



*“We need to help non-Party stakeholders achieve the recognition they seek. At the same time, we owe it to the integrity of the UNFCCC process to make sure that these initiatives and coalitions achieve the targets they set for themselves; that these targets are truly consistent with the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement; and that the participants in initiatives and coalitions are actually doing what it takes to achieve the commitments they made. Therefore, we intend to work on improving transparency of action and tracking of implementation to demonstrate the credibility of their work.” (Call for Submissions on the road map for global climate action, 3).*

In addition to the contribution made by CAN International, CCFD-Terre Solidaire would like to submit complementary elements in response to the invitation made by the two high-level Champions, Laurence Tubiana and Hakima El Haite.

#### *1. How do we assess the initiatives?*

CCFD-Terre Solidaire believes a distinction needs to be made between the selection and inclusion of initiatives in the LPAA and the monitoring once they have been selected.

In order to strengthen commitments made by the collective initiatives, it is essential to first redefine criteria of inclusion. The six existing criteria are too vague and there is no guarantee of their application. For instance, the 4 per 1000 initiative or the West African Climate Smart Initiative which are both part of the agricultural sector of the LPAA have neither showcased implementation, nor demonstrated their capacity to deliver the commitments made. Criteria of exclusion should also be settled to avoid false solutions and negative impacts. For example, all actors involved in the LPAA should show consistency between the initiative and their general policy. Zero deforestation and zero land grabbing must also be red lines to respect.

We believe any potential LPAA initiative should be consistent with common guiding principles, including human rights and environmental integrity considerations. Those guiding principles could be based on existing international obligations, including the Paris Agreement preamble. In addition to those common principles, criteria can be set by sector (agriculture, forest, transport, renewable energy, energy access and efficiency, resilience, cities and subnationals, private finance, business, innovation, building, short lived climate pollutants) to better suit specific stakes. In terms of monitoring and transparency, every actor should deliver an annual report as a basis to assess their action, based on different criteria (see below). Last but not least, a grievance mechanism for communities impacted by one of the initiative should be developed and operationalised to ensure a right-based approach.

#### *2. What would be the ideal set of criteria?*

CCFD-Terre Solidaire believes sets of criteria should be established for each sector. For instance and regarding agriculture that is closely followed by CCFD-Terre Solidaire, this set of criteria could be made of two types: 1) criteria related to the agrarian structure evolution to ensure the initiative is truly transformative (GHG emissions, contribution to the four pillars of food security, farming systems, etc.); 2) criteria related to the safeguards in order to assess potential negative impacts (e.g. Voluntary Guidelines on the responsible Governance of land Tenure, biodiversity and water management, Free, Prior and

Informed Consent, etc.). Those criteria could then be operationalised through the establishment of indicators and the use of existing tools (such as the ex-ante guide for large scale based investment in agriculture).

3. *Who would assess them?*

CCFD-Terre Solidaire feels that clearer governance for the Lima-Paris Action Agenda is needed. A specific team should be identified to drive it with efficiency and with a clear mandate (UNFCCC or UN). For each sector, a college of experts could be identified. Synergies with others UN Conventions should be encouraged to ensure consistency and avoid overlapping. For instance, FAO experts and the High Level Panel of Expert of the CFS (Committee on world food security) could be part of the college of experts for the agricultural sector.

4. *What should be the role of the Non-State Actor Zone for Climate Action (NAZCA)?*

CCFD-Terre Solidaire would like to raise awareness on the fact that LPAA and NAZCA do not have the same level of institutionalisation within the Paris Agreement. Therefore, a differentiation has to be made between those two spaces. The LPAA must be considered as the golden standard of transformative actions to close the ambition gap by 2020 within a rights-based approach that protects environmental integrity and fundamental rights. By showcasing certain initiatives, the LPAA has the responsibility to establish strong criteria to assess and monitor them, especially if those are then linked to the NDCs. On the other hand, NAZCA tends to be a platform for information and communication with an inventory of numerous climate actions (thousands of them whilst the LPAA is only targeting less than hundred initiatives) that cannot be retained in the official GHG emission reduction efforts. A close follow-up of those actions seems unrealistic and CCFD-Terre Solidaire believes NAZCA should not be included in the LPAA's team mandate as the platform is not equipped to evaluate the transformative potential of the initiatives.