



# CLIMATE CHANGE

V I E W P O I N T P A P E R

*Benefits and Costs of the Climate Change Targets  
for the Post-2015 Development Agenda*

ForumCC

# Benefits and Costs of the Climate Change Targets for the Post-2015 Development Agenda

---

## Post-2015 Consensus

Rebecca Muna

*ForumCC*

Fazal Issa

*ForumCC*

## **Abbreviations**

CO <sub>2</sub>	Carbon Dioxide
COP	Conference of Parties
ForumCC	Tanzania Civil Society Forum on Climate Change
GHGs	Greenhouse Gases
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPRs	Intellectual Property Rights
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

## **About ForumCC Tanzania**

ForumCC, also known as the Tanzanian Civil Society Forum on Climate Change, is an association of civil society organisations committed to work on climate change in their own programmes as well as through advocacy. It brings together development and environment organizations, those with technical skills and those with a more delivery and advocacy focus.

ForumCC works to ensure effective and informed engagement of Civil Society Organisations in Tanzania on Climate Change issues for the benefit of the environment and people in poverty who are affected.

The Forum has three main areas of engagement, these are:

1. Capacity and institutional strengthening.
2. Coordination and network building.
3. Advocacy and policy engagement.

You can learn more about us through our website: [www.forumcc.org](http://www.forumcc.org)

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>GENERAL REVIEW .....</b>	<b>1</b>
STRENGTHS.....	1
WEAKNESSES .....	1
<b>COUNTER ARGUMENTS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>ISSUES TO BE ADDED .....</b>	<b>3</b>
CLIMATE FINANCE .....	3
LOSS AND DAMAGE [DISASTER MANAGEMENT AND EARLY WARNING SYSTEMS] .....	3
TECHNOLOGY .....	3
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>3</b>

## **Introduction**

As we are heading to a crucial year, 2015, for climate change in terms of global climate agreement and global development framework – the post-2015 consensus project has come at a right time with the assessment of various targets of the post-2015 agenda.

This paper intends to provide additional perspectives to the climate change assessment paper by Isabel Galiana.

## **General Review**

### ***Strengths***

Generally, the paper has covered well the technical and benefit-cost analysis of the climate change concept as well as energy and technology. The author has built strong evidence-based arguments, especially on climate change mitigation which the paper has focused most. The arguments were built and backed by recent literatures which serve the best for the dynamic and complex nature of the climate change concept.

Also, the link between the recommendations and arguments is clear whereby the author well analyzed the targets and clearly categorized the targets according to their benefit-costs and effectiveness.

### ***Weaknesses***

The major shortcoming of the paper is on imbalance of the arguments, as the author focused much on the mitigation part (energy and technology) rather than a balance of arguments which would have also included issues on adaptation, climate finance and loss and damage, which are very important especially to developing countries. This has also led to the author's review focus to be on targets that are mitigation-based/oriented (Goal 7, 9 and 12) and left other ones on Goal 1 (target 'd'), Goal 5 (c, d and e), and Goal 6 (c). These targets include issues on natural disasters, agriculture and food security, and water.

Though adaptation was briefly discussed and outlined as one of the recommended targets, the discussion of the arguments did not cover much about adaptation. Adding to this, climate finance were not discussed which are also vital for the climate change issue. Also, technology was only discussed by linking to energy issues through low carbon development. Each of these will be explained further in the coming parts.

Apart from these weaknesses, there were also some arguments raised by the author which contradict with the actual situation. These will be explained further on the next part below.

## **Counter Arguments**

There are doubts or concerns about the validity of two of the author's arguments in the challenge paper. These arguments are:

- *“Limited technology being the major challenge on climate change mitigation compared to political readiness/will and ineffective compliance mechanisms and sanctions”*: As the author also acknowledged, emission levels have been increasing with CO2 emissions increasing more than 46%, climate change mitigation still remains a challenge, and a number of issues have led to lesser mitigation efforts such as Ineffective compliance mechanisms and sanctions, Lack of political will, and Limited technologies.

The first two best describe the developed countries’ situation (being major polluters) whereby due to lack of effective compliance mechanisms and sanctions under the current global climate architecture and negotiations processes as well as the lack of political will – the mitigation commitments and efforts of the developed countries still remain low. To add to that, the ineffective mechanisms and sanctions can be a result of economic dependence of developing countries to developed countries (who are major polluters) as well as high political influence (due to their economic status) by these developed countries which leads to domination of negotiations and associated decisions.

Though the cost of investing on low carbon development technologies is high and therefore a challenge to mitigation, this seems to be more of a problem to developing countries (rather than developed) with a number of development challenges and therefore limited funds to invest on low carbon technologies.

Investment on low carbon development technologies leads to reducing GHG emissions and therefore a reduction in adaptation costs also. As the adaptation costs are estimated to be around US \$ 100 billion and could rise to US \$ 450 billion as early as 2030, therefore, if there is political will, investment will be made on mitigation like other mega projects such as on aerospace.

- *Effective adaptation will lead to lesser mitigation and hence higher atmospheric concentrations*: Adaptation and Mitigation are complimentary to each other, but it is more valid to conclude that if mitigation measures are undertaken effectively there will be lesser adaptation needed because the impacts will be low. But this is not the case the other way round, because if there are lesser mitigation efforts there will more impacts of climate change and therefore creating an adaptation gap whereby adaptation will always play a catching-up game (this is also highlighted in the adaptation gap report).

As the world will still experience climate change effects for a number of decades even if emissions are stopped today (which is impossible), the only scenario that adaptation could be effective and lead to lesser mitigation efforts is when there are no emissions for decades and having continuous coordinated adaptation efforts, which is not a practical scenario.

## **Issues to be Added**

### ***Climate Finance***

The author overlooked the issue of climate finance whereby it did not come out clearly from the discussion or recommendations. The major concern regarding this is for the developed countries to fulfill their commitment of providing climate finance of US \$ 100 billion per year by 2020, with priority being adaptation for the developing countries. This also includes having a transparent system at global and national levels by establishing better monitoring, reporting and verification mechanisms.

Climate finance issues have also been taken on board on the recently released proposal by the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals on the specific climate change proposed goal (goal 13) as target '13a'.

### ***Loss and Damage [Disaster Management and Early Warning Systems]***

As it has been acknowledged in the decision '2/CP.19' which established the 'International Mechanism for Loss and Damage' during the UNFCCC COP19 in Warsaw-Poland, issues of Loss and Damage can be more than those, which can be reduced by adaptation and therefore should be taken with more importance.

Regarding this, it is more about building adaptive capacity and resilience to extreme weather event/climate-related hazards. As it has been pointed out in the IPCC 5th Assessment Report, a number of extreme weather events have increased, therefore, capacity building is needed especially in developing countries for establishing early warning systems and technologies.

### ***Technology***

The author discussed much about the issues of technology, but this was a focus on energy and technology issues which also demonstrate the author's concentration on mitigation. The author could have gone further by discussing technology issues on adaptation and capacity building as explained above on issues such as early warning systems.

Also, in order to facilitate transfer of environmentally friendly technologies from developed countries to developing countries, issues of Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs) should also being included as it has been one of the constraining factors. IPRs should be reviewed and reformed in order to relax (rather than strengthen) them. This will help facilitate the transfer and diffusion of these technologies for both mitigation and adaptation.

## **Conclusion**

Climate change is a complex, cross-sectoral, global development challenge, and despite having effects on all countries, the level of impact is different among and between countries - and this can be mainly due to adaptive capacity, which is always associated with (but not limited to) the level of development. In order to address such challenges, joint, comprehensive and coordinated actions and solutions need to be implemented. The actions

and solutions should take into consideration and have a balance of (as it was categorized in Bali Roadmap) mitigation, adaptation, and means of implementation (capacity building, technology and climate finance).

This paper was written by Rebecca Muna, Program Manager and by Fazal Issa, Program Manager at ForumCC. The project brings together 62 teams of economists with NGOs, international agencies and businesses to identify the targets with the greatest benefit-to-cost ratio for the UN's post-2015 development goals.

For more information visit [post2015consensus.com](http://post2015consensus.com)

## COPENHAGEN CONSENSUS CENTER

Copenhagen Consensus Center is a think tank that investigates and publishes the best policies and investment opportunities based on how much social good (measured in dollars, but also incorporating e.g. welfare, health and environmental protection) for every dollar spent. The Copenhagen Consensus was conceived to address a fundamental, but overlooked topic in international development: In a world with limited budgets and attention spans, we need to find effective ways to do the most good for the most people. The Copenhagen Consensus works with 100+ of the world's top economists including 7 Nobel Laureates to prioritize solutions to the world's biggest problems, on the basis of data and cost-benefit analysis.

