

**EU oral statement at Bangkok workshop on clarification of developing country pledges
2 September 2012**

For us the clarification of developing countries NAMAs has a twofold purpose:

1. It will contribute to DC capabilities to design and implement NAMAS
2. It will contribute to our collective knowledge on whether we are on track to reach our collective objective to stay below 2' C

On my 1. point:

When we developed our convention and KP reporting system we reached a much deeper understanding around where our emissions come from and on how to best address them. This will also be true for developing countries. Those countries which have started to develop LEDS have already experienced this.

In addition this increased information on NAMAs will further facilitate decision making and targeting of climate finance.

Appreciate the submission of new pledges in March 2012 by the African Group, Swaziland, Malawi and Egypt.

On my 2 point:

At our last workshop in Bonn we saw the assumptions underlying NAMAs can make a big difference with regard to the effect it has to the atmosphere. We have a joint interest to know about them in order to know about the size of the gap between our current pledges and what is needed to stay below 2°C.

Having said all this I come to your questions:

1. what assumptions should be considered while preparing a NAMA?

NAMAs are country driven and have a great variety. Therefore we think the assumptions need to be developed by countries individually.

2. What are the main methodological challenges that need to be addressed for the preparation and implementation of NAMAs?

- o Assumptions associated with establishing baselines and business-as -usual projections
- o Inclusion of sectors and gases
- o Support needs for implementation
- o Estimation of mitigation outcomes.
- o GWP values used
- o The role of offsets in reaching the pledge

- The assumptions need to be structured. This allows to have a clear view of what additional information is needed.

This morning we spoke about the assumptions related to the calculation of Business as Usual associated with Pledges. Key methodological challenge: are policies and measures included in the BAU and how? We would like to know what methodologies countries apply while calculating their BAU. More general we need to understand how much of the investment by developed countries in CDM is being counted by developing countries towards their own pledge?

Some pledges are lists of policies and measures. We recognise their value but we must be able to build on that in order to see their potential in term of emission reductions.

There are financial conditionalities on some of the NAMAs. Do they apply to the whole pledge or are they conditional to one aspect?

In the series of Workshops on understanding the diversity of developing countries actions, a number of developing countries (Chile, Kenya) have presented their experience with establishing institutions and national capacity to prepare emission inventories, develop tools to plan mitigation measures. These efforts are essential to prepare for further longer-term mitigation, maximising benefits for sustainable development.

Also, as we have mentioned before, we recognise the diversity of NAMAS and would like to preserve that; in that regard would also suggest that work is undertaken in SBSTA next year to define what type of information is required for each type of NAMA, with a view to reducing the uncertainty and ensuring transparency, while at the same time preserving diversity. That will help clarify what information is needed in order to be able to view the contribution of all types of pledges to the global effort. Ultimately, it will be important to track progress on the fulfillment of pledges, ensure transparency, estimate resulting emission reductions and to assess whether overall global emissions reductions are accurate.

Our long term vision (post 2020) is that common rules should be used by all. In the context of a future agreement, common accounting rules would need to be defined by type of commitments.

That said, we do recognise the need to build capacity in developing countries to implement an international accounting system, i.e. its rules, tools and methodologies, while signalling the importance of contributions from all Parties to achieve the 2 degree objective. And support from developed countries will be crucial in this context.

3. What are the main gaps of information on NAMAs communicated to the UNFCCC and what could UNFCCC do to address them?

Fully implementing pledges is cornerstone in achieving necessary 2020 reductions. We encourage those countries that have not yet done so to present their pledges and those who have done so to move to the top of their ranges.

There is a continued need for greater transparency around existing pledges including with regard to how targets and actions are defined and progress in delivery is tracked in terms of actual emission reductions in CO₂eq.

As next steps on the clarification process we see:

Continue to further clarify 2020 pledges and assumptions after the successful conclusion of the LCA. We would see this under the SBs with a clear and technical focus to further clarify the elements behind the pledges described in the Durban decision in a structured and systematic manner.

We recognise the diversity of NAMAS and would like to preserve that; in that regard would also suggest that work is undertaken in SBSTA next year to define what type of information is required for each type of NAMA, with a view to reducing the uncertainty and ensuring transparency, while at the same time preserving diversity.

The information this process has delivered should be summarised by the secretariat so it can serve as useful input/reference to other process of where the 2020 pledges stand.