

---

# THE UN CLIMATE SUMMIT'S PUBLIC–PRIVATE ACTION ANNOUNCEMENTS

## Sorting the promising from the greenwash

---

### THE PURPOSE OF THIS GUIDE

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon invited business leaders to bring to the Climate Summit the bold actions they are undertaking to address climate change. These public–private initiatives are touted to be a key outcome of the summit – especially given that few governments will be in a position to make major new commitments. The hope is that they will inject some positive momentum into the global talks by showing that business is already ‘getting on with it’ and leading the way.

The public–private initiatives announced range from recycled commitments and greenwash, to promises of more meaningful new and additional efforts towards emissions reductions and strengthening climate resilience. This guide assesses the different initiatives against a number of tests, including whether the initiative is new and will lead to action that goes beyond business-as-usual; whether it is transformational (i.e. will it lead to change on the scale required); is pro-poor; helps or hinders government action; is just a voluntary commitment; and whether it includes transparent benchmarks for measuring impact and ensuring accountability. On the basis of these tests, Oxfam has awarded each initiative an initial overall ‘traffic light’ rating: green for those that meet most or all of the tests; amber for those that meet some and show promise; and red for those that clearly fall short of the benchmarks.

For more on the context of the Ban Ki-Moon Summit in September 2014, see Oxfam media briefing: [The Summit that Snoozed?](#)

### WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT THE INITIATIVES

This guide organizes the initiatives in eight categories: agriculture, forests, energy, short-lived climate pollutants, transport, resilience, financing and cities. It assesses the overall headline announcements in those areas in which Oxfam has some level of expertise only, and offers an initial reading of the strengths and weaknesses of each based on the limited information that is available (though the framework could be used to assess any of the initiatives launched at the summit). Across the board, greater transparency of the details behind the announcements is essential for civil society and other stakeholders to hold those making commitments to account, both at the summit and in the months and years ahead.

## SUMMARY

Announcement	Brief description	Traffic light rating	Main strengths/weaknesses
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>			
<b>Global Alliance for Climate-Smart Agriculture</b>	The Alliance is a voluntary global platform for governments, private sector and civil society actors which aims to facilitate the spread of climate-smart agriculture (CSA) approaches at scale. CSA is commonly characterized as agricultural approaches which seek 'triple wins' of enhanced productivity, increased resilience, and improved carbon mitigation and sequestration in soils. Key champions include the governments of the Netherlands, USA, South Africa and Vietnam, and the FAO and CGIAR.		<p>The creation of a Global Alliance to promote CSA is new, but it will initially act as an umbrella for a range of existing initiatives. The Framework Document establishing the Alliance has been criticised by many civil society organizations, including for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• its vague definition of CSA and lack of clear metrics to evaluate the scale and added value of its impact;</li> <li>• lacking membership criteria or strong social and environmental safeguards to avoid members using the Alliance brand to greenwash questionable agricultural approaches;</li> <li>• the lack of deep or consistent participation by farmer organizations and civil society, especially from low-income or highly climate vulnerable countries;</li> <li>• the lack of clear differentiation between the roles and responsibilities of large- and small-scale farmers (especially with regard to mitigation and sequestration).</li> </ul>
<b>Africa Alliance for Climate-Smart Agriculture</b>	This initiative was launched at the African Union Heads of State meeting held in June 2014. Led, by the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), the initiative is a partnership among governments, research institutions and NGOs, including Oxfam, which aims to improve the productivity and resilience of agriculture for 6 million farming households by 2021.		<p>This initiative aims to address many of the criticisms levelled at the Global Alliance for CSA, including by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• working to include African farmer-based organizations and CSOs in the initiative, and to develop a definition of CSA which is appropriate for the African context and owned by local stakeholders;</li> <li>• focusing on practices which aim to boost the productivity and resilience of small-scale producers, rather than the triple wins of productivity, resilience and mitigation;</li> <li>• establishing clear and transparent baselines against which to assess progress, performance and results in terms of real impact on small-scale producers.</li> </ul>
<b>ENERGY</b>			
<b>Africa Clean Energy Corridor</b>	This aims to create a predominantly renewable-powered energy grid spanning eastern Africa from		This initiative was first agreed in January 2013, but is being given an extra push for the summit. The initiative will not make a big impact on current emissions, but has the potential to avoid future emissions by

	<p>Cairo to Cape Town – to allow strong winds or bright sunshine in different parts of the continent to benefit electricity production for the whole region. The initiative will assess and identify renewable hotspots and help to get projects off the ground by working with governments to improve the regulatory framework, implement new financing models, and take a regional approach to planning – working out how to optimize renewable generation across countries.</p>		<p>helping the continent leap-frog fossil fuels and move straight to renewables. This is in line with IPCC recommendations that renewable energy needs to treble by 2050.</p> <p>The ambition of this project is welcome, but it will require huge investment to succeed, and since the project is still at a scoping stage, it is too early to tell whether that will be forthcoming, Since it is designed to serve existing large-load areas like cities and industrial areas, it will not directly improve energy access for the 90% of people living in sub-Saharan Africa who are not already connected to the grid. However, the project may indirectly benefit people off the grid by pushing technology forward, increasing financing and improving the regulatory frameworks for all renewables projects.</p>
<p><b>Energy Efficiency Accelerator</b></p>	<p>A platform for multi-stakeholder action to scale up energy efficiency in different sectors, including: buildings; transport and fuel efficiency; lighting and appliances; district energy systems; and industrial energy efficiency, including SMEs.</p>		<p>A mixture of new and existing initiatives with differing levels of ambition. The lighting and appliances accelerator offers most promise to deliver significant emission cuts; the transport accelerator could introduce fuel economy standards to developing and transition countries for the first time, but at a lower level than exists in many regions and would allow overall emissions from cars to increase. The main drawback is that only a handful of cities will initially pilot each initiative, meaning that the overall impact will be limited.</p>
<p><b>FINANCE</b></p>			
<p><b>‘Putting a Price on Carbon’ Statement</b></p>	<p>Governments and companies support a statement committing to work together towards the long-term aim of a global carbon price.</p>		<p>A global carbon price has huge potential to cut emissions, depending on how it is designed (the level of the price; is there an overall cap; does it cover all sectors; is it legally binding – i.e. set by government with accompanying policy measures, rather than being an internal corporate carbon price). This statement is new, but it follows two very similar previous statements from companies which have been more ambitious<sup>1</sup>. It is 17 years since the Kyoto Protocol established the idea of a carbon market, and little impact has been achieved. This initiative will only add value if additional companies and countries which do not already have a carbon price sign-up. On its own, the statement does not guarantee any mitigation action.</p> <p>There is also a concern that, at the Ban Ki-moon Summit, the potential prominence of this initiative will focus attention on just one policy solution at the</p>

			expense of other equally important measures needed to tackle climate change effectively, e.g. efficiency standards, renewable energy targets and subsidies, GHG reduction targets, ending fossil fuel subsidies, etc.
<b>Green Bond Principles</b>	In this initiative, issuers, banks and other investors (i.e. the issuers, underwriters and buyers of green bonds, which are marketed as packages of investment opportunities in the low-carbon economy) sign up to a set of voluntary standards termed the 'Green Bond Principles' aimed at reassuring investors that bonds deserve their 'Green' label.		<p>We desperately need a major financial shift away from fossil fuels and towards the low-carbon economy – and standards to help direct money in this direction are imperative. Green Bonds are a way of leveraging private finance, with the aim of moving some of the huge bond market flows away from 'brown' into 'green' investments.</p> <p>But these new voluntary standards lack key environmental and social safeguards, including guarantees that the money actually goes to the intended green projects, without posing risks to rights of local communities. They also lack transparent reporting obligations to track how the proceeds from the bonds are spent. They were designed by a small group of major banks without developing countries or affected communities at the table, and risk serving to substitute agreements reached in legitimate, multilateral fora – for example under the UNFCCC or Green Climate Fund – where the participation of governments and civil society stakeholders is assured.</p>
<b>FORESTS</b>			
<b>New York Declaration on Forests</b>	The declaration picks out some of the leading commitments to halting deforestation in the context of the UNFCCC, as well as voluntary commitments by companies to tackle deforestation in their supply chains – and seeks to grow support for these models. It targets forest countries to encourage them to increase their ambition; developed countries to encourage them to finance REDD+ implementation; and major producers and traders, especially those active in Indonesia, to push them to adopt industry-leading targets.		<p>Tackling deforestation, while protecting the land and livelihoods of the many millions of people who depend on forests, is imperative if we are to limit global warming to 2°C. This initiative to build best practice commitments among governments and companies has huge potential. Despite being a non-binding declaration, it will create momentum for ambitious forest commitments in Paris in 2015, and for an ambitious 2015 SDGs goal on forests.</p> <p>The key test of the declaration's success will be whether the countries with the most forest (Brazil, DRC, China and Australia)<sup>2</sup> or the worst deforestation rates (such as Indonesia) and new companies sign up.</p> <p>A small number of companies have committed to eliminate deforestation earlier than the declaration's 2020 deadline and, wherever possible, companies should be encouraged to move their timeline forward to avoid another 6 years of cutting down natural forests for plantations. Of even greater concern, the text lacks reference to the principle of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) – a</p>

			critical safeguard to ensure that local communities are part of decision making about the forests on which they depend for their livelihoods.
<b>RESILIENCE</b>			
<b>Climate Information Initiative</b>	<b>The global El Niño phenomenon is due to strike this year, bringing extreme rain and droughts to different regions. This initiative is focused on improving climate services for Africa – translating El Niño forecasts into practical advice for farmers.</b>		This sounds like a very worthwhile new initiative, and one of the few really new initiatives to focus on adaptation at scale. If farmers have access to accurate climate information in advance, they can adapt planting times and choose different crops to avoid losing their harvest. It will also help vulnerable communities be better prepared – thus saving lives. At the moment, the initiative lacks clear commitments or milestones from any new partners from the private sector, making it hard to gauge to what extent this initiative will genuinely achieve the potential scale of impact envisaged. Although it appears to have been designed around the needs of vulnerable farmers and communities in poor countries, there is little information about the engagement of civil society or farmer-based organizations in developing the initiative.

## GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR CLIMATE-SMART AGRICULTURE

### Rating: Red

This initiative has been several years in the making, driven by institutions and governments promoting the ‘climate-smart agriculture’ (CSA) concept – commonly characterized as agricultural approaches which seek ‘triple wins’ of enhanced productivity, increased resilience and improved carbon mitigation and sequestration in soils.<sup>3</sup> Key champions include the World Bank, FAO, CGIAR and the governments of the USA, Netherlands, Vietnam and South Africa. At least three international conferences have been held in Johannesburg, Hanoi and The Hague as part of a preparatory process; however at each stage, significant criticisms have been raised from stakeholders in civil society. These include the lack of genuine participation and ownership of farmer-based organizations (FBOs) and civil society organizations (CSOs) in the development of the alliance; the imprecision of the definition of CSA used by the alliance, including the lack of clear differentiation between the roles and responsibilities of large- and small-scale farmers (especially with regard to mitigation and sequestration) and the lack of membership criteria; and social and environmental safeguards in the alliance. Despite several revisions, the Framework Document of the alliance does not sufficiently address these shortcomings.

**CATEGORY: Agriculture****INITIATIVE: Global Alliance for Climate-Smart Agriculture****STAKEHOLDERS**

Key stakeholders include governments, international institutions and others. Supporters include the Netherlands (which is hosting the interim secretariat of the alliance), Vietnam, South Africa and the USA, although many tens of countries, as well as the FAO, World Bank and the African Union may be expected to announce their 'intention to join' the alliance at the summit. Other stakeholders expected to signal their intention to join include: The Nature Conservancy, Environmental Defense Fund, and companies like Kellogg, McDonald's and Syngenta. The FAO will host the secretariat for the inaugural year of the alliance.

**STATED PURPOSE: From the Foundational Document of the alliance:**

*'The Alliance will help governments, farmers, scientists, businesses, and civil society, as well as regional unions and international organizations, to adjust agricultural, forestry and fisheries practices, food systems and social policies so that they better take account of climate change and the efficient use of natural resources. Members will work toward sustainable increases in the productivity of food systems, by a sustainable management of natural resources – including soil, water and biodiversity, the adaptation of people's livelihoods that are threatened by climate change, and agricultural practices that contribute to reduced emissions and less deforestation/land degradation as a result of agriculture. The Alliance will enable governments and other stakeholders to make these transformations in ways that bridge traditional sectoral, organizational and public/private boundaries.'*

**New initiative?*****Is this initiative a new development or has it already been operating? Does it guarantee action beyond business-as-usual?***

New initiative, but at least at launch it will act as an umbrella for a range of existing initiatives. Over time, it may help to facilitate genuinely new initiatives that would not have taken place otherwise, but there are no guarantees that this will happen because there are no criteria for members to declare business-as-usual baselines against which their initiatives under the alliance will be considered 'new'. The Framework Document merely states that *'To encourage progress the Alliance will advocate the use of methods for measuring the impact of its participants' collective actions ... These outcomes might be expressed in terms of expected achievements globally, or within specific countries or regions, if possible numerically, bearing in mind internationally agreed goals, such as SDG's'*.

**Is it transformational?*****What is the potential of action in this area?***

The mitigation potential of global agriculture is significant – potentially ranging from 1.1 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e to 4.3 GtCO<sub>2</sub>e.<sup>4</sup> However, there are significant uncertainties over the carbon sequestration potential of soils, including with regard to non-permanence of reductions.<sup>5</sup>

Around 150 million households rely on small-scale agriculture, and are among the most vulnerable to climate change, with extensive needs for adaptation support.

***How far will this initiative address this?***

The Framework Document does not include specific metrics for measuring impact of the alliance (see above), making it hard to assess the potential impact of the alliance's activities. There is big potential in the agricultural sector which could potentially be transformational, but it will be impossible to gauge real impact as the metrics lack detail. Whether such metrics will be adopted is a question that the alliance will address in its inception year.

**Springboard for government action?*****Is the initiative framed as a way to make government action easier or is it framed as a replacement for government action?***

The alliance is framed as a complement to multilateral action under the UNFCCC and Committee on World Food Security; however concerns that the activities of the alliance will prejudice discussions in these multilateral fora remain, suggesting that it will not be a springboard for agreements there.

	<p>The alliance can potentially function as a springboard for government action, for instance by developing national or regional climate and agriculture policies or strategies. Given the voluntary nature of the alliance, each member remains responsible itself to inform the alliance on actions made and qualitative or quantitative impact achieved. At this stage, it is hard to say whether the types of actions that are communicated will help to encourage governments to take additional action.</p> <p><b><i>Is the initiative designed mainly by public bodies or by industry?</i></b></p> <p>Primarily by a group of governments and intergovernmental organizations. The Netherlands was holding the interim secretariat, which will now be housed in the FAO. Other key players are the USA, Vietnam, South Africa and the World Bank. Some companies – for example Kellogg and McDonald's – have also engaged at an early stage. Broad-based engagement by (Southern) FBOs and CSOs has been lacking.</p>
<p><b>Pro-poor?</b></p>	<p><b><i>Will the initiative benefit or pose risks to people on the frontlines of climate change, especially women? Have their views been adequately heard in the development of the initiative?</i></b></p> <p>The alliance recognizes internationally agreed principles and guidelines, including the Rome Principles and the Right to Food. However, it lacks basic social and environmental safeguards, like the principle of FPIC, and any criteria for membership which might ensure that companies with poor records on human rights, for example, are excluded from its activities.</p> <p>The alliance also lacks sufficiently clear differentiation between the roles and responsibilities of small-scale versus large-scale agricultural producers, especially with regard to mitigation and sequestration. This could mean that initiatives are developed under the alliance which place unfair burdens for reducing or removing GHGs onto small-scale producers – who are least responsible for causing climate change and have fewest resources to tackle it – and ignore the responsibilities and capabilities of large-scale producers.</p> <p>The alliance has not benefited from deep or consistent participation of and ownership by FBOs and CSOs, particularly from Southern and highly climate-vulnerable countries.</p>
<p><b>More than a voluntary commitment?</b></p>	<p><b><i>Are commitments voluntary?</i></b></p> <p>Entirely. Very few requirements are set on what members can or cannot do.</p>
<p><b>Will results be transparent and measurable?</b></p>	<p><b><i>Will information be made public?</i></b></p> <p>There has been no agreement to date on whether metrics to assess impact are desirable. At this stage, we presume no detailed common metrics will be agreed, and so metrics proposed on a voluntary basis by individual members will be used, undermining comparability between initiatives and social and environmental integrity.</p> <p><b><i>Is civil society effectively represented in the governance structures?</i></b></p> <p>The alliance has not benefited from deep or consistent participation of and ownership by FBOs and CSOs.</p>

# AFRICAN ALLIANCE FOR CLIMATE-SMART AGRICULTURE

## Rating: Green

This initiative was launched at the African Union Heads of State meeting held in June 2014. Led by the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), the initiative is a partnership among governments, research institutions and NGOs, including Oxfam. Committed political leadership along with the technical expertise of agriculture research institutions and the practical, on-the-ground experience of alliance members, will support the uptake of CSA practices in order to improve the productivity and resilience of agriculture for 6 million farming households by 2021. In doing so, the alliance is committed to improving food, nutrition and livelihood security for food producers, their families and communities. Membership in the initiative is open to organizations which share the vision and aspirations of the alliance. The alliance will collaborate with farmer-based organizations and local CSOs in order to develop a definition of climate-smart agriculture practices appropriate for the African context.

<b>CATEGORY: Agriculture</b>	
<b>INITIATIVE</b>	
The AU–NEPAD–INGO Alliance for Scaling- Up Climate-Smart Agriculture in Africa	
<b>STAKEHOLDERS</b>	
The New Partnership for Africa's Development has initially convened 10 partners: the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the CGIAR Research Consortium, the Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA) and the Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Analysis Network (FANRPAN) will serve as technical partners; five INGOs – CARE, Catholic Relief Services, Concern Worldwide, Oxfam and World Vision – serve as implementing agencies.	
<b>STATED PURPOSE</b>	
Improve the productivity and resilience of agriculture for 6 million farming households by 2021.	
<b>New initiative?</b>	<p><b><i>Is this initiative a new development or has it already been operating? Does it guarantee action beyond business-as-usual?</i></b></p> <p>The African CSA Alliance is an independent initiative led by NEPAD. It was launched in June, 2014 alongside the African Union Heads of State meeting which renewed commitments to the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Program (CAADP).</p> <p>Baselines are being developed against which actions under the alliance will be assessed according to transparent metrics, ensuring that actions will be beyond business-as-usual.</p>
<b>Is it transformational?</b>	<p><b><i>What is the potential of action in this area?</i></b></p> <p>In Africa, small-scale producers represent 80 percent of the farming population, and are among the most vulnerable people to climate change, with extensive needs for adaptation support. Delivering tailored support to improve food security while helping farming households adapt to climate change is necessary in order to reduce poverty and build resilience.</p> <p>A wealth of practical experience already exists, including a body of knowledge about effective agro-ecological farming practices, which can be scaled up to increase agricultural productivity while building resilience to climate change.</p> <p><b><i>How far will this initiative address this?</i></b></p> <p>The initiative aims at impact at scale, and includes specific goals for</p>

	<p>contributing to improved food security, with the headline goal of reaching 6 million farming households by 2021. A program framework is being developed and three countries have been identified for first implementation as pilots.</p>
<p><b>Springboard for government action?</b></p>	<p><b><i>Is the initiative framed as a way to make government action easier or is it framed as a replacement for government action?</i></b></p> <p>The alliance was launched under the auspices of CAADP, the primary organizing tool to plan, implement, monitor and peer review agriculture and food security investments in African countries.</p> <p>The alliance has committed to working with local state and non-state actors and stakeholders, including local governments. Capacity development of governments through training and support can ensure the sustainability of this effort.</p> <p><b><i>Is the initiative designed mainly by public bodies or industry?</i></b></p> <p>The initiative's 10 core founding members are a mix of government, research institutions and technical organizations and INGOs. There is no industry representation in the alliance.</p>
<p><b>Pro-poor?</b></p>	<p><b><i>Will the initiative benefit or pose risks to people on the frontlines of climate change, especially women? Have their views been adequately heard in the development of the initiative?</i></b></p> <p>The alliance is focused on supporting the productivity and resilience of small-scale food producers. Alliance members are committed to developing a definition of CSA appropriate for the African context, in full consultation with African FBOs and CSOs, and to catalysing and supporting the scaling up of such practices in the millions of smallholder farms in Africa.</p>
<p><b>More than a voluntary commitment?</b></p>	<p><b><i>Are commitments voluntary?</i></b></p> <p>Yes. Members have come together under a voluntary agreement.</p>
<p><b>Will results be transparent and measurable?</b></p>	<p><b><i>Will information be made public?</i></b></p> <p>Yes, the ACSAA is committed to sharing progress in a publicly available fashion and based on a robust monitoring and evaluation system to assess progress, performance and results in terms of real impact on small-scale producers.</p> <p><b><i>Is civil society effectively represented in the governance structures?</i></b></p> <p>Five INGOs are core members of the alliance. Membership is open to additional NGOs/CSOs and a strong commitment exists to ensure there is consultation and collaboration with African-based FBOs and CSOs both in the development and implementation of ACSAA-supported activities.</p>

# ENERGY EFFICIENCY ACCELERATORS

## Rating: Amber

A mixed bag of initiatives: those on lighting are good, while those on transport could be stronger. Cities are helped to move to more efficient lighting, heating and buildings by green industry that is set to benefit. But as only a handful of cities will initially pilot each initiative, impact will be limited.

<b>CATEGORY: Energy</b>	
<b>INITIATIVE: Energy Efficiency Accelerator</b>	
<b>STAKEHOLDERS</b>	
Led by the Energy Efficiency Committee of the Sustainable Energy for All (SE4ALL), and UNEP. Companies involved include Philipps, Danfoss, Veolia and IKEA.	
<b>STATED PURPOSE</b>	
A platform for multi-stakeholder action to scale up energy efficiency in different sectors, including: buildings; transport and fuel efficiency; lighting and appliances; district energy systems; and industrial energy efficiency, including SMEs. The idea is that a number of countries, cities, regions and industries demonstrate how to scale up action in each sector – with support from governments, investors, experts etc.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Global Fuel Economy Initiative (GFEI)</b> – Aim is to double the efficiency of the global car fleet by 2050 (by making new cars twice as efficient by 2030 – i.e. going from 8l to 4l/100km), in line with IPCC and G8 targets.</li> <li>• <b>Building efficiency accelerator</b> – Aim to get 10 cities and local governments signed up to double energy efficiency in new and existing buildings by 2030. The building industry, NGOs and others will all help co-design roadmaps for participating cities which will be used to secure finance. Cities and regions will then be asked to commit to doubling the rate of efficiency. This paves the way for a planned commitment in Paris in 2015 from a wider group of cities and local governments to double the rate of energy efficiency improvement in public and private buildings within their jurisdiction by 2030.</li> <li>• <b>Lighting and appliances accelerator</b> – Aim to get an extra 10 countries to commit to the enlighten initiative to phase out incandescent bulbs by end 2016, and 10 cities to commit to move to highly efficient LED lamps in their streets and businesses by 2020,<sup>6</sup> helped with a \$1bn fund from the World Bank. In addition, 10 governments to participate in the Appliance and Equipment Efficiency Accelerator – to pave the way for setting a public goal by COP21 to double the rate of energy efficiency improvement of refrigerators and air conditioners by 2020.</li> <li>• <b>District energy accelerator</b> – Aim to get a commitment from 10–15 city governments, supported by their national governments, 3–5 utilities/technology companies, and 3–5 finance institutions to participate in the accelerator.</li> </ul>	
<b>New initiative?</b>	<p><i>Is this initiative a new development or has it already been operating? Does it guarantee action beyond business-as-usual?</i></p> <p><b>The Global Fuel Economy Initiative</b> – an existing initiative set up in 2009 – but the aim is to get 20 new countries and several new companies on board at the summit. Currently only has 4 pilot countries signed up.</p> <p><b>Buildings</b> – a new initiative.</p> <p><b>Lighting and appliances</b> – a mix of existing and new initiatives.</p> <p><b>District heating</b> – a new initiative.</p>
<b>Is it transformational?</b>	<p><i>What is the potential of action in this area? How far will this initiative address this?</i></p> <p><b>GFEI</b> – The number of cars on the planet is set to triple by 2050, and 90% of the growth will happen in developing and transitional countries, most of which do not have fuel efficiency standards in place. However the GFEI fuel standard is actually less ambitious than existing regulations in</p>

	<p>many regions, and so its impact falls short of total potential.<sup>7</sup> It would not require a move away from conventional fuel guzzlers, and would allow overall emissions from cars to increase.<sup>8</sup></p> <p><b>Buildings</b> – the IPCC says it is possible to more than halve energy use (i.e. double efficiency) in buildings, through existing technologies and behavioural change.<sup>9</sup> So asking cities to achieve this by 2030 gives them plenty of time. Only aiming for 10 cities to sign up initially.</p> <p><b>Lighting and appliances</b> – Lighting is the right sector to focus on – it is easy to do, and moving to efficient lighting could save 0.5 GtCO<sub>2</sub> annually; moving to highly efficient LED lighting would save even more.<sup>10</sup> Only aiming for 10 cities to sign up initially.</p> <p><b>District heating</b> – Copying countries like Denmark and the Netherlands and moving to ultra-efficient district heating and cooling systems, and capturing and pumping waste heat from power stations to houses could save over 35GtCO<sub>2</sub> by 2050. Only aiming for 10 cities to sign-up initially.</p>
<b>Springboard for government action?</b>	<p><b><i>Is the initiative framed as a way to make government action easier or is it framed as a replacement for government action?</i></b></p> <p>Springboard for action – industry leaders in the energy efficiency sector give financial and technical support to help cities and local governments implement policies to save energy. Pilot cities are supposed to report back on progress, encouraging others to join them. Could lead to central governments adopting the standards at national level.</p>
<b>Pro-poor?</b>	<p><b><i>Will the initiative benefit or pose risks to people on the frontlines of climate change, especially women? Have their views been adequately heard in the development of the initiative?</i></b></p> <p>Low-income households spend a larger proportion of their income on energy bills, and so energy-efficiency savings – e.g. from cheaper heating – will benefit them the most. But people on low incomes worldwide are unlikely to benefit from initiatives targeting consumption of luxury goods like cars, refrigerators etc. Things that would more clearly benefit people on lower incomes, such as more efficient cooking stoves, are not included in the scheme.</p>
<b>More than a voluntary commitment?</b>	<p><b><i>Are commitments voluntary?</i></b></p> <p>Cities regulate to set standards and modernize their infrastructure. Private sector involvement will be to give advice, and also fund their implementation</p>
<b>Will results be transparent and measurable?</b>	<p><b><i>Will information be made public?</i></b></p> <p>UN bodies are due to measure and report results.</p> <p><b><i>Is civil society effectively represented in the governance structures?</i></b></p> <p>Only the Natural Resources Defense Council</p>

# THE CLEAN AFRICA ENERGY CORRIDOR

## Rating: Amber

This is an ambitious project, in line with IPCC recommendations that renewable energy needs to treble by 2050. It will require huge investment to succeed, and this is what is lacking at the moment. There do not appear to be any companies committing to take the plunge and invest in renewable generation projects, or any milestones for driving the scheme forwards. The aim of this initiative is to do the groundwork to help make it easier for power generators and transmitters to get renewables on their grids. A better connected regional renewable energy market is an important first step, but will only benefit those who are already connected to the grid – so more work will have to be done to meet the Sustainable Energy for All goal of universal access.

<b>CATEGORY: Energy</b>	
<b>INITIATIVE: Africa Clean Energy Corridor</b>	
<b>STAKEHOLDERS</b>	
Led by IRENA (International Renewable Energy Agency). The 19 African countries that are members of the Eastern Africa Power Pool (EAPP) and the Southern African Power Pool (SAPP) have signed up. Utility companies like Copperbelt Energy Cooperation, ENEL, ESKOM and Vestas are also involved. <sup>11</sup>	
<b>STATED PURPOSE</b>	
The aim is to create a predominantly renewable-powered energy grid spanning eastern Africa from Cairo to Cape Town <sup>12</sup> – to allow strong winds or bright sunshine in different parts of the continent to benefit electricity production for the whole region. At the moment, these countries depend mainly on fossil fuels, <sup>13</sup> although much of their infrastructure remains to be built as demand is set to rocket over the next quarter-century. The initiative will assess and identify renewable hotspots; help to get projects off the ground by working with governments to improve the regulatory framework; implement new financing models and take a regional approach to planning – working out how to optimize renewable generation across countries.	
<b>New initiative?</b>	<p><b>Is this initiative a new development or has it already been operating? Does it guarantee action beyond business-as-usual?</b></p> <p>The idea was formalized in January 2013 – when energy ministers signed the Action Agenda of steps to be taken over the next 5, 10 and 20 years to build and support the Clean Energy Corridor.<sup>14</sup> So it is a long-term project that is being given an extra push for the Ban Ki-moon Summit – when heads of state, partner organizations and leaders from the private sector are being asked to lend their support to the next phase of the Africa Clean Energy Corridor process.<sup>15</sup> Should therefore entail action that is mostly beyond business-as-usual.</p>
<b>Is it transformational?</b>	<p><b>What is the potential of action in this area?</b></p> <p>The initiative will not make a big impact on current emissions, but has the potential to avoid future emissions by helping the continent leap-frog fossil fuels and move straight to renewables.</p> <p>Overall energy demand is expected to triple and quadruple in southern and eastern Africa respectively over the next 25 years. Renewable energy currently makes up less than 2% of the power supply, but IRENA estimates that in the Southern African Power Pool it has the potential to grow to 46% by 2030,<sup>16</sup> edging out fossil fuels (70% of planned capacity in the Southern African Power Pool through to 2025 is from fossil fuels).<sup>17</sup> Achieving such scale would indeed be transformational.</p> <p><b>How far will this initiative address this?</b></p>

	<p>Unclear. The test will be how much new renewable capacity this results in. At the moment the initiative is still at a scoping stage – utility companies have not yet committed to any new renewable projects. Also, the latest Action Agenda lacks any concrete milestones for driving the scheme forwards, or measuring its impact.<sup>18</sup></p>
<p><b>Springboard for government action?</b></p>	<p><b><i>Is the initiative framed as a way to make government action easier or is it framed as a replacement for government action?</i></b></p> <p>Makes government action easier. This is a government-driven initiative which builds on existing country and regional priorities and plans, facilitating their implementation, through assistance with planning etc. The original idea for a north–south energy corridor was an African Union infrastructure priority.</p>
<p><b>Pro-poor?</b></p>	<p><b>Will the initiative benefit or pose risks to people on the frontlines of climate change, especially women? Have their views been adequately heard in the development of the initiative?</b></p> <p>Simply installing electricity generating capacity does not guarantee access. This initiative is designed to serve large-load centres, e.g. growing cities and industrial areas – especially the mining industry. Unlike small renewable projects, it will not improve energy access for those who do not already have it – including the 80% of people living in rural sub-Saharan Africa who are not already connected to the grid.<sup>19</sup> So while the initiative is a good first step, more work will have to be done to help to meet the Ban Ki-moon SE4ALL goal of universal access by 2030.</p> <p><b>Some other considerations:</b> part of the regulatory reform is about liberalizing energy markets (many countries involved have nationalized energy industries) and removing consumer subsidies for electricity.<sup>20</sup> However over time, greater renewable energy in the mix and better interconnected grids should bring down what are currently very high electricity prices in the region.</p> <p>Another test will be around which renewable technologies are favoured – the initiative will promote everything from solar to biomass. It is important that sustainability criteria are built into projects so that biofuels do not divert valuable agricultural land to energy, or lead to the chopping down of forests – making their carbon footprint worse than conventional fossil fuels.</p> <p>The initiative is clear that it will favour large-scale renewable projects which will centralize profits in the hands of the few. However one of the aims is to open the door to alternatives to (mainly) Chinese funded mega-dams. At the moment, the long-term plans for the Eastern African and the Southern African Energy Pools both include substantial hydropower but limited amounts of other renewable energy.<sup>21</sup></p>
<p><b>More than a voluntary commitment?</b></p>	<p><b><i>Are commitments voluntary?</i></b></p> <p>No – the private sector’s role would be to invest financially in renewable projects through public–private partnerships.</p>
<p><b>Will results be transparent and measurable?</b></p>	<p><b><i>Will information be made public?</i></b></p> <p>Yes.</p> <p><b><i>Is civil society effectively represented in the governance structures?</i></b></p> <p>Part of the Action Agenda is about civil society outreach and awareness-raising; however so far there has been limited civil society involvement.</p>

## ‘PUTTING A PRICE ON CARBON’ STATEMENT

### Rating: Amber

This statement is useful to encourage governments to regulate to put a price on carbon, or to increase the price where one already exists. But for companies making no other commitment at the summit, this is a low-ambition commitment – talking about carbon pricing is a very comfortable area for them, and there have been many such statements in the past. Some companies could continue to just call for a carbon price and act as though that is all they need to do in the fight against climate change. Corporate leaders should not hide behind this statement as a way of avoiding other, more meaningful and tangible action. Companies need to get their own houses in order and step off the sidelines and do more to advocate at a political level for action across the board.

<b>CATEGORY: Finance</b>	
<b>INITIATIVE: ‘Putting a Price on Carbon’ Statement</b>	
<b>STAKEHOLDERS</b>	
Led by the World Bank and supported in particular by the European Commission and business associations such as the UN Global Compact, the Prince of Wales’ Corporate Leaders Group, CDP, the International Emissions Trading Association and the World Business Council on Sustainable Development. More than 40 countries and 300 companies have already joined the statement.	
<b>STATED PURPOSE</b>	
Governments and companies express support for a statement committing to work together towards the long-term aim of a global carbon price – through introducing and strengthening carbon pricing policies and sharing experience.	
<b>New initiative?</b>	<p><b><i>Is this initiative a new development or has it already been operating? Does it guarantee action beyond business-as-usual?</i></b></p> <p>This particular initiative is new but there have been two very similar previous statements from companies which have been more ambitious.<sup>22</sup> This one will only add value if different companies and countries which do not already have a carbon price sign up. On its own, the statement does not guarantee any mitigation action.</p>
<b>Is it transformational?</b>	<p><b><i>What is the potential of action in this area?</i></b></p> <p>A global carbon price has huge potential to cut emissions, depending on how it is designed (the level of the price; is there an overall cap; does it cover all sectors; is it legally binding – i.e. a government carbon price rather than an internal corporate carbon price).</p> <p><b><i>How far will this initiative address this?</i></b></p> <p>This is just a statement of support – and statements do not reduce emissions. There is also a concern that this initiative focuses attention on just one policy solution, which will not be enough by itself. A range of other measures will be needed (efficiency standards, renewable energy targets and subsidies, GHG reduction targets, ending fossil fuel subsidies, etc.). The carbon price in major markets worldwide has nose-dived since Copenhagen (the collapse of the EU ETS and the CDM price; the repeal of Australia’s carbon price) which shows the need for accompanying policy measures.</p>
<b>Springboard for government action?</b>	<p><b><i>Is the initiative framed as a way to make government action easier or is it framed as a replacement for government action?</i></b></p> <p>It encourages government action, although the statement could be clearer that it is talking about a government carbon price, and not an internal corporate price.</p>

	<p>Risk is that large corporate associations will present a carbon price as a silver bullet, whereas many other policies will also be needed beyond a carbon price</p> <p><b><i>Is the initiative designed mainly by public bodies or industry?</i></b></p> <p>This is a World Bank initiative.</p>
<b>Pro-poor?</b>	<p><b><i>Will the initiative benefit or pose risks to people on the frontlines of climate change, especially women? Have their views been adequately heard in the development of the initiative?</i></b></p> <p>Carbon markets can be a way of raising finance for adaptation or mitigation in developing countries, but there is no mention in the statement of revenues from carbon markets being redirected in this way. Without the use of revenues in this way, carbon pricing can have a regressive impact on people on lower incomes, who spend a higher proportion of their income on high carbon goods and services.</p>
<b>More than a voluntary commitment?</b>	<p><b><i>Are commitments voluntary?</i></b></p> <p>Yes – there is no follow-up action required to signing the statement</p>
<b>Will results be transparent and measurable?</b>	<p><b><i>Will information be made public?</i></b></p> <p>Names of signatories will be made public. But follow-up action will not be monitored or measured.</p> <p><b><i>Is civil society effectively represented in the governance structures?</i></b></p> <p>Yes, but unclear to what extent.</p>

# GREEN BOND PRINCIPLES

## Rating: Red

Green bonds are a new way of leveraging private finance. The aim of this initiative is to move some of the huge bond market flows away from ‘brown’ into ‘green’ investments. Leading fund managers commit to buying a certain amount of green bonds a year. Issuers, underwriters and buyers of green bonds (which are marketed as packages of investment opportunities in the low-carbon economy) sign up to the Green Bond Principles – one of a plethora of voluntary standards aimed at reassuring investors that bonds deserve their ‘green’ label. However these particular voluntary standards were designed by a small group of five major investment banks, rather than through appropriate multilateral fora, and as they stand, they lack adequate safeguards to ensure the social and environmental integrity of the projects supported. As a result, well-meaning investors’ cash could end up in projects which do not do anything to tackle climate change and may actually make it worse. This abuses the green finance label, and well-intentioned investors – like pension funds – deserve better.

<b>CATEGORY: Climate finance</b>	
<b>INITIATIVE: Green Bonds</b>	
<b>STAKEHOLDERS</b>	
Four investment banks drafted the original ‘Green Bond Principles’ (Bank of America, Citigroup, Crédit Agricole and JPMorgan Chase), and 25 banks have so far signed up to support the initiative. The World Bank is also supporting, but there is a notable absence of any government or civil society involvement.	
<b>STATED PURPOSE</b>	
To shift some of the huge bond market flows into investments which help to tackle climate change. This particular initiative has two aims: 1) issuers of Green bonds sign up to the voluntary Green Bond Principles, and 2) investors commit to targets to increase the share of Green bonds in their portfolios – to double the green bond market to \$20bn by the Ban Ki-moon Climate Summit (NB given the very fast-growing market this draft target has already been exceeded, so will have to be updated) with more ambitious targets articulated for the Lima and Paris climate conferences.	
<b>New initiative?</b>	<p><b><i>Is this initiative a new development or has it already been operating? Does it guarantee action beyond business-as-usual?</i></b></p> <p>This particular initiative is new, but there are already a number of different voluntary standards for Green Bonds/Climate Bonds. Where the initiative succeeds in growing the green bond market, it should entail action beyond business-as-usual.</p>
<b>Is it transformational?</b>	<p><b><i>What is the potential of action in this area?</i></b></p> <p>The total fixed-income investment market (characterized by long-term investors like pension funds, insurance companies, etc.) is estimated to be \$80 trillion – so there is a large amount of money that could be directed into investments which help to tackle climate change. But this will only make a difference if the green bond market is truly green, so before setting quantity targets, it is important to get the quality standards right.</p> <p><b><i>How far will this initiative address this?</i></b></p> <p>As it stands, this proposed set of voluntary standards lacks key environmental and social safeguards, e.g. guarantees that the money actually goes to the green projects identified without posing risks to rights of local communities, as well as transparent reporting obligations to track how the proceeds from the bonds are spent.</p>

<p><b>Springboard for government action?</b></p>	<p><b><i>Is the initiative framed as a way to make government action easier or is it framed as a replacement for government action?</i></b></p> <p>The major risk in the Green Bond Principles initiative is that it may serve to substitute for agreements reached in legitimate, multilateral fora – for example under the UNFCCC or Green Climate Fund – with the participation of governments and civil society stakeholders. Although some international financial institutions are included in the governance framework, this is largely controlled by the private sector.</p> <p><b><i>Is the initiative designed mainly by public bodies or industry?</i></b></p> <p>Industry.</p>
<p><b>Pro-poor?</b></p>	<p><b><i>Will the initiative benefit or pose risks to people on the frontlines of climate change, especially women? Have their views been adequately heard in the development of the initiative?</i></b></p> <p>Rather than a small group of investment banks agreeing their own standards and designing the rules for their development, these should be agreed in appropriate multilateral fora – poor countries and affected communities need a seat at the table in deciding standards about finance in their countries. The current standards lack adequate social, as well as environmental, safeguards (such as the principle of FPIC).</p> <p>In general, green bonds have the potential to help to shift private finance flows – but it is important to be clear that this should not replace public finance in any way – or count towards the \$100bn climate finance goal. As with most market-based mechanisms, the finance raised will likely go to richer rather than poorer countries, and mostly to projects that are already commercially viable.</p>
<p><b>More than a voluntary commitment?</b></p>	<p><b><i>Are commitments voluntary?</i></b></p> <p>Yes, these are still voluntary standards, and ultimately the green bonds are still being self-labelled by the issuer.</p>
<p><b>Will results be transparent and measurable?</b></p>	<p><b><i>Will information be made public?</i></b></p> <p>The principles do not require any reporting on how proceeds from the bonds are spent.</p> <p><b><i>Is civil society effectively represented in the governance structures?</i></b></p> <p>The Green Bond Principles are a living document, and there is a governance structure which is open to stakeholders, with the aim of developing the criteria over time. However, currently this is largely controlled by private financial institutions.</p>

# NEW YORK DECLARATION ON FORESTS

## Rating: Amber

The declaration identifies the best practice commitments that have been made on deforestation by countries and by companies, and seeks to grow support by bringing additional companies and countries on board. This will mean stretching the ambition of forest countries, and pushing a number of industry giants (major tree-felling palm oil and paper companies) further than they have gone to date. All this will be helped by the UK, Norway and Germany pledging funds to help developing countries implement these commitments.<sup>23</sup>

<b>CATEGORY: Forests</b>	
<b>INITIATIVE: New York Declaration on Forests – and accompanying Action Agenda</b>	
<b>STAKEHOLDERS</b>	
UN, World Bank. The declaration was initially started by Norway, Germany and the UK, and has now been endorsed by 15 countries (Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, DRC, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Indonesia, Liberia, Mexico, Norway, Peru, The Netherlands, United Kingdom, Zambia), Seventeen companies (Asia Pulp & Paper, Cargill, Delhaize, GAR, General Mills, Grupo Bimbo, Johnson & Johnson, Kellogg, Marks and Spencer, Nestle, P&G, Pick n Pay, SC Johnson, Sime Darby, Sobeys, Unilever, Wilmar), Ten NGOs and 6 indigenous leaders or organizations.	
<b>STATED PURPOSE</b>	
The declaration picks out some of the leading commitments to halting deforestation in the context of the UNFCCC, as well as voluntary commitments by companies to tackle deforestation in their supply chains, and seeks to grow support for these models. It targets forest countries to encourage them to increase their ambition; developed countries to encourage them to finance REDD+ implementation; and major producers and traders, especially those active in Indonesia, to push them to adopt industry-leading targets.	
<b>New initiative?</b>	<p><b><i>Is this initiative a new development or has it already been operating? Does it guarantee action beyond business-as-usual?</i></b></p> <p>New initiative, but echoes most ambitious positions to date on deforestation by countries and companies. Where new companies and countries sign up to the commitments, it should entail action beyond business-as-usual.</p>
<b>Is it transformational?</b>	<p><b><i>What is the potential of action in this area?</i></b></p> <p>Huge potential; the IPCC says it will be impossible to limit global warming to 2°C without tackling deforestation.<sup>24</sup> It is the 'single largest opportunity for cost-effective and immediate reductions of carbon emissions' according to the Stern Review.<sup>25</sup></p> <p><b><i>How far will this initiative address this?</i></b></p> <p>Overall, it represents a big step forward. The headline goal – to halve forest loss by 2020, and halt it by 2030 – is the EU's existing position for REDD+ negotiations at the UNFCCC (although the language is slightly weaker in the declaration as it says 'strive to halt'.) However, this would represent a new commitment for many other countries. The test will be whether the countries with the most forest (Brazil, DRC, China and Australia)<sup>26</sup> or the worst deforestation rates (such as Indonesia) sign on.</p> <p>The restoration target (350m ha by 2030) goes far beyond the Bonn Challenge (150m ha by 2020). This is a commitment to restore an area larger than India.</p> <p>The main goal for the private sector – to eliminate deforestation from production of key agricultural commodities by 2020 – is taken from the</p>

	<p>Tropical Forest Alliance and Consumer Goods Forum. But some companies, including some that Oxfam have engaged with on this question, have gone further.<sup>27</sup></p> <p>The key test here will be whether new companies sign up. To the extent that they do, this represents an improvement on commitments made to date by major palm oil company GAR, as well as Wilmar and APP.<sup>28</sup></p>
<b>Springboard for government action?</b>	<p><b><i>Is the initiative framed as a way to make government action easier or is it framed as a replacement for government action?</i></b></p> <p>Springboard – despite being a non-binding declaration, it will create momentum for ambitious forest commitments in Paris in 2015, and for an ambitious 2015 SDGs goal on forests.</p> <p><b><i>Is the initiative designed mainly by public bodies or industry?</i></b></p> <p>Both contributed to drafting.</p>
<b>Pro-poor?</b>	<p><b><i>Will the initiative benefit or pose risks to people on the frontlines of climate change, especially women? Have their views been adequately heard in the development of the initiative?</i></b></p> <p>With the right safeguards in place, combating deforestation also has the potential to reduce poverty, enhance food security, secure rights and livelihoods for indigenous peoples and local communities, and help them adapt to climate change. However, a critical social safeguard in this respect is the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent, which is currently missing from this declaration (at the time of writing).</p>
<b>More than a voluntary commitment?</b>	<p><b><i>Are commitments voluntary?</i></b></p> <p>Yes. The declaration is a non-binding political statement and the Action Agenda is intended as an information document.</p>
<b>Will results be transparent and measurable?</b>	<p><b><i>Will information be made public?</i></b></p> <p>Unclear if there will be any follow-up.</p> <p><b><i>Is civil society effectively represented in the governance structures?</i></b></p> <p>NGO representatives to the forest programmes of the UN and the World Bank were consulted and gave input.</p>

# CLIMATE INFORMATION FROM EL NIÑO TO ACTION

## Rating: Amber

This appears to be a very worthwhile initiative, and one of the few genuinely new initiatives to focus on adaptation at scale; however a green light cannot be given until more details are available, particularly on how the private sector will be involved.

The global El Niño phenomenon is due to strike in 2014, bringing extreme rains and drought to different regions. This initiative is focused on improving climate services for Africa: translating El Niño forecasts into practical advice for farmers in time for the upcoming October to March farming season. If farmers have access to accurate climate information in advance, they can adapt to the extreme weather and either plant at different times or choose different crops, such as those that mature early. It will also help communities which are particularly vulnerable to climate disasters to be better prepared – thus saving lives.

<b>CATEGORY: Resilience</b>	
<b>INITIATIVE: Climate Information</b>	
<b>STAKEHOLDERS</b>	
<p><b>International organizations:</b> UNDP, UNEP, the World Meteorological Organisation, the Global Framework for Climate Services, the African Centre of Meteorological Application for Development and its regional Climate Outlook Forums. <b>Countries:</b> those African countries due to be worst affected by El Niño weather, as well as other countries affected (with a focus on least-developed countries and small island states). <b>Private sector:</b> companies which develop weather and climate technologies and hardware; companies that provide software to process the data (such as Google and Microsoft) and local mobile phone companies in Africa; local farmers and other community groups and members who rely on information for their livelihoods. Global Hand's network of local businesses.<sup>29</sup></p>	
<b>STATED PURPOSE</b>	
<p>Access to relevant, timely information is crucial to enable vulnerable communities and farmers to adapt. The UNECA African Climate Policy Centre has identified shortcomings in the provision and use of climate information in Africa.<sup>30</sup> These include lack of appropriate decision-relevant information and lack of capacity to use what little information is generated. The aim of this initiative is to seek commitments from stakeholders to 1) support existing African Regional Outlook Forums to translate forecasts into an understanding of sectoral impacts and options; 2) promote universal access via new technologies for disseminating this information; and 3) support civil society to act based on the forecasts. The aim is to come up with a feasible business model and service delivery mechanism that is replicable in other regions.<sup>31</sup></p>	
<b>New initiative?</b>	<p><b><i>Is this initiative a new development or has it already been operating? Does it guarantee action beyond business-as-usual?</i></b></p> <p>This particular initiative is a new attempt at implementing existing initiatives such as the Global Framework for Climate Services, the African Centre of Meteorological Application for Development and its regional Climate Outlook Forums.<sup>32</sup> To the extent that it delivers information to farmers who currently do not receive it, it will indeed facilitate action beyond business-as-usual.</p>
<b>Is it transformational?</b>	<p><b><i>What is the potential of action in this area?</i></b></p> <p>Millions of households rely on small-scale agriculture for their livelihoods and are therefore highly vulnerable to climate change impacts, meaning the potential beneficiaries of this initiative are many and the potential impact is transformational.</p> <p><b><i>How far will this initiative address this?</i></b></p> <p>At the moment, the initiative lacks clear commitments or milestones from</p>

	any new partners from the private sector, making it hard to gauge to what extent this initiative will genuinely achieve the potential scale of impact envisaged.
<b>Springboard for government action?</b>	<p><b><i>Is the initiative framed as a way to make government action easier or is it framed as a replacement for government action?</i></b></p> <p>It makes government action easier by helping them to implement strategies they have already endorsed – the African Union and other African regional bodies have already declared support for the UN-led Global Framework for Climate Services.<sup>33</sup></p> <p><b><i>Is the initiative designed mainly by public bodies or industry?</i></b></p> <p>A UN initiative.</p>
<b>Pro-poor?</b>	<p><b><i>Will the initiative benefit or pose risks to people on the frontlines of climate change, especially women? Have their views been adequately heard in the development of the initiative?</i></b></p> <p>As far as it is possible to tell, this is designed around the needs of vulnerable farmers and communities in poor countries, although there is little information about the engagement of civil society or farmer-based organizations in developing the initiative.</p>
<b>More than a voluntary commitment?</b>	<p><b><i>Are commitments voluntary?</i></b></p> <p>Unclear: there is no detail available on actual commitments.</p>
<b>Will results be transparent and measurable?</b>	<p><b><i>Will information be made public?</i></b></p> <p>Unclear.</p> <p><b><i>Is civil society effectively represented in the governance structures?</i></b></p> <p>Unclear.</p>

## NOTES

- 1 The UN Global Compact's Caring for Climate initiative includes 400 companies who have signed a 2007 statement calling for 'the urgent creation, in close consultation with business, community, and civil society, of long-term policies to create a stable price for carbon.' And The Prince of Wales' Corporate Leaders Group on Climate Change's Carbon Price Communiqué includes 150 companies that have asked for 'a clear, transparent and robust price on carbon.'
- 2 <http://www.economist.com/news/international/21613327-new-ideas-what-speeds-up-deforestation-and-what-slows-it-down-clearing-trees>
- 3 <http://www.fao.org/climatechange/climatesmart/en/>
- 4 <http://www.unep.org/newscentre/Default.aspx?DocumentID=2755&ArticleID=9683&l=en>
- 5 [http://www.actionaid.se/sites/files/actionaid/say\\_no\\_to\\_soil\\_carbon\\_markets.pdf](http://www.actionaid.se/sites/files/actionaid/say_no_to_soil_carbon_markets.pdf)
- 6 <http://www.energyefficiencycentre.org/Energy-Efficiency-Accelerators/Lighting-and-Appliances/Commitments>
- 7 Standards are already more ambitious in the EU (they meet the 4l target by 2020 for new cars), and in the USA, Japan and China, who are all on track to exceed the 4l target by 2030. P8  
[http://www.theicct.org/sites/default/files/info-tools/ICCT\\_PV\\_standard\\_Feb2014.pdf](http://www.theicct.org/sites/default/files/info-tools/ICCT_PV_standard_Feb2014.pdf)  

The newest types of conventional fuel combustion cars on the market already meet the 4l/100km threshold. And the standard does not incentivise hybrid / electric cars (to move to plug-in hybrid / electric cars the goal would have to be to improve fuel efficiency four-fold: to 2l/100km.
- 8 It would cut emissions by more than 1GtCO<sub>2</sub> annually by 2025 and 2Gt CO<sub>2</sub> annually by 2050 (yet these are relative not absolute savings and would be in the context of a doubling of overall vehicle emissions).
- 9 P9 [http://www.worldbank.org/content/dam/Worldbank/document/Energy/se4all/SE4ALL-Energy-Efficiency-Committee-Report-1\\_06\\_14.pdf](http://www.worldbank.org/content/dam/Worldbank/document/Energy/se4all/SE4ALL-Energy-Efficiency-Committee-Report-1_06_14.pdf)
- 10 P 19 of Abu Dhabi handbook
- 11 P16 [http://www.un.org/climatechange/summit/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2014/05/ASC\\_Brochure\\_13-May-2014\\_latest.pdf](http://www.un.org/climatechange/summit/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2014/05/ASC_Brochure_13-May-2014_latest.pdf)
- 12 Connecting the 10-country Eastern Africa Energy Pool with the 12-country Southern African Energy Pool.
- 13 80% of Southern Africa's energy comes from coal. East Africa relies on natural gas for 60% of electricity. <http://www.greenbiz.com/blog/2014/01/20/19-countries-join-forces-develop-africa-clean-energy-corridor>
- 14 P 8,  
<http://www.irena.org/DocumentDownloads/Publications/Africa%20Clean%20Energy%20Corridor%20brochure.pdf>
- 15 <http://www.irena.org/rethinking/climate.aspx>
- 16 A recent IRENA study on the prospects for renewable energy in the Southern Africa Power Pool has found that if transmission and distribution infrastructure is systematically expanded to accommodate peak system demand, renewables could account for 46 percent of the regional generating mix by 2030. P6  
<http://www.irena.org/DocumentDownloads/events/2013/July/Africa%20Clean%20Energy%20Corridor%20Workshop%20Report.pdf>
- 17 P8  
[http://www.irena.org/DocumentDownloads/events/2013/July/Africa%20CEC%20session%202\\_IRENA\\_Singh\\_220613.pdf](http://www.irena.org/DocumentDownloads/events/2013/July/Africa%20CEC%20session%202_IRENA_Singh_220613.pdf)
- 18 [http://www.irena.org/adsw/download/Africa\\_communicu%C3%A9.pdf](http://www.irena.org/adsw/download/Africa_communicu%C3%A9.pdf)
- 19 P 11 [http://www.worldenergyoutlook.org/media/weoweb/2011/weo2011\\_energy\\_for\\_all.pdf](http://www.worldenergyoutlook.org/media/weoweb/2011/weo2011_energy_for_all.pdf)
- 20 P6  
<http://www.irena.org/DocumentDownloads/events/2013/July/Africa%20Clean%20Energy%20Corridor%20Workshop%20Report.pdf>
- 21 P 2 <http://www.irena.org/DocumentDownloads/Publications/ACEC%20Document%20V19-For%20Web%20Viewing-Small.pdf>
- 22 The UN Global Compact's Caring for Climate initiative includes 400 companies which have signed a 2007 statement calling for 'the urgent creation, in close consultation with business, community, and civil society, of long-term policies to create a stable price for carbon.' And The Prince of Wales' Corporate Leaders Group on Climate Change's Carbon Price Communiqué includes 150 companies that have asked for 'a clear, transparent and robust price on carbon.'

- 23 The World Bank's public private partnership called the BioCarbon Fund already has \$280 million from the USA, Norway, and the UK. This fund helps developing countries become REDD+ ready, and pilots REDD+ projects, as part of the plan to get the new Warsaw REDD+ framework off the ground: <http://www.rtcc.org/2013/11/20/norway-usa-uk-pledge-280-million-to-combat-deforestation/>, and <http://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/biocf/files/documents/BioCF%20ISFL%20FAQ%20Updated.pdf>
- 24 [http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/forests/deforestation/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/clima/policies/forests/deforestation/index_en.htm)
- 25 <http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21613262-saving-trees-one-best-ways-saving-environment-seeing-wood>
- 26 <http://www.economist.com/news/international/21613327-new-ideas-what-speeds-up-deforestation-and-what-slows-it-down-clearing-trees>
- 27 p 20 [http://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/file\\_attachments/bp186-standing-sidelines-big10-climate-emissions-200514-en\\_0\\_0.pdf](http://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/file_attachments/bp186-standing-sidelines-big10-climate-emissions-200514-en_0_0.pdf)
- 28 Members of the CGF include Cargill, Unilever. New companies include Wilmar, APP, GAR.
- 29 [http://www.un.org/climatechange/summit/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2014/05/ASC\\_Brochure\\_13-May-2014\\_latest.pdf](http://www.un.org/climatechange/summit/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2014/05/ASC_Brochure_13-May-2014_latest.pdf)
- 30 [http://www.uneca.org/sites/default/files/publications/wp1-climate\\_science\\_data\\_and\\_info\\_formated\\_draft\\_final.pdf](http://www.uneca.org/sites/default/files/publications/wp1-climate_science_data_and_info_formated_draft_final.pdf)
- 31 [http://www.un.org/climatechange/summit/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2014/05/ASC\\_Brochure\\_13-May-2014\\_latest.pdf](http://www.un.org/climatechange/summit/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2014/05/ASC_Brochure_13-May-2014_latest.pdf) p 63
- 32 <http://www.acmad.net/new/>
- 33 <http://www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/news/v.php?id=28834>

© Oxfam International September 2014

This paper was written by Kiri Hanks. It is part of a series of papers written to inform public debate on development and humanitarian policy issues.

For further information on the issues raised in this paper please e-mail [advocacy@oxfaminternational.org](mailto:advocacy@oxfaminternational.org)

This publication is copyright but the text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. E-mail [policyandpractice@oxfam.org.uk](mailto:policyandpractice@oxfam.org.uk).

The information in this publication is correct at the time of going to press.

Published by Oxfam GB for Oxfam International under ISBN 978-1-78077-719-1 in September 2014.

Oxfam GB, Oxfam House, John Smith Drive, Cowley, Oxford, OX4 2JY, UK.

## OXFAM

Oxfam is an international confederation of 17 organizations networked together in more than 90 countries, as part of a global movement for change, to build a future free from the injustice of poverty. Please write to any of the agencies for further information, or visit [www.oxfam.org](http://www.oxfam.org).