



**Progress towards a global climate agreement  
Imperial College  
London, United Kingdom 17 September 2013**

**Halldór Thorgeirsson, Director for Implementation Strategy  
United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change**

Ladies and gentlemen,

I will assume that I can take acceptance of the following as points of departure for our conversation:

- Ignoring climate change is not an option.
- Time available is severely limited and delay in changing policies will only make the required transformation more disruptive and painful.
- Further disruption to the climate system can be averted with swift and appropriate policy responses, most of which will bring significant co-benefits.
- There is no one silver bullet and results will not come overnight calling for long-term strategic focus.

The findings of the study launched here today significantly strengthen the growing evidence base demonstrating that preventing major disruptions to the climate system remains feasible.

I am here to update you on on-going efforts to design and reach convergence among Governments on a new global climate agreement for the period after 2020 to be adopted in Paris in December 2015.

To put the new agreement into context, it is essential to understand where the global effort to address climate change stands at the moment. The world can't wait until 2020 and Parties are determined to deliver tangible results in the critically important six years remaining of this decade. This includes putting in place the pillars of a strategic approach to cooperative action.

We are witnessing a major mobilization for action and growing momentum behind the needed economic transition. This is happening at national and sub-national levels and in business and civil society. Multilateral cooperative arrangements bringing together actors around targeted objectives are multiplying.

Leadership is increasingly coming from developing countries and from non-state actors. Awareness of the problem and, more importantly, appreciation for the co-benefits of the solutions, is growing. In fact, climate change is unlikely to be the sole driver for the big policy shifts.

You can't be blamed for drawing the conclusions from the headlines flowing from climate meetings since the Copenhagen Climate Summit in 2009 that Governments are

hopelessly divided and can't agree to anything of significance. The international process is not paralyzed and when the history of global climate governance will be written, I suspect that Copenhagen will be seen as "the most successful failure" in the climate negotiations as one of the leading UK climate policy academics put it.

Why do I say this? The fact of the matter is that all aspects of the Accord agreed by world leaders in that famed room during the chaotic final hours of Copenhagen have, given time to analyse and consult, been turned into reality through decisions adopted through consensus in Cancun, Durban and Doha.

All Parties to the Convention have committed to take action to control net emissions of greenhouse gases, to communicate their plans up to 2020 to the international community and to increase the frequency of reporting on efforts and of results. Parties to the Kyoto Protocol have agreed to a second commitment period containing caps on 2014-2020 emissions. National adaptation plans are also being drawn up.

This commitment to action is coupled with commitments to scale up the mobilization of climate finance and to refocus technology cooperation. Developed country Parties have committed to the goal of mobilizing by 2020 100 billion USD annually in support of climate change action by developing country Parties.

A new Fund, the Green Climate Fund, has been established and its Board will next month complete consideration of the GCF Business Model Framework, which will allow the Fund to launch resource mobilization next year. The permanent secretariat for the GCF will commence operations in Songdo in the Republic of Korea shortly taking over from a small interim secretariat we have hosted in Bonn jointly with the Global Environment Facility.

The operational arm of a new Technology Mechanism, the Climate Technology Centre and Network, based in Copenhagen, will shortly open its doors to developing countries wishing to seek assistance in preparing investment grade policies and measures that can unlock emission reduction opportunities and integrate climate resilience into development initiatives. The aim is to generate a pipeline of well-designed and bankable strategies, policies, programmes and projects that already have buy-in from governments, technical institutions, financiers and the private sector. To CTCN is looking for partners to achieve this.

Governments are also taking scientific advice. Next week their representatives will gather in Stockholm to approve line-by-line the first instalment of the findings the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (the IPCC) namely on the physical science basis. The other three instalments will be presented for Government approval in the course of the next twelve months. The AR5 will make the scientific foundation for a strong policy response even firmer, further strengthening the case for action in Paris.

At the same time, Parties to the Convention have agreed to evaluate the adequacy of the upper limit of acceptable warming, now set at 2°C, and the progress made towards limiting warming. This review is to be concluded in 2015 at the same time as the negotiations of the Paris Agreement and has the potential to become a precursor for the science policy interface needed to make the new agreement capable of managing the pathway to stabilization.

These encouraging signs should not lead to complacency, however. The sum total of all of these positive developments will not add up to what is needed to bend the curve and mankind is not on track to limit warming to 2°C. There is clearly a need for a step change in

Paris. The core challenge is to achieve sufficient scale, speed and strategic focus of the global policy response.

Scale is needed because of the magnitude of the required transition.

Speed is needed because of the inherent inertia and the time it takes for policies adjustments to have impact.

Strategic focus is needed because of the long-term nature of the problem.

In other words, the Paris agreement needs to be anchored in current reality but at the same time capable of transforming that reality.

Rest assured; there will be a deal in Paris no matter what. What future generations need is a meaningful deal capable of delivering the needed scale, speed and strategic focus.

We are now approaching the halfway point on the road from Durban to Paris. The negotiations are now moving into their content forming phase where the elements of the actual outcome are starting to emerge.

The deal in Paris will need to go beyond delivering the core legal agreement and refocus political attention on the broader economic reform agenda required to deliver the needed transformation. To sharpen that political focus, the UN Secretary-General has decided to convene a Climate Change Summit in New York one year from now. He is taking this important step to mobilize not just Government leaders but also leaders of thought and non-governmental decision makers.

Next year, 2014, will therefore be a year of mobilization, delivery and the refocusing of the longer-term policy direction. Capitals don't need to wait for the international negotiations to conclude before launching the domestic, and the case of the EU, regional processes to determine what each Party is prepared to do post 2020. Many are quite advanced in this homework and will use the SGs event next year to announce their intentions. The Warsaw Conference in November is expected to help Parties focus their homework.

The hardest nut to crack is designing lasting structures capable of providing true strategic focus to the risk management exercise of finding a safe landing zone for global emissions that respect the dual objective of meeting human needs while respecting planetary boundaries. Negotiating the content of national obligations at the international level would likely result in a zero-sum game and a race to the bottom. At the same time, letting every nation decide in isolation what it can bring to the table will simply not add up to what is required.

The negotiators are now actively exploring how these top-down and bottom-up imperatives can be combined. How the understandable desire of national Governments to remain in control over the determination of their national obligations can be reconciled with the equally compelling global imperative of staying on track. This brings in profound equity considerations. There is growing realization that this reconciliation will not be achieved once for all in Paris and will need to be one of the core functions of the new agreement.

However, Paris would not be a success if all it does is put in place the needed longer-term arrangements to capture national obligations and to strengthen their ambition over time. For that reason, Governments need to be prepared to put credible commitments on the table in Paris. They will also need to be ready to be held accountable for the delivery on their obligations.

- - - - -