



# Clima East: Support to Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation in Russia and ENP East Countries

**Guidance to preparations of INDCs provided by the COP.20 in Lima.**

**A short analysis of the Lima call for climate action.**

**December 2014**



The COP.20 in Lima ended with a compromise text of the *Lima call for climate action*. The decision contains in an annex a draft text of the future agreement which will be used as a basis for further negotiations in 2015 leading to the final agreement being adopted in Paris. The decision contains also agreed scope of information on the future contributions which countries will put forward before Paris. The key expectation before the Lima COP was that it would provide a guidance to countries on how to prepare their Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) to 2015 Agreement. Those who expected comprehensive guidance on how to draft an INDC are bound to be disappointed.

The Lima decision reiterated invitation from Warsaw to *each UNFCCC Party to submit to the Secretariat its INDC towards achieving the objective of the Convention*.

All INDCs are to be communicated in a *clear, transparent and understandable way*. Without clarity, transparency and understanding of INDCs it would not be possible to quantify and judge the proposed contributions. However, it is for each Party to decide what these qualifiers do mean in their case.

The decision also specified that the information provided by Parties together with their INDC (the upfront information, or UFI) *may include (for each Party to decide) as appropriate in the light of differing national circumstances* a number of specific information. Inter alia, countries are invited to provide, if they wish (since the decision specifies that they *may do so*), *quantifiable information on the reference point* including, as appropriate, a base year, *time frame for implementation or period of implementation* proposed for their contributions, *scope and coverage* of proposed INDCs, *planning processes, assumptions and methodological approaches*, including those for *estimating and accounting for anthropogenic GHG emissions*, and, as appropriate, *removals*.

All this information refers to mitigation that countries are planning to undertake under 2015 agreement. Although the requirements to include all of this information are not mandatory, they may serve as a basis for comparison based on understanding on how the proposed INDCs contribute to achieving the objective of the Convention as set out in its Article 2 and it is hoped that they will help to create peer pressure between countries to put forward ambitious contributions.

However, Parties are also *invited to consider* communicating their undertakings in adaptation planning or *consider* including an adaptation component in their INDCs. This should be interpreted that countries submitting their INDC on mitigation may also add an adaptation component to their INDC. Adaptation component of INDC differs from the

mitigation component insofar that the mitigation component will be considered under the aggregate effect of the INDCs communicated by Parties by 1 October 2015. In the absence of a global adaptation goal (which some developing countries would like to see but which would be difficult to define), mitigation components and their aggregate effect on the way towards achieving long term goal of keeping the rise of the global temperature below 2 degrees Celsius until 2100 will be considered by the Secretariat of the Convention in a synthesis report that the Lima decision requires it to prepare for the Paris COP. An enormous effort of all Parties is required to limit global warming to 2 degrees Celsius. Key for achieving that goal would be the ambition of the world's largest economies.

Special circumstances of LDCs and small island developing states (SIDS) were recognized by the COP in allowing these countries to include in their INDCs, should they wish to do so, information on their strategies, plans and actions for low GHG emission development *reflecting their special circumstances*.

The *deadline* for communicating INDC was set as *well in advance of the COP.21* and for those Parties ready to do so they are to be communicated by *the first quarter of 2015*. Some countries already announced before the Lima negotiations their intention to submit INDC to the UNFCCC Secretariat by the first quarter of 2015. Significantly, the key two emitters, China and the US issued a joint statement in November 2014 on planned climate action, announcing measures of the planned cooperation and the mitigation goals they intend to achieve by 2030 and 2025, respectively. China intends to achieve the peaking of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions around 2030 and to make best efforts to peak early and intends to increase the share of non-fossil fuels in primary energy consumption to around 20% by 2030. The United States intends to achieve an economy-wide target of reducing its emissions by 26%-28% below its 2005 level in 2025 and to make best efforts to reduce its emissions by 28%. Both countries also announced that they intend to continue to work to increase ambition over time. Also the European Union, no longer the top emitter with its c. 10% share in global GHG emissions in 2012 and falling, but long considered as a leader in climate action and willing to show the way, announced its target to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions *at least* 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030, thereby indicating it may consider an increase of its target. Combined emissions of all three amount to about half of the global GHG emissions, so their contributions to 2015 Agreement do matter. Their announced pledges already provide a benchmark against which other countries will inevitably measure their INDCs.

Other countries willing to participate in 2015 Agreement need to get on with deciding what mitigation goals and measures *they* will be able to put forward by March 2015 or soon after. The planned actions have to be considered as a step on the way to a transition to low-carbon economies, as only in this way the long term goal of limiting the rise of the global temperature to 2 degrees Celsius may be achieved collectively by the global community. Crucially, each INDC should represent a progression beyond current undertaking of the Party which is submitting that INDC, as stated in para. 10 of the Lima decision. The first three announcements, by the EU, USA and China, of the possible future INDCs indicate that the proposed reductions represent a clear deviation from business as usual. Current pledge of the US is a reduction in the range of 17 % by 2020 and 83 % by 2050. The new target for 2025 will require the US to reduce emission below its current trajectory, and the 2025 target will have to be pursued vigorously, with many additional measures, as in 2012 the US was not set even on the way to achieve its 2020 target. China's pledge to peak its emissions around 2030, or earlier, and to increase its share of non-fossil fuel in primary energy mix to 20% by 2030 compared to its previous pledge of reducing carbon intensity (emissions per unit of GDP) by 40% to 45 % from 2005 levels by 2020, and to increase non-fossil fuels share in the energy to 15 % by 2020 shows progress and will require new measures, since, according to IEA scenarios, with current measures emissions would level off between 2030 and 2040 at 12-14 billion metric tonnes per year. In the absence of a forum to discuss the proposed INDCs at the UNFCCC, it will be up to international community, NGOs, experts and intergovernmental institutions to provide their assessment of the pledges, which, although non-binding, will provide a degree of pressure on countries to increase their ambition, if it is deemed too modest. The Lima decision underscored the commitment of Parties to the UNFCCC to „reaching an ambitious agreement in 2015 that reflects the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, *in light of different national circumstances.*” Significantly, China and the US in their joint announcement declared that both are committed to reaching an ambitious 2015 Agreement that reflects the *principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in light of different national circumstances.* In Lima, most developing countries, in particular the likeminded developing countries (LMDCs), maintained that there should be differentiation, both in the 2015 agreement and the INDCs, in line with Parties' obligations under the Convention, and reflecting the principles of CBDR and equity. The fact that the Lima decision refers to CBDR and respective capabilities in line with varying national circumstances opens the door to the interpretation and is considered by commentators as the end of the firewall between

developed and developing Parties to the Convention. To protect the differentiation between Parties, the LMDCs also strongly opposed the use of expression “*parties in a position to do so*” in relation to the provision of support to developing countries for their ambitious mitigation and adaptation actions, despite Mexico taking the floor and appealing for recognition that a developing country may want to provide finance to support other countries’ efforts on a voluntary basis. The overall meaning of the Lima decision is to provide a recognition that all countries need to make effort and that a list of possible information accompanying INDCs applies to all countries, not just developed ones. The appropriateness of the information provided with the INDC should be considered on case by case basis, in reference to the INDC and the type it belongs to.

Eastern Partnership countries belong partly to Annex I of the Convention and are recognized as economies in transition, and partly they are non-Annex I countries. The guidance provided by the COP does not distinguish between these categories, and does not offer a separate set of recommendation to them. Only LDCs and SIDS are considered to be a group of countries which may reflect and communicate their special circumstances explicitly in the context of their INDCs. Therefore EaP countries were invited much in the same way as other countries to submit their INDCs to the UNFCCC Secretariat by the first quarter of 2015, for those Parties ready to do so, or well in advance of the COP.21. The communication should be made in a manner facilitating the clarity, transparency and understanding of the INDC. In other words, the INDC should be communicated in such a way as to clarify what the country intends to achieve, in what period, how this will be achieved, how this was calculated and will be accounted for, and in what way this effort is fair and ambitious in the light of national circumstances, and how it contributes to the objective of the Convention as set out in its Article 2. No minimum level of common types of information submitted by Parties was established, so Parties in need of support in preparation of their INDCs have to rely on such support<sup>1</sup> provided to them by developed countries and operating entities of the Financial Mechanism or any other organisations in a position to do so, as stated in para. 15 of the Lima decision. Setting to work on the submission, countries have to bear in mind that their INDCs have to demonstrate they go beyond business as usual and currently planned measures, and do all they can to be ready with their submission well in advance of the COP.21.

---

<sup>1</sup> Clima East 2015 work programmes are formulated for partner countries and the region focusing on INDC preparation support.