

Wednesday, June 4, 2014

**Fifth Meeting of the Second Session of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP 2-5)**

**Opening Statement by Nepal on behalf of the Least Developed Countries Group**

---

Co-Chairs, I have the honour to speak on behalf of the LDC Group. I would like to align my statement with the statements made by Bolivia on behalf of G77 and China, by Sudan on behalf of the Africa Group, and by Nauru on behalf of AOSIS.

At the outset allow me to thank you for your continued efforts and commitment to leading this process forward, as demonstrated by your reflection and scenario notes. The LDC Group has every confidence in your leadership and we are prepared to maintain our high level of engagement in this process.

Co-Chairs, the LDC Group believes that a successful outcome in 2015 is possible. In this critical stage of negotiations it is important for all Parties to redouble their efforts for ambition and constructive engagement. We are encouraged by the efforts countries have taken to raise climate change in their governments' agenda.

In this regard, we welcome the most recent announcement from the USA to reduce emissions from existing power plants. The LDC Group views this action as really constructive first step. This proposal, whilst very useful, does not yet lead the USA on a pathway towards achieving their goal of reducing emissions 80% by 2050 nor on a 2°C pathway leading towards the 1.5 degree target as called for by the LDCs, SIDS and Africa. We look forward to further developments in US policies as we progress toward the adoption of the 2015 agreement.

Co-Chairs, the LDC Group sees no substantial problem with the way you have proposed to proceed during this session. The order of discussions starting with adaptation in the first week and technology development and transfer in the second week is acceptable to our Group, as long as adequate time is given to each element.

Co-Chairs, for LDCs, the 2015 agreement should embrace all of the elements reflected in decision 1/CP17, even if there are institutions already established by COP decisions. The agreement also needs to be underpinned by the latest science, and the sense of high urgency arising from the findings of the IPCC fifth assessment report.

Co-Chairs, we welcome your reflections note, and the annex on "landscape of issues" is a useful way forward. However, we will need to develop a process where we can consolidate the options into a more manageable list, narrowing down the options toward a workable agreement in 2015. We will be providing our views on what we think are the preferable options within this landscape, including: how we see an agreement that is applicable to all and legally binding as wanted by the LDCs; and how to accommodate a clear reference to the specific circumstances of the LDCs, as spelt out in Article 4.9 of the Convention.

For LDCs, the key elements for the new agreement include: the need for a legally binding agreement that delivers strong mitigation ambition with short time periods no longer than five years; the inclusion of the Loss and Damage Mechanism in the new agreement; a compliance mechanism for cases where Parties do not meet their obligations; a review process to assess the adequacy of the aggregate proposals to ensure that they are consistent with emission pathways to limit global average temperature increases to below 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels over the long-term; and adequate and predictable finance, technical support and capacity building for both adaptation and mitigation. Furthermore, LDCs want to see how a legally binding agreement applicable to all, can accommodate a clear reference to the specific circumstance of the LDCs, as per article 4.9 of the Convention.

Co-Chairs, our Group believes that Parties need to have a discussion about the legal form of the 2015 agreement. While we acknowledge that there are sensitivities with this discussion, we need to ensure that the text we develop is consistent with the legal form of the outcome. The legal form will no doubt be a political decision and so we need to consider a process to deliver that political decision. We cannot leave this to the last minute as we have to adhere to the UNFCCC six-month rule. Perhaps we need to consider whether Lima can provide us with the necessary mandate, something like the Berlin mandate.

We believe that the work on “intended nationally determined contribution” as well as on the “information Parties needs to provide when submitting their contributions” deserve our greatest attention at this and upcoming sessions with the view to respect the timeline we assigned to ourselves in 2014 and 2015.

As you are aware, the Secretariat is working to identify institutions which are willing to support efforts in assisting countries to develop their intended nationally determined contributions. It seems that some of this work overlaps with the ongoing actions to develop NAMAs. It may be useful to set aside some time to have a discussion on the respective processes, where we invite the Secretariat to give a presentation on how they believe these two processes are connected. Needless to say, clarity on funding to assist in both these processes will be necessary, and the sooner we get this clarity, the sooner will the Parties be able to present their contributions.

Before we provide our views on the work of the Workstream 2, allow us to take the opportunity to congratulate all Parties that have submitted their instrument of ratification for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol.

With respect to the technical expert meetings under Workstream 2, it is important that we consolidate the discussions into concrete outcomes. We need to clearly identify both national and international actions that we can take collectively and provide the means to implement them. We need to carefully consider how this could be done.

LDCs are keen to get substantial outcomes under both workstreams and are ready to work closely with you.

Thank you!