Converting INDCs into action

Introduction

The Convention obligates all Parties to take steps to address emissions and promote adaptation, with an additional obligation for developed countries to provide financial, technical and other support, including through the Financial Mechanism, to help developing countries fulfill their obligations.

These parallel commitments have evolved and become more specific over time. First introduced in the Bali Action Plan and further specified in the Cancun Agreements, Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) refined how developing country Parties would present mitigation actions. The Cancun pledges included quantified actions to be taken unilaterally and with support as well as quantified, collective climate finance commitments by developed countries, encouraging international cooperation for bold, bottom-up developing country actions.

All Parties have now been invited to put forward Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) to a post-2020 climate agreement, with the expectation that these INDCs would go beyond current undertakings under the Convention. As of October 2nd 2015, pledges from about 146 countries were submitted, covering over 85% of global emissions.

Developing country Parties have, in large number, submitted quantified economy-wide mitigation targets and broad adaptation goals – for many, marking their first comprehensive effort in respect. The mitigation targets broadly reflect a progression in scope and coverage with respect to previously pledged NAMAs, although many Parties indicate that they need support to achieve greater ambition than they can achieve on their own.

An elaboration of the broad targets included in these INDCs will likely be necessary. For Parties seeking support, converting INDCs into implementable policies and measures and financeable investment plans will be key to fully operationalize their targets by leveraging their own resources and attract public and private international financing at scale.¹

Addressing the issue of conversion of INDCs to investment strategies is timely, given the need to rapidly mobilize support for a pipeline of high quality, country-driven proposals to the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and other public and private funders that aim to go beyond one-off investments to achieve broader transformational change. How public institutions, including those under UNFCCC auspices, can support the preparation of transformational proposals in a way that is consistent with existing mandates and criteria needs consideration.

¹ Developed countries will also need to elaborate their INDCs domestically and report on progress through UNFCCC reporting in line with Convention guidelines.
This paper seeks to build a common vision of what converting INDCs into investment strategies involves, and to take stock of the level of progress in this respect by examining key INDCs from developing country Parties. We will also consider whether UNFCCC institutions, as well as entities outside the UNFCCC, are currently in a position to effectively support the conversion process in order to identify ways to strengthen the provision of support. We also consider domestic and international actions that can drive private finance, including the creation of policy frameworks and the development and financing of large scale project pipelines.

The work of Parties to implement INDCs

While much emphasis has been given to the development of comprehensive mitigation and adaptation goals within INDCs, the focus of Parties after Paris will turn to how to effectively operationalize these goals by converting INDCs into implementable actions that achieve transformational impacts. As part of this process, Parties will likely carry out the following:

- Define country circumstances, national priorities, and key barriers to action;
- Identify strategic policy priorities at the national and sectoral level in line with achieving economy-wide mitigation, adaptation and sustainable development goals; and,
- Design specific policies, regulations, and incentives to spur public spending and mobilization of private resources to implement these strategic priorities.

In the case of developing countries, additional steps will likely be necessary for Parties that wish to access international financing for implementation to leverage domestic investments in mitigation and adaptation, including to:

- Select programs and measures most in need of support and most likely to contribute to global ambition, based on various factors, such as cost, sustainable development and climate benefits, consistency with national priorities, and potential to catalyze additional public and private investment;
- Collaborate with potential domestic and international public and private implementing partners and financial intermediaries to develop finance-ready investment strategies for implementation; and
- Present the investment strategies as compelling grant, concessional and non-concessional finance proposals that fulfill the criteria of targeted funding sources.

How far have countries come in converting INDCs?

CCAP has undertaken an analysis of key INDCs in order to understand the progress that has been made, at an aggregate level, in converting economy-wide mitigation targets into finance-ready plans that can attract public and private support for implementation.
Analytical findings

We looked at INDCs submitted by October 2\textsuperscript{nd} 2015, and selected those from the highest 50 emitting Parties (with the EU counted as one due to the common INDC). Of those, we analyzed the 39 INDCs of the developing country Parties included in our top-50 sample in order to focus on the conversion of INDCs into investment strategies for countries eligible for support under the Convention. Of these 39 developing countries Parties, 35 indicate they can achieve a greater level of ambition conditional on international cooperation.

This analysis focuses on the mitigation information countries choose to present in their INDC, and did not seek additional information from other UNFCCC-related or national documents. An INDC can be seen as the priority messages that a Party wishes to communicate to the Convention about their planned actions and their needs for their implementation.\textsuperscript{2} Annex A provides a consolidated table of findings.

CCAP’s analysis revealed a wide range of information included in the 39 INDCs, with respect to emissions projections, specificity of planned actions, clarity on unilateral versus supported actions, and financial information.\textsuperscript{3}

Emissions projections

Of the 39 INDCs analyzed, all presented an economy-wide mitigation goal or target. However, not all present emissions projections. Two-thirds present a business as usual projection and one third project their emissions, showing the expected impact of their INDC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions projections</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes a business-as-usual projection</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes a projection showing the expected impact of the INDC</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specificity of planned actions

Many of the INDCs include reference to relevant sectors, with about half including a specific, quantified sector-wide goal, expressed in various forms (e.g.: intensity improvements, hectares of reforestation, renewable energy capacity increases). However, less than a quarter provide an estimate of emissions reductions to be achieved for that sector.

\textsuperscript{2} A number of developing countries also put forward adaptation elements in their INDCs. Inherently more sector-specific and varied, it would be difficult to analyze these goals alongside mitigation. Future work can focus on understanding how the adaptation component of INDCs have been expressed, and the degree of progress toward turning these goals into finance-ready programs and measures.
Furthermore, nearly half include specific sub-sectoral measures to be implemented, although only one Party quantifies the emissions impact of each individual measure included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specificity of planned actions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifies quantified sector-wide targets</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes quantified expected sector-wide emissions reductions</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies specific sectoral measures to achieve these targets</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes quantified expected emissions reductions of specific sectoral measures</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Clarity on unilateral vs. supported actions**

Of the 35 Parties seeking support, half distinguish a unilateral economy-wide target from the target they can achieve conditional on support. However, only 2 provide that information at the level of specific measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity on unilateral vs. supported actions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes a unilateral economy-wide target and a target that can be achieved with support</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides a clear indication of which measures can be taken unilaterally vs. which require support</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*35 INDCs that include a conditional target

**Financial information**

Nearly half of the 35 INDCs that indicate conditionality on international support present an estimate of the investment costs for implementation of their INDC, with a few breaking down these costs by sector or sub-sectoral measure. Five of the Parties that present cost information specify the amount needed from international sources versus what can be financed domestically, but these are not generally presented as a specific financial request to individual funding sources like the GCF. Parties that do not quantify costs also do not quantify the financial need from international sources.

---

4 Generally it would appear that, rather than considering incremental costs, the INDCs present the total investment cost, i.e.: the total cost to all relevant entities to achieve the INDC or specified sector targets or measures.
Assessment

Although the level of transparency and specificity varies, many of the mitigation INDCs examined here provide clarity on country priorities by presenting specific sector targets and measures, and include emissions projections that enhance the credibility of expected reductions. A substantial number of INDCs also distinguish a unilateral economy-wide target from the target they can achieve with support, as well as present expected investment costs for the full implementation of their INDC. Within the broad range of INDCs, some submissions stand out in the level of detail included on the sector-specific targets, policies and measures expected to contribute to mitigation targets, as well as specificity on the elements that will require support and their anticipated costs. Appendix B highlights examples of such INDCs.

In general, however, the lack of more granular sectoral information and clarity on supported versus unsupported actions, as well as the lack of specificity on financial requests, points to the future work to be done to convert INDCs into credible and finance-ready investment plans. Because putting in place the policies, programs and financing strategies needed to effectively operationalize the INDCs will take time, it will be critical to take this work forward pre-2020 in order to achieve countries’ post-2020 goals.

The current landscape of support and cooperation for INDC conversion

There appears to be broad agreement among Parties that existing UNFCCC institutions should play a meaningful role in supporting the implementation of INDCs. A number of UNFCCC institutions, including the GCF, GEF and the CTCN, as well as MDBs and bilateral donors that engage in climate finance, already possess many of the institutional structures, mandates, and modalities consistent with the provision of such support, as well as robust criteria for the evaluation of requests. We assess current capabilities and identify future considerations for how these entities could enhance the ecosystem of support available for Parties seeking help to convert their INDCs into action.
Financial Mechanism, Technology Mechanism, and other UNFCCC Institutions

Green Climate Fund

Current capabilities
The GCF is intended to support developing country efforts to limit or reduce their emissions and adapt to the impacts of climate change, with the capacity to fund the implementation of larger-scale, transformative projects and programs, including a Private Sector Facility that will help leverage private sector capital.

The Fund has also established a readiness program to help countries effectively engage with the Fund and access its resources. A number of activities supported under the readiness program could facilitate the conversion of INDCs into financeable plans, in particular support for the development of project and program proposals to the GCF.

However, the total amount of readiness funding available at present is limited, with up to US $30 million currently earmarked for readiness by the Board⁵, and a US $1 million cap per country per year. Existing readiness modalities may not be adequate to help countries with the design and development of policy frameworks, long-term infrastructure plans, and finance-ready investment strategies.

Beyond readiness funding, the Fund’s investment framework prioritizes proposals that have strong country buy-in and that build on, and contribute to, existing national climate change strategies and plans. In this sense, projects and programs anchored in ambitious and country-driven INDCs should be well-positioned to benefit from GCF financing. Yet with no explicit reference to INDCs in the investment framework, how the selection criteria will be implemented in this respect is unclear.

Future considerations
In response to calls led by the Africa Group for a more streamlined and long-term strategic work plan for the GCF, a number of Board members have submitted ideas for a strategic plan for the Fund for initial consideration at the 11th meeting in November 2015. These submissions put forward a number of suggestions, including:

- that the Fund should do more to support proposal development anchored in national programs and commitments;
- the need for additional resources and a potential new facility for program preparation; a greater role for country programs in the development of project pipelines; and
- that the strategic plan should include explicit goals and indicators related to delivery of support for national climate change strategies and plans, including NAMAs, NAPAs or NAPs, and INDCs.⁶

---

⁵ US $15 million has been initially made available, with up to US $30 million in total earmarked for readiness activities.
⁶ Submissions include those from South Africa and Egypt on behalf of the Africa Group, Germany, the UK, and a joint submission from board members from small island states.
The most recent progress report on the Fund’s readiness program identifies a gap in the level of international support available for the preparation of NAPs, and proposes a draft decision that would allow a country to receive up to US $2 million for this purpose, beyond the US $1 million annual cap. In addition to NAPs, the Board should consider whether there should be a broader discussion of access modalities and/or additional support to facilitate the preparation of national climate change plans and strategies—including those anchored in countries’ contributions under the UNFCCC—and how these elements should be addressed in the strategic plan.

**Global Environment Facility**

**Current capabilities**
The GEF provides grants for the implementation of climate change mitigation and adaptation projects and programs, as well as technical assistance and capacity building support for GHG measurement and forecasting of emissions.

The GEF also supports broader capacity-building at the national level through the Country Support Program, which includes dialogues and workshops aimed to help countries to define priorities for support and develop national strategies and plans, integrate GEF projects within national policy frameworks, improve stakeholder engagement and inter-ministerial coordination, and facilitate regional information-sharing. Grant-based support is also available for the development of endorsed proposal.

Recently, the GEF supported countries in the preparation of their INDCs as requested by the COP. However, there is a lack of clarity as to the role the GEF will be playing in their further development.

**Future considerations**
With the advent of the GCF as a principle source of support for climate change action post-Paris, it may be useful to ensure a distinct and complementary role for the GEF going forward. The GEF may be well-positioned to facilitate the conversion of INDC targets into national policy frameworks and implementation strategies, and to support related reporting on implementation and MRV, given its historical focus on capacity building, technical assistance and reporting.

Consideration should be given to how the independent adaptation-focused trust funds that the GEF manages can support countries to convert the adaptation component of their INDC into effective policies and plans, including identifying opportunities to leverage private sector investment. This could help build a pipeline of adaptation projects to help the GCF fulfill its commitment to provide 50% of its funding for adaptation projects, as well as similar commitments by a number of bilateral funders.

---

7 The GEF finances adaptation actions through three independent trust funds, the Least Developed Countries Fund, the Special Climate Change Fund and The Strategic Priority on Adaptation.
Adaptation Fund

Current capabilities
The Adaptation Fund finances adaptation and resilience efforts in developing countries particularly vulnerable to the adverse impacts of climate change. As the first international climate fund to operationalize direct access, the Adaptation Fund also provides readiness support to national and regional entities to build capacity for the receipt and management of climate finance, and to meet fiduciary and other accreditation standards of the Fund.

Future considerations
Like the GEF, the Adaptation Fund could help accelerate the development of high-quality adaptation projects and programs, in addition to funding their implementation. Beyond support for implementing entities, a broader readiness program could support the development of policies, financial mechanisms and funding schemes, and program proposals that help countries to operationalize their INDC adaptation goals and mobilize finance for their implementation.

Technology Mechanism

Current capabilities
The Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) responds to requests from developing countries to deliver technical assistance through a global network of partner organizations, and works to increase access to information on climate-friendly technologies and foster collaboration. The CTCN has taken a fairly expansive definition of technology cooperation that extends to the “how to” of implementing policy change, including support for the development of policy and planning documents and implementation plans.

Future considerations
The CTCN’s comprehensive support for technology transfer can help Parties identify, design, and integrate policy and technology elements into a cohesive strategy. Consideration should be given as to whether the network would need to be expanded and diversified to strengthen support for the development of finance-ready strategies, including the identification of viable options for financial mechanisms and incentive programs to accelerate the penetration of low-carbon technology. Moreover, while the CTCN currently has US $34 million in guaranteed donations from governments, additional commitments will be necessary to meet the Center’s expected spending of US $100 million over the next 5 years.

More generally, the Technology Needs Assessment process led by the Technology Executive Committee is currently under review, and could be enhanced to allow countries to assess their technology needs in terms of implementing their INDCs.
Workstream 2

Current capabilities
In addition to direct technical and financial support for INDC translation, workstream 2 (WS2) under the ADP has provided a valuable platform for knowledge-sharing and showcasing success, as well as capacity building through concrete discussions of policy, technology and financing options in specific sectoral policy areas such as renewable energy. At COP20 in Lima in December 2014, the COP decided to extend the technical examination process in the 2015-2020 period, and requested the ADP to make recommendations at COP21 on how to take this work forward after Paris.

Future considerations
The decision to continue the technical examination process until 2020 can accelerate the design and implementation of enabling frameworks that contribute to the country’s post-2020 mitigation and adaptation goals, and drive long-term transformation.

Consideration should be given to broadening the focus of WS2 to include not only pre-2020 measures, but also matters of relevance to Parties post-2020, such as long-term policy planning, effective GHG measurement and forecasting of emissions, and discussion of cooperative efforts that could complement or supplement actions taken under INDCs.

Similar processes for the implementation of Paris Agreement commitments, once it enters into force, should also be considered.

Other sources of support
A growing number of institutions and programs provide climate finance readiness and preparatory support, such as the Climate Finance Readiness Program, funded by Germany, Czech Republic and the United States, the Mitigation Action Plans and Scenarios (MAPS) program, or broader facilities at a number of multilateral banks that provide technical assistance alongside larger scale program investment.

Announcements in recent months herald significant new flows of bilateral and multilateral climate finance, including pledges for increased support from the UK, Germany and China, as well as commitments to boost climate lending from the World Bank and other MDBs at a meeting of finance ministers in Lima in October. Donors looking at their provision of finance post-Paris would be well-advised to consider how to enhance the provision of support for readiness activities such as technical analysis, policy design, and project preparation in support of developing country INDCs.

Mobilizing private finance at scale
Private financiers will need clear, long term policy frameworks to which they can respond, and will be concerned with the lack of significant project pipelines, without which broad and liquid markets for
climate specific financial instruments like green bonds cannot develop. They will also be concerned with the risk (financial, technology and policy) of projects and how to mitigate these risks.

Domestic actions will be critical in this respect. As part of the conversion of the INDC into policies, measures and a finance ready investment strategy, a country may need to consider how to:

- Offer long-term policy certainty to enable large investments with long pay-back periods (e.g. renewable energy generation or low-carbon transportation infrastructure);
- Design incentive schemes such as feed-in-tariffs and rebates that address high investment costs and risks;
- Remove barriers to low-carbon investment through regulatory approaches that level the playing field, including the elimination of fossil fuel subsidies;
- Promote the development of robust financial sectors with the capacity to understand and evaluate projects based on new technologies; and
- Develop a strong pipeline of low-carbon, finance-ready projects that will attract private capital.

International action can complement domestic efforts, building on the longstanding work of institutions such as the International Finance Corporation, to:

- Structure viable financial arrangements for private projects in developing countries;
- Mitigate risks through instruments such as guarantees and financial terms not offered on the market; and
- Demonstrate the viability of technologies that have not been tested in a specific country.

The GCF’s Private Sector Facility aims to launch a competitive request for proposals that will disburse up to US $500 million to innovative proposals that catalyze private sector investment at scale. The achievement of results with financing through this Facility will be strengthened as countries put in place enabling policies and develop full finance-ready investment plans.

**Conclusion and next steps**

The adoption of comprehensive mitigation and adaptation targets by Parties lays the groundwork for an ambitious outcome in Paris. Our review of INDCs from key developing country Parties reveals that many include information that signal country priorities and give a broad understanding of the intended path to reach their overall goals. However, in general, greater specificity is needed to turn pledges into specific policies and programs and finance-ready investment plans. A number of institutions, both within and outside of UNFCCC auspices, already provide financial, technology and capacity building support that can help countries in this respect, and many are in a position to enhance the delivery of support for INDC conversion going forward. At the same time, domestic and international actions to put in place enabling policies and build project pipelines will be key to achieve the promised level of ambition and drive private finance at scale.
With a view to identify areas of convergence on how to effectively take forward action on INDC conversion, we present the following as key issues for further consideration and discussion:

Steps for INDC conversion
For all Parties, what are the steps countries have already taken, and future steps envisioned, to convert INDCs into policy frameworks and finance-ready investment strategies, including key challenges? For countries seeking international support for implementation, what are the opportunities for cooperation and support from public institutions and the private sector that might be most useful in facilitating this process? What can countries discover about their own opportunities for action by effectively converting their INDCs?

Potential roles of UNFCCC and non-UNFCCC entities
The potential roles of UNFCCC institutions in supporting INDC conversion, consistent with their existing selection criteria and approval processes, including:

In the case of the GCF:
- If and how the Fund should prioritize support for turning INDC goals into specific policies, programs and investment plans—for example, should the current GCF readiness program be expanded or are additional modalities needed to deliver preparatory support, including broader programmatic support for the development of national climate change plans and strategies? Should additional funds be earmarked by the Board and/or greater levels of support be made available beyond the current per-country allocation limit for readiness support in order to facilitate this kind of work?
- If and how the GCF should prioritize support for the implementation of projects and programs anchored in Parties’ INDCs—for example, should an explicit link be made between GCF programming and INDC implementation (e.g. consideration of the transparency and ambition of a country’s INDC in the evaluation of country ownership)?
- How can the GCF move quickly to build country capacity to drive private sector flows, and help countries develop investment strategies that consider both public and private sources?
- Should a Strategic Plan for the Fund address INDC conversion and/or implementation, for instance through the inclusion of priorities for support and/or aggregate goals or indicators for delivery?

In the case of other UNFCCC entities:
- Given the GEF’s historical focus on capacity building, technical assistance and reporting, is there a role for the GEF to support Parties that want help to operationalize their INDCs? Relative to the GCF and other UNFCCC institutions, what are the GEF’s comparative advantages in doing so? Would new support modalities be needed?
- How can both the GEF and the Adaptation Fund help build a strong pipeline of country-driven adaptation programs and proposals?
- Should the CTCN further expand its network to better support countries to develop finance-ready investment strategies to promote the penetration of low-carbon technology? How could
the Technology Needs Assessment process be enhanced to allow countries to assess their technology needs for the implementation of their INDCs?

- What are the options for expanding and extending the scope of ADP WS2 to accelerate progress toward INDC implementation and facilitate the transition to low-carbon, resilient economies? How can the scope of these exchanges be broadened to better address issues relevant for post-2020 ambition, such as long-term policy planning and MRV, and facilitate opportunities for cooperative efforts? Should the technical examination process itself be extended beyond 2020 to provide ongoing collaboration as Parties implement their pledges?

In the case of non-UNFCCC entities:

- In addition to mobilizing direct support for implementation, how can multilateral and bilateral institutions add value and promote the transformational impact of scaled-up donor funds, including through the provision of readiness support for policy and program preparation?

Opportunities to mobilize financing at scale

- How can support be strengthened to help countries put in place policy frameworks and project pipelines that catalyze private finance, as well as design and deploy financial instruments where real or perceived risks are a barrier to private investment and catalyze these project pipelines?

- What existing institutions are best in a position to provide support to help countries mobilize private finance in these ways, and how can new institutions like the GCF Private Sector Facility further accelerate this work? Are there opportunities for countries to partner with private sector actors directly for this kind of cooperation?
## Annex A: Analytical Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDC Feature</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number of INDCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emissions projections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes a business-as-usual projection</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes a projection showing the expected impact of the INDC</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specificity of planned actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies quantified sector-wide targets</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes quantified expected sector-wide emissions reductions</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies specific sectoral measures to achieve these targets</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes quantified expected emissions reductions of specific sectoral measures</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity on unilateral vs. supported actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes a unilateral economy-wide target and a target that can be achieved with support</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides a clear indication of which measures can be taken unilaterally vs. which require support</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specificity of financial information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates overall investment costs</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates investment costs by sector</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicates investment costs for specific sectoral measures</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimates the overall amount needed from international sources</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimates the amount needed from international sources by sector</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimates the amount needed from international sources for specific sectoral measures</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The second set of features are only examined over the 35 INDCs that include a conditional target, for which these questions are relevant.
Annex B: “Highly-specified” INDC examples

The following case studies highlight INDC submissions that include meaningful details that can support the conversion of broad targets into policies, programs and investment plans for implementation.

Morocco

Morocco’s INDC commits to reduce emissions by 13% below BAU between 2020-2030 unilaterally, and an additional 19% conditional on international support. The INDC provides BAU and the expected trajectory for both the conditional and unconditional targets.

With 50% of reductions expected from the energy sector, the INDC lays out the following key objectives for energy transformation and reform:

- Increasing installed capacity from renewables by 50% by 2025
- Reduce energy consumption by 15% by 2030
- Reduce fossil fuel subsidies building on recent reforms
- Increase the use of natural gas through infrastructure projects allowing LNG imports

The INDC provides additional information on sectoral targets and actions drawn from existing national laws and plans in five priority sectors, including energy, water, waste, forest, industry and housing sectors, as well as expected sectoral contributions to the overall reduction target. Accomplishing Morocco’s unconditional target will be based on the implementation of 10 actions, while reaching the conditional target would require the implementation of all 54 actions included in the submission. The country estimates this would require investments of US $45 billion, US $35 billion of which is conditional on the mobilization of climate funds through the GCF.

In terms of adaptation, Morocco plans to use its Green Investment Plan and develop a National Adaptation Plan up to 2030 to help coordinate climate resilience efforts already identified in 21 national policies, strategies and action plans for at risk sectors such as forest, agriculture, and water. Morocco estimates these efforts would require an investment of US $2.5 billion, and as such requests international financial support, together with institutional capacity building, technical assistance for the design and implementation of technology.

Peru

Peru put forward an unconditional pledge to reduce emissions by 20% below BAU by 2030 (base year 2010), with an additional 10% reduction dependent on international financing and outcomes it deems favorable with regard to the Paris Agreement.

Peru’s robust INDC preparation process to identify and prioritize mitigation and adaptation measures helps lay the groundwork for converting the country’s targets into action on the ground. While the final submission has more limited details, the emissions reduction target presented to the UNFCCC is consistent with the proposed scenario included in the highly specified draft INDC released for public
consultation in June. Along with the baseline, this document lays out 58 sectoral measures to support the proposed reduction target, as well as the expected cumulative mitigation potential of each to 2030. The document explicitly references the sectoral policy documents, laws and programs from which these measures are drawn, including NAMAs and Peru’s National Strategy on Climate Change (PlanCC). According to the draft document, over half of the measures required to achieve their target have already been initiated.

Peru’s INDC also identifies 5 priority sectors for adaptation (water, agriculture, fisheries, forestry, and health), and the scope and intermediate objectives for each. While the level of resources required are not specified, the INDC differentiates between goals that have funding from those conditional on international support.

**Lao**

In its first international undertaking to take action on climate change, Lao has pledged to reduce its emissions from its 2000 levels (56.2 MtCO2) through a number of policies and actions between 2020-2030, and conditional on international support.

Lao’s INDC includes sector-level targets, policies and programs to reduce emissions, including through expansion of hydropower resources, increasing small scale renewable energy, the implementation of a National Forest Strategy, as well as NAMAs in rural electrification and transportation. For each of the efforts identified, the INDC describes the expected mitigation potential and level of international investment required, as follows:

- **Increase forest cover by 70%** of land area (16.68 million hectares) by 2020 with a sequestration potential of 6 MtCO2 - 6.9 MtCO2 per year from 2020 onward. The full implementation of this strategy would require international investment in the sum of US $180 million.
- **Expand and use hydropower resources** and export clean energy to neighbors, with an estimated emissions reduction of 16.28 MtCO2 per annum between 2020 and 2030, and total financial investment of US $320 million.
- **Meet 30% of energy consumption with small scale renewable energy** by 2025 and increase the share of biofuels to meet 10% of the demand for transport fuels by 2025. These initiatives would require a financial investment of US $658.75 million, and are expected to yield reductions of 1,468 MtCO2 by 2025.
- **Implement NAMAs for rural electrification** which would lead to a reduction of 0.0063 MtCO2 per year through reduced reliance on fossil fuel and fuel wood and would require an investment of US $160 million.
- **Improving transportation networks and buses** what which would result in lower emissions while catering to the increasing demand for travel. The implementation of this NAMA would lead to emissions reductions of 0.19 MtCO2 per year and cost US $150 million.
The INDC details intended adaptation objectives, related activities, and barriers in agriculture, forestry, water, health, and transport and urban development. The type of support required (e.g.: capacity building, financial support) and associated costs are specified for each goal.