

## SUBMISSION BY LITHUANIA AND THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN UNION AND ITS MEMBER STATES

This submission is supported by Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia

Vilnius, 16 September 2013

**Subject: Enhancing pre-2020 mitigation ambition<sup>1</sup>**

### Introduction

1. Parties are not yet collectively on an emissions pathway to achieve our shared goal of limiting global temperature increases to below 2°C relative to pre-industrial levels (the *below 2°C objective*). Current annual emissions stand at approximately 50 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>e. This is already 14% higher than the median estimate (44 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>e) of an emission levels in 2020 consistent with a likely chance of meeting the below 2°C objective. In May 2013, CO<sub>2</sub> levels in the atmosphere exceeded 400 ppm for the first time in several hundred millenia<sup>2</sup>. The Science is clear. We need to act urgently if we are to achieve our collective below 2°C objective and, as recent extreme weather events have demonstrated, we face devastating impacts if we fail to do so. According to the IPCC, achieving the lowest stabilisation levels assessed to date requires global CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to peak by 2015.<sup>3</sup>
2. The agreement to take forward work to enhance pre 2020 global mitigation ambition was an essential and integral part of the Durban outcome and resulted in the establishment of Workstream 2 of the ADP (*ADP WS2*). This followed recognition from all Parties that negotiating a new, global, legally binding agreement by 2015 is vital, but that we cannot wait until 2020 to act. It is imperative that action to increase collective pre 2020 mitigation ambition is taken if we are to achieve the below 2°C objective. This was reaffirmed in Doha.
3. The EU agrees with the assessment of the outgoing co-Chairs<sup>4</sup> that discussions on ADP WS2 in the two Bonn sessions this year have been constructive and productive. The Roundtable and Workshop format has provided for an exchange of views on a variety of options for closing the mitigation gap, exchange of best practices, and in-depth discussions on areas of high mitigation potential, such as energy efficiency, renewables and land use. We have found this to be a useful way of organising our work, and stress that Workshops and Roundtables should continue in Warsaw and beyond. ADP WS2 should be a forum for open exchange of ideas and best practice. We thank the outgoing co-chairs for their expert guidance, and look forward to working with the new co-chairs in a similar vein.
4. We welcome the technical paper produced by the Secretariat<sup>5</sup>, which highlights that:
  - the mitigation potential exists, across a number of sectors, to close the mitigation gap
  - there are many cost effective, and in some cases cost negative, opportunities for emissions reductions

---

<sup>1</sup> This submission should be read together with the previous submissions of the European Union on Workstream 2 of the ADP.

<sup>2</sup> WEO2013

<sup>3</sup> IPCC AR4 SPM

<sup>4</sup> ADP.2013.14.Informal note

<sup>5</sup> FCCC/TP/2013/4

- many of the emissions reductions opportunities carry significant co-benefits, including for adaptation
  - there are a number of examples of countries working together through International Cooperative Initiatives (*ICIs*) which could be scaled up and expanded.
5. The technical paper also highlights areas of high mitigation potential, such as energy (energy efficiency, renewables, fossil fuel subsidy reform), land use (including REDD), HFCs, the building sector, and transport. We look forward to the next iteration of the technical paper, which should be more focused on specific options, policies and initiatives that could make a major contribution to closing the mitigation gap. The EU's contribution to the next version of the technical paper is annexed to this submission.
  6. Despite the progress made, the pace of discussions has been too slow. It does not reflect the urgency with which we all need to act. As we approach Warsaw, the EU agrees with a number of Parties that it is time to move from constructive discussions to concrete outcomes. This should be achieved through the engagement of technical experts and Ministers, and reflected in the ADP's work through a COP 19 Decision. We welcome the intention of the new ADP co-Chairs to consult Parties intersessionally on the best way to focus our work on substantive issues and to accelerate progress.
  7. It is clear that 2014 will be a crucial year for building the political momentum necessary to ensure that we close the mitigation gap and lay the ground for a new, global, legally binding agreement applicable to all Parties to be adopted in 2015.
  8. In that context, Parties welcomed in Doha the plans of the UN Secretary General (UNSG) to convene World Leaders in 2014. Leaders should come to that meeting prepared to discuss ideas and present options for staying on track achieve the below 2°C objective, consistent with what Parties agreed in Durban in Decision 1/CP.17 and noting that all countries need to play their part.
  9. In order to deliver real increased mitigation efforts before 2020 we will need high-level political engagement throughout 2014 and 2015, starting in Warsaw. Appropriate engagement from observers, including civil society and the private sector, is also vital. The outcomes from Warsaw should set the stage for this.
  10. It should be emphasised that the two workstreams of the ADP are separate, and may move at different paces. They should be mutually supportive, and each should seek to enhance rather than hinder progress in the other. Progress under ADP WS2 will help us to prepare for the 2015 Agreement by:
    - signaling political will to do more
    - giving confidence to stakeholders to invest in low-emission climate resilient development opportunities, and avoiding lock in to carbon-intensive investments
    - putting us on a lower collective emissions trajectory to reduce the mitigation and adaptation challenges beyond 2020; creating the baselines for action post 2015
    - building trust and experience about the processes that can be effective to assess and enhance our collective ambition as science requires.

## Warsaw outcomes

11. The EU sees the need for outcomes in three main areas in Warsaw:

- (i) Agreement on a process for all Parties to consider and present options for enhancing their mitigation effort next year.
- (ii) A call upon all Parties to the Montreal protocol on substances that deplete the ozone layer to take action to phase down the production and consumption of HFCs, noting that the UNFCCC will continue to account for emissions from HFCs.
- (iii) A Decision setting out the role of the UNFCCC in recognising, supporting, and scaling up action and initiatives. This should include a call for Parties, international organisations and non-governmental organisations to join and develop ICIs in areas of high mitigation potential; and to submit information on the activities, expected and realised outcomes to the UNFCCC on a voluntary basis.

**(i): Agreement on a process for all Parties to consider and present options for enhancing their mitigation ambition next year.**

12. Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (*KP*) have agreed to revisit their QELRCs in 2014, and the EU will proceed according to that mandate. However, Parties with emissions reductions commitments in the second commitment period of the KP cover less than 14% of global emissions. Increased ambition by these Parties alone will not be enough to close the gap.
13. To meet the below 2°C objective it is essential that all Parties to the Convention are prepared to consider what they can do to increase their own ambition, with developed countries taking the lead, and in line with common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities.
14. We call on those countries that have not yet pledged to do so; for increased ambition of existing pledges; and for Parties to consider any other actions that could be taken in areas of high mitigation potential. We must also ensure that progress is made on implementation and clarification of existing pledges and continue to build pre 2020 accounting rules to avoid double counting, and ensure environmental integrity in the system.
15. On 5 September 2013, the Leaders of the Pacific Islands Forum adopted the Majuro Declaration for Climate Leadership<sup>6</sup> agreeing to present to the Secretary General of the United Nations actions to complement and strengthen the emission reduction commitments already made, including from non-state actors. We welcome this initiative, which should provide political momentum to the work and outcomes of ADP WS2.
16. **In 2014 all parties should be prepared to review their mitigation ambition and discuss options to increase their mitigation effort in line with the below 2°C objective.** This discussion should include, where appropriate, the support that would be required to achieve increased mitigation effort. Means of Implementation, and in particular the mobilisation of scaled up climate finance, will be

---

<sup>6</sup> [www.majurodeclaration.org](http://www.majurodeclaration.org)

essential to our efforts, and the EU reiterates our commitment to mobilising our fair share of \$100 billion per year by 2020. In this regard, we should ensure that the outputs of the Long Term Finance Work Programme, the finance Ministerial in Warsaw, and other relevant meetings such as the climate finance meeting due to take place in Denmark in October, feed into deliberations on ADP WS2

17. The EU calls for a specific Ministerial meeting in the first half of 2014, at which options for enhancing mitigation action should be discussed by all Parties. This could, for example, be held back to back with the Ministerial to discuss KP QELRCs.

**(ii): A call upon all Parties to the Montreal protocol on substances that deplete the ozone layer to take action to phase down the production and consumption of HFCs**

18. We must take decisive steps to enable global phase down of HFCs. HFCs are potent GHGs, and their use is increasing by 10-15% per year, with the potential for emissions from HFCs to double by 2020. This would severely reduce our chances of achieving our below 2 degree objective. Yet the opportunity exists to take early action to phase down the use of HFCs, Countries that already use HFCs at large scale should reduce their consumption in line with the widespread and increased availability of suitable alternatives. With many developing countries due to start using HFCs as replacement for ozone depleting substances, money and effort can be saved by moving directly to alternative substances. Based on recent analysis from the Montreal Protocol's TEAP we know that there is already a host of low-GWP alternatives available, which are technically feasible, safe, energy-efficient and affordable.. The EU put forward a proposal for a UNFCCC Decision calling on Parties to pursue a phase down of HFCs through the Montreal Protocol in its previous submission to the ADP.<sup>7</sup> While such a decision is not a legal requirement for the Montreal Protocol to act on HFCs, it presents an opportunity for the UNFCCC Parties to express their political encouragement to the Montreal Protocol to act, and to clarify the respective roles of the Montreal Protocol and the UNFCCC in regulating and accounting for the emissions reductions associated with an HFC phase down..
19. The Montreal Protocol has the structures in place, and the mandate, to phase down HFCs. It already regulates the relevant sectors globally and has an excellent track record – reducing 98% of ozone depleting chemicals over the last 25 years. The Montreal Protocol includes means of implementation (through the multilateral fund) as well as technology transfer capability. Using the Montreal Protocol would thus help avoid the duplication of existing structures. On the other hand, emissions from HFCs should remain fully within the scope of the UNFCCC. We welcome the recent establishment by the Parties to the Montreal Protocol of a formal Discussion Group on the management of HFCs and join others in calling for the establishment in October 2013 of an Open-Ended Contact Group to negotiate an amendment to the Montreal Protocol for the global phase down of HFCs.
20. The EU considers that a signal from the UNFCCC highlighting the importance of tackling HFCs to our below 2°C objective would provide the political impetus for action. We must build upon and widen the support of G20 Leaders to phase down HFCs under the Montreal Protocol. As such we call on all Parties to the UNFCCC for their support, and would like to see this discussed specifically in Warsaw in the context of ADP WS2.

<sup>7</sup> [http://unfccc.int/files/documentation/submissions\\_from\\_parties/adp/application/pdf/adp\\_eu\\_workstream\\_2\\_20130527.pdf](http://unfccc.int/files/documentation/submissions_from_parties/adp/application/pdf/adp_eu_workstream_2_20130527.pdf)

**(iii): A Decision setting out the role of the UNFCCC in recognising, supporting, and scaling up action and initiatives**

21. The UNFCCC should recognise, encourage, and scale up actions and initiatives in areas of high mitigation potential, in line with Sustainable Development priorities, and with a focus on those that can deliver additional co-benefits.
22. A number of Parties have called for the UNFCCC to play a role in catalysing, encouraging, and supporting such actions and initiatives. The UNFCCC could play this role by, *inter alia*:
  - Acknowledging the contribution that ICIs could make towards closing the gap, and calling for Parties and International Organisations to identify, develop, join and implement initiatives in areas of high mitigation potential
  - Providing a forum for initiatives to come forward/options to be discussed, so that practical solutions can be developed. This should include the engagement of Ministers through a dedicated Ministerial round table on pre 2020 mitigation ambition
  - Providing transparency on ongoing initiatives and facilitating sharing of expertise/best practice/experiences
  - Sending a signal to other bodies (such as the Montreal Protocol and ICAO) to encourage further action in areas of importance to mitigation ambition (such as HFCs and aviation)
23. Initiatives should be encouraged to report their activities and expected outcomes to the UNFCCC on a voluntary basis. The Secretariat may have a role to play in facilitating this. The EU has included information on some of other initiatives that EU Member States are contributing to in Annex 1 to this submission.

**Process for Warsaw**

24. In Bonn, we heard proposals for a continued technical process that should feed into a ministerial process with the aim of achieving outcomes in Warsaw and beyond. This way of working received support from a number of Parties, including the EU, as a means to translate technical inputs into practical action.
25. Building on this input, the EU would suggest the following process to achieve concrete outcomes in Warsaw:

- i. Parties and IGOs have had the opportunity to collate and submit further technical information on the policy options and initiatives that they feel have the highest potential for closing the mitigation gap. The EU's contribution is set out in Annex 1. These submissions should feed into the updated Technical Paper, which should be drafted to provide focused input on specific policy options and initiatives to inform Warsaw discussions.
- ii. The Roundtable and Workshop format should continue and should be focused on identifying clear policy options for Parties to take forward.
- iii. We should build on the workshops we have had so far - bringing in the appropriate inputs from a wide range of stakeholders and experts. We should focus on energy efficiency and renewables and improving the risk/return profile for climate-related investments. Other suitable topics could be identified following the production of the Technical Paper. These workshops could also consider

how we enhance collaboration between existing institutions and processes under the Convention to deliver outcomes on mitigation ambition.

- iv. The opportunity should also be provided for international initiatives to provide information on specific actions they are taking to reduce emissions and to call on more parties and IGOs/NGOs to join initiatives and take actions in the areas where additional action is needed to close the gap.
- v. The workshops should be held at the beginning of Warsaw, and the outcomes of these - in addition to the Technical Paper - should highlight the policy options of highest mitigation potential as input to a dedicated Ministerial roundtable on mitigation ambition.
- vi. The Ministerial roundtable should be geared towards achieving concrete outcomes, and provide an opportunity for a genuine exchange of views through an open and productive discussion.
- vii. The outcomes of ADP WS2 in Warsaw should be reflected in Decision text.

### Warsaw Decision text

26. The Warsaw Decision text could cover the following areas in relation to pre 2020 mitigation ambition:

- Preambular language reiterating past commitments and outlining that all Parties should consider how they can increase their ambition in 2014, with developed countries taking the lead and providing support for meaningful mitigation action in developing countries.
- Acknowledgement of the technical input and discussions to date.
- Acknowledgement of areas of highest mitigation potential and options for further action in these areas.
- A call for all Parties to Convention to consider in 2014 how they could enhance their mitigation efforts - including, where appropriate, the support that would be required to achieve it -and present options for action next year at a dedicated ambition Ministerial.
- The role that international cooperative initiatives can play in providing the opportunity for countries to voluntarily come together to share experiences and increase ambition in particular sectors.
- The role of the UNFCCC in catalysing action, encouraging and supporting initiatives, recording progress, and facilitating scaled up action.
- A request for International Cooperative initiatives to voluntarily report on their activities and expected outcomes to the UNFCCC.
- A call on Parties to the MP to phase down HFCs.
- Clear direction for our work in 2014 & 2015 - including how to link the technical work to the political processes in 2014. This should include expectations for ongoing high level engagement within and outside of the UNFCCC process.

27. In summary, we must have an outcome from Warsaw that results in real action to close the pre 2020 mitigation ambition gap. ADP WS2 should continue as a forum for exchange of views, information, and best practice. But we need to move to the next stage in our work and consider what specific actions could be taken, how the UNFCCC can play a role in catalysing, encouraging, and supporting these action, and how Parties can work together to deliver the political momentum needed to achieve the below 2°C objective.

## Annex 1 - Technical input on actions, initiatives and options to enhance mitigation ambition

1. In June 2013, in Bonn, there was broad interest and support for the proposal for a technical, concrete and collaborative process that creates a space for collective problem solving to enhance action.
2. The EU looks forward to parties, international organizations and non-governmental organizations sharing the experiences, ideas and information to complement the Technical Paper FCCC/TP/2013/4 and enable a focused and action-oriented discussion on enhancing action.
3. The EU wants to take forward specific options, policies and initiatives that could make a major contribution to closing the gap, and to this aim wants to see highlighted: (i) some experiences to overcome barriers to implementation, notably through international cooperation; (ii) further evidence of sustainable development benefits attached to actions aiming to reap mitigation opportunities in areas of high mitigation potential.
4. This technical input focuses on the areas of: enabling energy transformation and reducing emissions from fluorinated greenhouses gases; and land use.

### Benefits at stake and Opportunities for cooperation in: Energy transformation area

1. **Energy efficiency** The IEA analysis points to the major role of energy efficiency for mitigation, associated with large economic benefits in terms of energy security, competitiveness, jobs, and co-benefits for health or adaptation<sup>8</sup>. Many countries are already acting to reap these benefits, cooperation in IEA or IPEEC is catalysing countries' efforts to develop or review their energy performance policies. However, a large no-regret potential is still untapped: IEA highlights new action cutting energy costs can take global buildings emissions to 1.9 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>/yr in 2050, and no new action would let these emissions grow to 3.5 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr by 2050<sup>9</sup>. Countries and stakeholders should consider supporting or joining the Major Economies Forum action proposed in April 2013 on improving the energy performance of buildings. Sharing expertise and best practices, providing technical assistance for countries which need it, and taking stock of progress in a relevant manner will unlock large benefits.
2. **Fossil fuel subsidies reforms** – The IEA *World Energy Outlook Special Report 2013, Redrawing the Energy-Climate Map* confirms the previous findings about the global mitigation potential of fossil fuel subsidies reforms that are quoted in the Technical Paper FCCC/TP/2013/4. In addition, the IEA is now exploring regional benefits: the IEA analyses the impact of a 25% reduction in subsidies for fossil fuel consumption by 2020 in OPEC countries, in addition to the G20 and APEC delivering their commitment to phase out inefficient fossil-fuel subsidies. IEA finds out that average gasoline prices in the Middle East region would remain at one-fifth of the OECD average in 2020; GDP levels in this region would slightly increase; and global emissions would be reduced by 360 Mt CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr by 2020 beyond the global effects of current mitigation pledges and policies. The IEA announced the forthcoming World Energy outlook 2013 will further examine the effects of fossil fuel reforms for all regions and at global level. As reforms to fossil fuel subsidies have the potential to improve the competitiveness, trade and fiscal balance of both importing and exporting countries, but may have negative consequences in the short-term on certain groups, countries would benefit from sharing further their experience to design and implement such reforms as part of their economic, energy or climate strategies<sup>10</sup>.

<sup>8</sup>See by IEA: 2013 Redrawing the Energy-Climate Map, 2013 Tracking Clean Energy Progress Report, 2012 World Energy Outlook, and 2012 Energy Technology Perspectives.

<sup>9</sup> IEA, Transition to sustainable buildings, 2013

<sup>10</sup> About country experiences – see for instance: World Bank July 2012 - Policy Research Working Paper 6122 - Implementing Energy Subsidy Reforms, An Overview of the Key Issues, Maria Vagliasindi

3. **Renewable energy** - The growing global renewable energy markets keeps opening up opportunities for new cost-effective mitigation with rapid benefits. As reviewed by IRENA, the costs of generating electricity from solar PV, CSP, wind power, hydropower and biomass keep decreasing across regions<sup>11</sup>. Relevant actors have to engage in networks and technology platforms, as these play a role to catalyze energy transformation investments. For instance, the 2012 JRC wind status report put together by industry, scientific and policy experts as part of the European Strategic Energy Technology Plan identifies opportunities for lowering costs and scaling up efficiency of wind energy projects. An efficient regulatory environment is essential. Once it is in place, policy makers and stakeholders could also work together to lift other barriers to renewable energy investments, like addressing technology-related risk premiums. For instance, the WEF Green Growth Action Alliance is incubating innovative financing models (e.g. new layered fund for energy efficiency in Russia and Mexico integrating EBRD support; a floor-price mechanism to backstop India renewable energy certificate markets integrating UK/DE support; an insurance scheme for geothermal energy production in Kenya).<sup>12</sup> Further structured dialogue and cooperation on these issues would also scale up the economic and environmental benefits of the available means of implementation (cross-reference to Finance Submission with more information on EU funds enabling sustainable energy investment).

4. **Cities initiatives.** UNEP Gap report 2013 highlights that some policies effective to reap the remaining mitigation potential by 2020 have to be implemented at subnational level, in conjunction with decisions at national and international levels. Under the Covenant of Mayors, local authorities share experiences and come up with ambitious climate and energy objectives. The sustainable energy action plans<sup>13</sup> put together so far by members of the Covenant of Mayors representing over 100 million citizens are focused on reaping energy savings in urban transport, buildings sector or improving waste management. These plans have been estimated to add 113 Mt CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr emission reductions by 2020 to the effects of the national policy framework. As more cities are joining sustainable cities' initiatives, their benefits have to be further monitored and assessed.

#### **Benefits at stake and Opportunities for cooperation - Land use area**

5. Governments, IGOs, NGOs and businesses engaged in the Global Partnership for Forest Landscape Restoration are working to facilitate the restoration of 50 million hectares of degraded and deforested lands by 2020. It has been estimated that achieving the Bonn challenge in full, i.e. restoring 150 million hectares of degraded lands by 2020, could potentially enhance natural carbon sinks by around 1 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr, and thereby contribute to closing the emissions gap by 11-17%. In addition, local economies would benefit for the growth in activities related to wood and non-wood forest products, with a value estimated around US\$ 40 billion per year.<sup>14</sup> There could be significant synergies<sup>15</sup> or trade-offs<sup>16</sup> with adaptation objectives.

6. Over 50 countries representing over a third of world's forest areas work together within multilateral initiatives such as the UN-REDD program, the EU-REDD Facility, the Forest Investment Program or Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF). They develop national strategic policy frameworks in line with national development priorities, slowly building up capacities. In addition to this background work, several initiatives have a potential to accelerate the practical implementation of the international mechanism for reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+), by

<sup>11</sup> Renewable Power Generation Costs November 2012 – IRENA

<sup>12</sup> World Economic Forum - Green Growth Action Alliance: Progress Report from the First Year of Catalysing Private Investment June 2013

<sup>13</sup> [http://www.covenantofmayors.eu/actions/sustainable-energy-action-plans\\_en.html](http://www.covenantofmayors.eu/actions/sustainable-energy-action-plans_en.html)

<sup>14</sup> [http://www.forestlandscaperestoration.org/sites/default/files/topic/the\\_bonn\\_challenge.pdf](http://www.forestlandscaperestoration.org/sites/default/files/topic/the_bonn_challenge.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> [http://www.unece.lsu.edu/certificate\\_eccos/documents/2013Mar/ce13\\_12.pdf](http://www.unece.lsu.edu/certificate_eccos/documents/2013Mar/ce13_12.pdf)

<sup>16</sup> <http://blog.cifor.org/18785/mitigation-without-adaptation-can-leave-communities-vulnerable-study/>

testing results based payments before 2020. Projects of this kind are starting with support of FCPF Carbon Fund, REM<sup>17</sup>, the International Climate Initiative (IKI)<sup>18</sup> and, in LDCs, with support of the Global Climate Change Alliance<sup>19</sup>. These open platforms; could welcome new partners and further cooperation would scale up benefits.

7. Given the significance of logging and agriculture as drivers of deforestation and degradation, more sustainable production and consumption, plus fair trade of these commodities could leverage significant improvements on the supply side if, on the demand side, consumers and companies received better information on the deforestation impacts of where and what they buy: Traceability, investment guidance, recognition of legality insurance systems, certification and labeling could also be explored, on the model of the FLEGT Action Plan<sup>20</sup>.

### **Benefits at stake and Opportunities for cooperation - Reducing HFC emissions area:**

8. Addressing HFCs emissions is an area where quick action would provide large benefits already before 2020. HFCs emissions are currently small but are increasing rapidly: driven by requirements to phase out ozone-depleting HCFCs, HFC emissions are now growing 10 to 15% per year. If unregulated, HFC emissions are expected to double by 2020 and become a major contributor to global warming.

9. We are encouraged by the increasing international attention to the need to address the rapid growth of HFCs and by the increasing number of environmentally friendly alternatives to high-GWP HFC available for many uses and sectors, as shown inter alia by the recent TEAP's Draft Task Force report on additional information on alternatives to ODS<sup>21</sup>. Furthermore, we strongly welcome the recent establishment by the Parties to the Montreal of a formal Discussion Group on management of HFCs. A phasedown in the production and consumption of HFCs under the Montreal Protocol should complement HFC emissions reductions under the UNFCCC. Some additional initial investments to assure a climate-friendly transition from ODS would reap important financial benefits in the long run, as phasing in the use of intermediate technologies that would require replacement in the future can be effectively avoided in this way. There is scope for further policy exchange, as EU, Japan, Switzerland, Norway, US and Australia work on regulating these sources.

<sup>17</sup> [http://www.bmz.de/en/publications/topics/climate/FlyerREDD\\_lang.pdf](http://www.bmz.de/en/publications/topics/climate/FlyerREDD_lang.pdf)

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.international-climate-initiative.com/en/issues/natural-carbon-sinksredd/>

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.gcca.eu/technical-and-financial-support/national-programmes>

<sup>20</sup> [http://www.euflegt.efi.int/portal/home/flegt\\_intro/flegt\\_action\\_plan/](http://www.euflegt.efi.int/portal/home/flegt_intro/flegt_action_plan/)

<sup>21</sup> [http://ozone.unep.org/Assessment\\_Panels/TEAP/Reports/TEAP\\_Reports/teap-task-force-XXIII-9-report-may2012.pdf](http://ozone.unep.org/Assessment_Panels/TEAP/Reports/TEAP_Reports/teap-task-force-XXIII-9-report-may2012.pdf)