



# Summer School 2014

of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV

## Main Findings

Gonçalo Cavalheiro & Johanna Bergmann  
September 10, 2014  
Punta Cana, Dominican Republic





# The 2015 agreement

- Elements to be included:
  - International carbon budget in line with scientific requirements to stay below 1.5 or 2°C = long term goal
  - Applicable to all, taking into account CBDR-RC
  - Comparable mitigation contributions
  - Adaptation
  - Transparency – common metric to track progress – convertible INDCs
  - Finance / support
  - Capacity building
  - Technology Transfer
  - Acknowledgement of non-state actors and sub-national actors' efforts
  - Evolving INDCs which become more ambitious over time
  - Non-compliance mechanism /compliance regime
- Some elements might be fix and some more flexible (bones and meat)
- non-paper by ADP co-chairs might prove helpful
- Unsolved questions:
  - When does the I in INDCs get removed?
  - How can a country accept a more ambitious target in the negotiations if the existing INDC has been elaborated in a democratic / stakeholder process?





# Ambition

- Current efforts not enough to bridge the emission gap but still technically possible to meet 2°C target.
  - Shedding light on co-benefits
  - Regular cycle of contributions and their assessment (no back-sliding)
  - Comparability
  - Increasing the level of knowledge
- Challenges
  - Definition of ambition
  - Comparability
  - Definition of equity / fairness
- Ways of raising ambition:
  - Having good domestic MRV systems
  - Initiatives like the NAMA facility
  - Pressure by non-state actors (NGOs, media, ...), by peers
- Preconditions
  - Comparability,
  - Transparency,
  - Up-front information
  - National / international assessment
  - Narrative of how countries arrived at their INDC and how they think to achieve it
  - Domestically: alignment of policies, cooperation between stakeholders, designated budget



# INDCs

- Different types of targets possible
  - Absolute, economy wide targets
  - Carbon intensity
  - Percentage below BAU
  - Policies and actions (?)
- Useful elements:
  - Clear goals (type of goal)
  - Time frame
  - clearly defined roles and responsibilities
  - Up-front information
  - policies and plans that will achieve this reduction
  - narrative on equity and fairness
  - narrative on ambition level
  - Domestic resources and support needed
  - Institutional set-up
  - MRV system
  - Conditionalities
  - Expected costs and co-benefits
- Open questions:
  - How to make INDCs transformational?
    - Link it to a long-term vision
    - Mainstream it to the development and growth agenda
  - Which other aspects should be covered in the INDCs and how? (means of implementation? Adaptation?)
- It will be difficult to compare contributions if countries choose differently, e.g. base and target years.
- Accounting the effect of individual policies and measures might require more resources than accounting an overall intensity target.
- Guidance given by a guidebook elaborated by ecofys for GIZ and the "Open Book Initiative" by WRI
- Support available from the Partnership



# Preparation of INDCs

- INDCs (incl. UFI) to be presented by March 2015 by those Parties able to do so
- broad views regarding the finalisation of INDCs, e.g. both assessment and formalisation occurring in 2015, or formalisation happening in 2015 and assessment in 2016.
- Process of preparation involves
  - analysis, (compilation of information)
  - Evaluation of costs and needs / gaps
  - Identification of co-benefits
  - political endorsement,
  - Stakeholder engagement
  - National assessment of ambition level
  - Package and present INDC
- Challenges:
  - Access to data (current and former)
  - Limited time
  - Limited capacities
  - lack of understanding of what an INDC should include,
  - lack of financial and human resources,
  - lack of clarity on what compliance and accountability mechanisms will look like
  - Lack of coordination and responsibilities



# Up-front information

- Up-front information is crucial to understand countries' contributions, build trust, track global and domestic progress and evaluate and compare ambition levels
- Up-front information may include:
  - Target type
  - sector coverage,
  - metrics and methodologies,
  - Gases, covered
  - Territory covered
  - selection of base year or base line
  - Target year
  - Peak year
  - commitment period,
  - percentage reduction,
  - Use of market mechanisms / flexible mechanisms
  - Information on the policies to be used
  - Information on the MRV system to be applied
  - Business as usual estimates, including assumptions
  - How it was calculated
  - Treatment of LULUCF
  - If BAU: fixed projections or dynamic. If dynamic, under what conditions?
  - if intensity: expected growth of GDP and emissions



# Assessment of INDCs

- Assessment of INDCs needed to analyze whether we are on track to meet the 2°C target and explore whether the level of ambition of individual contributions can be raised.
- The process may be different before and after Paris, given time and resource implications of having the Paris deadline.
- The post-2020 framework may see a regular cycle of contributions, supported by various assessments, e.g. individual, aggregate, support, implementation, ambition and equity.
- The international community could consider setting up a space for exploring how to more effectively assess the ambition and equity level of the contributions (methodological development).
- Regular cycle of review and revision post-2020 should include provisions for no backsliding and provide regular opportunity (and international pressure) for countries to scale up their contribution.
- Open questions:
  - Who should undertake the assessments?
  - How often should contributions be put forward and assessed if opted for a regular cycle?
  - How can the “threshold of pain” be tested?
  - What is the right ambition level for countries whose economies benefit from more ambitious efforts?
  - How can the assessment process lead to more ambition? How does it feed into the “scaling-up process”?
  - How to handle parties that have not handed in a contribution? (compliance, incentives)

Sources: WRI papers “Race to the top – Driving ambition in the 2015 agreement” (2014) and “A Pathway to a Climate Change Agreement in 2015 – Options for setting and reviewing GHG emission reduction offers” (2013)



# Domestic implementation of commitments

- Need of capacity and institution building to ensure the implementation of commitments and MRV/accounting
  - National policy process and INDC process inform and spur each other
  - Important to show how much public money has already been spent on mitigation and what it has achieved
  - Consider both technological solutions and behavioral changes
- long-term vision / strategy to be able to do R&D and implement policies before it's too late (lock-in effects) and to create predictability (in particular for private sector engagement)
  - Give it „teeth“ ... High level political ownership
  - legal framework,
  - policies that incentivize change.
  - Enabling environment
  - good data base on gaps, emissions, capacities, finance, mitigation
  - stakeholders engagement
  - narrative of how you plan to achieve your target
  - MRV systems for emissions, for emission reductions, for policies, including precise indicators (later on we also discussed tracking of finance which is still at an early stage of development, also in developed countries),
  - Dedicated budget

- Important to have:





# MRV and accounting

- The post 2020 regime should build upon lessons from current MRV requirements and include elements to which all parties should aspire taking into account their CBDR RC.
- There are some commonalities between MRV requirements for developing and developed countries, which provide a platform forward,
- However, there are still gaps which are related to capacity issues
- Important to strike a balance between additional requirements (frequency and level of detail) and benefit. Initial cost in setting up the MRV system is seen to be a barrier. Up-front support matters.
- A Capacity Building Mechanism to support Parties in building domestic capacity is crucial for monitoring, reporting as well as verification to allow for all parties to be at the same place at some point in the future (KP as potential benchmark). A phased approach, including tiers and piloting could help parties move forward, bearing in mind CBDR RC.
- MRV needs to be strengthened for mitigation, adaptation as well as support (revision of guidelines?). Methodological guidance on adaptation, finance and accounting needs to be developed taking into account any ongoing work.
- Definition of 'accounting' is still lacking
- Accounting rules define „what counts“ and lay out a clear framework for assessing countries' progress and achievements toward their target/goal.
- Accounting enables the comparison of allowable emissions to accountable emissions
- Two standards from WRI can be used:
  - Policies and actions standard
  - Mitigation goal standard
- Knowledge product of Summer School 2013 of the International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV “An accounting framework – background and recommendations”
- Lessons learned in the preparation of BR/BUR:
  - All countries are involved in preparing either NC or BUR
  - Most will submit BUR by end of 2014, others in 2015
  - Countries invested in building capacity of national teams, reducing outsourcing
  - Data quality and availability vary in different sectors; efforts to engage the private sector
  - Timeliness of support is key for fulfilment of commitments by developing countries



Which findings would you  
like to add?

...



# Thank you for your attention!



Johanna Bergmann  
bergmann.slw@gmail.com

