



CARE International submission to the Talanoa Dialogueⁱ

Question 1: Where are we?

Climate change is already severely impacting hundreds of millions of people, and this is expected to increase in impact and breadth. Limiting temperature increase to 1.5°C, as envisaged by the Paris Agreement, remains essential to avoid the worst scenarios of climate change.

Already in Paris all countries confirmed that there is a significant emissions gap and that the world, instead of being on track to keep warming below 1.5°C, is on a highly dangerous trajectory which would result in a radical altering of the key climatic parameters of our planet affecting negatively potentially large shares of the world population. This has been confirmed by numerous studies.^[i] Country-specific analysis such as the [Climate Action Tracker](#) also reveal transparently that the climate plans put forward by various major economies are by far not ambitious enough. Or, as the Civil Society Review recently put it, “all countries need to take on more mitigation than currently pledged, but this means different things for different countries”.ⁱⁱⁱ

Thus, much is known about the “Where are we?” and “Where we need to go?” elements of the TD. While it is positive to see that the 1.5°C limit is increasingly having an impact (see CARE response to question 3), the speed of change is still far too low, and many countries are still supporting activities which run counter to the objectives of the Paris Agreement (e.g. through subsidies for fossil fuels).

Adapting to a changing climate and building resilience is key to limiting the adverse effects of climate change impacts as much as possible but comes as an additional challenge to poor countries. According to estimates by UNEP, the additional costs of adapting to climate change in developing countries could be in the range of 140-300 billion USD per year by 2030 and 280-500 billion USD per year by 2050. This does not even include unquantifiable human suffering and non-economic costs. Research also clearly shows that the costs both for adaptation and of loss and damage are higher for scenarios of higher levels of global warming. Only a very small share of this is currently covered by international adaptation finance, and the huge adaptation gap results in insufficient preparedness of vulnerable communities and countries. In addition to adaptation costs, loss and damage will generate significant costs, likely hundreds of billions, through un-avoided impacts in poor countries.

Question 2: Where do we want to go?

CARE’s vision is of a world of hope, tolerance and social justice, where poverty has been overcome and all people live in dignity and security. In our daily work with poor and vulnerable communities and people, in particular women and girls and their households, we see the adverse impacts of climate change as they undermine food security, and exacerbate gender inequality and perpetuate the underlying causes of poverty. Achieving our vision will not be possible in a world which would see significantly greater climate change impacts and human suffering, due to higher levels of temperature levels and a bigger adaptation gap.

Thus, we need rapidly and radically increased mitigation efforts to contain global warming to as close as possible 1.5°C while promoting sustainable development and eradicating poverty.

CARE is also of the view that urgently increasing mitigation ambition cannot be undertaken without regard for cross-cutting principles and obligations, which Parties recognized in the Paris Agreement, such as protecting human rights, safeguarding food security, and promoting gender equality and women's empowerment, and without acknowledgement that the goals and principles of the Paris Agreement do not have to be at odds but can be mutually supportive.

Furthermore, mitigation ambition must not be viewed in isolation and needs to be accompanied with increasing ambition in adaptation and building climate resilience (including tackling loss and damage). Almost all developing countries have included adaptation and climate change impacts in their NDCs, and it becomes more and more evident that achievement of key national and global sustainable development objectives, such as the SDGs, will be impossible without adequately addressing the adverse impacts of climate change. National Adaptation Plans can therefore be a key implementation roadmap towards achieving the NDCs. Loss and damage from climate change impacts is already reversing development gains and causing significant economic and human development losses, which constrain countries in pursuing low- to zero-emission sustainable development strategies. Also, mitigation strategies which fail to incorporate climate impacts are doomed to fail. Thus, becoming more climate-resilient also puts countries in a better position to pursue ambitious mitigation goals.

Question 3: How do we get there?

For the purpose of this limited submission to the Talanoa Dialogue, we will focus on two key aspects, a) the need to consider and promote gender equality and women's empowerment across all climate and sustainable development action, and b) the impact of the 1.5°C limit which can prepare the ground for urgently needed greater ambition.

Women's empowerment: the key towards sustainable development and climate action

Promoting gender equality and women's empowerment is core to CARE's global contribution to overcoming the underlying causes of poverty and social injustice. Our work uses participatory, rights-based approaches, with a specific focus on women's voice, confidence, knowledge, skills and aspirations. We also work with men and boys to engage in shifting gender relations and to be part of a change that promotes respect and support for the significant but often unacknowledged contributions that women and girls make in their communities. CARE's experience is that achieving gender equality and women's voice requires transformative change, not only empowering women, but also transforming the social, cultural and political factors that help or hinder people's realization of full human rights. This is also true for climate action.

Experience shows that proactive investments used for adaptation, including disaster risk reduction, pay off. For example, evidence from Niger shows that adaptation projects can generate socio-economic benefits four times greater than the resources invested for adaptation measures in the target communities.^{iv} Yet, care must be taken to ensure adaptation measures positively contribute to sustainable, inclusive development that reaches the most vulnerable.

CARE has documented multiple evidence from effective local resilience strategies which also take into account climate change impacts, incl. from the Sahel region in the publication "Resilience champions - when women

contribute to the resilience of communities in the Sahel through savings and community-based adaptation”^v or from the Asia-Pacific region.^{vi}

An area of particular relevance to both mitigation and adaptation, as well as addressing gender inequalities, is agriculture and food and nutrition security. **CARE’s recent submission to the Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture** highlights key experience and needs, including the development of guidelines and criteria or safeguards for climate action in the agriculture sector to ensure the environmental and social integrity of any action and adherence to the principles of safeguarding food security, promoting gender equality, and protecting human rights. All of these have to be seen in the context of a broader, much-needed approach of inclusive governance in all countries and at all levels, in NDC and SDG implementation, in the design of NAPs, and climate finance programmes, in order to develop lasting solutions.

The story of the 1.5°C limit: preparing the ground for greater ambition

Including the 1.5°C limit in the Paris Agreement was a major political achievement. 1.5°C isn’t merely a symbolic or “aspirational” number to be plugged into international agreements; it is an existential limit, and it must be taken seriously! Despite the still glaring emissions gap, the 1.5°C limit offers a story as it increasingly leaves its footprint in the climate policy debate, a perspective which must receive more attention and which can contribute to increasing urgently needed ambition:

- The Paris Agreement has triggered the science-policy community to have a much closer look on the 1.5°C limit, including in terms of the strategies and approaches for mitigation as well as aspects related to dealing with climate change impacts.^{vii} One key takeaway is that the climate change risks from above 1.5C temperature increase are much higher than for 1.5°C, and that the economic costs of the actions needed to stay within 1.5C are often grossly overestimated, as many studies ignore or neglect avoided costs from reduced climate change impacts and multiple socio-economic and environmental co-benefits.
- The 1.5°C limit has already made a difference in terms of analysing countries’ contributions to global climate action, which has highlighted the need to increase ambition significantly.^{viii}
- The 1.5°C limit has triggered increased political ambition and influenced long-term planning, but not yet at sufficient scale.^{ix}
- Analyses triggered by the 1.5°C limit have provided more clarity on which [sets of key strategies](#) and near-term [steps before 2020](#) need to be pursued, and are available, to get us on a 1.5°C pathway. There are also examples of new research on 1.5°C consistent pathways for specific countries and regions^x which also show the need to shift away from particularly carbon-intense technologies such as coal-based electricity. With the falling costs e.g. of renewable energies, the fundamental economic parameters underlying such analyses also increasingly shift towards low- and zero-emission options.
- The 1.5°C limit drives up ambition of non-state actors, as for example reflected in the C40 work, with major cities drawing up 1.5°C climate action plans.^{xi}
- There is also increased attention to the sustainable development benefits of solutions towards the 1.5°C limit, including with regard to human rights, gender equality and building climate resilience, health, water and other benefits from renewable energies^{xii}; it is key and more effective to promote those solutions which generate rather than go against such essential benefits.

Governments are also well-advised to use the Talanoa Dialogue to explore, and learn from each other, how these and other relevant parameters can help them accelerate the implementation of NDCs, and enhance their ambition as soon as possible. The TD must be used as an opportunity for such open exchange and exploration, and not be limited by the concern that such exchange may already “force” countries into new commitments.

These are just some of the key aspects which should give countries and multiple stakeholders increased confidence that greater climate ambition, consistent with 1.5°C pathways, is not only urgently needed, but can help tackling multiple challenges at a time, while avoiding a large-scale disastrous planetary development pathway.

Government actions at COP24

The basic message is already clear: countries’ plans do not add up to what is needed and more ambition is required! There must be a rapid shift to 100% sustainable renewable energies, and other known solutions, instead of shifting the focus to unproven and high-risk negative emissions technologies. For all solutions, following the guiding principles of the Paris Agreement, such as human rights, and contributing to the Sustainable Development Goals should be a key parameter. The Talanoa Dialogue can inspire and build confidence among governments (and all stakeholders) for exploring how to go further, faster, together in the pursuit of the objectives of the Paris Agreement.

At COP24, governments should be ready to take next steps to make the Paris Agreement’s 1.5°C limit a reality, agree to go back and revise NDCs towards closing the emissions gap, and present new NDCs and long-term zero-emission and climate-resilient sustainable development strategies, by 2020 at the latest, with particular emphasis on the largest emitters.

In light of the above, COP24 also needs to step up ambition on adaptation and climate resilience, including through donors taking additional steps to **increase the share of adaptation finance towards the envisaged balance with mitigation** (e.g. as part of the COP24 finance ministerial), an acceleration of the development and implementation of **gender-transformative National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)**, and efficient and effective guidance on **communicating and recognizing adaptation needs and efforts as part of the Paris Rulebook discussions**, further steps to develop effective guidelines for climate action in agriculture (under the **Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture**), and **initiating a strong review of the Warsaw International Mechanism on Loss and Damage following the Suva Expert Dialogue and delivering additional finance**. These can also provide valuable inputs to future NDC revisions. Equitable solutions based on the polluter-pays principle should be introduced, such as fossil fuel extraction levies, to mobilize support for addressing loss and damage from climate change.

ⁱ Contact: Sven Harmeling, Global Policy Lead Climate Change and Resilience, sharmeling@careclimatechange.org

ⁱⁱ See e.g. UNEP Emissions Gap Reports

ⁱⁱⁱ CSO Equity Review (2017). Equity and the Ambition Ratchet: Towards a Meaningful 2018 Facilitative Dialogue. Manila, London, Cape Town, Washington, et al.: CSO Equity Review Coalition. [civilsocietyreview.org/report2017] [doi:[10.6084/m9.figshare.5917408](https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.5917408)]

^{iv} CARE and New Economics Foundation, 2014: Community-Based Adaptation: Managing Uncertainty. An economic evaluation of community-based adaptation in Dakoro, Niger.

<http://careclimatechange.org/publications/managing-climatic-uncertainty/>

https://www.care.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Presse/Downloads/Studien/Sahel_Resilience_Champions_Full_Report_English.pdf

^{vi} <https://careclimatechange.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/enhancing-resilience.pdf>

^{vii} Various scientific journals have also initiated special editions related to 1.5°C; one overarching trigger for a reorientation of research is the 1.5°C Special report by the IPCC. Emission pathways analyses take a much closer look at what is required under different conditions to stay within 1.5°C, with varying results. This includes [studies](#) with more positive messages about the possibility of staying within that limit, and clear proposal [sets of key strategies](#) and near-term [steps before 2020](#) to get us on a 1.5°C pathway. The social and economic opportunities as well as avoided climate change impacts – for example significantly lower impacts on agriculture, different crops and weather systems – have also been highlighted, e.g. in the [Low Carbon Monitor](#), [Nature](#) articles and other [research](#).

^{viii} While the 1.5°C target was absent from the pre-Paris [UNFCCC synthesis report](#) on the aggregate effect of INDCs, the 2016 INDC [update report](#) took a much closer look at this, also highlighting the ambition gap. Though the [UNEP Emissions Gap](#) report published in November 2015 looked at scenarios for “an aspirational target” of a 1.5°C limit, the 2017 report released on 2 November, gave much more prominence to 1.5°C analysis. Additionally, The International Energy Agency (IEA) has widened the scope of its [analysis](#) and civil society research work, such as the [Equity Review](#), has put the 1.5°C limit at the centre of the discussion.

^{ix} On the national level, there are, unfortunately, too few examples of countries who have recognised that the 1.5°C limit requires additional efforts. The [Marrakesh Declaration](#), adopted by the 53 countries in the Climate Vulnerable Forum, includes the unprecedented commitment to 100% renewable energies between 2030 and 2050, specifically framed as a means to “trigger increased commitments from all countries for urgent progress towards the 1.5°C or below goal.” Countries such as Sweden or [New Zealand](#) have recently adopted more ambitious policies or objective for carbon neutrality by 2050 or earlier than before Paris. Various countries have submitted long-term (mostly 2050) strategies to the UNFCCC which reflect 1.5°C scenarios, even though they do not follow-through with increased ambition, but it is a first step. Examples include Mexico’s [report](#), Canada’s [strategy](#) or [Germany’s](#) 2050 plan. The latter one notes that the new goal of the Paris Agreement goes beyond the 2°C limit and states that the current EU 80-95% reduction target for 2050 would have to be re-evaluated in light of the Paris Agreement’s long-term goal.

^x i.e. [Germany](#), [Australia](#), [EU](#)

^{xi} A particularly promising example of the impact of the 1.5°C limit is how non-state actors approach the need to act on climate is reflected in the C40 work. In December 2016, the C40 – a group of major cities from various countries – released a report, “[Deadline 2020](#),” which identifies how C40 cities can stay within their share of carbon budget consistent with 1.5°C consistent.

^{xii} There is also increased attention to the sustainable development benefits of solutions towards the 1.5°C limit, which should increase governments’ and stakeholders’ confidence that ambitiously pursuing the limit can be done in line with sustainable development and equity, and by promoting human rights and gender equality. This is for example highlighted in the “[Compendium of solutions for achieving the SDGs and staying below 2°C or 1.5°C](#)”.