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1. International policy frameworks
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- Hottest years in modern record
- 16 of the top 17 have occurred since 2000
To date the Paris Agreement has been:

- signed by 195 Parties and
- ratified or otherwise joined by 176 Parties
- representing 88% of global emissions
Adaptation under the UNFCCC

- 1996 COP2: Observing impacts, assessing risks and vulnerabilities
- 2001 COP7: Moving to planning and pilot implementation
  - LDC Support (NAPAs, LEG, LDCF)
  - SCCF and AF
- 2005 COP11: Sharing knowledge and lessons learned
  - Nairobi work programme
- 2007 COP13: Scaling up implementation
  - Bali Action Plan
- 2007 COP13: Strengthening institutions
  - Cancun Adaptation Framework
  - Adaptation Committee, NAPs and L&D
- 2011 COP16: Adaptation in the future
  - Full-scale implementation

Adaptation Fund

Financial allocations

- By fiscal year
- 2011: $120 million
- 2012: $100 million
- 2013: $80 million
- 2014: $60 million

Financial allocations

- By sector
- Rural development
- Agriculture
- Water management
- Food security
- Coastal management
- Multi-sector
- Disaster risk reduction

Project distribution

- By region
- Africa: 10
- Latin America and the Caribbean: 10
- Asia-Pacific: 13
- Eastern Europe: 1
- Disaster risk reduction: 4
- Coastal management: 4
- Agriculture: 6
- Rural development: 6
- Food security: 5
- Multi-sector: 3
- Water management: 6
Adaptation in the NDCs to the Paris Agreement
Key challenges for global stocktake on adaptation

- What to measure?
  - Adaptation activities: descriptive metrics and evaluative questions
  - Assessing adaptation outcomes: policy evaluation methods

- Accounting for mainstreaming
- Data collection and reporting burden
- Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Type of indicators</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output based</td>
<td>Extent of implementation of strategies, plans, process</td>
<td>Austria, France, UK measure % of implementation of national action plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of mainstreaming across sectors and levels of government</td>
<td>Cambodia and Kenya measure degree of mainstreaming adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on targets</td>
<td>Degree of achieving adaptation targets (from NAP or NDCs)</td>
<td>Brazil is monitoring implementation of the NAP targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome based</td>
<td>Changes in risk or vulnerability over time</td>
<td>Colombia, Germany, Morocco, UK monitor over time at the national, subnational or programme level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoided negative climate impacts</td>
<td>Any systems having direct impact indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement of development goals despite climate impacts</td>
<td>Proposed in Cambodia, Kenya, Phellinus and South Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNEP Adaptation Gap report, 2017
2. Implementation by states: Global trend in national governance
What is climate governance?

- **Governance:** purposeful attempts at coordinating action towards the desired policy goals (Knill and Tosun, 2012)
- **Institutions:** formal rules and informal norms (North, 1993; Ostrom, 1986) and processes or practices that prescribe behavioral roles for actors, constrain activity, and shape expectations (Keohane 1988)
Climate legislation in 1997
72 legislative and executive acts
Climate legislation in March 2018:
1500 legislative and executive acts: A twenty fold increase in 20 years
Number of climate-related laws and policies passed globally, to 2017

25 of 102 laws and policies passed since the Paris Agreement reference it or NDCs

Global trends in climate change legislation and litigation: 2018 snapshot, Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment
Annual Legislative Action to 2016

Developing (middle and low income countries)
Climate laws and policies by focus area

- Climate change / low-carbon transitions
- Energy
- Mainstreamed into planning
- Forestry
- Various
Sectoral focus of legislation does not match emissions profiles

GHG emissions from various sectors

- Electricity and heat production: 25%
- Agriculture, forestry, and other land use: 24%
- Industry: 21%
- Transportation: 14%
- Buildings: 6%
- Other energy: 10%

There are 741 legislative and executive acts addressing energy supply.

There are only 278 legislative and executive acts addressing emissions from agriculture, forestry and land use change.
Adaptation is under-legislated

- Legislation addressing adaptation; 7%
- Executive orders addressing adaptation; 7%
- Legislation and executive orders addressing mitigation; 73%
- Legislation and executive orders addressing mitigation; 20%
Examples of framework laws

- UK Climate Change Act, 2008
- Mexico "General Law on Climate Change" 2012 (and Decree of 2018)
- Honduras "Decree no. 297-2013 (Law on Climate Change)" 2014
- Malta “Climate Action Act”, 2015
- Mexico "Energy Transition Law" 2015
- France “Energy Transition Law”, 2015
- Ierland, Climate Action and Low Carbon Development Act 2015
- Finland Climate Change Act, 2016
- Kenya Climate Change Act, 2016
- Ecuador "Organic Code on the Environment" 2017
- Paraguay "National Law on Climate Change no. 5875" 2017
- Sweden “Climate Change Act”, 2017
- Peru "Framework Law no 30754 on Climate Change" 2018

Drafts:
- South Africa (published June 2018)
- Chile (to be published July 2018)
- New Zealand
3. Assessing effectiveness of governance frameworks: Case study on the UK Climate Change Act
Our research method

• Multiple analytical techniques
  – Interviews, consultations, lit review

• Range of angles & expertise
  – 33 interviews >50 perspectives
  – Different views about speed of emission cuts
  – 2 overt climate sceptics
  – Only 18% female respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Politicians, by party:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Democrat</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-bench peers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by function:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentarians</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister/secretary of state</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special advisers to ministers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government officials, including:</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Energy and Climate Change/Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Climate Change, including:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector, including:</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-carbon/energy-intensive</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-carbon (e.g. renewables)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g. services, agriculture)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other stakeholders, including:</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs/think tanks</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalists</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Long-term target to 2050

What and how?
Reduce emissions by at least 80% on 1990 levels
Covers the whole economy and all greenhouse gases

Outcomes
Long-term direction of travel
Defines the UK's contribution to solving climate change

Scientifically informed, long-term approach to policymaking
Rolling set of medium-term targets

**Carbon budgets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What and how?</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sequence of 5-year targets</td>
<td>Basis for concrete policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended by Committee on Climate Change (CCC)</td>
<td>Long-term target translated into near-term actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debated and legislated by Parliament</td>
<td>Flexibility built in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 12 years ahead</td>
<td>Progressive, ratcheted emissions cuts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continual adaptation planning

What and how?
5-year cycles of adaptation programmes and risk assessments
Scrutinised by CCC

Outcomes
Introduced climate change risk into public and private sector decision-making
Prepares for the now unavoidable impacts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What and how?</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Climate Change: experts and secretariat</td>
<td>Independent, objective analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommends carbon budgets</td>
<td>Long-term consistency in approach across government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitors progress on emissions reduction and climate resilience</td>
<td>Transparency and legitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More informed decision-making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Independent advisory body**
Background CCC and ASC members (number of members)

- Natural environment: 2 members
- Behaviour: 2 members
- Climate science: 3 members
- Economics: 3 members
- Food / agriculture: 2 members
- Technology / engineering: 7 members
- Politics: 1 member
- Third sector: 2 members
- Business: 3 members
- Academia: 7 members
## Duties and powers to deliver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What and how?</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government is accountable to Parliament to deliver</td>
<td>Assigns clear responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government obliged to produce plans to meet budgets</td>
<td>Holds government accountable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC provides annual progress reports to Parliament</td>
<td>Enables public scrutiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament Judicial review if non-compliant</td>
<td>Provides basis for policy implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Different stages in the life of the Act

• Agreeing the Act (2006-08)

• Building the institutions (2008-10)

• Safeguarding climate ambition (2011-17)

“Vote blue go green”

David Cameron
September 2005

“We’ve got to get rid of all the green crap”

David Cameron
November 2013
Areas of success
The political debate on climate change has improved

- The Act provides a clear structure for debate

- The Committee on Climate Change as a custodian of analytical rigor

- But much less impact on the public debate, e.g. in the media
The political consensus on climate change has held

• Political commitment to particular climate policies has waxed and waned, but there is no real opposition to the Act.

• The Act is both a beneficiary and a cause of the political consensus on climate change.
Mentions of Climate Change Committee in Parliamentary debates

Work in progress, please do not cite
Mentions of Climate Change Committee in Parliamentary debates

Work in progress, please do not cite
The UK’s international standing has grown

• The Act became the basis of a sustained international campaign on climate change by the Foreign Office

• It helped the UK to play a leadership role in negotiating the Paris Agreement and inspiring other countries to take action
The power sector has been transformed

• Greenhouse gas emissions have fallen since 2008, but this trend started well before the Act came into force

• But the impact of the Act on the UK power sector has been transformative

4 Share of low-carbon power up from 20-45% by 2016
UK emissions started to fall in the early 1990s

The trend continued under the Climate Change Act

Source: Expanded from Committee on Climate Change (2017)
Areas for improvement
Four areas where expectations have not been met

- The Climate Change Act on its own is not sufficiently investible
  - Certainty about carbon targets is different from certainty about carbon policies

- Insufficient protection against backsliding
  - A gap between emissions targets and the policies to deliver them

- More adaptation planning than adaptation action
  - A slower start and some problems with the 1st Climate Change Risk Assessment and National Adaptation Programme

- Government buy-in is uneven across departments
The impact of the Climate Change Act on key debates

Source: Interview responses
The Act remains an effective framework for climate action
But some adjustments to climate governance should be considered

- Compatibility with the Paris Agreement (net-zero target for UK by 2020)
- Stronger safeguards against backsliding
  - a statutory timetable for carbon plans; financial independence of the CCC; clearer criteria for assessing compliance
- Implications of Brexit
  - Carbon accounting based on gross emissions, not of carbon trades under the EU ETS
Key Learnings

• A framework law is an effective way to coordinate and advance climate action

• A good framework law is not a substitute for political leadership on climate change

• The UK needs to reinvigorate this consensus as it moves into the next phase of decarbonisation
For more information see:

The Governance and Legislation research programme:
http://www.lse.ac.uk/GranthamInstitute/research-theme/governance-and-legislation/

Thank you!

Alina Averchenkova
a.averchenkova@lse.ac.uk
+44 7799657954
http://www.lse.ac.uk/GranthamInstitute/profile/alina-averchenkova/