DRAFT INTERVENTION ON BEHALF OF SOUTH AFRICA ON OTHER ISSUES RELATED TO ELEMENTS AND THE STRUCTURE OF THE AGREEMENT

Co-chairs

Thank you for the opportunity to share some views on very important aspects of our work in designing the 2015 agreement.

I would like to start off by highlighting some of the most important linkages:

When we look closely at the ultimate objective of the Convention as expressed in Article 2, it is clear that we need to address adaptation and mitigation in a balanced and complementary manner. There is a fundamental link between the level of mitigation ambition and the need for adaptation action. There is a further link between the required action to address the climate change challenge and mobilising the necessary means of implementation.

We believe that this link must be clearly established in the new agreement. On adaptation, for example, we have proposed a global adaptation goal, which could express such a linkage by joining the dots between mitigation ambition, the level of action required to achieve climate resilience and the support required under any given temperature scenario, including for loss and damage.
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In addition to the fundamental linkages between the core themes of the Durban Platform – mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation – we believe that equity and transparency also cut across the themes and each phase of the process. Equity and transparency are the necessary keys to unlock full participation and maximum ambition.
Transparency on what is an adequate and fair effort from each Party is needed in our process under the ADP as we develop the new agreement and assess *ex ante* what Parties will contribute and commit to. A distinct *ex post* assessment must be built into the agreement and post-2020 system, when we get to the point in time where we will assess the implementation of and ensure compliance with commitments.

With regard to the task we set ourselves for Lima, we should keep in mind that there is a link between the information that Parties must provide when putting forward their INDCs, the *ex ante* assessment process and adequacy and fairness. The decision in Lima on information must therefore include a requirement that Parties provide information on why their contributions are adequate given the objective of the Convention and the global goals on mitigation, adaptation and a financing pathway. In this process, Parties should also take into account the latest scientific information and the work under the 2013-2015 Review.

Turning to institutional linkages, we believe that we should strengthen and build on the existing and impressive architecture of bodies, institutions and mechanisms under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol by anchoring them in the new agreement, e.g. the Green Climate Fund, the Adaptation Committee and the Technology Mechanism. Many of the tools available under the existing regime, such as market mechanisms and REDD+ should also be available to countries in the post-2020 period to enhance action and help them comply with their commitments in a cost efficient manner, while environmental integrity is ensured.
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As I said, transparency is a cross-cutting issue across the core themes and throughout the development and implementation of the post-2020 system. As explained in previous sessions here in Bonn, we believe that the existing system of MRV is a good basis to work from. With regard to initiatives outside the Convention system, such as international cooperative initiatives (ICIs), we believe that we should find ways to support real action that contributes to our fight against climate change, while ensuring that the integrity of the multilateral response to the global challenge of climate change is protected and strengthened. We propose that ICIs be invited to register their initiatives under the Convention with a view to recognise these
cooperative efforts as a contribution to the global goal. In the post-2020 system, we should create space in the *ex post* assessment to account for ICIs, initiatives at regional and sub-national levels, through the Convention’s accounting and transparency system and ensure that double counting is avoided. We must ensure that the Convention is the central place where global action comes together when we assess the total global effort.
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I think we are also ready to engage in a discussion on the appropriate placement of the various elements that we need for a fair and effective post-2020 system. We believe that crucial elements that pertain to common global objectives, individual commitments, principles operationalising CBDR&RC, assessment and compliance should be an integral part of the 2015 agreement. There are however a number of issues on which it may not be practically feasible to finalise in Paris and that we can successfully address through COP decisions in a manner similar to the Marrakesh process. Identifying what areas are best located in the agreement and which ones can be addressed by the COP could be extremely helpful in planning our work further, particularly since the ADP is working to a very ambitious schedule.
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Related to the question of placement, is the question of structure. As stated many times before, we believe that the 2015 agreement should contain common global commitments on mitigation, adaptation and the means of implementation. We see these located in the agreement text. Individual commitments, first in a preliminary form of INDCs should then be part of the agreement as an annex/schedule and finally inscribed in an updated annex/schedule, following the *ex ante* assessment process. The annexes/schedules of INDCs and commitments should in turn be structured according to an agreed template that includes commitments on mitigation, adaptation and the provision of means of implementation, and specifies the minimum information that Parties will provide when putting forward their contributions.