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Dimensions of challenges

- **The ambition challenge**
  - How to incentivise ambitious action to
  - Reduce emissions in line with the below 2 degree goal
  - Increase resilience
  - Mobilise finance and technology

- **The participation challenge**
  - How to ensure broad participation, achieve equal playing field, and avoid free riding?

- **The durability challenge**
  - How to respond to changes over time?

- **The implementation challenge**
  - How to ensure delivery of results on the ground and effective monitoring of progress?
Since Copenhagen, we have had a new international climate change regime that can be called “concerted domestic action”

- Increasing recognition that enforceable international agreement not feasible
- But concerted domestic action based on international peer pressure and domestic political pressure allows progress
- Serious domestic political commitments can provide firm basis including for trade in abatement
Targets representing ambitious changes in emissions trends

- China’s 40 to 45 percent intensity the most substantial change in trajectory
- Compare US 17% reductions 2005-2020 with previous expectations of 2025 peak
- Australia’s minus 5% unconditional and 25% conditional a huge break in trend given population and economy growth
- India’s “never higher per capita than developed countries” important to future regime
- Substantial commitments from other large developing (note Indonesia, Brazil)

Much more consequential than Kyoto but pointing to 4 degrees not 2 degrees
Countries are delivering on targets

- China, USA, Europe, Australia
- Demonstrating that reducing emissions is less costly than anticipated
- Suggesting opportunity to do more despite weak recovery from financial crisis
But global climate change policy is in crisis

- Serial disappointment about UNFCCC outcomes
  - Collapse of confidence in process outside the “negotiating community”

- Lack of strong incentives – e.g. collapse of carbon prices discrediting market-based regimes
  - CDM credits useless and with huge overhang
  - European carbon price at derisory levels
  - Discrediting new carbon pricing regimes in NZ, Australia and plans in Korea and China
  - Important to preserve carbon pricing for mitigation as well as economic efficiency because necessary for future deep emissions reduction
Resilience, or "Adaptation"

Successful mitigation is the front line of adaptation

- fanciful to think of effective policies for adaptation to above 2 degrees.
- people will have to adapt above two degrees although not through effective policies from today's national and international entities

Adaptation policies valuable for moderate warming

- scientific knowledge of likely impact in all countries
- flexible economies with effective markets including for food and water
- effective provision of public infrastructure required for development in general
Solutions to UNFCCC and carbon pricing crises have common elements

- Recognise reality that a major lifting of mitigation ambition required to keep 2 degree target in reach
- Guide national targets with independent expert assessment on allocating global emissions budget 2020-2050
- Provide substance for commitments to climate financing for developing countries
- Tighten targets for 2020, announced by 2015
- Adoption of domestic 2020-2050 targets consistent with below 2 degree goal, at COP21 in 2015
Elsewhere I have referred to Concerted Domestic Action as "Concerted Unilateral Mitigation".