont désormais comptées. C'est pourquoi les négociations en cours à Bonn doivent accélérer et s'attacher à créer de nouvelles convergences, notamment sur les questions qui font encore débat.

Dans leur « outil » (cf. [note informelle ADP.2015.4.](#)), les co-présidents du groupe de la Convention-cadre des Nations unies sur les changements climatiques chargé de parvenir à un accord à Paris ont identifié la « revue stratégique » comme l'une des questions nécessitant un travail particulier de façon à clarifier les différentes options possibles. En effet, la partie du texte des co-présidents consacrée à la revue stratégique, notamment dans la partie I (« ébauche d'accord »), témoigne d'une certaine confusion, sur l'objectif, la portée, le calendrier et les procédures

liées à cette revue stratégique.

[Texte en anglais, traduction à venir]

Before taking a closer look at these inconsistencies and attempting to bring clarity, it is useful to take a step back and revisit the basics. The main role of the Paris Agreement is to further the implementation of the objectives of the UNFCCC, notably to reach the global goal of keeping temperature rise below 2 degrees Celsius (in addition to reaching any other long-term goal the Parties might inscribe in the new agreement). It is now widely acknowledged that the INDCs submitted in 2015 will most likely not be in aggregate *ex ante* sufficient to place global emissions on a 2 degrees trajectory. Thus, the Paris Agreement has the fundamental role of instituting processes enabling countries to progressively raise their ambition in line with this goal.

Strategic review: the critical link between the transparency system and cycles of contribution

Two essential ambition-raising processes in the new agreement are the transparency system and rounds of collective action (also known as cycles of contributions). Indeed, a well-constructed transparency system that collects, processes, and shares information on the implementation of their Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) helps to build trust in collective action among countries, and in this way allay concerns which currently limit countries' mitigation ambition, including fears related to free riding, economic competitiveness issues, as well as fears related to the technical, social, political, and economic feasibility of deep decarbonisation (see this [blog post](#) and [IDDRI paper](#)). In turn, cycles of contributions will enable countries to progressively raise countries' ambition through regular moments of high-political visibility in which countries come together to revisit and extend their contributions (see [IDDRI's paper on rounds of collective action](#)).

While there is growing convergence on the possible general contours and elements of the transparency system and the cycles of contribution in the new agreement, the link between them still lacks clarity.

This is precisely the position the strategic review should occupy. In our view, the strategic review should be a collective review of global progress toward the achievement of the objectives of the agreement. Concretely, the strategic review would consist of an aggregate assessment of the implementation of NDCs.

Aggregate, as a critical complement to the review of individual country implementation conducted by the transparency system. Indeed, while this individual assessment (currently focused on progress toward the achievement of Cancun pledges, and when transposed into the post-2020 climate regime, implementation of NDCs—see IDDRI's transparency paper for a proposal for how to transition from the current transparency system into the new one) is important for keeping individual countries accountable on their commitments, it cannot on its own fully build trust in collective action. Only an aggregate assessment can track broad implementation trends occurring across a group of countries or a region, and provide a synthetic view of how the world as a whole is progressing on implementation towards the 2 degree global goal.

Focused on *implementation of NDCs*, as an essential step to building trust in collective action and raising ambition. The strategic review should focus on building ambition, since this is the essential role of the Paris Agreement. To this end, it should be distinct from an *ex-ante* review of countries' commitments, which while essential to build trust among countries in their seriousness and willingness to act, and important for keeping the global community accountable to working toward the 2 degree goal, does not provide information on countries' mitigation action on the ground.

Having better defined the strategic review, we can clarify how the strategic review can be concretely linked to the transparency system and the cycles of contribution. For its inputs, it should draw primarily from the new transparency

system's country-level reports (bi-annual reports on the implementation toward NDCs, and technical reports) and synthesis reports (of the 'peer-to-peer' sharing between countries), as well as from other sources of information (e.g. IPCC reports, reports from UN agencies and other multilateral or external assessments, as the International Energy Agency [IEA]). This would be summarized in an information report to be shared with the governing body of the new agreement, with the explicit purpose to serve as a key non-political strategic input into the following cycle of contributions.

Guiding principles of the strategic review

For the strategic review to be a success, it is fundamental that Parties also inscribe in the final Agreement text major principles to help guide the creation of the strategic review's modalities, and enable its implementation.

Drawing on our research on the transparency system, the cycle of contributions, and the 2013-2015 review, and reflecting views present in the negotiation text, we have identified the following principles important principles for the strategic review:

1. Universal: all Parties to take part in the strategic review

In our view, all countries should take part in the strategic review. This would notably mean that firstly, the strategic review could draw from all individual country reports (from the transparency system) to produce its aggregate synthesis report on progress of implementation. Secondly, all countries would be expected to take into account the strategic review when updating their contributions (in a nationally-determined manner) in the following cycle.

2. Equitable: based on an equitable transparency system

Having as main input the reports of a transparency system in which countries equitably report on progress they are taking toward their NDC would go a long way to *de facto* render the strategic review equitable. Furthermore, if the strategic review is aggregate and has a purely information purpose, equity becomes less of a driving issue than in the transparency system, which operates at the country-level scale.

3. Technical: a process that is technical, rather than political

The review should be technical, not political, so as to ensure that the review process not be hijacked and as a proxy for political negotiations, which would affect its ability to produce results that inform the cycles in a neutral, factual manner. This is in particular based on our detailed analysis of the 2013-2015 review, in which we concluded that it is likely to fail in influencing the ADP outcome in 2015 (as it was supposed to) because it became too politicized. To this end, we suggest that the strategic review be conducted not in an open plenary, but rather by an *ad hoc* Committee to be convened of Parties' representatives, selected on the basis of expertise and from a representative group of Parties, members of the Convention's sectoral bodies (the Adaptation Committee, the Standing Committee on Finance, the Technology Executive Committee) and the IPCC. The Standing Committee of Finance could serve as a model for this Committee.

4. National determination and self-differentiation: regarding the strategic review's outcome

The outcome of the strategic review should be a report to be shared with the COP that the countries use to shape their subsequent contributions upwards, along the no-backsliding principle, and also the principles of self-differentiation and national determination. National determination here means that the strategic review aims to provide information that should influence countries' updated contributions, but as these are nationally determined there would be no top-down imposition of conclusions from the review onto Parties.

5. *Periodical: undertaken every 5 years, in view of being an input into and influencing the following cycle of contributions*

The strategic review informing countries' updating of their commitments should thus take place likewise every five years, sufficiently in advance of the cycle year to influence this process, yet also be as timely as possible.

6. *Facilitates clarity and understanding of aggregate progress, to influence countries to provide contributions that progress beyond the previous undertakings of the Party*

The outcome of the strategic review (a synthesis report) should facilitate clarity and understanding of the implementation that has been taken so far, and thus how far we are from the 2 degree and other goals, and thus give a sense of direction for the new contributions.

CLIMATE