

Equity and spectrum of mitigation commitments in the 2015 agreement

Arild Underdal

Steffen Kallbekken

Håkon Sælen



Strategic Challenges
in International Climate
and Energy Policy

www.cicep.uio.no

Overview

- Project for NOAK
- Review of literature on equity and spectrum
- Analysis of Parties' views
- Global indicators
- Operationalizing equity in a spectrum of mitigation commitments



Normative theory



Strategic Challenges
in International Climate
and Energy Policy

www.cicep.uio.no

The good news

- *CBDR/RC* is a fairly succinct expression of what in fact emerges as a broadly accepted *framework* of distributive fairness
- The search for distributive fairness criteria is an effort to **combine** two basic principles
 - **Equal** treatment of *equal* cases
 - **Differential** treatment of cases that differ significantly in important respects

The bad news

- ‘Responsibility’ and ‘capacity’ – are subject to ***divergent interpretations***, and this divergence tends to reflect ***conflicts of interests***
- Under these circumstances, search for a *consensual* and *precise formula* for a new climate change mitigation agreement is ***not likely to succeed***

Operationalizing equity



Strategic Challenges
in International Climate
and Energy Policy

www.cicep.uio.no

Responsibility: issues that matter

- *Comprehensiveness of coverage*
- Applying the *equality–equity–exemption framework* or relying on simple dichotomy
 - No single dichotomy can adequately capture the full range of variance
- Time horizons
 - To reflect important change, a ***dynamic*** agreement will be needed



Capabilities: issues that matter

- Ability to pay (gdp/cap) only or including also renewable energy resource endowments
- Conceiving of capabilities in terms of *aggregate transformation capacity* or as a matter of ability to pay more narrowly defined
- Time horizons matter less for capacity indicators

Integrated capabilities index

with the United States as baseline (=1.00)

Actor	Transformation capacity (50 %)	Renewable energy endowments (50 %)	Aggregate (100 %)
USA	1.00	1.00	1.00
EU (27)	0.76	0.21	0.49
Japan	0.83	0.08	0.46
Brazil	0.38	0.56*	0.47
China	0.32	0.21*	0.27
India	0.24	0.08*	0.16
Russia	0.47	1.82*	1.12

Analysis of parties' views



Strategic Challenges
in International Climate
and Energy Policy

www.cicep.uio.no

What is equity associated with in submissions?

Term	Correlation with “equity”
CBDR	0.95
Annex I or Annex II	0.84
Developed countries should take the lead	0.89
Historical (responsibility)	0.94
Principles of the Convention	0.92
ADP should not rewrite or reinterpret the Convention	0.94
Poverty (alleviation)	0.95
Means of implementation	0.95
Bali (Action Plan/ Road Map)	0.95
Right to (sustainable) development	0.91
Equitable Access to Sustainable Development	0.97
Loss and Damage	0.85

Equity vs. Fairness

	Equity	CBDR	Fair(ness)	National circumstances
AI Parties	15	8	40	39
LMDC	59	71	2	5

Operationalizing equity in a spectrum of commitments



Strategic Challenges
in International Climate
and Energy Policy

www.cicep.uio.no

Points of departure

- Commitments will likely be domestically determined.
- Commitments will likely be subjected to an *ex-ante* review – which should include equity.
- Several norms of distributive fairness are valid, and each can be operationalized in multiple ways.
- There must be a limited set of indicators.

Proposals on the table

- CAN, South Africa, Gambia, Kenya, African group: Equity Reference Framework
- EU, NZ: parties should outline how they represent a fair contribution based on responsibilities and capabilities. Up to parties to choose which criteria/indicators to use.



A template of indicators approach

- Will not agree a set of equity indicators for all.
- Should be limits and expectations on what indicators to report.
- Bounded flexibility is a compromise.

Different options on each indicator

- a) Report the indicator
- b) Disclose data for an official expert group to calculate the indicator
- c) Allow the expert group to calculate the indicator based on available data
- d) Decline reporting

Key insights: mutual recognition

- Parties accept a *set* of norms and a *range* of interpretations as *legitimate*, i.e., as consistent with CBDR/RC.
- Parties respect a principle of *reciprocity*: any (interpretation of a) principle of fairness invoked by oneself can legitimately be invoked also by others.
- A mutual recognition that all parties operate under *feasibility constraints* – political, technical and economic.
- Bounded feasibility as an approach for the spectrum of commitments

