

As of 7 October 2016

Submissions on the roadmap for global climate action Synthesis written by the COP21 and COP22 champions' teams

Following the invitation for [submissions on the roadmap for Global Climate Action](#) communicated by the two high-level champions, sixty-two submissions were received. Fifty-four non-Party stakeholders responded to the invitation, including think tanks, NGOs, companies, business networks, trade unions and international organizations. Eight submissions from Parties to the UNFCCC were also received (including the Alliance of Small Island States, the Environmental Integrity group and European Union), representing a total of 76 countries. Submissions can be downloaded at the following links:

- Non-Party Stakeholders: <http://unfccc.int/documentation/items/9636.php> ;
- Parties: <http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/SitePages/sessions.aspx?search=Roadmap>

Submissions were very diverse in their length, their level of detail, and the propositions made. However, a consensus emerged on several aspects, notably a broad support for the champions' roadmap on Global Climate Action, and for the champions themselves. The following synthesis aims at highlighting the key elements that can be drawn from those submissions. References to submissions are indicated in footnotes.

1. The current situation

When addressing the urgency of action, submissions explain that the urgency of pre-2020 must be science based¹. Urgency cannot justify bad choices in the short term², and long term strategies are essential to boost investments³, highlight co-benefits (poverty reduction, health, development...) and avoid lock-in. Pre-2020 action can also focus on many "quick-wins"⁴.

Regarding the involvement of non-Party stakeholders, the main takeaway from submissions is that the champions must recognize that current NDCs are not sufficient to be on track for the "well below 2°C" and that non-Party stakeholders' commitments can facilitate bold climate action collaborating with Parties on the implementation of their NDCs/national plans⁵. Some submissions underline that there is a need for other fora of discussions between non-Party stakeholders (NPS) and Parties⁶. Governments need to act now to enable actions from NPS, especially for investors, cities and businesses⁷. To summarize some of the positions expressed in submissions, this quote from the WWF submission is interesting to consider: *"While action pledged to date do not meet the level of ambition agreed to in the Paris Agreement, initiatives from the world are indications of untapped potential for pre-2020 action"*.

¹ WWF

² C40

³ Idem, I4CE

⁴ Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport, Paris Process on Mobility and Climate

⁵ I4CE, WWF, Climate Action Network, Slovakia and the European Commission, Maldives

⁶ Climate Chance

⁷ Global Investor Coalition on Climate Change, Principles for Responsible Investment, United States Council for International Business

2. The role of the high-level champions

A. Role of interface

Submissions agree with the role of champions as an interface that ensures dialogue and collaboration among NPS and countries to implement national policies, in particular NDCs and NAMAs⁸. It is suggested that, within the UNFCCC process, the champions should organize a proper process of dialogue between Parties and non-Parties, i.e. between the Global Climate Action and the UNFCCC⁹. It was further suggested that the Champions could also organize a consultation process (an online forum or an event) with focal points from the UNFCCC¹⁰.

Submissions point out that the role of the champions cover all efforts to enhance to Global Climate Action¹¹. Therefore, they should also work directly with governments on several tasks that are detailed in the submissions: reinforcing means of implementation¹²; deepening international cooperation on implementation, mitigation, and adaption¹³; reviewing ambition with countries willing to do so¹⁴ (with the creation of a coalition of Parties on pre-2020 action for example); highlighting capacity of particular initiatives regarding countries' specific concerns¹⁵; and removing specific barriers to action for NPS¹⁶. Submissions also underline the opportunity to promote convergence between climate action and implementation of SDGs¹⁷.

B. Work with initiatives

A top priority found in many submissions is that the champions should support existing initiatives¹⁸, by ensuring that initiatives receive sufficient resources¹⁹, and by defining reporting mechanisms that incentivize initiatives to deliver on their existing commitments²⁰. The champions should also support new initiatives by providing a broader coverage for specific commitments²¹ (based on geographic and thematic dimensions) or by showcasing initiatives that are usually less visible²² (local communities for example). The champions should also focus on the implementation and replication of initiatives with the most impact²³.

⁸ France, World Resources Institute, Climate Alliance, Canada

⁹ Climate Alliance

¹⁰ International Chamber of Commerce, Business Europe, Climate Alliance

¹¹ University of Maryland

¹² WWF

¹³ WWF

¹⁴ WWF, Tyrsky Consulting

¹⁵ I4CE, International Association of Public Transport

¹⁶ Cf footnote 7.

¹⁷ CliMates, Hivos

¹⁸ France, Slovakia and the European Commission, USA

¹⁹ The Climate Group, We Mean Business,

²⁰ Cf 3. Transparency and tracking (infra)

²¹ UNEP

²² European Economic and Social Committee Sustainable Development Observatory

²³ I4CE, European Economic and Social Committee Sustainable Development Observatory, Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer, SE4ALL, Maldives

C. The importance of communication: the champions as the “public face” of the climate action

The champions, for many respondents, are a voice of climate action²⁴. They speak about actions in diverse international organizations²⁵ (Montreal Protocol, ICAO, IMO...) and ensure a coherent narrative of the need for and impact of action. They develop synergies and avoid duplications among many fora on pre-2020²⁶. They highlight success stories²⁷. They identify obstacles to rapid and ambitious climate action. They highlight convergence between climate action and SDGs²⁸. They support bottom-up actions of civil society²⁹. They deepen the understanding of what is happening inside and outside of the “UNFCCC world”³⁰. They highlight actions needed to be on track of the 2°C³¹. They mainstream a long term approach³². They are inclusive, and focus on issues such as capacity building and adaption, and on actors such as women or the poor³³. In order to achieve all those missions, the champions could have a clear communication platform detailing their goals and actions³⁴.

D. Organization of Global Climate Action

The champions should not build a bureaucratic system to pilot Global Climate Action³⁵. In many submissions, it appears that the guiding principles must be self-organization, transparency, and accountability³⁶. Champions should build a light-touch mechanism which could enhance cooperation, ensure accountability and generate commitments³⁷. Champions could propose once and for all themes and areas of focus for Global Climate Action, and let the initiatives decide which themes they belong to³⁸ (self-governance). This guidance and the work of the champions are essential to the continuity and the stability of Global Climate Action until 2020³⁹.

E. Champions must build the material conditions to achieve their tasks

²⁴ Fondation Avina,

²⁵ Climate Action Network, USA, CliMates, Slovakia and the European Commission

²⁶ Tyrsky Consulting

²⁷ Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer, USA, cf. footnote 23

²⁸ Cf. footnote 17

²⁹ European Economic and Social Committee Sustainable Development Observatory

³⁰ Business Council for Sustainable Energy

³¹ Caisse des dépôts

³² Cf footnote 3

³³ SE4ALL

³⁴ Business Council for Sustainable Energy, Eurelectric

³⁵ Norway, USA, Caisse des dépôts

³⁶ We Mean Business, Galvanizing the Groundswell of Climate Action

³⁷ Idem

³⁸ Idem

³⁹ Climate Alliance, Business for Social Responsibility

Many respondents are aware that in order to fulfill their missions, the champions need to be supported by a permanent team with a dedicated budget⁴⁰. They could also be assisted by key stakeholders from several initiatives⁴¹.

3. Transparency and tracking

A. Criteria

In order to track progress or include new initiatives, the issue of criteria is of utmost importance. Many propositions were made in the submissions regarding criteria, and examples of criteria were provided⁴². The idea that common criteria should be used for all initiatives across all sectors is widely supported⁴³. In addition, a few submissions underline that specific criteria could be set up by sectors themselves, or by initiatives⁴⁴. One submission proposes to establish exclusion criteria and “red lines”⁴⁵. Several contributions highlight that different kinds of criteria could be used⁴⁶: in order to be included on NAZCA, a few basic principles could be considered; then, further recognition of the initiative within the work of the champions would involve stricter criteria; and in the end, the inclusion in the HLE would imply “best in class” criteria. Overall, criteria should be in line with the Paris Agreement and with the SDGs, and should include social and human rights aspects⁴⁷. Several submissions advise that the criteria used by the LPAA were a good basis to build on, and could be strengthened and refined⁴⁸. Therefore, there is no need to start from scratch.

B. Reporting

Many submissions underline that initiatives are self-governed and should report on a voluntary basis⁴⁹. Therefore, there is no need for a centralized MRV mechanism⁵⁰. The reporting system cannot be a burden for initiatives, and must remain simple and transparent⁵¹. In many submissions, transparency appears as a guiding principle for reporting, a pillar that will guarantee the credibility and the success of the Global Climate Action. It has been suggested that sending questionnaires to initiatives was a good idea⁵², and this could be done by data providers. Regarding the timeframe, reporting should be accomplished on an annual basis⁵³, with the same approach undertaken from year to year. Several submissions indicate that UNEP, with its Cooperative Initiatives Platform, could be in charge of making cooperative initiatives report, with the outcomes being then transferred to NAZCA⁵⁴.

⁴⁰ We Mean Business, Climate Alliance, Maldives, France

⁴¹ C40

⁴² We Mean Business, Galvanizing the Groundswell of Climate Action

⁴³ CliMates, Iberdrola, C40, Climate Alliance, Suez, France

⁴⁴ CCFD-Terre Solidaire

⁴⁵ Idem

⁴⁶ Groundswell, WWF

⁴⁷ InterAmerican Clean Energy Institute, Climate Action Network, WWF, CliMates, Business & Human Rights Resource Centre and Center for International Environmental Law, Hivos

⁴⁸ World Resources Institute, Slovakia and the European Commission, USA

⁴⁹ Slovakia and the European Commission, International Chamber of Commerce

⁵⁰ Slovakia and the European Commission

⁵¹ France, Climate Alliance, World Resources Institute, Iberdrola

⁵² A proposition of questionnaire was sent by the World Resources Institute.

⁵³ CCFD-Terre Solidaire, Suez

⁵⁴ Slovakia and the European Commission, Galvanizing the Groundswell of Climate Action, Principles for Responsible Investment, UNEP

C. Tracking

Tracking is essential for cooperative initiatives⁵⁵ and many submissions state that common tracking standards should be established for all initiatives. In order to do so, it is possible to harmonize norms, methodologies, and standards already existing among sectors and among actors, and already implemented by data providers (such as CDP or GRI)⁵⁶.

D. Who would assess initiatives?

The UNFCCC and the champions appear as playing a central role in the assessment of initiatives. The UN is also mentioned, especially regarding the link with SDGs⁵⁷. The champions may mobilize independent experts, in order to assess initiatives and determine which cooperative initiatives should be showcased through the activities of the champions, including the High-Level Event⁵⁸. Then, data providers are described as actors with the capacity to play a role regarding the assessment process: they are able to identify initiatives with a high potential for example⁵⁹. Some submissions highlight that the information provided in a transparent manner by initiatives should allow for external verification and additional analyses, by think tanks and NGOs for instance, in addition to the verification undertaken in the first place by data providers⁶⁰.

E. Role of NAZCA

NAZCA encompasses both individual commitments and cooperative initiatives. It is described in the vast majority of submissions as a key tool, which, however, has to be improved⁶¹. In that perspective, several suggestions can be drawn from the submissions. As an interface between climate action and a broad audience, its communication and outreach strategy must be strengthened⁶². In order to expand its scope, NAZCA has to work with more data providers. Coordination with data providers is important, so that the exchange of information between data providers and NAZCA is facilitated, with a harmonized framework for all data providers⁶³. In order to be more comprehensive, NAZCA may include more commitments from local communities and small-scale initiatives, and it could also include a new category about bilateral commitments made among countries⁶⁴. Many submissions point out that the “cooperative initiatives” category is the most relevant category on NAZCA for the champions, and provides a lot of room for improvements⁶⁵. Cooperative initiatives should provide information on their objectives and on their progress on NAZCA⁶⁶. They could also specify a focal point, or whether they are in line with NDCs. Last but not least, NAZCA could point out the “best in class” cooperative initiatives with a distinctive sign⁶⁷.

⁵⁵ CCFD-Terre Solidaire, Slovakia and the European Commission

⁵⁶ United States Council for International Business, Eurelectric, Business Council for Sustainable Energy, International Chamber of Commerce, Spanish Association of the Electricity Sector, The Climate Group

⁵⁷ SE4All

⁵⁸ Galvanizing the Groundswell of Climate Action

⁵⁹ Iberdrola, Business Council for Sustainable Energy, UNEP

⁶⁰ Slovakia and the European Commission, USA, Eurelectric, Spanish Association of the Electricity Sector, Norway

⁶¹ Slovakia and the European Commission, USA, We Mean Business, Business and Climate Summit, Tyrsky Consulting, Caisse des dépôts, Suez

⁶² The Climate Group

⁶³ Business Council for Sustainable Energy, Climate Alliance, Business for Social Responsibility, Principles for Responsible Investment

⁶⁴ Climate Action Network

⁶⁵ CCFD-Terre Solidaire, Climate Alliance, I4CE, Japan

⁶⁶ World Resources Institute, InterAmerican Clean Energy Institute, SE4All

⁶⁷ Climate Alliance

4. High Level Event

There is a large agreement on the main functions of the High Level Event, notably announcing new or strengthened commitments and initiatives, and showcasing progress and results achieved by the coalitions. Many respondents also highlight the role of the HLE in promoting the dialogue between Parties and NPS as well as the connection between the initiatives and the NDCs. Several submissions emphasize the need to make it an interactive forum instead of a series of declarations⁶⁸. While some suggest to highlight the most impactful initiatives⁶⁹, several respondents note that the HLE should not only be about successes, but also remaining challenges, obstacles, and gaps, with solutions to overcome them⁷⁰ (which can draw on the TEMs). Many respondents recommend to replicate the model of thematic days held at COP21, to ensure that all key sectors get sufficient visibility⁷¹. Respondents also emphasize the need to insert the HLE in a structured process along each year, putting it in perspective with other climate action events, such as the Climate Chance summit⁷². As to the timeline, respondents unanimously recommend to set the HLE on the second week of the COP in order to make it appear as a key deliverable and achievement of the COP.

Points of view are more varied with regard to the Climate Action Summit in 2018. While most respondents support the summit in principle⁷³, a few of them consider that it should not be a single day event but rather a longer conference, or a series of thematic events⁷⁴. As to the date, some suggest to hold it earlier in the summer (June)⁷⁵ while others suggest to have it in the margins of the UN General Assembly in September⁷⁶ or even during the COP⁷⁷.

5. The role of the Technical Expert Meetings (TEMs)

It is worth noting that the question about the role of the Technical Expert Meetings (TEMs) yielded the fewest direct answers out of the five questions that were asked: around half of them, addressed this question within their contribution. Furthermore, the responses were often less developed on this part, which may indicate that knowledge about and implication in the TEM process are relatively lower among those organizations. Nonetheless, the answers raise useful observations and recommendations.

A. Practical organization and format of the TEMs

Many respondents highlight the need for a better preparation and organization ahead of the TEMs. Business Europe, for instance, regrets that the agenda is set “only three days before meetings are held”. Several respondents recommend that agendas for the meeting, as well as supporting documents, be distributed well in advance⁷⁸. To ensure broader and easier participation, several submissions suggest to

⁶⁸ Climate Action Network, UNEP, Norway, We Mean Business

⁶⁹ Climate Alliance, USA, Global CCS Institute, I4CE, Maldives

⁷⁰ SE4All, C40, European Economic and Social Committee's (EESC) Sustainable Development Observatory, Tyrsky Consulting

⁷¹ France, Slovakia and the European Commission, Partnership on Sustainable, Low Carbon Transport, Paris Process on Mobility and Climate

⁷² Climate Alliance, Slovakia and the European Commission

⁷³ France

⁷⁴ International Association of Public Transport, WWF

⁷⁵ Principles for Responsible Investment, Designated Operational Entities and Independent Entities Association

⁷⁶ USA

⁷⁷ Caisse des dépôts

⁷⁸ Norway, USA, Slovakia and the European Commission, International Chamber of Commerce, Business Europe, Canada

facilitate remote participation⁷⁹, or to develop live streaming⁸⁰. To enhance the organization of the TEMs, some suggest to increase allocated budgetary and technical means⁸¹, or to designate entities in charge of the organization (such as countries)⁸². Several respondents recommend making the format of the TEMs more interactive, leaving more time for Q&A, dialogue, and networking⁸³.

B. Determination of the participants

Various demands were made with regard to the composition of the TEMs. Depending on their own interest in promoting particular perspectives, organizations call for more sectoral ministers⁸⁴, representatives of the private sector⁸⁵, technology providers⁸⁶, financial institutions⁸⁷, subnational authorities⁸⁸, or civil society figures⁸⁹ to attend and be involved in the TEMs. Respondents generally assert the need to carefully select the participants, in order to ensure that they are competent, involved in their field, and have real decisional power⁹⁰.

C. Subject of the TEMs

Some recommend more emphasis on adaptation⁹¹, consistently with a demand for more balanced North-South representation⁹². Several respondents⁹³ ask for meetings dedicated to the issue of carbon pricing.

D. Links with Global Climate Action initiatives and other institutions

Several respondents call for a strengthened link between the TEMs and the Global Climate Action initiatives⁹⁴ as well as the NDCs⁹⁵, in order to trigger a mutually reinforcing dynamic. Some recommend a better cooperation with other institutions such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the Technology Executive Committee (TEC), and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN)⁹⁶.

⁷⁹ Slovakia and the European Commission, International Chamber of Commerce

⁸⁰ Norway, USA

⁸¹ Tyrsky Consulting, Caisse des dépôts

⁸² Business Council for Sustainable Energy, Slovakia and the European Commission

⁸³ Business Council for Sustainable Energy, Climate Alliance, Maldives

⁸⁴ Tyrsky Consulting, Caisse des dépôts

⁸⁵ Business Council for Sustainable Energy, United States Council for International Business

⁸⁶ Business Council for Sustainable Energy

⁸⁷ Tyrsky Consulting

⁸⁸ The Climate Group, Business Council for Sustainable Energy

⁸⁹ University of Maryland, Caisse des dépôts

⁹⁰ WWF, International Chamber of Commerce, IndustriAll Global Union

⁹¹ USA, Business & Climate Summit, WWF

⁹² Tyrsky Consulting

⁹³ The Climate Group, Eurelectric, RUSAL

⁹⁴ Slovakia and the European Commission, Norway, WWF, Canada

⁹⁵ Business Council for Sustainable Energy

⁹⁶ Tyrsky Consulting, International Chamber of Commerce