

Submission by the Republic of Senegal on behalf of the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) Group on inputs to the First Global Stocktake.

The Least Developed Countries Group (LDC Group) welcomes the opportunity to submit inputs to the first Global Stocktake, pursuant to decision 19/CMA.1, paragraph 19, 36 and 37 for the first Global Stocktake (GST).

This submission is structured to respond the "guiding questions by the Subsidiary Bodies Chairs for the Technical Assessment component of the first Global Stocktake", published on 18 February 2022. The section below attempts to respond to the guiding questions, in the light of equity and the best available science, including the latest reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

A. Background

The Global Stocktake (GST) is a key element in the Paris Agreement to take stock of the implementation and to assess the collective progress towards achieving the purpose and long-term goals of the Agreement. The outcome of the GST must provide a clear picture of how the Paris Agreement's ambition mechanism is working in the context of ratcheting up ambition to keep the 1.5°C limit within reach.

In the context of findings from the IPCC AR6 reports, the first GST that started this year will be provide a critical overview of whether the individual bottom-up commitments made by countries under the Paris Agreement are enabling it to meet its collective goals. It will also serve as an important input to guide countries on updating and enhancing climate action and support to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement. The LDC Group believe that the outcome of the GST should not be limited to taking stock of actions, but it should also drive action across all thematic areas that countries should implement while enhancing ambition and action. The output of the GST should consist of key political messages and recommendations, best practices, new opportunities and lessons learned.

B. Thematic inputs

Mitigation

The IPCC WGIII report once again rings the alarm bells by stating that in 2010-2019 average annual global greenhouse gas emissions were at their highest levels in human history. Without

immediate and deep emissions reductions across all sectors, limiting global warming to 1.5°C is beyond reach¹.

The latest NDC Synthesis report confirms that, based on the NDCs assessed, emissions are still on a pathway to increasing by 13.7% by 2030 compared to 2010. To keep the possibility of limiting warming to 1.5°C, the strengthened NDCs must collectively meet the 45 per cent reductions by 2030 - and updated long term strategies must get the world to net zero by 2050. The need for urgency and more ambitious action that is aligned with 1.5°C pathways must translate into strengthened headline targets in NDCs, starting this year.

The latest global assessment undertaken by the Climate Action Tracker (CAT) in November 2021 estimated that under current policies, end of the century warming is likely to be 2.7°C. This points towards the fact that policy development and implementation on the ground is not advancing broadly, deeply or quickly enough. Moreover, the CAT assessment concluded that the current 2030 targets in Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) (without long-term pledges) put us on track for a 2.4°C temperature increase by the end of the century.

Globally, around [90% of emissions are now covered by net zero targets](#). While these targets are an important signal, and some have accelerated governments' climate action, the quality of most remains questionable according to the CAT analysis. This is mainly attributed to the fact that no single country that has been analysed in the CAT, has sufficient short-term policies in place to put itself on track to its net zero target. Moreover, it also includes announcements made by the governments which are not backed up by adequate policies, legislations or plans, while some lack critical fundamental information such as whether net-zero is defined as CO₂ only or cover all greenhouse gases. Despite of all these shortcomings and inaccuracies, the CAT assesses that if all the announced net zero commitments, long-term strategies and NDC targets under discussion are implemented, this would bring temperature estimate for this "[optimistic scenario](#)" down to 1.8°C by 2100, with peak warming of 1.9°C².

In 2019, average global per capita net anthropogenic GHG emissions is estimated to be around 7 tCO₂-eq, while Least Developed Countries (LDCs) have much lower per capita emissions of 1.7 tCO₂-eq than the global average. In 2019, LDCs are estimated to have emitted only 3.3% of global GHG emissions. Moreover, in fossil fuel combustion and industrial processes, LDCs contributed less than 0.4% of historical cumulative emissions³.

It is clear that if emissions are not rapidly reduced within this decade, this would expose the most vulnerable – particularly LDCs – to unacceptable levels of risk and impacts. Even though the contribution of emissions from LDCs are negligible, LDCs are taking actions on all fronts by presenting ambitious actions to reduce emissions and adapt with the impacts of climate change.

¹ IPCC AR6 WG3

² Climate Action Tracker (CAT), 2022

³ IPCC AR6 WG3

As of now, three-quarters (36 LDCs) of 46 LDCs have submitted new and updated NDCs. Likewise, three LDCs have submitted Long-term low greenhouse gas emission development strategies (LT-LEDS) and many other LDCs are in a process of formulating their strategies. Many LDCs have embedded their NDCs within existing institutional frameworks and policies to help ensure effective implementation, and have committed to what is possible within their given limited resources and what needs to be supported for more ambitious action to be taken.

Limited financial and technical capacity has hindered LDCs' formulation of NDCs and LT-LEDS, as well as implementation of the mitigation actions required from them. Likewise, lack of data availability and systems to collect data on a regular basis to project future scenarios constrain the ability of LDCs to engage effectively in long term policy making processes. Despite these constraints, there is also a broader understanding by LDCs in terms of opportunities associated with co-benefits from these mitigation actions that can contribute to overall sustainable development, ensure food and nutrition security and poverty reduction in LDCs.

Adaptation

As stated on the IPCC AR6 WG2 report *"Global warming, reaching 1.5°C in the near-term, would cause unavoidable increases in multiple climate hazards and present multiple risks to ecosystems and humans"*. The report also reminded us of the urgent need for adaptation and limits to adaptation. In the face of unprecedented climate impacts, adaptation to climate change has never been more pressing. By 2050, one billion people in low lying coastal areas face escalating climate risks that will undermine adaptation efforts and approximately 3.3 to 3.6 billion people live in contexts that are highly vulnerable to climate change⁴.

Across sectors and regions, the most vulnerable people and systems are observed to be disproportionately affected. The rise in weather and climate extremes has led to some irreversible impacts as natural and human systems are pushed beyond their ability to adapt. If current greenhouse gas emissions do not rapidly decline in this decade in line with the 1.5°C limit, the prospects for climate resilient development for vulnerable countries are limited. Exceeding 1.5°C will undermine climate resilient development, including surpassing adaptation limits for critical ecosystems and the livelihoods that depend on them.

As indicated by the IPCC AR6 WG2 report, enabling conditions are key for implementing, accelerating and sustaining adaptation in human systems and ecosystems. These include political commitment and follow-through, institutional frameworks, policies and instruments with clear goals and priorities, enhanced knowledge on impacts and solutions, mobilization of and access to adequate financial resources, monitoring and evaluation, and inclusive governance processes.

⁴ IPCC AR6 WG2

Further, the IPCC AR6 WG2 report clearly shows that the vulnerable countries are facing severe constraints to adaptation, particularly on finance. Global climate finance on adaptation is still insufficient. This includes public and private finance sources. Rapid scaling up of climate finance is needed. Enhanced mobilisation and access to financial resources are essential for the implementation of successful adaptation and to reduce adaptation gaps.

Finance flows and means of implementation

While developed countries have made progress in raising their climate finance contributions in recent years, it is clear that the amount being mobilized to date is insufficient to address the investments required to meet the Paris goals. The level of ambition required to keep 1.5°C within reach is not yet reflected in the current finance flows nor in our discussions on climate finance.

The first *report on the determination of the needs of developing country Parties*, from the Standing Committee on Finance indicates that needs from developing countries are valued in the range of four to nine trillion dollars, only up to 2030. In contrast, the target we have in place, from 2020 until 2025 is only USD 100 billion. Moreover, the “climate finance delivery plan” published in October by the COP26 Presidency indicates that the delivery of the USD 100 billion goal by 2020 will not be fulfilled before 2023. The 2020 OECD climate finance report⁵ indicates that the total climate finance provided and mobilised in 2018 was USD 78.9 bn. It is important to note that these figures could be considerably lower depending on what exactly is counted as climate finance. For example, after adjusting reported figures for the grant equivalent of loans and the relevance of projects, Oxfam reached climate specific estimates that amounted to only a third of those reported by the OECD.

The 2021 UNEP Adaptation Gap report indicated that the estimated annual adaptation costs are now in the upper range of the previously estimated (2016) US\$ 140–300 billion by 2030 and US\$ 280–500 billion by 2050. However, in 2018 approximately only USD 16.5 bn were provided and mobilized for adaptation. Between 2016 and 2018 over 70% of climate finance supported mitigation activities (OECD 2020). Clearly the provision of finance for adaptation is far from meeting a scaled-up and balanced allocation with mitigation, as agreed in Article 9.4 of the Paris Agreement. In this context, the Glasgow Climate Pact (paragraph 18 of decision 1/CMA.3) urges developed countries to at least double their collective provision of climate finance for adaptation to developing countries from 2019 levels by 2025. .

According to the OECD report, finance provided specifically to LDCs more than doubled from 2016 to 2018, reaching around USD 15 bn. Nevertheless, financing for LDCs represented only 14% of total climate finance provided and mobilized in the same period. We believe that this amount and share is low and insufficient to meet the needs and priorities of LDCs, especially when the

⁵ OECD 2020, “Climate Finance Provided and Mobilised by Developed Countries”.

adaptation needs are more and exceeded the available finance. Furthermore, a significant share of climate finance provided to LDCs is in the form of loans. From 2016 to 2018, 66% of climate finance provided to LDCs were loans, including for adaptation actions, which mostly supports activities that do not generate revenue. Grants only represented 33% of public climate finance for LDCs during the period 2016-2018.

Besides the provision of the appropriate amount of finance, to achieve the goals under Article 2 of the Paris Agreement, we must urgently tackle a range of political and operational challenges to implement the necessary improvements across the broad financial environment:

- Improving the availability and predictability of support: It is time to go beyond the political announcements. The general statement is necessary and useful to provide a signal and inform what to expect at general level, but this is not enough for supporting effective planning and implementation. It does not ensure predictability in mobilisation of resources. That is why it is important to increase provision of public finance, especially for adaptation where private finance barely goes.
- Improving the accounting and reporting of climate finance. Monitoring progress under a clear and shared understanding of what climate finance is important. Among others, conceptual clarity on areas such as additionality and climate specificity need to be clear.
- Delivering funding options that address the needs of developing countries, including long term finance for transformational investments as well as capacity building and technology transfer is urgently required.
- Increasing the share of grants over loans, especially for adaptation actions and loss and damage.
- Improving and simplifying access to finance. Funding needs to reach the countries with minimum additional burden and in a timely manner.

Loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change

The LDCs are highly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. The SR6 WGI report of the IPCC states that the world has already warmed by 1.1°C due to anthropogenic activities and as a result climate and weather extremes are on the rise. Additionally, the SR6 WGII report confirms that climate change is pushing human and natural systems beyond their ability to adapt and causing irreversible harm in the process, especially for the world's poorest populations. The report also confirms that limiting warming to 1.5°C will avoid the worst impacts of climate change and limit associated loss and damage but will not eliminate them completely.

As warming climbs, the SR6 WGII report projects that climate risks will occur earlier than previously estimated and some of these risks will be much higher than anticipated. If global average temperature crosses the 1.5°C threshold, then climate impacts, including climate extremes, will be much severe and result in the loss of entire ecosystems as well as water and

food shortages. Impacts will also become increasingly irreversible. Moreover, territorial losses will remain a challenge for many small island developing states due to sea level rise. The right to survive for many vulnerable developing countries will be severely affected and the number of climate change refugees will increase dramatically.

Climate impacts and associated loss and damage in LDCs are rising and the arising economic losses are higher than previously estimated. Such impacts that push socio-economic and environmental systems beyond their adaptation limit endanger the prospect of sustainable development in LDCs.

As climate impacts grow, LDCs need to be assisted in identifying and addressing associated loss and damage. The IPCC AR6 WGII report warns that the current financial, governance and institutional arrangements are inadequate to address loss and damage in a comprehensive manner.

In response to the guiding question on loss and damage, the assessment of the LDC group is that the collective progress in terms of implementation of, and ambition in, efforts to enhance action and support to address loss and damage is very far from what is needed at this moment. LDCs are facing **now** significant impacts from extreme events and slow onset events. These impacts will only increase. Therefore much greater speed and ambition is needed in setting up institutional arrangements that can assist LDCs in addressing the loss and damage they face.

To address such loss and damage effectively, the existing institutions under the WIM, including the Santiago Network for Loss and Damage need to be strengthened. The third function of the WIM, to enhance action and support, must be effectively implemented, including through delivering real and meaningful actions at grassroots level in the most vulnerable developing countries. Moreover, and new, additional, dedicated and grant-based finance is required. Loss and damage finance should not be provided in an ad hoc manner, nor derivative of adaptation or disaster risk financing; a dedicated loss and damage finance facility is required, with significant resourcing. A loss and damage finance mechanism or facility is absolutely essential to ensure a full and effective implementation of Article 8 of the Paris Agreement.

Engagement of non-party stakeholder

As the Global Stock take is framed as a transparent, inclusive process involving the participation of non-Party stakeholders, the LDC Group recognizes the need for effective engagement of non-Party stakeholders throughout the GST process, which will strengthen the ownership of the process. Lessons can be drawn from past practices undertaken in regional meetings, the Technical Examination Process (TEP) and the work of climate champions to facilitate engagement of stakeholders.

C. Organization of the Technical Assessment

The three Technical Dialogues of the Technical Assessment are important steps of the GST process, where the inputs will be considered and discussed with experts. It will be important for wider stakeholders to better understand the overall organization of the Technical Dialogues, particularly the approach for conducting the three meetings of the Technical Dialogue to ensure consideration of all inputs and topics in a balanced, holistic and comprehensive manner. Having this information about the approaches and organizing the work of the dialogue for each thematic area, including the cross-cutting elements (equity and best available science) and loss and damage, well in advance of the Dialogues will help to organize the input process, and subsequently support the co-facilitators of the Dialogue to prepare a summary report after each Dialogue session. The synthesized key findings from the technical assessment would then serve as input to the process that will consider the outputs component of the GST.

Therefore, following the advice of the Chairs of the SBSTA and SBI, as mentioned in the non-paper, the LDC Group strongly encourage the co-facilitators of the Technical Dialogue to prepare and share well in advance an approach for conducting the three meetings of the Technical Dialogue. This would help lead to a consideration of all inputs and topics in a balanced, holistic and comprehensive manner.
