

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 based<sup>1</sup>. Urgency cannot justify bad choices in the short term<sup>2</sup>, and long term strategies are essential to boost investments<sup>3</sup>, highlight co-benefits (poverty reduction, health, development...) and avoid lock-in. Pre-2020 action can also focus on many "quick-wins"<sup>4</sup>.

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 plans<sup>5</sup>. Some submissions underline that there is a need for other fora of discussions between non-Party stakeholders (NPS) and Parties<sup>6</sup>. Governments need to act now to enable actions from NPS, especially for investors, cities and businesses<sup>7</sup>. 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"*.

---

<sup>1</sup> WWF

<sup>2</sup> C40

<sup>3</sup> Idem, I4CE

<sup>4</sup> Partnership on Sustainable Low Carbon Transport, Paris Process on Mobility and Climate

<sup>5</sup> I4CE, WWF, Climate Action Network, Slovakia and the European Commission, Maldives

<sup>6</sup> Climate Chance

<sup>7</sup> 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 NAMAs<sup>8</sup>. 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 UNFCCC<sup>9</sup>. It was further suggested that the Champions could also organize a consultation process (an online forum or an event) with focal points from the UNFCCC<sup>10</sup>.

Submissions point out that the role of the champions cover all efforts to enhance to Global Climate Action<sup>11</sup>. Therefore, they should also work directly with governments on several tasks that are detailed in the submissions: reinforcing means of implementation<sup>12</sup>; deepening international cooperation on implementation, mitigation, and adaption<sup>13</sup>; reviewing ambition with countries willing to do so<sup>14</sup> (with the creation of a coalition of Parties on pre-2020 action for example); highlighting capacity of particular initiatives regarding countries' specific concerns<sup>15</sup>; and removing specific barriers to action for NPS<sup>16</sup>. Submissions also underline the opportunity to promote convergence between climate action and implementation of SDGs<sup>17</sup>.

### B. Work with initiatives

A top priority found in many submissions is that the champions should support existing initiatives<sup>18</sup>, by ensuring that initiatives receive sufficient resources<sup>19</sup>, and by defining reporting mechanisms that incentivize initiatives to deliver on their existing commitments<sup>20</sup>. The champions should also support new initiatives by providing a broader coverage for specific commitments<sup>21</sup> (based on geographic and thematic dimensions) or by showcasing initiatives that are usually less visible<sup>22</sup> (local communities for example). The champions should also focus on the implementation and replication of initiatives with the most impact<sup>23</sup>.

---

<sup>8</sup> France, World Resources Institute, Climate Alliance, Canada

<sup>9</sup> Climate Alliance

<sup>10</sup> International Chamber of Commerce, Business Europe, Climate Alliance

<sup>11</sup> University of Maryland

<sup>12</sup> WWF

<sup>13</sup> WWF

<sup>14</sup> WWF, Tyrsky Consulting

<sup>15</sup> I4CE, International Association of Public Transport

<sup>16</sup> Cf footnote 7.

<sup>17</sup> CliMates, Hivos

<sup>18</sup> France, Slovakia and the European Commission, USA

<sup>19</sup> The Climate Group, We Mean Business,

<sup>20</sup> Cf 3. Transparency and tracking (infra)

<sup>21</sup> UNEP

<sup>22</sup> European Economic and Social Committee Sustainable Development Observatory

<sup>23</sup> 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 action<sup>24</sup>. They speak about actions in diverse international organizations<sup>25</sup> (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-2020<sup>26</sup>. They highlight success stories<sup>27</sup>. They identify obstacles to rapid and ambitious climate action. They highlight convergence between climate action and SDGs<sup>28</sup>. They support bottom-up actions of civil society<sup>29</sup>. They deepen the understanding of what is happening inside and outside of the “UNFCCC world”<sup>30</sup>. They highlight actions needed to be on track of the 2°C<sup>31</sup>. They mainstream a long term approach<sup>32</sup>. They are inclusive, and focus on issues such as capacity building and adaption, and on actors such as women or the poor<sup>33</sup>. In order to achieve all those missions, the champions could have a clear communication platform detailing their goals and actions<sup>34</sup>.

### D. Organization of Global Climate Action

The champions should not build a bureaucratic system to pilot Global Climate Action<sup>35</sup>. In many submissions, it appears that the guiding principles must be self-organization, transparency, and accountability<sup>36</sup>. Champions should build a light-touch mechanism which could enhance cooperation, ensure accountability and generate commitments<sup>37</sup>. 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 to<sup>38</sup> (self-governance). This guidance and the work of the champions are essential to the continuity and the stability of Global Climate Action until 2020<sup>39</sup>.

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

---

<sup>24</sup> Fondation Avina,

<sup>25</sup> Climate Action Network, USA, CliMates, Slovakia and the European Commission

<sup>26</sup> Tyrsky Consulting

<sup>27</sup> Fondation Charles Léopold Mayer, USA, cf. footnote 23

<sup>28</sup> Cf. footnote 17

<sup>29</sup> European Economic and Social Committee Sustainable Development Observatory

<sup>30</sup> Business Council for Sustainable Energy

<sup>31</sup> Caisse des dépôts

<sup>32</sup> Cf footnote 3

<sup>33</sup> SE4ALL

<sup>34</sup> Business Council for Sustainable Energy, Eurelectric

<sup>35</sup> Norway, USA, Caisse des dépôts

<sup>36</sup> We Mean Business, Galvanizing the Groundswell of Climate Action

<sup>37</sup> Idem

<sup>38</sup> Idem

<sup>39</sup> 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 budget<sup>40</sup>. They could also be assisted by key stakeholders from several initiatives<sup>41</sup>.

### 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 provided<sup>42</sup>. The idea that common criteria should be used for all initiatives across all sectors is widely supported<sup>43</sup>. In addition, a few submissions underline that specific criteria could be set up by sectors themselves, or by initiatives<sup>44</sup>. One submission proposes to establish exclusion criteria and “red lines”<sup>45</sup>. Several contributions highlight that different kinds of criteria could be used<sup>46</sup>: 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 aspects<sup>47</sup>. Several submissions advise that the criteria used by the LPAA were a good basis to build on, and could be strengthened and refined<sup>48</sup>. 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 basis<sup>49</sup>. Therefore, there is no need for a centralized MRV mechanism<sup>50</sup>. The reporting system cannot be a burden for initiatives, and must remain simple and transparent<sup>51</sup>. 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 idea<sup>52</sup>, and this could be done by data providers. Regarding the timeframe, reporting should be accomplished on an annual basis<sup>53</sup>, 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 NAZCA<sup>54</sup>.

---

<sup>40</sup> We Mean Business, Climate Alliance, Maldives, France

<sup>41</sup> C40

<sup>42</sup> We Mean Business, Galvanizing the Groundswell of Climate Action

<sup>43</sup> CliMates, Iberdrola, C40, Climate Alliance, Suez, France

<sup>44</sup> CCFD-Terre Solidaire

<sup>45</sup> Idem

<sup>46</sup> Groundswell, WWF

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

<sup>48</sup> World Resources Institute, Slovakia and the European Commission, USA

<sup>49</sup> Slovakia and the European Commission, International Chamber of Commerce

<sup>50</sup> Slovakia and the European Commission

<sup>51</sup> France, Climate Alliance, World Resources Institute, Iberdrola

<sup>52</sup> A proposition of questionnaire was sent by the World Resources Institute.

<sup>53</sup> CCFD-Terre Solidaire, Suez

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

### C. Tracking

Tracking is essential for cooperative initiatives<sup>55</sup> 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)<sup>56</sup>.

### 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 SDGs<sup>57</sup>. 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 Event<sup>58</sup>. 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 example<sup>59</sup>. 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 providers<sup>60</sup>.

### 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 improved<sup>61</sup>. 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 strengthened<sup>62</sup>. 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 providers<sup>63</sup>. 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 countries<sup>64</sup>. 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 improvements<sup>65</sup>. Cooperative initiatives should provide information on their objectives and on their progress on NAZCA<sup>66</sup>. 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 sign<sup>67</sup>.

---

<sup>55</sup> CCFD-Terre Solidaire, Slovakia and the European Commission

<sup>56</sup> 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

<sup>57</sup> SE4All

<sup>58</sup> Galvanizing the Groundswell of Climate Action

<sup>59</sup> Iberdrola, Business Council for Sustainable Energy, UNEP

<sup>60</sup> Slovakia and the European Commission, USA, Eurelectric, Spanish Association of the Electricity Sector, Norway

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

<sup>62</sup> The Climate Group

<sup>63</sup> Business Council for Sustainable Energy, Climate Alliance, Business for Social Responsibility, Principles for Responsible Investment

<sup>64</sup> Climate Action Network

<sup>65</sup> CCFD-Terre Solidaire, Climate Alliance, I4CE, Japan

<sup>66</sup> World Resources Institute, InterAmerican Clean Energy Institute, SE4All

<sup>67</sup> 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 declarations<sup>68</sup>. While some suggest to highlight the most impactful initiatives<sup>69</sup>, several respondents note that the HLE should not only be about successes, but also remaining challenges, obstacles, and gaps, with solutions to overcome them<sup>70</sup> (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 visibility<sup>71</sup>. 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 summit<sup>72</sup>. 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 principle<sup>73</sup>, a few of them consider that it should not be a single day event but rather a longer conference, or a series of thematic events<sup>74</sup>. As to the date, some suggest to hold it earlier in the summer (June)<sup>75</sup> while others suggest to have it in the margins of the UN General Assembly in September<sup>76</sup> or even during the COP<sup>77</sup>.

## 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 advance<sup>78</sup>. To ensure broader and easier participation, several submissions suggest to

---

<sup>68</sup> Climate Action Network, UNEP, Norway, We Mean Business

<sup>69</sup> Climate Alliance, USA, Global CCS Institute, I4CE, Maldives

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

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

<sup>72</sup> Climate Alliance, Slovakia and the European Commission

<sup>73</sup> France

<sup>74</sup> International Association of Public Transport, WWF

<sup>75</sup> Principles for Responsible Investment, Designated Operational Entities and Independent Entities Association

<sup>76</sup> USA

<sup>77</sup> Caisse des dépôts

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

facilitate remote participation<sup>79</sup>, or to develop live streaming<sup>80</sup>. To enhance the organization of the TEMs, some suggest to increase allocated budgetary and technical means<sup>81</sup>, or to designate entities in charge of the organization (such as countries)<sup>82</sup>. Several respondents recommend making the format of the TEMs more interactive, leaving more time for Q&A, dialogue, and networking<sup>83</sup>.

## 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 ministers<sup>84</sup>, representatives of the private sector<sup>85</sup>, technology providers<sup>86</sup>, financial institutions<sup>87</sup>, subnational authorities<sup>88</sup>, or civil society figures<sup>89</sup> 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 power<sup>90</sup>.

## C. Subject of the TEMs

Some recommend more emphasis on adaptation<sup>91</sup>, consistently with a demand for more balanced North-South representation<sup>92</sup>. Several respondents<sup>93</sup> 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 initiatives<sup>94</sup> as well as the NDCs<sup>95</sup>, 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)<sup>96</sup>.

---

<sup>79</sup> Slovakia and the European Commission, International Chamber of Commerce

<sup>80</sup> Norway, USA

<sup>81</sup> Tyrsky Consulting, Caisse des dépôts

<sup>82</sup> Business Council for Sustainable Energy, Slovakia and the European Commission

<sup>83</sup> Business Council for Sustainable Energy, Climate Alliance, Maldives

<sup>84</sup> Tyrsky Consulting, Caisse des dépôts

<sup>85</sup> Business Council for Sustainable Energy, United States Council for International Business

<sup>86</sup> Business Council for Sustainable Energy

<sup>87</sup> Tyrsky Consulting

<sup>88</sup> The Climate Group, Business Council for Sustainable Energy

<sup>89</sup> University of Maryland, Caisse des dépôts

<sup>90</sup> WWF, International Chamber of Commerce, IndustriAll Global Union

<sup>91</sup> USA, Business & Climate Summit, WWF

<sup>92</sup> Tyrsky Consulting

<sup>93</sup> The Climate Group, Eurelectric, RUSAL

<sup>94</sup> Slovakia and the European Commission, Norway, WWF, Canada

<sup>95</sup> Business Council for Sustainable Energy

<sup>96</sup> Tyrsky Consulting, International Chamber of Commerce