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Political aspects

1) To identify relevant interlocutor(s)
Multiple city and/or urban region networks lobbying in order
  - “To be recognized”
  - “To have a seat at the decision-making table”
  - “To be supported in their actions”

Preliminary questions:
  Which level of “local government” is relevant to tackle territorial issues? Urban region or city? How to coordinate them?

2) To match with post-KP negotiation timetable
Necessary that one Party officially make the proposition for inclusion in the negotiating text
  → The submission of Senegal (April, the 22nd 2009) called for the recognition of “regional governments”.

The deadline is June, the 7th 2009.
Economic aspects (1/4)

Three key questions:
- What and where is the potential of significant urban CO2 emission reduction?
- What are the amount and nature of costs related to these CO2 emission reductions?
- What are the needs (technologies, funding, capacity building, etc) of local authorities to move towards a sustainable trajectory?

+ need to differentiate:
- Investment cost & Maintenance and operation costs.
- Middle-size cities & Mega-cities.
- Cities of capped countries & cities of non-capped countries
As climate policies and measures would only be a piece of a broader set of incentives and financial instruments, building a coherent framework remain the big issue.

- Necessary to untangle the urban fabric processes and required evolutions from BAU trajectories in order:
  - To take into account the systemic mechanisms of urban development
  - To enlarge the discussion on needed policy to the issue of coherence between climate policies and the other fields of public actions at both the European and national levels.
  - To take into account the link between city’s capacity to act and specific national institutional context.

- Three main urban GHG emission sources have to be tackled urgently
  - Urban transportation, in relation with land-uses
  - Building, in relation with (renewable) energy production deployment
  - Waste
Economic aspects: Transportation (3/4)

**ASIF framework** (IEA; Schipper et al., 2001)

\[
\text{Emissions} = [\text{A. Activity (pkm=trips x km)}] \times [\text{S. mode Share (% pkm)}] \times \\
[\text{I. fuel Intensity (quantity per Km)}] \times [\text{F. Fuel mix (emission per qty)}]
\]

**ASIF highlights**
- Categories of mitigation actions
- That there are multiple factors influencing each of the ASIF components, with many affecting more than one component (contradictory effects)
- Key role of specific stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactions Matrix</th>
<th>Governance Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component / actions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Stakeholders / actions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 1</strong></td>
<td>Impacts of the policy on each ASIF components taking into account linkages between ASIF components and rebound effects: changes in one term of ASIF lead to changes in the opposite sense in another term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Economic aspects: Building (4/4)

Same approach can be developed for residential and commercial buildings.

\[ Emission = A \times B \times I \times \sum \frac{F_i \cdot S_i}{\eta_i} \]

- need to differentiate existing VS new constructions, in relation with the rate of urbanization of a city and/or a country
- need to tackle these issues in an articulated way with (renewable) energy production capacity deployment.
Technical aspects

1) CO2 emission inventory
   - Need of standardized methodologies, at least on a core set of parameters.

2) MRV procedures
   - MRV = medium of accountability and credibility, recognizing efforts as well as political credit
   - MRV of actions and MRV of support to actions = different objectives but linked to one another.
   - The UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol contain useful provisions on MRV, but this acquis should be expanded.
   - MRV requirements may vary by country and type of action.
   - MRV should cover mitigation outcomes in terms of performance and/or results.
Legal aspects (1/2)

International acknowledgement records of cities’ commitments:
- UNFCCC and KP are multilateral treaties involving States as Contracting Parties
- Under the KP, cities can participate in CDM projects or programmes of activities
- AWGs LCA and KP are Party driven processes
- to date, there is no multilateral treaty placing binding obligations directly upon cities
- Only UNESCO, on commitment against racism: voluntary commitment in a “partnership” (collaboration)

Regional (UE):
- Madrid Convention / Strasbourg Protocol on cross-border cooperation, but implementation subordinated to inter-state agreement.
- Convenant of Mayors
Legal aspects (2/2)

Possible institutionalisations of cities’ contribution

1) Possible nature of cities’ involvement:
   - Mandatory with official emission reduction targets (= cap for city) VS voluntary as in the Covenant of Mayors

2) Possible scope of city involvement:
   The issue of perimeter of actions: urban territory VS prerogative.

3) Possible nature of cities’ commitments acknowledgement:
   - In the preamble part of the Copenhagen agreement addressing the need to involve all stakeholders, in particular cities
   - In the NAMA’s part of the Copenhagen agreement
   - In a ministerial declaration that would be adopted by the COP in Copenhagen
   - Integrate Covenant of Mayors into the AIG scheme

4) Could cities access directly to carbon finance and support or do they have to go through national channels systematically?
   - A possible role for the improved CDM (in particular through programmes of activities)
   - Eligibility of actions undertaken by cities to sector-based instruments (SD PAMs, Sectoral No lose Target, NAMAS, etc.)
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