

Path to Paris: Issues & Strategies

Mahendra Kumar
Advisor, Climate Change



Presentation

- Background: UNFCCC processes
- Lima Call for Action
- Key unresolved issues
 - Adaptation
 - Loss & Damage
- INDCs
 - Unresolved Issues
- Key issues for PICs
- Conclusions

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)

- UNFCCC Ratified by 196 Parties
- Kyoto Protocol Ratified by 192 Parties
- **“stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that will prevent dangerous human interference with the climate system”.**
- Doha amendment: 2nd commitment period (2013-2020), ratified by 44 countries

Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP)

- **Mandate: to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties, which is to be completed no later than 2015 in order for it to be adopted at the twenty-first session of the Conference of the Parties (COP) and for it to come into effect and be implemented from 2020.**

Lima Call for Climate Action 20th Conference of Parties Decision

.....shall address in a **balanced** manner, inter alia, **mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology development and transfer, capacity-building, and transparency of action and support;**



Lima Decision (cont'd)

9. Reiterates its invitation to each Party to communicate to the secretariat its **intended nationally determined contribution** towards achieving the objective of the Convention as set out in its Article 2;

11. Also agrees that the **least developed countries** and **small island developing states** may communicate information on strategies, plans and actions for low greenhouse gas emission development reflecting their special circumstances in the context of intended nationally determined contributions:



2015 Negotiations to Paris

- New Chairs for ADP
- Geneva meeting in March: Geneva Negotiating Text (100 pages)
- Bonn meeting in June (reduced text by 20 pages)
- Co-Chairs asked to produce consolidated text
- Co-Chairs Tool: Basis of current negotiations in Bonn

Co Chairs' Tool

Geneva Negotiating Text divided into three categories:

- (i) Provisions that are, by their nature, obviously appropriate for inclusion in an agreement
- (ii) Provisions that are, by their nature, obviously appropriate for inclusion in a decision
- (iii) Provisions whose placement requires further clarity among Parties in relation to the draft agreement or draft decision.

Informal Lima Dialogue

- No agreement on the **legal form** of the Agreement in Paris.
- Most prefer a **protocol or legally binding instrument of similar form**.
- Some developing countries are still holding out for **COP Decisions** only (notably India and Singapore).
- Most Alliance of Small Island Developing States want a **legally binding Protocol**.



Paris Dialogue

- Still debate whether “below 2 degrees C” or “below 1.5 degrees C” will be the basis for a long term goal
- EU support 2 deg C,
- AOSIS, LDCs, Africa Group want below 1.5 deg C
- References to a longer term goal around 2050 based on the term “decarbonisation” still controversial.
- Oil Producing Countries are not supporting the term “decarbonisation”.

Unresolved Issues

Adaptation

- A developed country said that in the context of adaptation, **political parity is not the same as legal symmetry**
- (meaning that adaptation could be addressed by COP decisions rather than being full incorporated in the legally binding agreement.)



Loss and Damage

- A mechanism to help countries rebuild after the impacts of climate change
- Includes arrangements for risk transfer (e.g. Insurance – Caribbean Catastrophe Risk Insurance, crop insurance, micro-insurance, etc.
- Arrangement for assisting people displaced by the impacts of climate change
- Compensation regime for permanent losses due to “slow-onset” events, e.g. sea level rise, ocean acidification, increased temperatures, etc.



Loss & Damage (cont'd)

- There is still some resistance to including Loss and Damage in the new legal agreement.
- The US strongly opposed to the idea
- There was a sense that developing language referring to a collective responsibility could be a way forward.
- Direct reference to **compensation** was not popular particularly among developed countries.
- The notion of some financial mechanism to compensate some countries for their extreme weather or climate would mark a large and acrimonious step in the climate debate, especially in a time of faltering international economies.



Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs)

- INDCs are **mitigation** contributions (target) set by each country to reduce their emissions from 2020.
- All countries are asked to produce an INDC
- Some countries are also producing an INDC for **adaptation** but this is not compulsory
- In October all the INDCs received will be compiled by the Climate Change Secretariat.
- The Secretariat will assess whether the aggregate leads us to a pathway that will prevent dangerous climate change (below 2 deg C or 1.5 deg C)



INDCs (cont'd)

- The informal meeting group in Lima suggested that INDCs should be **nationally** determined with **no backsliding** provisions (once you set a reduction target, a country cannot set a lower level next time).
- There is a view that INDCs would remain intended in Paris and would become **Nationally Determined Commitments (NDCs)** at the time of ratification.



Nationally Determined Commitments

- Some believe that the NDCs would be housed in an annex to the legal agreement (European Union, Alliance of Small Island States, the Least Developed Countries)
- Others believe that the NDCs should be incorporated into a COP decision as a schedule or registry (US, Australia, New Zealand)
- Others are unclear but are tending towards a COP decision registry (China and the Like Minded Developing Countries)

Unresolved Issues within INDCs

- There is still debate whether there should be a goal for adaptation.
- Strong support for an adaptation goal from developing countries.
- Some suggest that the goal should be linked to mitigation effort.

Unresolved Issues within INDCs

- Length of the **Commitment Period**
- Some want a **5 year commitment** period 2020-2025 (US, Least Developed Countries, Alliance of Small Island States, Group of Latin American countries called AILAC)
- Others want a **10 year commitment** period, 2020-2030 (EU, China, Singapore, Brazil)

Review Process

- The current INDC process has a form of **ex ante review** (publish targets early, they are reviewed and then finalised).
- Push back from a number of large developing countries (China, Brazil) to have a review process that will assess individual INDCs for the start of each commitment period
- General agreement for a review to a **global assessment** of collective ambition all INDCs combined

Current Status of INDCs

- Over 50 INDCs submitted
- Represent around 60% of emissions
- Falling far short of 1.5 degrees goal
- Urgent need to address “ambition gap”
- Giving greater impetus to 5-year cycle

Status of INDCs

- Switzerland 50% by 2030 relative to 1990
(Copenhagen) 20% by 2020 relative to 1990
- European Union 40% by 2030 relative to 1990
(Copenhagen) 20-30% by 2030 relative to 1990
- Norway 40% by 2030 relative to 1990
(Copenhagen) 40% by 2020 relative to 1990
- US 26-28% by 2025 relative to 2005
(Copenhagen) 17% by 2020 relative to 2005
- Russian Federation 25-30% by 2030 relative to 1990
(Copenhagen) 15-25% by 2020 relative to 1990

Submitted INDCs

- Australia: 26 to 28 per cent below 2005 levels by 2030
- New Zealand: 30% below 2005 levels by 2030
- Singapore: Emissions Intensity by 36% from 2005 levels by 2030
- Trinidad & Tobago: emissions from three key sectors by 15% by 2030 from BAU; No adaptation

Status of PIC INDCs

- RMI: first SIDS to submit INDC with ambitious targets: 32% below 2010 by 2025; 45% below 2010 by 2030 with a “view to achieving net zero GHG emission by 2050
- Other countries have begun process: Kiribati, Nauru, Tuvalu, Solomons, Vanuatu, Fiji, PNG

Levels of Ambitions?

Climate Tracker (Fairness of Contributions)

Inadequate: Australia, NZ, Japan, Korea, Russia, Canada

Medium: Switzerland, USA, EU, Norway, Mexico

Satisfactory: Gabon, Ethiopia, Morocco

- Helen Clark on NZ target – "a lift in ambition"
- Connie Hedegaard on Australia's stance: "the world is changing track, hopefully Australia is too"

Diversity in INDCs

- DRC – 17% below **business as usual** by 2030, 90% emissions from agriculture/forestry
- RMI – 45% below 2010 levels by 2030
 - Reduce reliance on imported fossil fuels
- NZ - 30% below 2005 levels by 2030
 - 48% emissions from Agriculture /Forestry
- Australia - 26 to 28% below 2005 levels by 2030; Direct Action, 87% energy from fossil fuels.

PICs INDCs

- Low emissions but opportunity to link to sustainable development efforts;
- Reduce reliance on imported fossil fuels;
- ‘Holistic’ – all of government approach, link to SD and sectoral plans;
- Ambitious but realistic;
- Can be ‘conditional’ and/or ‘unconditional’
- SIDS have flexibility to submit, no deadline.

Advice to PICs on INDCs

- Sudden rush to get INDC out of the door
- COP decision gives SIDS and LDCs flexibility
- Important that INDCs are based on robust information and data.
- Should be inclusive – all arms of government, all sectors, involve private sector and civil society.
- Need buy-in and country ownership

Key Contentious Issues

- Will the Paris Agreement be a Protocol, a set of COP decisions or a combination of both?
- Will NDCs/INDCs be in the Paris Agreement?
- Will the INDCs presented by Parties lead us on a temperature stabilisation pathway of 1.5 deg C or 2 deg C or above?

- Will new finance be forthcoming?
- Will there be a review mechanism for assessing financial contributions
- Will adaptation be properly treated in the Agreement or left to COP decisions?
- Will Loss and Damage be included in the Agreement?

Signs of Optimism

- New vision of world's economy based on clean, renewable sources
- Universal support of huge cross-sections of society
- The only way to ensure stabilisation of GHG concentrations
- If energy system not decarbonised by 2050, there will be no 'fairness' or 'equity'

Our hope.....

- Those with greater responsibility and capability must act first and support others to get to a new energy future.
- That means insuring that we do not neglect the challenges of adapting to the climate change impacts happening already today.

Demands from Paris

- Long-term mitigation, recognising ‘differentiation’
- Need for Parties to increase pre 2020 ambitions
- Strong outcomes for **finance**, pre and post 2020
- Equal support for **adaptation**
- Inclusion of **Loss & Damage**
- Strengthened **technology mechanism**, incl R&D, recognising SIDS special circumstances

Worth noting.....

“Governments should not trade off ambition, fairness, and effectiveness for consensus. The world can't afford to leave Paris with a **lowest common denominator** agreement that fails to meaningfully tackle the problem of climate change.”

Link to Sustainable Development Goals

- The Paris outcomes should build on this momentum and promote the effective integration of human rights and gender equality into climate action.
- Would contribute to the implementation of the Post-2015 sustainable development agenda.

Two Key Questions

If we do have a Paris
Protocol will **key**
countries ratify it?

Will the Paris Agreement be ambitious
enough to save Kiribati, Marshalls
& Tuvalu?

