Submission by Nepal on behalf of the Least Developed Countries Group on ADP workstream II: the pre 2020 mitigation ambition, building on the conclusions of the ADP 1-2

The Least Developed Countries Group (LDC Group) welcomes the invitation by the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) to submit further information, views and proposals on matters related to paragraphs 7 and 8 of decision 1/CP.17 dealing with the work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition for the period pre-2020. The views expressed in this submission, which further explores and elaborates on specific ideas and proposals, complement those expressed in the LDC Group's previous submission of 3 March 2013.

Many recent studies, for example, UNEP's Emissions Gap Report, IEA's World Energy Outlook and the World Bank's Turn Down the Heat Report, have shown that Global Mean Temperature (GMT) is likely to increase by 3 to 4^{o}C by the end of the 21st century. The LDC Group continues to express its concerns that emissions levels are too high, and if necessary actions are not taken now, this will lead to severe climate related impacts affecting livelihoods, infrastructure and the wellbeing of the people of our countries.

The LDC Group believes that it is urgent to mitigate anthropogenic GHG emissions in order to keep GMT increase below 1.5°C. For this reason, the group reiterates the need for the ADP workstream II to make tangible progress and deliver concrete outcomes that lead to enhanced mitigation actions by 2020. This will help to close the emission gap which is estimated to be 8–13 GtCO2eq in 2020 according to the 2012 UNEP Emissions Gap Report.

To ensure that the ADP workstream II achieves its objectives, it is essential to manage the sensitivities around the scope of this workstream and to limit it to what is clearly defined in the decision 1/CP 17, i.e. "… *decides to launch a work plan on enhancing mitigation ambition to identify and to explore options for a range of actions that can close the ambition gap with a view to ensuring the highest possible mitigation efforts by all Parties*."

Means of implementation, namely finance, technology development and transfer, and capacity building to support implementation of mitigation actions, are an essential part of the work of workstream II. The LDC Group believes that progress under workstream II is essential to maximize progress on climate finance. Sufficient financing is needed for those countries that need it the most, to allow them to realize their greatest potential to engage in the global mitigation effort. However, a debate on means of implementation under this workstream should not block discussion on enhanced mitigation actions.

Moreover, there should be clarity on adequate, reliable and sustainable funding to allow the implementation of measures such as those identified in the UNEP Emissions Gap Report in the pre-2020 period.

Already Parties have submitted over 66 NAMAs seeking support as of June 2013, including some LDCs (e.g. Mali and Ethiopia). Now, the focus should be to request developed countries, as an indication of their commitment to the agreement, to meet their commitment to provide finance and other means of implementation to support countries to implement these already submitted NAMAs. Providing support will be a good sign of developed countries' commitment to provide the needed support.

Urgent implementation of short-term measures to reduce the concentration of GHGs in the atmosphere as shown by the UNEP Emission Gap Report is paramount in the pre-2020 period. The implementation of such measures needs technology, capacity building and finance.

COP19 in Warsaw should agree on concrete interventions for pre-2020 emissions reduction actions. Parties need to finalize and adopt a clear roadmap from 2013 towards 2020, including a clear list of effective options and preparation for the world leaders' summit on ambition in 2014. Actions to be considered may cover, *inter alia*:

- The full implementation of the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, including ratification, entry into force and review of ambition in 2014 to ensure that the emission reduction pledges are in line with a 1.5°C pathways by 2020;
- Implementation of comparable actions under the Convention from developed countries that are not part of the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, including through reconsideration of inadequate pledges by Parties;
- Removal of conditionalities around 2020 pledges, moving to the higher range for all countries which have provided ranges and towards deeper reductions than currently pledged for all developed countries;
- Full implementation of developing countries' NAMAs including through provision of finance, technology and capacity building needed to support and facilitate implementation;
- Submission and implementation of additional mitigation actions from those developing countries that have not yet submitted NAMAs;
- International cooperative initiatives comprising both international and national actions providing additional emissions reduction. In this regard, actions with co-benefits for development such as those in the areas of energy efficiency and renewable energy should be prioritized among other options to ensure drastic move towards renewable energy;
- Removal of all barriers related to technology transfer by developed countries, to enable developing countries to use affordable and sustainable energy sources and ensure sustainable development and climate resilience.

Overall, rapid progress under this workstream depends on how developed countries are showing the lead on pre-2020 mitigation issues, how sustainable and affordable will be the adoption of measures in the energy sector, and how LDCs and other vulnerable countries will be assisted in terms of means of implementation.

The LDC Group would also like to provide its reflections on the two concrete proposals made by AOSIS and EU to close the mitigation gap:

Initiatives on energy efficiency, transformation and renewable energy: Initiatives can draw from recommendations made by the International Energy Agency in "Energy Technology Perspectives 2012" which acknowledged that: "*Knowing what we do about the link between GHG emissions and climate change, it is disturbing to see that investments in fossil-fuel technologies continue to outpace investments in best available clean energy technologies. [...] Continued heavy reliance on a narrow set of technologies and fossil fuels is a significant threat to energy security, stable economic growth and global welfare, as well as to the environment*." The report continued to provide the following recommendation for Energy Ministers, among others: "*Level the playing field for clean energy technologies.* ***Governments should commit to, and report on, progress on national actions that aim to appropriately reflect the true cost of energy production and consumption***. *Pricing carbon emissions and phasing out of inefficient fossil fuel subsidies, while ensuring access to affordable energy for all citizens, are central goals*."

The Group calls for advancing the AOSIS proposal (submitted in May 2013) into more structured discussion around the elements identified above. Indeed, transforming the global economy through a low emission pathway, greener growth and job creation entails a more focused approach, which systematically seeks to address gaps, inconsistencies and shortcomings at three critical regulatory and policy level of actions, namely:

- Global regulatory framework and policy level adequacy (practices of global regulators such as Bank for International Settlement, Bretton Woods Institutions, World Trade Organization, etc.);
- Pricing carbon potential including through initiatives such as cap and trade, carbon tax etc.);
- Regulatory, policy, investment, and technology support needs of developing countries

The transformation of energy systems – making the system more efficient and increasing the share of renewable energy in the energy mix – is a compulsory step to meet GHG mitigation objectives consistent with a 1.5˚C pathway. Energy efficiency and renewable energy could contribute to reduce GHG emissions up to 5 GtCO2eq by 2030 as outlined in the first version of the UNFCCC Technical Paper (FCCC/TP/2013/4). The LDC Group welcomes the ideas of a revised version of the technical paper and calls upon Parties to use this revised version in a practical manner to ensure that clear options are mapped, prioritized and planned for urgent delivery.

Initiatives on Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs): HFCs pose a mitigation challenge mainly for the future. In some projections, emissions of HFCs are set to increase, particularly in developing countries, while other projections show much lower increases. Some HFCs have high global-warming potential while others do not. The LDC Group believes that there is a very high uncertainty with regards to HFCs, and the question is how much effort Parties should take with regard to HFCs as compared to the urgent and immediate challenge of reducing the emissions of CO_2. HFCs are in the basket of gases considered under the UNFCCC and can be dealt with by strengthening current and future commitments.

The Montreal Protocol is a model of success for any multilateral environmental regulatory framework and as such, the UNFCCC and ADP should draw extensively from its provisions and *modus operandi*. Further, the success of the Protocol is anchored both on the availability of technology alternatives and the provision of adequate financial resources in making the corresponding transfer and adjustment.

Based on the statement above, there is a need to carefully evaluate how the Montreal Protocol might be an effective tool, given provisions in the Montreal Protocol, including possible existing exemptions for certain countries, gases and sectors. Furthermore, the LDC Group calls upon Parties to assess whether the mitigation discussions and initiatives should be focused on phasing out all HFCs, or rather immediate phase out of HFCs with high global warming potential.

In evaluating the Protocol's effectiveness in mitigating HFCs before any formal decision can be adopted, a thorough financial analysis should be done to determine the amount of financial resources needed, and identify their sources which the developed countries need to mobilize.

Without such a sequence, we risk derailing an existing model, which has otherwise proven adequate and effective in carrying its mandate.

Recalling the difficulty in addressing the emissions from aviation and maritime which were controlled under the UNFCCC, and are currently under the control of ICAO and IMO, there is a need for careful consideration with regards to moving HFCs from UNFCCC. An option might be to include in a possible Warsaw decision on HFC, a sunset provision to ensure that the decision is cancelled if there is little or no progress to phase down HFCs under the Montreal Protocol.

Finally, although adaptation is clearly not part of the ADP workstream II discussion, it is also important to progress under other agenda set for the period before 2020, such as issues related to finance, including the need to provide clarity on finance for adaptation. Full operationalization of the NAMAs registry, in particular matching the updating needs and actions with the information on available support, is also paramount. Strong and clear coordination of all these important issues for effective implementation between 2013 and 2020 will help to address not only the scope of and progress under the workstream II, but will concomitantly ensure progress under the ADP workstream I.