

**Submission by the Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean -
AILAC¹**

March 1, 2013

ADP – Planning of Work in 2013

AILAC would like to share views on the questions on the ADP work plan in response to the paragraph 13 and paragraph 15 of Draft conclusions proposed by the co-Chairs with respect to the Planning of Work.

Strong political signal

It is our view that we need to gradually bring more structure into the program of work to underscore our *political commitment* to deliver a new legally binding agreement by 2015, in the form of a Protocol under the Convention. We welcome the initiative by the Secretary General of the United Nations to call for a Summit of Leaders by 2014. For this initiative to be successful in building political momentum for the new agreement and for further ambition pre 2020, all Parties must work throughout 2013 and 2014 to make meaningful and transparent advances in the implementation of their mitigation commitments and pledges already existing under the Kyoto Protocol and the Convention, as well as the timely and consistent delivery of financial resources committed for developing countries. With significant advances in these areas, the Summit of Leaders could help increase momentum for building positive synergies between *domestic* dynamics—the growing and unprecedented levels of climate action around the world, in particular in developing countries—and the negotiations of the 2015 agreement, which need to increase level of ambition around the world if we are to attain the ultimate objective of the Convention.

New procedures 2013-2015

It is important to recall that in Doha Parties agreed to consider elements for a draft negotiations text no later than COP 20 with a view to making available a negotiating text before 2015. Furthermore, as mentioned in paragraph 2 of the Co-Chair's draft conclusions, "*The ADP has expressed its determination to complete its work as early as possible and no later than 2015.*" Considering this ambitious timeline agreed by the Parties, we fully recognize that will need to identify and test new and more efficient working procedures in 2013 and 2014. With this in mind, AILAC requests the support of the Co-Chairs of the ADP in helping the Parties identify and test new working procedures that could be used throughout 2013 and 2014 in order to make our discussions more focused, efficient, and effective for reaching a legally binding agreement applicable to all by 2015.

¹ Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Panama and Peru.

At this point in time, we are open to a number of procedures that could be used to facilitate productive negotiations, but these could include a range of options, including:

- Opportunities for general discussion on overarching issues that will frame the new agreement, including the application of the principles of the Convention and the architecture of the new agreement.
- Focused discussions that address specific questions, to be posed by the Co-Chairs, where Parties and technical experts (in particular from think tanks, academia and NGOs) present views and discuss specific topics.

As highlighted above, these discussions held under the ADP must move the negotiations forward substantially through 2013 and 2014, in order to produce the content for elements for a draft negotiating text no later than COP 20. To facilitate advancement, we suggest that the Co-Chairs use the April/May session to broadly address the issues already identified in their informal note released on February 18th, under the two separate workstreams.

Under workstream 1, we would encourage the Co-Chairs to foster a very focused, specific discussion by using targeted questions as they have in the past, in order to address the main issues outlined in the informal note, including:

- Defining how the principles of the Convention will be applied. For example: Will all principles of the Convention be applied in the same manner and to the same extent as others? Is it possible to identify or separate principles that can be addressed qualitatively versus quantitatively? Will the principals apply in the same manner to all of the elements to be included in the new agreement?
- Working to define a spectrum of commitments and options for ensuring the agreement will be applicable to all and enable ambitions participation from all countries. For example: What type/form of commitments would the spectrum include? What form would these commitments take? How would individual countries identify or be assigned what type/form of commitment to take? How to harmonize the notion of a spectrum of commitments from a spectrum of respective responsibilities and capabilities?
- Engage on how to incorporate adaptation, mitigation, and means of implementation in the final agreement. Does each element need to be addressed individually or should certain elements be addressed jointly in combination? Should we begin to think about how some elements may be addressed in a distinct legal framing than others? How do we take advantage of the new institutions created under the AWG-LCA to streamline our negotiations?

Under workstream 2, the April/May session should take the first step in operationalizing a process whose final objective is closing the pre-2020 mitigation ambition gap. The first step in this process should involve presenting Parties with technical information on the size of the ambition gap pre 2020 and an analysis of potential emissions reductions globally and regionally from all IPCC sectors and sub sectors. Technical presentations and discussions can be used to facilitate Parties

understanding of what different policies and actions exist, and what technologies exist that can facilitate an increase in mitigation ambition. These discussions should include a discussion on the marginal costs of various mitigation options.

With these substance-related discussions underway in the April/May session, we should also set aside a specific, time-limited space (perhaps 2 or 1.5 hour discussion blocks) to specifically address the process that will be used to continue the ADP discussions from June 2013 onward. We would support the Co-Chairs efforts to propose to Parties different possibilities for structuring the coming negotiations, with the goal of helping Parties identify concrete elements for a draft negotiating text at COP 20. This could include the formation of contact groups on specific issues; however, these would have to be defined in a way that would prevent cyclical discussions, allowing discussions to advance in parallel.

Views on **Workstream 2**

Workstream 2 should be operationalized through a logical progression of topics that allows Parties to understand the magnitude of the ambition gap pre-2020 and to identify and explore a range of actions that can close the pre-2020 ambition gap.

In our view, this workstream should begin by presenting Parties with technical information on the size of the ambition gap pre 2020 and an analysis of potential emissions reductions globally and regionally from all IPCC sectors and sub sectors. Technical presentations and discussions can be used to facilitate Parties understanding of what different policies and actions exist, and what technologies exist that can facilitate an increase in mitigation ambition. These discussions should include a discussion on the marginal costs of various mitigation options.

Once a common understanding of global mitigation potential has been developed among Parties, Parties should be encouraged to share experiences and efforts to individually and jointly increase mitigation ambition pre 2020. In this context, Parties could also discuss possible financial, technology and capacity building needs that could result in increased ambition pre 2020 and ways to meet these needs. This exercise should include an analysis of the barriers and obstacles that parties face to either move to the upper end of their pledges or provide more information about NAMAs, as well as their potential for reductions and the possible ways to overcome those obstacles. These discussions should, as already suggested by the co-chairs of the ADP in their informal note, include specific inputs from the SBSTA and SBI.

The final stage of operationalizing workstream 2 should include a process to compile the information being presented under this workstream and to present concrete suggestions for actions to close the pre 2020 ambition gap. These suggestions must be targeted at different audiences inside and outside of the UNFCCC context. The results of this workstream should send a message across the public and private sector, as well as to civil

society on how to increase mitigation ambition. In particular, there could be specific recommendations packaged for the meeting of world leaders in 2014.
