Co-chairs
Let me start by reminding us that the Warsaw outcome determines how the 2015 agreement will have to be conceptualised and constructed. It was agreed in Warsaw that the formulation of Parties’ contributions will be nationally determined on the basis of information that needs to be identified in Lima in December 2014. In our view, this is the most important aspect of the 2015 regime. Furthermore, the contributions need to be communicated to ensure transparency.

The Warsaw outcome speaks of intended nationally determined contributions – this implies that the outcomes are provisional and subject to an ex ante multilateral assessment.

In Lima we need to take a decision on four issues:

• The minimum information that Parties must provide when putting forward their INDCs;
• The process through which Parties’ INDCs will be communicated;
• The ex ante process which will assess Parties’ INDCs for their fairness and adequacy; and
• Elements for a draft negotiating text.

We believe that we need to adopt a single decision in Lima on both the elements (as agreed in the Doha decision), as well as the information that Parties will provide when putting forward their INDCs (as agreed in Warsaw).

In our remarks, we will be commenting on both the elements and the information.

Long-term and collective aspects of mitigation

We believe that the 2015 agreement must commit all Parties collectively to limiting temperature increase to a 2 degrees goal as a common global commitment, translated into trajectories, including a reference to the global goal for emission reductions of at least 50%
below 1990 levels by 2050, with a qualification that science may require a more ambitious goal. In order to be credible and fair, these long-term global trajectories must be based on ambitious mid-term targets and actions and an equitable burden-sharing paradigm.

Having said that, we need to find a way to reflect differentiation in the treatment of mitigation. We believe neither a “one-size-fits-all” approach, nor a strict binary division, will do for the future. In our submission we have proposed a format that follows the structure of Article 4 of the Convention: all Parties that have commitments under Article 4.1 (which includes all Parties) and those that have additional further commitments under Article 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5.

With regard to the decision on information that we need to take in Lima, we must set the stage for the process of ex ante assessment. The minimum information that Parties will provide should be reflected in an agreed format or template that expresses the differentiation between developed and developing countries according to the structure of Article 4 of the Convention – all Parties take action and some (developed countries) do more in addition to that.

We believe that it is important to have a clear format for INDCs. South Africa has proposed a number of tables which if appropriately adjusted, could serve us well as a format to present the required information in a simple, clear and transparent manner.

**Commitments**

To enhance the implementation of the provisions of Article 4.1(a) of the Convention, Parties must formulate and implement mitigation commitments. These may include relative emission reduction commitments and actions. This might be expressed in the form of intensity targets (reducing carbon intensity of GDP) or sets of NAMAs. All commitments, targets and actions must be measurable, reportable and verifiable (MRV).

Building on the existing commitments under Article 4.2, developed country Parties shall undertake the following specific commitments in addition to the commitments that all Parties have, including:

- Absolute economy-wide emission reduction commitments or targets, against a 1990 base year (with flexibility for EITs). Mitigation commitments would take the form of QELROs, or QEERTs for multiple years defining a trajectory to 2030, with every year defined;
- Zero carbon emissions pathways should peak by 2015, start declining rapidly up to 2030, and define a long-term goal of zero emissions for each developed country
Party in 2050. The commitments and targets should be comparable among developed countries.

Information related to mitigation commitments should include underlying assumptions and methodologies, sectors and gases covered, GWP values used, use of credits from a new market mechanism, which is to be agreed, and estimated mitigation outcomes.

In addition to the common accounting rules for all Parties, developed countries shall also apply a common base year, treatment of the land-use and forest sectors and carbon credits, expected reductions for the period 2020-2030, associated assumptions and conditions related to the ambition of the pledges and demonstrating progress towards QELROs/QEERTs.

It is also important that the minimum information provided include an explanation on why a Party regard its own INDC as an ambitious and equitable contribution to the global effort.

**Institutional arrangements, cooperation and coordination**

On the question of institutional arrangements, cooperation and coordination, South Africa believes that we should utilise and build on existing mechanisms, including flexibility mechanisms and land-based tools (e.g. REDD+). The 2015 agreement should also provide for the use of a new market-based mechanism subject to considerations of environmental integrity and additionality.

Existing transparency provisions (e.g. national communications, biennial reports and biennial update reports, international assessment and review, and international consultation and analysis, etc.) should be incorporated in the new agreement and strengthened and adjusted as may be required.

Provision should also be made for accounting for international cooperative initiatives outside the Convention to ensure they set targets and adopt rules under the Convention.

**Processes**

With regard to the processes needed for the effective implementation of this regime, we have made a submission that sets out our thoughts in this regard. It might be worth repeating that, but noting that these processes will be applicable to the totality of Parties’ commitments, namely on mitigation, adaptation, and the provision of means of implementation.

It is absolutely essential that Parties’ INDCs are known early in the process, as agreed in Warsaw. Depending on the legal nature of the commitments, the provisions of Article 17 of the Convention will have to be taken into account. We are of the view that the INDCs should
be captured as part of the Paris outcome, but with the clear understanding that they will be assessed and finalised in 2016 and inscribed in the manner to be agreed by the Parties.

South Africa is of the view that an *ex ante* process of assessment is critical to assess the INDCs for their adequacy and fairness. We suggest the following process:

The secretariat should be requested to collate and package Parties’ INDCs in a compilation by early 2016, which must include all Parties’ INDCs on all the agreed elements: mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation.

The Lima and Paris decisions must then provide for a panel of technical experts that will look at Parties’ INDCs and prepare a technical report. This technical report should then be submitted to the subsidiary bodies that will sit jointly to make an assessment of the INDCs in order to make recommendations to the COP on:

- the adequacy of the aggregate intended effort; and
- the adequacy and fairness of Parties’ individual INDCs.

Following the *ex ante* process, Parties will consider the recommendations and finalise and inscribe their commitments by July 2017 at the latest.

We also need provisions for an *ex post* assessment process to assess the implementation of Parties’ individual commitments, as well as a review process of the implementation and adequacy of the common global commitments. We also foresee that the *ex post* assessment will be utilised to set further future commitments. South Africa believes that implementation of commitments should be in 10-year iterative periods with mid-term reviews.

Finally, South Africa sees an important link between mitigation and adaptation: Ambition on mitigation determines how much adaptation is needed. It is therefore necessary that both are considered as part of contributions, not least because adaptation and mitigation are existing commitments we all have under Article 4 of the Convention.