
SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL FOR

Tempering and enabling ambition: how equity is considered in domestic processes preparing NDCs

Ceecee Holz · Guy Cunliffe · Kennedy Mbeva · Pieter W. Pauw · Harald Winkler

Guiding questions for case study interviews

1. Processes leading to the preparation for updating of your NDC / preparation of the INDC
 - Is your country planning to update its NDC or submit a new one in 2020? If yes, are there processes under way, or when are they expected to start?
 - Can you briefly describe the process as you have experienced it and your role in it? Specifically, what interactions with stakeholder have taken place, were other departments involved in it, was there an intergovernmental piece or interaction with stakeholders, what was the interaction between political level and bureaucracy like, what kind of scientific and economic sources and considerations were considered.
 - [Follow ups on]
 - i. Stakeholder engagement
 1. Consultations within national government
 2. Provinces, territories, municipalities, or Member States (case of EU)
 3. Industry/Business
 4. Civil society / Indigenous communities / Labour unions
 - ii. Nature of interaction between political level and bureaucracy
 1. Nature and breadth of advice given to political level
 - a. Role of science in target setting (i.e. consistency with global temperature limitation objectives/emissions pathways)
 - b. Role of equity in target setting (for INDC mitigation target)
 - i. “fair share”
 1. Political: to what extent does the country care about relative fair shares?
 2. Technical: type of target (form) and level of M-ambition (stringency)
 3. Indicators/criteria for both
 - ii. Effort-sharing interprovincial/between Member States
 - iii. Equity between economic sectors in target achievement
 - iv. Other considerations of equity in target setting?

- v. Comparability of effort to other countries? (what kind of countries?)
 - vi. Timing
 - c. Considerations of achieving the target
 - i. Was consideration of policy options for target attainment part of the target setting conversations (or considered internally by bureaucracy?)
 - ii. Economic modelling?
 - iii. (in case of EU: burden sharing among countries)
 - Adaptation:
 - i. For EU and Canada: To your knowledge, were there discussions regarding the inclusion of adaptation in the INDC?
 - ii. What equity arguments were used in relation to the adaptation NDC / undertaking / communication?
 - iii. Were metrics such as vulnerability used?
 - Means of Implementation:
 - i. For EU and Canada: to your knowledge, were there discussions on whether providing funding was part of the contribution (whether included in the INDC or not)? Why (not)?
 - ii. For Kenya and South Africa:
 - 1. Was support needed for adaptation raised? As an equity argument?
 - iii. Criteria from previous papers
 - 1. Impacts
 - 2. Vulnerability
 - 3. Who pays for adaptation
 - Political structure and culture of each country
 - i. Canada PCF
 - ii. EU burden-sharing
 - iii. Kenya Climate Act
 - iv. South Africa – carbon tax, IRP
 - Domestic measures for climate action,
 - i. noting the requirement for countries to pursue domestic mitigation measures (Art 4.2 of Paris Agreement)
2. New and revised NDC
- [reference ministerial declaration; potentially para 24, 1/CP.21]
 - International equity and ambition: is equity enabling ambition, e.g. others are also updating/doing more, so we can go a bit deeper or is target setting independent of such considerations
 - Any processes already anticipated/planned
 - Role of finance in these reconsiderations
 - Considerations of equity in target setting? Consultations?
 - Does Paris inclusion of the 1.5 °C goal play any role
 - Role of adaptation in revised NDC