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This paper is a product of the Bridging the Gap (BtG) initiative
The Bridging the Gap initiative, formed at the COP14 in Poznań, Poland, in 2008 by GIZ, Veolia Transport, TRL and UITP (later joined by ITDP), bridges the gap between the transport and climate change sectors and promotes the assertion that land transport should play a more prominent role in addressing climate change. For more information about the work of Bridging the Gap initiative, including reviews of COP15/CMP5 and COP16/CMP6, visit: http://www.transport2012.org/.

Bridging the Gap is part of the SloCaT Partnership, which aims to improve knowledge on sustainable low carbon transport. For more information see: http://www.slocat.net/.
1 Introduction

The United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP17/CMP7) took place in Durban, South Africa, from 27 November to 11 December 2011. Durban hosted both the 17th Conference Of the Parties (COP17) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the 7th meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP7). The UN Climate Secretariat reported more than 12,480 participants, including over 5,400 government officials attended.

The expectations for the conference were relatively modest. The UNFCCC negotiating process was in a precarious position at the start of Durban as it was still recovering from COP15 (Copenhagen, 2009). The majority of developing countries arrived at the talks with the firm conviction that the only way forward was: with a continuation of the Kyoto Protocol, that CBDR (common but differentiated responsibility) should underpin any new agreement, and there were key issues to overcome in particular on Intellectual Property Rights1 (IPR) and finance. In contrast the position of industrialised countries were fragmented with major players such as Canada, Japan and Russia not supporting a second commitment period, the US pushing for a new universal framework and others such as the EU, Norway and Australia preferring a universal framework but open to a two track approach. Despite the solid progress made at COP16 in Cancún (December 2010), it was therefore crucially important for the future of the process and any internationally binding agreement that Durban delivered on key issues such as the post-2012 regime, adaptation and climate finance.

In reality the Durban Conference delivered a number of key decisions – although none of these constitute a major breakthrough. After extending the length of the conference by a day and half Parties decided to adopt a universal, legally formed agreement2 to be implemented as soon as possible and no later than 2015. The Ad-hoc Working Group on the “Durban Platform for Enhanced Action”3 (DPEA) was mandated to start work immediately and to develop the legal framework that should be applicable to all Parties – including those that are not currently bound under the Kyoto Protocol. However this “agreement with legal force”, protocol, or legal instrument is not expected to enter into force sooner than 2020. As the first commitment period for the Kyoto Protocol terminates at the end of 2012, this planning horizon signals a gap of eight years over during which procedures and regulations regarding climate change mitigation actions are unclear.

A list of the 36 decisions reached by COP17 and CMP7 is contained in the Appendix to this paper. In summary, the issues with potentially the greatest significance for climate change mitigation in the land transport sector include the following:

- **The Technology Mechanism**, comprising a Technology Executive Committee and a Climate Technology Centre and Network, which the COP noted should be made fully operational in 2012.
- **Finance and the operationalisation of the Green Climate Fund** (GCF). Here the main issues for parties were: legal status; relationship to the COP; the role of private sector financing; establishing the Board; and elaborating a process to establish an interim.

---

1 Seen in particular as a major obstacle to technology transfer.

2 Note that the interpretation of 'legal' is not year clear and is under negotiation.

secretariat to support the Board. GCF as an operating entity of the financial mechanism of the Convention, with arrangements to be concluded between the COP and the Fund at COP 18 to ensure that it is accountable to and functions under the guidance of the COP to support projects, programmes, policies and other activities in developing country parties.

**Decisions in respect to the registry**, especially for NAMAs, LEDs and MRV are potentially interesting for increased action as well as registering and quantifying mitigation actions from land transport; **Increasing capacity building.** The COP decision invites all relevant UN agencies and intergovernmental organizations to continue providing support to developing countries and Annex II parties, and for the private sector and multilateral, bilateral and international agencies to support capacity-building activities. The decision, *inter alia*, invites parties to enhance reporting on best practices and states that further implementation of the capacity-building framework in developing countries should be improved by *inter alia* enhancing integration of climate change issues and capacity-building needs into national development strategies, plans and budgets and strengthening networking and information sharing especially via South South and triangular cooperation.

**Progress on Adaptation** and the work of the adaptation committee (Adaptation and response measures (Decision 1/CP.10). Adaptation is not covered in any detail in this overview as it is presently not included in the work programme of Bridging the Gap. It could be said that with an increasing number of weather related extreme events more attention should be given to critical transport infrastructure in both developed and developing world.

Many of these decisions can help increase the visibility and potential of land transport as a valuable tool for reducing national and global emissions.

On the other hand there was little appetite for increasing reduction targets (binding or voluntary) despite the significant gap between pledges (made in or since Copenhagen) and the emission reduction levels identified by science to keep us around the 2°C temperature increase levels. An update by UNEP on the gap between what is needed and what is pledged showed an increase and now stands at 6 to 11 gigatonnes. Parties acknowledged the risk of a gap between the first and second commitment periods and were invited to submit their voluntary QELRO’s by 1 May 2012 in a “pledge and translate” exercise that, unlike Kyoto, will not be derived, for now, by an overall aggregate level of ambition.

There was nonetheless a strong sense that elements of the Durban package restored sufficient momentum for a new negotiation process, one that could deliver a new inclusive 21st century climate regime despite the differentiated interests across and within developed and developing countries. Many welcomed the adoption decisions including on the Green Climate Fund, and the Durban Platform, as well as the process to launch an agreement with legal force, while others continued to insist on the urgent need to significantly scale up the level of ambition to address the gap between existing mitigation pledges and the needed emission reductions recommended by science.

There is a gradual increase in attention to all transport sectors in the negotiations especially international aviation and maritime transport but also to land transport and Bridging the Gap.

---

4 More details of adaptation and transport can be found on the website www.resilient.mobility.org
members noted that there was a strong increase in transport and transport related side events and visits to their stand in the exhibition area. It was notable that the land transport sector was the focus of a series of side events (at least nine side events over the two week period). Bridging the Gap and its partners took part in several of these promoting the potential of low carbon transport. This paper gives an overview and offers some analysis on opportunities that the decisions reached at Durban could provide for climate change mitigation in the land transport sector.

2 COP17/CMP7 outcomes

The Durban conference did not result in any major breakthroughs in terms of any of the issues that needed to be resolved but nonetheless reached an agreement that there should be a second commitment period for Kyoto.

One of the most significant outcomes of COP17 was the “launch of a process to develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties”. This means that the Parties still feel that there should be an international process post 2012 and the end of the legal term of the Kyoto Protocol. This includes Parties that are not currently bound under the Kyoto Protocol. A new ad-hoc working group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (DPEA) was created to start work in 2012 and has been mandated to deliver an agreed outcome as early as possible and this should be no later than 2015. Any agreement is not expected to enter into force sooner than 2020, which is eight years after the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol will have expired and leaves a question mark over international climate change mitigation actions for this period. How the transition phase will be managed is also part of the work of the DPEA.

There was certainly concern and much discussion in Durban about this transition period. At the outset of the negotiations, significant political hurdles remained to be scaled in terms of how this might be agreed, which countries would be part of any new agreement and what a new legal framework (including any emission reduction targets) might look like. As this strikes at the heart of the Convention, the Kyoto Protocol, as well as the legitimacy of the current structure of the process (and traditional negotiating groups) there was little doubt of the stakes and importance of any decisions or outcomes. The COP decided to start a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol on 1 January 2013 which will expire on 31 December 2017 or 2020, the end date being one of the details yet to be decided. Thus, big emitters like China, India and USA will have legal emission commitments post 2020. The developed countries – EU, Norway, Australia and New Zealand – agreed to participate in a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol to start from 1 January 2013 until either 2017 or 2020 (to be decided COP 18 Qatar next year). The extent of participation of Japan, Russia and Canada in the Kyoto Protocol phase II remains unclear.

The Durban conference also made progress in relation to finance, notably through a decision to conclude arrangements for the Green Climate Fund (GCF), an operating entity of the financial mechanism of the Convention, at COP18. It will be accountable to, and function under the guidance of, the COP to support projects, programmes, policies and other activities in developing country Parties. The GCF’s first meeting will take place in 2012 and South Korea providing start up finance for the fund.

---

In Copenhagen (COP15), developed world governments committed to a goal of jointly mobilising US$100 billion a year by 2020 to address the needs of developing countries and this finance was to be ‘new and additional’ rather than being generated from, for example, the realignment of existing financial streams such as overseas aid, although could come from a wide variety of sources. Operationalising the GCF was therefore of paramount significance. The present trend of using less public money still prevails and the private sector is seen as being a source of some new finance, although this has led to concerns being voiced over issues such as transparency and independence.

A third area of critical importance at Durban was MRV (the Measurement, Reporting and Verification of climate change mitigation activities). Developing countries are being asked to be increasingly transparent in their own climate actions, especially in relation to those which are internationally supported. New standards of transparency in respect to MRV, as well as guidance on reporting, were therefore key points for discussion at Durban. Reporting guidelines for developing countries have been made stringent and they need to file biennial reports.

Movement was also seen in relation to technology transfer, notably the elaboration of the Technology Mechanism and of the Technology Executive Committee and Climate Technology Centre and Network that it comprises. It will enhance action on technology development and transfer and there is an intention that these will be fully operational in 2012.

The Parties of the UNFCCC reaffirmed their commitment to NAMAs as a means for climate change mitigation and this was reflected in a number of decisions and developments around its operationalisation, such as the registry, which the UNFCCC aims to have completed by COP18.

There were many discussions in Durban that focused on moving the technology mechanism and adaptation frameworks forward, creating an adequately resourced capacity building coordinating body (with a mandate to fast start capacity building programmes) and agreeing rules for the registry (agreed in Cancún) that will link developing country mitigation actions with necessary support and provide a record of their unsupported mitigation efforts.

Emissions from international aviation and maritime were discussed as the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the International Maritime Organization (IMO) reported to the Parties. It should be noted that emissions from these modes are not included in national inventories and as international emissions grow, they are increasingly seen as problem sectors. ICAO highlighted recent developments in respect to civil aviation on climate change through state action plans and assistance to states; sustainable alternative fuels for aviation; market-based measures; and global aspirational goals. The IMO reported on improvements made to energy efficiency of maritime transport and the corresponding reduction of emissions from ships regarding air pollution and greenhouse gases, noting the July 2011 “breakthrough” at the IMO when 30 parties listed in Annex I of the Convention, and 19 non-Annex I parties, adopted amendments to MARPOL Annex VI to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Several countries said work to address sectoral emissions under the IMO and ICAO should be guided by the principles of the UNFCCC, and progress achieved in ICAO and IMO was in general welcomed however Panama questioned that the UNFCCC is the correct forum to discuss maritime emissions. SBSTA adopted the information presented (FCCC/SBSTA/2011/L.19 and invite the secretariats to continue to report at future SBSTAs. In terms of finance, it was noted that alternative sources such as carbon pricing of global

---

aviation and maritime transportation have the potential to generate significant funds (from transport levies especially on bunker fuels), generating a price signal necessary to achieve emission reductions in these sectors and inviting IMO and ICAO to develop instruments including market-based instruments.

2.1 A focus on the land transport sector

The last two years have seen some of the highest growth rates of economy-wide emissions globally. GHG emissions dropped slightly at the beginning of the financial crisis in 2009, but in 2010 oil consumption increased by 3% globally and emissions reached an all-time peak of 30.6 gigatonnes. This growth took place in both developed and developing countries.

In 2009 two sectors, electricity and heat generation and transport, were responsible for nearly two-thirds of all global CO₂ emissions. A recent study of the net climate impacts of emissions from economic sectors also found that on-road transportation is currently the greatest net contributor to climate change when the contribution of vehicle emissions to the formation of ozone in the troposphere, which is both an air pollutant and a strong greenhouse gas, are considered.

The IEA predicts that this high level of global demand for transport is unlikely to decrease in the foreseeable future and estimate that transport fuel demand will grow by about 40% by 2035. They warn that the window of opportunity for action is closing fast and that much of the expected increase of energy related CO₂ will come from transport. It is recognised that road transport is a major polluter so it is becoming increasingly critical that the land transport sector must be accommodated within the provisions of the UNFCCC that are currently being negotiated. It is in this context that this paper looks at the main opportunities that the decisions reached at Durban could provide for climate change mitigation in the land transport sector.

3 The implications of the COP17 and CMP7 outcome for land transport

The decisions reached in Durban reflect an implicit need for climate change mitigation actions across all sectors. The international aviation and maritime transport sectors are explicitly mentioned in the decision texts, although it should be noted that emissions from international air and marine transport are not included in any national reduction targets.

---


12 There were intense discussions on a possible levy on bunker fuel that would in part be reinvested in the developing world and partly be used to fund the GCF. This could create an
While land transport was not explicitly mentioned, the proceedings contain numerous elements that intervention in the sector could contribute towards. The sections that follow are based on an analysis of the decisions adopted by COP17 and CMP7, with a focus on the possible implications of specific threads of the negotiations for climate change mitigation in the land transport sector under the UNFCCC.

A full list of the decision documents upon which it is based can be found in the Appendix to this report for reference. Please note that at the time of writing these decision documents are ‘advance unedited versions, and so there may be minor changes to the wording of the text in the coming weeks.

3.1 Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs)

The outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA\textsuperscript{13} reports on ‘Enhanced action on mitigation’ (II) and refers to ‘Nationally Appropriate Mitigation commitments or Actions’ by developed country Parties and to those by developing country Parties. The decision reaffirms the commitment of the Parties of the UNFCCC to NAMAs as a means for climate change mitigation.\textsuperscript{14}

\textbf{NAMA communications to the UNFCCC}

The work of the AWG-LCA\textsuperscript{13} notes the NAMA proposals submitted by developing country Parties under the Copenhagen Accord\textsuperscript{15} and further encourages developing countries that have not yet submitted information on intentions to conduct NAMAs to do so [paragraph 32].

A decision is also made to continue to conduct workshops in 2012 to better understand the diversity of mitigation actions communicated as NAMAs [paragraph 33]. The land transport sector has been prominent in both the NAMA text submissions and presentations made at workshops in both 2010 and 2011.\textsuperscript{16} The continuation of both of these forums for proposing opportunity for a transport window to more generally support low carbon land transport but little progress was made on this.


\textsuperscript{15} These are summarised in UNFCCC (2011) Compilation of information on nationally appropriate mitigation actions to be implemented by Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention. Note by the secretariat. Available from: http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2011/awglca14/eng/inf01.pdf.

mitigation actions therefore presents further opportunities for highlighting the role of the sector in current – and future – climate change mitigation activities.

There is not yet a registry developed in which NAMAs can be recorded (see the ‘registry’ section below), but more clarity is afforded to developing country Parties over the type of information that they are invited to submit in relation to NAMAs. Paragraph 46, for example, lists details that the secretariat has requested be submitted in relation to supported NAMAs. Paragraph 48 of the AWG-LCA outcome document also lists the corresponding information that is requested from developed country Parties, as well as other entities that are able to provide either financial, technological or capacity support, about the support available. An overview of the information that these Parties and entities have been invited to submit is provided in Table 1). There is much less clarity on the type of information that developing country Parties need to submit in relation to NAMAs that are not requesting international support. The secretariat invites these Parties to ’submit to the secretariat information on other individual nationally appropriate mitigation actions to be recorded in a separate section of the registry, for their recognition’ [paragraph 47].

Table 1: An overview of the information that developing and developed country Parties, as well as other entities that are in a position to provide support (such as the GEF, Green Climate Fund and multilateral and bilateral donors), are invited to submit to the secretariat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information that developing country Parties are invited to submit in relation to individual NAMAs seeking international support</th>
<th>Information that developed country Parties and other entities in a position to provide financial, technological or capacity building support are invited to submit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A description of the mitigation action and the national implementing entity</strong></td>
<td>Whether the support is available for preparation and/or implementation of NAMAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expected time frame for implementation</td>
<td>The source of the support (i.e. the name of the developed country Party and the executing entity channelling the support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The estimated full cost of preparation</td>
<td>The amount and type of support available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The estimated full and/or incremental cost of implementation</td>
<td>The status of delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount and type of support (financial, technological and capacity building) required to prepare and/or implement the mitigation action</td>
<td>The types of action that may be supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The estimated emission reductions</td>
<td>The process for the provision of support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other indicators of implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relevant information, including co-benefits for local sustainable development, if this information exists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developing country Parties could be supported to submit this information in relation to transport NAMAs to elevate recognition of the ability of climate change mitigation activities in the sector to be appropriate and eligible for international support. This transparency could help Parties to identify the potential for transport NAMAs (t-NAMAs), and also experts to suggest matches between potential activities and available support.
Box 1: Linking domestic land transport strategies with international climate policy in Mexico

Through the project “Facilitating the development of Transport NAMAs in Mexico”, EMBARQ Mexico and ECOFYS aimed to identify an existing program or policy that mitigates GHG emissions and explore how it could become a NAMA. The Federal Mass Transit Program (PROTRAM) of the National Fund for infrastructure (FONADIN) was the pilot study chosen to determine the feasibility of becoming a supported NAMA.

The NAMA has two objectives. The medium term is to provide complementary support to PROTRAM/UTTP (National Urban Transport Transformational Program) by financing capacity building and the development of assessment methodologies to speed-up mitigation actions that are already taking place. However the long-term objective is to ensure the continuity of the programs with long-term climate funds that go beyond the expiration period of UTTP in 2016.

From this experience the following are some of the main lessons learned:

- Selecting an ongoing project was challenging in the sense that there was a need to fit a project to a NAMA, this require reorienting existing objectives and introducing new variables like CO2 and requirements like MRV. In the case of PROTRAM it was necessary to identify areas so far not covered by the existing program which could then be taken up as components of the NAMA.
- Stakeholder engagement and ownership in the selection of the NAMA is key in achieving the momentum to bring a NAMA to implementation. In the case of this NAMA, although there was some interest from PROTRAM, it lacked a champion and ‘ownership’ which made it difficult for SEMARNAT (the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources) to move it forward for international financing.
- A clear boundary of a NAMA is important for being able to measure the impact of a given intervention. PROTRAM presented many challenges in this respect because the NAMA consist in additional activities that would be complementary to PROTRAM and UTTP.
- The boundary of a NAMA affects the method and feasibility of different degrees of measurement, reporting and verification, since it includes activities with indirect impacts (e.g. capacity building) that are not easy to measure.
- NAMA finance is far from being tangible. Significant sums have been pledged in international climate negotiations. However, the majority of this money is not yet available.

Low-Emission Development Strategies (LEDs)

In addition to NAMAs, the outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA13 also ‘encourages’ developing country Parties to develop low-emission development strategies (LEDs), with the implication that NAMAs will be framed within these [paragraph 38]. It similarly ‘invites’ developed country Parties to ‘submit information related to progress towards the formulation of their low-emission development strategies’ [paragraph 11].

The AWG-LCA recognises the need for developing country Parties to receive related support (financial and technical) from developed country Parties, and both developed and developing country Parties are invited to share their experience in relation to the development of LEDs during in-session workshops. The large and growing contribution of the sector to GHG emissions, as well as the social and economic co-benefits of climate change mitigation activities in the sector, should be reflected in LEDs. This could be best done through the assignment of sector specific sections, with the section relating to transport strategy.
reflecting the comprehensive ‘avoid, shift, improve’ approach to transport strategy. These LEDs could provide a useful framework for low carbon transport and encourage a system-wide rather than a project based approach.

---

**Box 2: Linking domestic land transport strategies with international climate policy in Colombia**

Colombia is determined to develop and implement mitigation actions in the transport sector. The country is committed to invest public resources to improve its vehicle fleet through a commercial vehicle fleet renovation scheme. The pledge amounts to US$ 500 million.

It is also one of the countries participating in the “TRANSfer – Towards climate-friendly transport technologies and measures” project, which aims to support decision-makers in developing countries to develop climate change strategies in the transport sector to be registered as Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs). The TRANSfer project, funded by the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) via the International Climate Initiative (ICI), is being implemented by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). This work was presented at a side event at COP17 hosted by the BMU and GIZ.

Mr. Felipe Targa (Vice-Minister of Transport, Colombia), who attended the COP17 in Durban and participated in the official joint BMU-GIZ side-event, highlighted the efforts his country is making to support sustainable transport.

Furthermore, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between GIZ and the Development Bank of Latin America (CAF) was signed in Durban. The objective of the MoU is to support the Government of Colombia with the implementation of transport NAMAs.

The joint work between the Colombian Ministry of Transport, BMU and GIZ show how domestic land transport strategies can be linked, under the current UNFCCC process, with international climate policy.


**The registry**

The Cancún Agreements decided to set up a registry to record NAMAs and to facilitate the matching of financial, technological and capacity-building support for these actions. They also decided to develop related modalities, such as any potential relationship with the financial mechanism. The work of the AWG-LCA at COP17 ‘recalls’ this and makes a number of decisions in relation to the form of the registry. These include the fact that the registry should be dynamic, web-based, flexible in terms of structure, managed by the secretariat, and populated on a voluntary basis [paragraph 45].

It is hoped that the flexible nature of the registry will increase the likelihood that it will be suited to record transport NAMAs. If this is the case then the NAMA registry could have the

---

potential to increase climate change mitigation activities in the land transport sector and highlight the wide range of activities that could be included as transport or transport related NAMAs (and their potential in relation to emission reduction and other social, economic and environmental objectives). It is likely that this would encourage greater replication and/or a scaling up of actions. **The registry could also facilitate the matching of t-NAMAs with international support, thereby increasing the likelihood of them being implemented.**

The AWG-LCA has requested that both developed and developing country Parties, as well as other providers of support, submit information to be included in such a registry. The specific type of information requested is outlined in Table 1. The secretariat will *record and regularly update* [paragraph 50] the information that is received. It requests that a prototype be developed by the UNFCCC secretariat by the 36th session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) [paragraph 54] (June 2012) and that feedback received at this session is taken into account and the registry finalised by COP18 (December 2012) [paragraph 55]. It is hoped that at least one of the parties presently working on t-NAMAs will be in a position to register a transport related NAMAs early in this process.

Parties should be encouraged to consider the suitability of the prototype registry for recording land transport activities, and transport experts should take the opportunity to suggest ways in which it can be enhanced to support the recording of transport NAMAs. The inclusion of a sectoral breakdown in the registry could, for example, help to highlight efforts in the land transport sector.20 This would not need to be complicated and might just refer to a split between land, aviation and maritime, passenger and freight at national level.

**Reporting**

The COP acknowledged the *value of ex ante information, and the need to elaborate rigorous, robust and transparent approaches in a systematic manner to measure progress towards the achievement of economy-wide emission reduction targets [for developed country Parties], building on existing processes, practices and experiences* [paragraph 9]. It also recalled the decision of the Cancun Agreements to enhance the reporting in national communications from non-Annex I Parties [developing countries] and recognised the need for international consultation and analysis (ICA) of reports to be *efficient, cost-effective and practical* and *not impose an excessive burden on Parties.*

Annexes III and IV of the *Outcome of the Work of the AWG-LCA* contain guidelines for biennial reporting and their ICA for developing country Parties. In respect to the national greenhouse gas inventory’ component emissions need to be listed by source. In terms of mitigation actions, information is required on their effects, and associated methodologies and assumptions made. Parties are also invited to provide information on related constraints and gaps, which, for example, provides an opportunity to highlight where support is required. The guidelines recognise that updates *should be consistent with capacities, time constraints, data availabilities and the level of support provided* [Annex III, paragraph 5]. Experts with knowledge of the land transport sector, and the challenges that are associated with reporting emission reductions from this sector, should support developing countries to provide the required information, both in terms of reporting achieved and predicted emission reductions and also in communicating information about related challenges to the UNFCCC. The COP decided that related modalities and guidelines will be revised based on *experiences gained* [paragraph 58 c], and so any such information relayed could have a positive impact on the suitability of future guidelines for the communication of information relating to emission reductions in the land transport sector.

---

Box 3: Measuring, Reporting and Verifying (MRV) climate change mitigation activities in the land transport sector.

It is particularly challenging for the land transport sector when it comes to reporting and monitoring due to the general lack of data and especially GHG related data, especially in developing countries. Countries should invest in data collection and developing baselines that will lead to the creation of better inventories and appropriate policy tools for decision-making. Increasing the quality of reporting will allow them to access climate finance and bilateral funding opportunities for a greater number of mitigation projects in the transport sector.

Several sketch models are available that work with default data and could help countries build up monitoring and reporting capacity. The TEEMP model, developed by ITDP and the Clean Air Initiative for Asian Cities, is a spreadsheet tool adopted by the Global Environmental Facility which is appropriate to analyze the impact of specific projects. It defines a baseline scenario, estimates GHG emissions, and compares interventions to business-as-usual scenarios. So far, the model includes 8 different project interventions that could be part of sustainable mobility practices such as Bus Rapid Transit, railway and bike sharing programs. A second model, developed by the International Council on Clean Transport with ITDP, is the “Roadmap model”, which can be used to analyze impacts of interventions at the national level. Roadmap’s scope includes so far 16 individual countries and regions and data on vehicle stock, activity by mode, and fuel technologies. It also contains levers to compare modal shifts, fuel improvements, traffic reductions and improved urban planning and designs, among other features.

Table 2: Key opportunities to better integrate land transport in terms of NAMAs and LEDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Specific Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International policy makers</td>
<td>• Develop a NAMA registry that reflects the characteristics of interventions in the land transport sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incorporate a sectoral breakdown in the design of the NAMA registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop reporting and MRV processes that do not place an excessive burden on Parties and that recognise the nature of emissions from the land transport sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage a more detailed breakdown of emissions from the land transport sector in national communications and other forms of reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop a harmonised international understanding of low carbon transport systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Work with the international community to operationalise NAMAs and LEDs across implementing agencies at national level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National governments</td>
<td>• Develop transport NAMAs and submit proposals to the UNFCCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Present information on transport NAMAs at UNFCCC workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop low-emission development strategies that include land transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developed countries provide information on support available for t-NAMAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Submit transport NAMAs to the UNFCCC for inclusion in the NAMA registry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Sectoral approaches to mitigation

The AWG-LCA agreed to 'continue its consideration of a general framework for cooperative sectoral approaches and sector-specific actions' [paragraph 74]. The text makes explicit reference to the agriculture and international aviation and maritime transport sectors. The AWG-LCA said that they had a 'view' to adopt a related decision at COP18, and transport experts should communicate with both the secretariat and developing country Parties to seek to ensure that the requirements of the land transport sector are recognised and considered in the context of decisions that relate to making provisions for certain sectors.

There is an indication that land transport could benefit more from approaches such as NAMAs and LEDS but land transport sector stakeholders should nevertheless be engaged in the development of sectoral approaches to mitigation to help to ensure that all opportunities to up-scale climate change mitigation activities in the land transport sector are capitalised upon.

Table 3: Key opportunities to better integrate land transport in terms of sectoral approaches to mitigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Specific Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International policy makers</td>
<td>Review the suitability of sectors other than agriculture and international aviation and maritime for sector specific approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National governments</td>
<td>Increase awareness of the desirability of a sector specific approach for the land transport sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Community</td>
<td>Highlight the benefits of considering the land transport sector as a candidate for a sector specific approach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 4: BtG side event

The land transport sector was the focus of at least nine side events at COP17. Bridging the Gap and its partners took part in several of these promoting the potential of low carbon transport. The side events focused on a broad range of issues related to low carbon transport, such as NAMA development and national climate change action plans for transport and many of them were attended by Parties.

The Bridging the Gap and EMBARQ Mexico side event took place on 1 December 2011 (all presentations can be downloaded from www.transport.2012). It focussed on how to make land transport part of national climate change action plans and NAMA development. Case studies of NAMAs in Mexico and Colombia were presented and highlighted the south-south cooperation in Transport NAMAs development. The BtG partners also presented methods to Monitor, Report, and Verify GHG Emission Reductions from Transport NAMAs (t-NAMAs).
A discussion panel with government representatives from Colombia, Indonesia and South Africa and a representative from ICLEI (Local governments for Sustainability) followed the presentations, which underlined the need for further development of technical guidance for developing countries within the transport industry and highlighted some challenges to implementation and capacity building.

3.3 Finance

The Durban conference resulted in a number of decisions that have implications for climate finance. These are summarised below in relation to the Green Climate Fund (GCF), long-term finance, the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), and other ‘approaches to promote mitigation actions.’

The Green Climate Fund

One of the key outcomes of Durban was the implementation of the Green Climate Fund (GCF), as well as the decision to accept the design recommendations of the Transitional Committee (TC) to operationalise the Green Climate Fund. The Fund has been established as an independent international entity under the guidance of and accountable to the COP with a host country still to be selected as its independent secretariat.21 The GCF will ‘support projects, programmes, policies and other activities in developing country Parties’ [paragraph 3] that are consistent ‘with national climate strategies and plans and a country driven approach’ [paragraph 7]. It will ‘promote the paradigm shift towards low-emission... development pathways’ in the context of sustainable development [Annex, I. 2]21 and support developing countries in a country-driven approach that involves ‘relevant institutions and stakeholders’ [Annex, I. 3].

There is concern that it is taking a long time to get the fund up and running. However now Korea, Denmark and Germany have pledged to contribute to the start up costs. Possible streams of funds for the GCF were discussed at the meeting in the autumn of the G20 finance ministers and a paper was prepared by the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, the OECD and the Regional Development Banks for COP. This outlined inter alia a possible stream of funding from a carbon price for bunker fuels for aviation and maritime transport.

The report of the Transitional Committee21 states that the Board of the GCF is still intending to ‘establish additional thematic windows and/or substructures to address specific activities, as appropriate’ [Annex, D. 18(h)]. These will initially comprise of one for mitigation and another for adaptation. It does not seem likely at this stage that sector specific windows will be developed, but the land transport sector could usefully use the historically low representation of the sector in climate change mitigation mechanisms in the past as a justification for considering such thematic windows or subdivisions in the future. Low carbon land transport could also benefit if a thematic window was created for Low Emission Development Strategies (LEDS) and/or Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs).

The GCF will be flexible and guided by experience [Annex, I. 3], and so it is recommended that transport professionals track the support of the GCF for low carbon transport interventions and provide feedback in terms of the effectiveness of the support that it provides, along with recommendations for how it can be improved. It is said that the GCF will provide ‘simplified and improved access to funding’ [Annex, V. 31] and so it could lead to a scaling-up of finance for the land transport sector. There could be particular potential for

this if there is complementarity with activities of other relevant bilateral, regional and global funding mechanisms and institutions that already provide support for low carbon transport.

Such institutions should be encouraged to initiate ‘discussions on coherence in climate finance delivery’ with the GCF, as invited by the Transitional Committee [Annex, A. 34]. Identifying synergies in remits could also result in low carbon transport interventions receiving more than the value of the ‘additional costs’ required to make a project viable, which is all that the GCF intends to finance [Annex, VI. 54].

**Long-term finance**

The GCF decision stated that it would receive financial inputs from developed country Parties and other public, private and alternative sources, but failed to address the issue of its financing in the long term. It is also not identified how much of the promised long-term finance of US$ 100 billion annually by 2020 should flow through the GCF. The AWG-LCA decides13 to undertake a work programme on long-term finance in 2012, including workshops, in order to progress related issues [paragraph 127], a key element of which will be analysing options up-scaling financial resources from a wide variety of sources.

Further related decisions are due to be made at the forthcoming meeting of the G20, where the Mexican presidency is expected to prioritise climate financing in the agenda of the summit.

**Clean Development Mechanism (CDM)**

The outcome of the work of the AWG-KP22 referred to the need to ensure a continuity of mitigation actions and decided to begin the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol on 1 January 2013 [paragraph 1].

There were no other decisions made in relation to the CDM at Durban, although a number of requests to the Executive Board of the CDM may have a positive impact on the registration of land transport project proposals. These include the following, as outlined in the CMP7’s ‘Further guidance relating to the clean development mechanism’23:

- Extend the simplified modalities for the demonstration of additionality to a wider scope of project activities, and develop simplified baseline methodologies for such project activities [paragraph 17]
- Further improve the guidelines on the use of ‘first of its kind’ [paragraph 19]
- Conduct further work to develop simplified top-down baseline and monitoring methodologies, tools and standardised baselines for use in underrepresented project activity types [paragraph 22]
- Expand the scopes covered by guidelines for the establishment of sector-specific standardised baselines [paragraph 22].

---


Land transport has in the past been referred to as one of the ‘underrepresented project activity types’ by the UNFCCC, and this acknowledgement could contribute to an increased likelihood of the unique characteristics of the sector being better accommodated within the modalities and procedures of the CDM in future. However CDM as a mechanism has some core aspects that do not allow transport projects to be easily accepted within the CDM process. It is, therefore, suggested that transport professionals focus their attentions largely on the discussion surrounding NAMAs where the potential to reduce carbon from transport is higher. Box 5 outlines the limited number of transport projects that have been supported under the CDM, and there is little reason to believe that the emission reductions from the sector under the CDM will be significantly scaled-up in the foreseeable future. The price of carbon has also recently decreased, and as a result the number of projects in the CDM pipeline may continue to fall.

**Box 5: CDM not delivering much from land transport**

The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) had registered 11 projects in the land transport sector as of January 2012 (0.29% of the total number registered). A number of other transport projects are requesting registration and are at the validation stage, which brings the total number of ‘expected’ transport CDM projects to 47 (0.6% of the total). The total amount of tonnes of CO\(_2\) reduced from the transport sector via the CDM is very low, with only an estimated delivery of 500 Mt CO\(_2\) eq from transport CDM projects or the period 2005-2011\(^{24}\). 45 of the 47 CDM land transport projects have been submitted since April 2010.

**Approaches including opportunities for using markets to enhance the cost-effectiveness of, and to promote, mitigation actions**

The AWG-LCA13 recalled decisions made at previous COPs to ‘maintain and build upon the existing flexibility mechanisms established under the Kyoto Protocol,’ and to recognise ‘the role of public sources of finance in the implementation of mitigation activities’ in this context [Section E]. The AWG-LCA, at COP17, stated that any mechanisms to promote mitigation actions ‘must meet standards and deliver real, permanent, additional and verified mitigation outcomes’ [paragraph 79]. The barriers to greater participation of land transport in previous mechanisms, particularly in relation to the requirements for measurement, reporting and verification (MRV), should be noted. The AWG-LCA aims to conduct a work programme to consider a framework for such approaches by COP18 [paragraph 80]. The AWG-LCA was requested to conduct one or more related workshops with Parties, experts and ‘other stakeholders’ [paragraph 82] and transport professionals should seek to be involved in these discussions.

**Table 4: Key opportunities to better integrate land transport in terms of finance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Specific Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| International policy makers| • Consider the feasibility of sector specific thematic windows in the GCF for land transport  
• Identify institutions that provide financial support for low carbon transport and seek opportunities for match-funding proposals  
• Address the fact that land transport is an under-represented project type under the CDM by enabling other more appropriate mechanisms  
• Reflect experiences of underrepresented sectors of the CDM in the development of any new approaches for using markets to promote mitigation. (contd...) |

\(^{24}\) TRANSfer project
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National governments (contd...)</th>
<th>Expert Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Consider transport NAMAs or other projects, programmes, policies or other activity types that could be eligible for support via the GCF</td>
<td>• Communicate the desirability of sector specific thematic windows in the GCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communicate the desirability of sector specific thematic windows in the GCF</td>
<td>• Highlight the fundamental role of the land transport sector in the low-emission development pathways approach to be promoted by the GCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide feedback to the GCF regarding any challenges faced in relation to receiving or using climate finance for low carbon transport to seek to ensure that lessons are learned</td>
<td>• Increase awareness within developing countries of the co-benefits of low carbon transport to increase the likelihood of the sector being awarded finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide increased support for low carbon transport</td>
<td>• Identify barriers that have existed to the provision of climate finance to the land transport sector in the past and seek to ensure that they are not likely to be experienced under the GCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with transport professionals to develop transport CDM projects</td>
<td>• Encourage dialogue between financial institutions that provide resources for low carbon transport to try to exploit complementarity and develop co-operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively seek to engage with transport professionals regarding opportunities for financing low carbon transport.</td>
<td>• Contribute to discussions regarding the future of the CDM, and in particular in relation to developments of its modalities and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Actively follow the development of any new approaches to using the markets to enhance mitigation actions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Box 6: Tackling climate change and transport – strategies from around the world.**

Bridging the Gap organised a high level side event in collaboration with the South African Ministry of Transport on the 6th of December in Durban. Experts from multilateral development banks, including representatives from IDB, ADB and CAF joined governmental officials from Colombia, South Africa climate mitigation strategies in the transport sector.

ADB and Indonesia to discuss noted that the total investment into the transport sector from multilateral banks is approximately US$100 billion annually, and that the development of commitments by the banks towards more sustainable options would be of much value. ADB also provided a projection of approximately US$270 trillion to be spent by both public and private sectors in the transport sector by 2050 in Asia and the Pacific, indicating a large sum of investment that could potentially be redirected at least partially to sustainable options. The IDB mentioned that they were emphasising the importance of transport in relation to GHG emission reductions. For more information see; http://www.transport2012.org/transport-climate-change-news/2011-12-15,cop17-side-event-dec6.htm.
3.4 Technology

The Durban package noted the establishment of the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) as well as the set up of the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) in the Cancún Agreements, and the need to make these fully operational in 2012. The TEC and CTCN are collectively referred to as the ‘Technology Mechanism.’

The role of the CTCN is to respond to requests for technology development and transfer that are received from developing country Parties. Its role is to build or strengthen national capacity, to help Parties to identify their technology needs, and to facilitate the preparation and implementation of projects and strategies. The Climate Technology Centre manages and responds to the request receives, and the Network component of the CTCN works with the Centre to respond to these requests. The Network’s mandate is to ‘undertake the substantive work to address requests made to the Climate Technology Centre by developing country Parties’ [Annex VII, paragraph 6]. Institutions that are capable of responding to such requests (whether they are in the public or private sector) will participate in the network.

The terms of reference for the Climate Technology Centre and Network are contained in Annex VII to the outcome of the AWG LCA. It is decided that they should be flexible to enable them to respond to technology needs of developing countries and the demands of the emerging climate regime [paragraph 134].

The large contribution of the land transport sector to international GHG emissions and the lack of success in other mechanisms necessitates that any new climate regime must contain provisions for the sector. There are a wide range of land transport technologies that are capable of achieving emission reductions, many of them affordable for the developing world. The related work of the AWG-LCA underlined the importance of ‘nationally determined technology needs,’ and transport professionals should seek to support developing countries to identify how low carbon transport technologies can contribute towards meeting these needs. Indeed a role of the CTCN that the COP request be considered is ‘identifying currently available climate-friendly technologies for mitigation… that meet their key low-carbon development needs’ [paragraph 135b]. There could therefore be scope for transport professionals to communicate the breadth of available land transport low carbon technologies to the secretariat as well as to Parties.

The draft decision that relates to the Technology Executive Committee ‘stresses the importance of engaging a broad range of stakeholders… including public institutions, the business community, academia and non-governmental organisations’ [paragraph 5]. It may therefore be possible for transport professionals to contribute expertise to the work of the TEC. One of the functions of the TEC is to produce technology outlooks, technical papers on specific policies, and overviews of existing technology and its development with a view to identifying key achievements, gaps, good practices and lessons learned [B paragraph 2]. In doing so it’s again stated that the TEC should liaise with appropriate organisations and

---


actively seek collaboration [B paragraphs 4 and 5]. Transport organisations should avail themselves for this purpose whilst also actively pursuing related opportunities for collaboration and providing inputs. Similarly, transport professionals should also seek to participate in any related opportunities for engagement, which based on the draft decision of the TEC26 include:

- Working groups or panels that the TEC chooses to establish [C paragraph 8].
- Workshops and forums to increase opportunities for sharing experience with experts in technology related activities [D paragraph 9].
- Issue-based engagement channelled through work programmes [E paragraph 13].
- Other models that the TEC may consider establishing, such as consultative groups, stakeholder forums and technical task forces [E paragraph 14].
- A collaborative online information platform designed for use by Parties and a wide range of technology actors, experts and stakeholders [G paragraph 15).

The terms of reference of the Climate Technology Centre and Network state that they will provide assistance to developing country Parties27 'at their request' [Annex VII, paragraph 1],13 and so communication with Parties about the potential impact of low carbon transport technologies on emissions, social and economic development should be encouraged in order to build awareness. Organisations with an in-depth knowledge of the land transport sector could seek to do this by affiliating themselves with the Network, which will be comprised of 'institutions capable of responding to requests from developing country Parties related to technology development and transfer' [Annex VII, paragraph 3b].13 The Network is tasked with prioritising and responding to the requests from developing country Parties (via a designated national entity) to the Climate Technology Centre. The Centre can therefore, in a sense, act as an intermediary between Parties interested in implementing low carbon transport technologies and organisations (governmental, academic, private sector, and so on) that are able to advise on how to address these needs.

The COP invites the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to provide financial support to developing country Parties to update their technology needs assessments (TNAs),28 drawing on the related UNFCCC/UNDP Handbook.29 The Handbook recognises the economic, environmental and social priorities that appropriate climate change mitigation technologies in the transport sector can contribute towards and suggests that transport could be considered a ‘prioritised sector’ by developing country Parties in TNAs.

Table 5: Key opportunities to better integrate land transport in terms of technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Specific Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International policy makers</td>
<td>• Seek to ensure that representatives from the transport sector are involved in stakeholder engagement activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New and affordable technology for low carbon land transport should be included as an integral part of the Technology mechanism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 For example in the form of building or strengthening their capacity to identify technology needs, and facilitating the preparation and implementation of technology projects and strategies.
National governments

- Communicate demand for support to develop and implement low carbon transport technologies with the UNFCCC
- Enable transport professionals to actively engage with the development of the Technology Mechanism
- Work with transport professionals to ascertain how low carbon transport technologies can contribute to sustainable development, and other technology, needs
- Increase capacity at the national level to identify the broad range of transport technologies available, and gain support for implementation (pilot projects and system wide introduction).

Expert Community

- Highlight the breadth of available low carbon transport technologies to Parties and the international community
- Clearly communicate the potential impact of low carbon transport technologies on environmental, social and economic factors
- Actively participate in the development of the Technology Mechanism
- Provide input and feedback, where possible, to outputs of the TEC
- Pursue opportunities to join the CTCN.

3.5 Capacity building

The COP ‘reaffirmed’ and ‘recalled’ previous decisions that requested the consideration of ways to enhance capacity building owing to its integral role in the development of low-carbon development strategies or plans in the context of sustainable development. The CMP similarly referred to the role of capacity-building in enabling developing countries to participate in the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol, for example through participation in the CDM.

The COP requested that the SBI organise an annual ‘Durban Forum’ for ‘in-depth discussion capacity-building with the participation of Parties... and relevant experts and practitioners, with a view to sharing their experiences, exchange ideas, best practices and lessons learned regarding the implementation of capacity-building activities’ [paragraph 144]. As with other elements of the Durban Platform the land transport community should seek to be represented in these discussions – be it via Parties, experts or both – in order to ensure that it optimises provisions for capacity building in the sector.

Parties are also invited to report on measures taken to enhance enabling environments for national mitigation capacity [paragraph 149] and other best practices related to capacity-building [paragraph 5]. Highlighting capacity building activities conducted within the transport sector in these submissions would increase awareness of the capacity building that needs to take place in order to optimise emission reductions and related sustainable development benefits. It could also lead to the replication and development of best practice examples in the land transport sector. Sharing lessons learned could also stimulate debate and discussion around capacity building in the sector, again increasing awareness and helping to ensure that related barriers are recorded and steps taken to overcome them.

In respect to the CMP remit it is recommended that there is a particular emphasis on MRV and the barriers that it has created to a greater number of land transport sector CDM

projects being registered. The CMP has invited developed country Parties to provide capacity-building support in relation to the planning of CDM project activities [paragraph 4], and dialogue with such countries could be used to elevate the prominence of support for land transport sector capacity building activities.

Table 6: Key opportunities to better integrate land transport in terms of capacity building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Specific Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International policy makers</td>
<td>• Actively seek to identify capacity building needs in the transport sector in support of the development of low carbon development strategies and plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Involve transport professionals in the development of capacity building support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify the specific needs of the transport sector in capacity building in relation to the CDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National governments</td>
<td>• Share experiences in relation to capacity building in the transport sector at the annual Durban Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Express increased demand for capacity building in the land transport sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Report to the UNFCCC on measures that could enhance the enabling environment for national mitigation of emissions from the land transport sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communicate best practices in relation to capacity building in the land transport sector with the UNFCCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Community</td>
<td>• Share knowledge of capacity building in the transport sector at the Durban Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support developing country Parties to identify measures that could enhance the enabling environment for low carbon transport interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Highlight best practices in relation to capacity building in the land transport sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reiterate the need for capacity building in the land transport sector to increase the representation of land transport in the CDM project portfolio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 7: Cities Climate Registry – local responses to measurable, reportable, verifiable global climate action
In Durban, cities and local governments demonstrated their leadership on global climate action and released their inaugural 2011 Annual Report of carbon Cities Climate Registry (cCCR). Together with the Global Cities Covenant on Climate - the Mexico City Pact, the cCCR was one of the two main outcomes of the World Mayors Summit on Climate on 21 November 2010. As of November 2011, 51 cities from 19 countries worldwide, diverse in geography, economies, size and structure, but in total representing 83 million inhabitants and controlling 447 million tCO2e/yr, have voluntarily reported 90 GHG inventories, 107 climate and energy commitments and 555 actions and action plans at the cCCR. 75% of the commitments for reduction of community GHG emissions are exceeding 1%/year, which exceeds the reduction commitments of most national governments under the Kyoto Protocol. The transport sector constitutes 27% of the GHG emissions, 19% of the implemented actions and 39% of the actions that are contingent on financing. The availability of a global registry for local climate actions can have a significant role in the development of NAMA registry. Paragraph 46 (h) of the Durban Outcomes (Report of AWG-LCA) invites developing country Parties to submit, as appropriate, to the secretariat information on co-benefits for local sustainable development. Further information is available at www.citiesclimateregistry.org.
3.6 Agreed next steps for 2012

COP18/CMP8 will be hosted by the Government of Qatar in Doha, Qatar from 26 November to 7 December 2012.\(^{32}\)

There are many actions that the COP17/CMP7 decisions state will be taken in 2012. A number of these aim to be completed by COP18/CMP8. The dates of other upcoming meetings had not been published on the UNFCCC website at the time of writing. A number of invitations to make submissions to the UNFCCC process have, however, been issued in decisions from Durban. An overview of selected invitations is provided in Table 7.

Table 7: UNFCCC invitations for submission of views.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant stakeholder</th>
<th>Submission invitation</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annex I Parties</td>
<td>Views on experience with reporting the first biennial reports</td>
<td>28 February 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information related to progress towards the formulation of their low-emission development strategies.</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Annex I Parties</td>
<td>Input to the process on continuing workshops to further the understanding of the diversity of mitigation actions as communicated and contained in FCCC/AWGLCA/2011/INF.1 by submitting more information relating to NAMAs, including underlying assumptions and methodologies, sectors and gases covered, global warming potential values used, support needs for implementation of NAMAs and estimated mitigation outcomes.</td>
<td>1 March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information outlined in paragraph 46 of the outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA13 on individual NAMAs seeking international support.</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information on other NAMAs [n.b. those that aren't seeking international support]</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parties and observer organisations</td>
<td>Views on options and ways for further increasing the level of ambition and possible further actions.</td>
<td>5 March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Views on various approaches, including opportunities for using markets, to enhance the cost-effectiveness of, and to promote, mitigation actions, and also on a work programme to consider a framework for such approaches</td>
<td>5 March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Views in relation to the definition of a new market-based mechanism and a related work programme to elaborate its modalities and procedures, including positive and negative experiences of existing approaches and mechanisms, as well as lessons learned.</td>
<td>5 March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed country Parties, entities entrusted with the operation of the financial mechanism, and others that are in a position to do so.</td>
<td>Information listed in paragraph 48 of the outcome of the work of the AWG-LCA13 on financial, technological and capacity-building support available and/or provided for the preparation and/or implementation of NAMAs.</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4 Summary and recommendations

The demand for transport is playing a pivotal role in the continued growth of global CO$_2$ emissions, which has been increasing overall since the 1970s. It is therefore becoming increasingly important that this is recognised in the international process and that mechanisms are put in place that encourage actions especially to mitigate present levels and any future growth.

Few mechanisms and instruments within the UNFCCC process work for transport but this first analysis of the decisions reached in Durban indicates that there are now several opportunities for the land transport community. A number of recommendations for capitalising upon these are summarised below.

Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs). Transport NAMAs, either stand-alone or as part of LEDs, need to be developed and communicated with the UNFCCC. There should also be a process in place to support the development of LEDs. It is a Party driven process but support should be forthcoming from transport experts, and the related provisions of the UNFCCC should be conducive to the specifics of the land transport sector. This support could take the form of increasing awareness and capacity building of the potential scope and impact of transport NAMAs, as well as sharing experience on collecting and reporting the data required by the UNFCCC.

The NAMA registry, MRV frameworks and national communications need to reflect the characteristics of the land transport sector. The sustainable transport community should work closely with Parties and the UNFCCC to ensure that the sector can deliver more tonnes of CO$_2$ and scale up more actions from the sector to catalyse climate change mitigation. Indeed today NAMAs that contain a transport component and/or land transport NAMAs (t-NAMAs) show the highest level of potential for land transport reduction in the international framework.

Finance. Finance is now becoming available and it is crucial that this is channelled into helping make low carbon transport a reality. The UNFCCC along with other international institutions should seek opportunities for capitalising upon synergies. The land transport sector is unlikely to be well suited to the CDM, even after reform, but opportunities to address the under-representation of the sector through other market (and other) mechanisms should be pursued. Lessons learnt should be applied to leverage more finance and applied in relevant contexts. Similarly, Parties and transport experts should share related experiences with the UNFCCC so land transport can be better accommodated in the other sources of climate finance, like the GCF, as a result.

From discussions in Durban, it would seem that some Parties may be holding back on investing in t-NAMAs until there is more clarity while others (such as Mexico) are advocating a ’learning by doing’ approach. As it is clear that progress is slow in setting an agreed framework it would seem appropriate to take the latter course, especially as there is a higher potential for bi-lateral funding between developed and developing countries.

Technology. There are many opportunities for stakeholders to be involved in the development of the Technology Mechanism and the transfer of technology is key to making low carbon transport a reality. Land transport sector representatives and Parties should use this opportunity to communicate aspirations for low carbon transport technologies, barriers to their adoption and examples of how barriers could be overcome. An active engagement and sharing of knowledge could have a positive impact on the development and diffusion of low carbon transport technologies and influence the report that will be presented to SBSTA later.
in 2012. Observers are able to attend the meetings that will be held and any members of the sustainable transport community are encouraged to do so.\textsuperscript{33}

**Sectoral approaches to mitigation.** As land transport is a complex sector that is not yet delivering what is possible in terms of mitigation, land transport could be considered for its suitability as a sector specific approach – something currently being done for agriculture and international aviation and maritime. Doing so could help to increase awareness of the unique characteristics of the land transport sector and help close the gap between land transport and other sectors.

**Capacity building.** If land transport is to benefit from financial and technical support that is available for capacity building then there needs to be a convergence of efforts by the UNFCCC, Parties and international experts to actively seek to identify capacity building needs in the transport sector to support the development of low carbon development strategies and plans (especially NAMs and LEDs). The input of transport professionals and Parties should be sought (and shared) in forums and workshops amongst other activities. Developing country Parties should express demand for related capacity building support, and when provided shared with others.

---

\textsuperscript{33} Bridging the Gap members would be happy to have any information from anyone attending these meetings.
Appendix

Thirty-six decisions were adopted by COP17 and CMP7. These are listed below as hyperlinks.

- Establishment of an Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action
- Launching of the Green Climate Fund
- Technology Executive Committee - modalities and procedures
- National adaptation plans
- Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change
- Work programme on loss and damage
- Forum on response measures
- Financial mechanism of the Convention: LDCF: support for the implementation of elements of the LDC work programme other than NAPAs
- Amendment to Annex I to the Convention
- Report of the Global Environment Facility to the Conference of the Parties and additional guidance to the Global Environment Facility
- REDD+ : Safeguards and reference levels
- Capacity-building under the Convention in developing countries
- National communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention - Work of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention
- Revision of the UNFCCC reporting guidelines on annual inventories for Parties included in Annex I to the Convention
- Research dialogue on developments in research activities relevant to the needs of the Convention
- Administrative, financial and institutional matters
- Programme budget for the biennium 2012–2013
- Dates and venues of future sessions
- Outcome of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol at its sixteenth session
- Land use, land-use change and forestry
- Emissions trading and the project-based mechanisms
- Greenhouse gases, sectors and source categories, common metrics to calculate carbon dioxide equivalence of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks, and other methodological issues
- Consideration of information on potential environmental, economic and social consequences, including spillover effects, of tools, policies, measures and methodologies available to Annex I Parties
- Report of the Adaptation Fund Board
- Review of the Adaptation Fund
- Further guidance relating to the clean development mechanism
- Materiality standard under the clean development mechanism
- Modalities and procedures for carbon dioxide capture and storage in geological formations as clean development mechanism project activities
- Issues relating to joint implementation
- Compliance Committee
- Proposal from Kazakhstan to amend Annex B to the Kyoto Protocol
- Appeal by Croatia against a final decision of the enforcement branch of the Compliance Committee in relation to the implementation of decision 7/CP.12
- Capacity-building under the Kyoto Protocol for developing countries
- Administrative, financial and institutional matters
- Programme budget for the biennium 2012–2013.