

SBSTA - Sources of input for the global stocktake under the Paris Agreement

Second Meeting of the First Global Stocktake

Closing Plenary Statement – Saudi Arabia, on behalf of the LMDC

Thank you, Farhan and Harald.

Hello everyone, good morning. Saudi Arabia speaking on behalf of the LMDC. We would like to begin by aligning ourselves with the statement made by the G77 and China.

As always, it is an honour for me to speak on behalf of the LMDC as I am representing the challenges, opportunities and diverse climate and development aspirations of over half of the world's population. And an appreciation of this diversity is crucial in our discussion on ambition.

I would like to begin by dearly thanking the co-facilitators for all their efforts in designing a facilitative and creative dialogue, which definitely gave rise to integrated and cross-sectional discussions of importance, albeit the growing challenge of following the great number of modalities. It did get to a point where it was a bit overwhelming to follow.

We would kindly request from our co-facilitators for next session for the modalities to be more simplified, but also to avoid introduction of language and mandates in prompts and roundtables that is out of the scope of the Paris Agreement.

I nonetheless wanted to re-iterate the full commitment of our group to this process and a successful, ambitious and equitable outcome to the Global stocktake.

Allow me to outline a few critical priorities for the group, and highlight some of the discussions we've engaged in this week.

Equity. Equity is not just a fashionable add-on term, it is firmly engrained in historical emissions, historical responsibility, historical responsibility based on those emissions, and the subsequent planetary effects of those emissions, many developing countries now being most acutely affected by those repercussions, in need of immediate financial support, immediate adaptation, and in light of all what was mentioned wanting to be extremely ambitious in terms of their climate targets. Which is why the equitable distribution of the remaining carbon budget, based on historical responsibilities, is pertinent in our response to this urgency.

Transitions. And specifically in response to some references to aggressive source-based transitions we heard this week. Allow me to remind you all of some facts from our best available science:

- Multiple IPCC pathways consistent with limiting warming to 1.5 envisage an increase in gas in the global mix, with one projecting a 30% increase in gas in the global mix.
- Oil and gas is expected to be in the global mix until at least around mid-century, if not beyond.
- In addition, we also need to be honest about the fact that the science, or specifically IPCC projections, are based on a global trajectory towards 1.5 and 2, with no considerations in the models themselves of national and regional circumstances, historical responsibility or equity.
- The scenarios, also, assume a world which is still grossly unequal even in 2050. This will mean some technologies will be needed perhaps much more than the projected pathways.

In this regard, we think it is more productive to focus discussions on a full and not selective depiction of the science and all possible inclusive solutions.

On rights. The right to development is a right for all, which includes economic growth to enable sustainable development, poverty eradication, energy access, and economic diversification in developing countries' efforts to protect the livelihoods of their people, including their children, and in their efforts to pursue climate action. *Emphasizing* the intrinsic relationship that climate change actions, responses and impacts have with equitable access to sustainable development and eradication of poverty. This is why historical responsibility, equity and CBDR-RC are at the heart of the Convention and its Paris Agreement. And I dearly thank our executive secretary who just noted how this should be used as an "Ambition and accountability exercise to ensure that every party is holding up on their commitments". This is critically why our group views the discussion on gaps in the implementation of pre-2020 commitments and backtracking on such commitments should be discussed at length within the Global Stocktake, with a clear path forward. To our dear co-facilitators, we repeat this kind request for such a dedicated discussion in the upcoming session.

Allow me to outline a very specific reflection. One thing I have noticed most acutely is that our entire discussion within this process seems to be taking place in the form of a loop. Perhaps it is because I am young and haven't been in this process for the longest time, but it seems that all of us are saying the same thing in different ways, all of which are not mutually exclusive, but we seem to be going around in circles.

We say that:

- We need to urgently reduce emissions.
- We need the support of all technologies available and to be available, always in the context of the protection of Mother Earth.

But urgency in one area should not be at the detriment of another.

Urgency of mitigation is to avoid future impacts, but developing countries are being disproportionately impacted today.

We need to urgently scale up the provision and mobilization of finance from developed to developing countries, not just for future needs but for today's needs. It is very concerning that this needs to be highlighted over and over again, as though it is a point of question. Adaptation action and support has to be a priority for the protection of human life.

Also, just and equitable transitions is about making sure, that we can all be ambitious, whilst also protecting the most vulnerable, everywhere.

Naturally some elements will be more relevant in different national contexts, but we need to raise the status of all.

Through the GST, we need to make sure no one is left behind, and that ambitious progress that preserves CBDR-RC, equity, and the right of sustainable development, is made across mitigation, adaptation, means of implementation and support, response measures and loss and damage.

Based on the clear assessment that we all need to move faster, with CBDR-RC and equity in mind, developing countries will now, more than ever, need to understand, assess and address the social and economic consequences and impacts of response measures when setting ambitious mitigation targets.

In this regard, we need to move beyond just understanding and assessing, both of which we need to do more of, to addressing these impacts. Within the global stocktake and based on the discussions we are having reflecting this urgency and the need to stop going around in circles, we see this as the perfect opportunity to announce a just and equitable transition mechanism, perhaps the Sharm-El-Sheikh Just and equitable Transition Mechanism.

We are very optimistic about this, because just transitions and equity are some of the key aspects we all agree on, particularly when thinking about long-term ambition. We invite further support on this and of course are committed to further discussing with all and how this may look like.

We see this being a crucial vehicle for us to move past talking about justice and fairness in a vacuum of a dedicated space to operationalize addressing response measures, but also map and exchange on the 'how' of just transitions with equity at its heart aligning with all pathways, all trajectories, and all mitigation options, with a unique zoom-into regional and local contexts.

Finally, in the COP of implementation, we need to highlight very clearly that actions speak louder than words, and that progress on targets is more important in our pursuit of our temperature goals, than empty promises.

Thank you.