

# COP 20 in Lima: Setting the Stage for Paris

**Elliot Diringer**  
Executive Vice President  
Center for Climate and Energy Solutions

*November 20, 2014*



CENTER FOR CLIMATE  
AND ENERGY SOLUTIONS

[C2ES.ORG](http://C2ES.ORG)

## *September:*

- **Ban Ki-moon summit in New York**

## *October:*

- **EU Council decision on 2030 GHG target: 40% below 1990**

## *November:*

- **U.S. pledge of up to \$3B to Green Climate Fund (\$9.3B from 21 countries)**
- **Joint announcement by US and China of post-2020 'actions'**
  - Builds momentum for an agreement
  - Underscores the need for an agreement
  - Offers clues to what the agreement will look like

- **1992 UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)**
- **1997 Kyoto Protocol**
  - Binding emissions targets and timetables for developed countries only
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> round of Kyoto targets (2013-2020) cover only 13% of global emissions
- **2009 Copenhagen Accord/2010 Cancún Agreement**
  - Voluntary pledges from 90+ countries with 80+% of global emissions
  - Aggregate pledges fall well short of 2°C pathway
- **What have we learned?**
  - Kyoto: strong legal and technical rigor; shrinking participation
  - Copenhagen/Cancún: broad participation but low ambition
  - Neither approach is getting the job done

A blend of *bottom-up* and *top-down* elements  
that balances *national flexibility* and *international discipline*  
to achieve both *broad participation* and *strong ambition*

- **COP 17 (2011): Durban Platform for Enhanced Action**
  - Established the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform (ADP) to deliver an agreement in 2015 that will:
    - Be “under the Convention”
    - Be “applicable to all Parties”
    - Have “legal force”
    - Apply from 2020
  
- **COP 19 in Warsaw (2013)**
  - Invited parties to communicate their “intended nationally determined contributions” (INDCs) to the new agreement well in advance of Paris
    - In the first quarter of 2015, for those “ready to do so”
  - Called for a decision in Lima on the information parties should provide with their INDCs
  - Explicitly “without prejudice to the legal nature of the contributions”

- **COP decision on steps leading to Paris**
  - What information should parties provide when presenting their INDCs?
  - How will parties conduct their *ex ante* consideration of the INDCs?
- **“Elements” text**
  - Mandate is for parties to consider “elements for a draft negotiating text... with a view to making available a negotiating text before May 2015”
  - Starting point in Lima will be a new “non-paper” from the ADP co-chairs

- **Scope**

- Draft decision says “all Parties should include a mitigation component” in their INDCs
- Offers three options on information to accompany INDCs:
  - Mitigation; adaptation; finance, technology and capacity-building
  - Differentiated for developed and developing countries
  - Mitigation only

- **Form**

- Unlikely to be prescribed; could be economy-wide emissions targets (absolute or intensity), sectoral targets, or other types of policies and measures
- Non-paper: they should be “of a type, scope, scale and coverage no less ambitious compared with those previously undertaken” (no backsliding)

- **Timeframe: 2025 vs. 2030**

- Unlikely to establish a common timeframe for initial INDCs
- More important to set a common timeframe for initiating the next round of INDCs

- **Differentiation**

- How to apply the principle of “common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities” (CBDRRC)
  - Some developing countries calling for Kyoto-like differentiation between Annex I (developed) and non-Annex I (developing) countries
  - US, EU and others favor de facto self-differentiation of “nationally determined” contributions

- **Legal character**

- Draft decision is “without prejudice to the legal nature of the contributions”
- Non-paper refers to “commitments/contributions,” reflecting divergent views



- Warsaw decision: INDCs are to be communicated “in a manner that facilitates the clarity, transparency and understanding of the intended contributions”
- It’s widely anticipated that, outside the UNFCCC, parties, experts and civil society will make their own assessments of ambition and fairness
- Within the UNFCCC, draft decision calls for:
  - Online Q&A for “clarification” of INDCs
  - Workshops on the “aggregate effect” of the INDCs

- **Paris outcome will likely be a set of legal instruments**
  - 1) a core legal agreement; 2) an instrument (annex, schedule, etc.) housing the NDCs; and 3) supporting COP decisions
  - Non-paper doesn't try to distribute content among different instruments; does contain provisions typical of a legally binding agreement
- **Mitigation**
  - A new long-term goal?
    - Options in non-paper include carbon neutrality or net zero emissions by 2050
  - Procedural commitments
    - Non-paper: “All Parties to prepare, maintain, communicate and implement commitments/ contributions”

- **Adaptation**

- “Political parity” with mitigation?
- A clearer adaptation vision or goal?
- Commitment by all parties to prepare national adaptation plans?
- Assurances of increased support for developing countries?

- **Finance**

- New finance goals for the post-2020 period?
- From whom? Toward what priorities? How much public vs. private?

- **Transparency**

- Lots of progress on measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) under Copenhagen/Cancun
  - Something to watch for: US and 16 other countries will undergo first “multilateral assessment” in Subsidiary Body on Implementation
- Challenge: creating a common system that still allows for differentiation

- **Accountability**
  - Any mechanism to address implementation or compliance?
  - With an enforcement and/or a facilitative function?
- **Updating contributions**
  - How often?
  - Will the parameters of commitments/contributions be any different for future rounds?
- **Legal form/character**
  - Central issue is what legal character to assign to different elements of the agreement

- Parties have made progress (albeit slow) and largely avoided major procedural fights
- We'll see in Lima whether recent momentum-building steps translate into stronger progress within UNFCCC
- An early test will be whether some parties aggressively challenge the ADP co-chairs on process
- There's a strong tendency in these negotiations to hold onto issues until the final moment, which isn't until Paris, so substantive progress may be modest
- Essential outcomes: a decision on INDCs; a reasonably clean "elements" text; confidence in the process

- **Why do we need an agreement?**
  - To build confidence that all countries are doing their fair share, which enables each to do more than it otherwise would
- **Numbers will provide one measure of success**
  - Initial NDCs are unlikely to put us on a 2°C pathway
- **A more qualitative measure**
  - A durable framework that gets all the major players on board, ensures accountability, and works to build ambition over time

- **Toward 2015 Dialogue – Report of the Co-Chairs**
  - <http://www.c2es.org/international/toward-2015>
- **Other C2ES resources (policy briefs, overview of party submissions, etc.)**
  - <http://www.c2es.org/international/2015-agreement>
- **Draft COP decision**
  - <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2014/adp2/eng/12drafttext.pdf>
- **Non-paper on elements for a draft negotiating text**
  - <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2014/adp2/eng/11nonpap.pdf>



CENTER FOR CLIMATE  
AND ENERGY SOLUTIONS

FOR MORE INFORMATION

[C2ES.ORG](http://C2ES.ORG)