

**Mitigation Work Programme**  
**2024 Global Dialogues and Investment-Focused Events**  
**Submission by the United States of America | February 2024**

This submission contains the United States' views on topics for the mitigation work programme (MWP) global dialogues and investment-focused events in 2024. In addition, the submission includes U.S. views on how to more effectively organize the MWP in 2024, reflecting on lessons learned from 2023.

**Context and Mandate**

The objective of the MWP is to urgently scale up mitigation ambition and implementation in this critical decade *in a manner that complements the global stocktake*. The global stocktake (GST) decision at CMA5 contains Parties' assessment of collective progress towards the long-term temperature goal of the Paris Agreement and identifies specific follow-up actions that Parties and non-Party stakeholders should take in the 2020s to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius. The MWP in 2024 should "complement" the GST mitigation outcome by selecting topics that build upon and meaningfully advance that outcome.

**2024 Topics**

In this regard, the United States suggests the following topics for 2024:

**1<sup>st</sup> Global Dialogue and investment-focused event (IFE)**

**Topic:** Buildings

**Specific focus:** The role of buildings in doubling the global average annual rate of energy efficiency improvements by 2030 (GST decision, para. 28(a))

**Subtopics:**

- Maximizing energy efficiency in new buildings
- Retrofitting existing building stock to maximize energy efficiency
- Low-emission/ carbon sequestering materials

Every country must construct new buildings to meet the needs of its people. The design of these buildings, decisions on the associated energy systems, materials used, and settlement designs all affect greenhouse gas emissions. In areas with significant existing building stocks, renovating existing building stock to meet current preferences and take advantage of advances in technology also represents a major opportunity to improve energy efficiency and enhance the resilience of the built environment.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Global Dialogue and IFE**

**Topic:** Industrial Processes and Product Use (IPPU)

**Specific focus:** The role of IPPU in accelerating substantial reductions of non-carbon-dioxide emissions globally by 2030 (GST decision, para. 28(f))

**Subtopics:**

- Technological advances in reducing emissions from hard-to-abate industries (e.g. steel, cement, aluminum)-
- Options to enhance estimations and accelerate substitution of fluorinated gases (F-gases), in particular hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) in the IPPU sector
- Opportunities to enhance estimations to reduce emissions of nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) in the IPPU sector
- Opportunities to reduce emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) in the IPPU sector

Emissions from the IPPU sector represent around twelve percent of global GHG emissions<sup>1</sup>, with emissions projected to grow with an increase in industrial production worldwide. Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) is the primary greenhouse gas emitted by this sector, with industries including cement, steel, aluminum, lime, iron, glass, and ammonia emitting CO<sub>2</sub> through production. Recent years have produced examples of technology breakthroughs that reduce the emissions from these industries, along with commitments by buyers via the First Movers Coalition and other initiatives to further spur emissions reductions in this sector. The IPPU sector is the primary emitter of F-gases, including HFCs, with applications in refrigeration, air-conditioning, insulating foams, aerosol propellants, solvents, and fire protection. While all F-gases only make up approximately two percent of global GHG emissions, the emission trends of these potent gases are notable. Between 1990 and 2019, F-gas emissions from developed country Parties increased by 48.2 per cent due to HFC use in refrigeration and air conditioning.<sup>2</sup> Between 2000 and 2015, F-Gas emissions from developing country Parties grew by 1,100.2 per cent.<sup>3</sup> Many countries, and industries, have examples to share of policies and programs leading to reductions of HFCs, including in connection with the implementation of the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol. The IPPU sector also emits N<sub>2</sub>O from the production of nitric acid and adipic acid; again, pioneering efforts can highlight opportunities to reduce emissions of this potent gas during industrial production.

### **Cross-Cutting Topic**

In addition to the specific topics suggested above, we suggest that each global dialogue feature a “TED-style” talk tackling a time-sensitive, cross-cutting issue. In 2024, we suggest that one “TED-style” talk focus on the technical process of synching short-term and long-term greenhouse gas targets, including the use of modeling and potential sources of data and analysis. This type of expert technical input would be helpful for policymakers and other stakeholders seeking to enhance ambition in this decade, including through the communication of ambitious long-term low greenhouse gas emission development strategies in 2024 and NDCs in 2025. As such, it would help respond to paragraphs 37, 39, and 42 of the GST decision. We suggest the second “TED-style talk” focus on the role of non-CO<sub>2</sub> gases in combatting climate change in this decade, in support of the implementation of GST paragraph 28 (f). This talk could focus on the importance of these incredibly potent greenhouse gases in limiting near-term temperature rise, and options to curb emissions including methane from the livestock, waste, and oil and gas sectors; N<sub>2</sub>O from agricultural applications; and the range of gases associated with the IPPU sector, as described above.

### **Improving the Organization of the MWP**

2023 marked the first year of MWP implementation, with significant improvements in organization from the first global dialogue and IFE to the second. However, additional improvements are needed. This is important if the MWP is to achieve its objective to urgently scale up mitigation ambition and implementation in this critical decade. The United States recommends the following improvements:

1. **Expand the space for participants to engage actively in discussions.** Build much more time for discussion among participants, and questions and answers with presenters, into the agenda. Include “world café”-style sessions for virtual participants by using virtual break-out rooms, as the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement processes have done for other online events. Have more breakout rooms, allowing for fewer people in each room, and mix up groups from day to day. In the first two global dialogues, senior experts were in some cases able to speak for less than a minute each, over three days of participation. The MWP will not continue to attract expert engagement with this approach.
2. **Reduce the limit on virtual participants from Parties and registered observers.** The objective should be to have as many people benefit from the MWP as possible, and the cost of additional virtual participants is minimal. As noted above, active participation for a greater number of people can be achieved through additional virtual break-out sessions.

3. **Create spaces to follow up on requests for expert input arising from previous dialogues.** This might be done through virtual panels or ask-the-expert sessions, open to all interested participants. Such follow-up, which would not have a formal output, would increase the potential of the MWP to actually provide value to participants.
4. **Take advantage of planned events to add dialogue space.** Upon request by regional groups, and budget permitting, host dialogues in the margins of regional climate events or relevant global climate or energy events. This would allow additional stakeholders from a region to engage in MWP discussions, multiplying the impact of the process. These dialogues should be hybrid in nature and open to participants from all regions.
5. **Advance submissions on case studies and speakers for Global Dialogues and IFEs.** The current guidance requests submissions four weeks in advance of a planned Global Dialogue. This does not allow the co-chairs to confirm specifics of the Global Dialogue and IFE with sufficient time to identify relevant experts and to seek the travel authorizations required by many. It also does not provide the co-chairs with enough time to assess a full range of examples and case studies, experts and stakeholders, and craft a complete agenda. Submitting recommendations for case studies, best practices, and speakers by March 31, four weeks after the co-chairs confirm the Global Dialogue topics, would create a much more certain process.