



## **Submission by the Plurinational State of Bolivia**

**Views from Parties and admitted observer organizations on the matters referred to in paragraphs 44–46 of document FCCC/CP/2012/L.14/Rev.1, including information, experience and good practice relevant to the design and operation of various approaches.**

### **1. The purposes of the framework**

1. *Decides* that the scope of the work programme shall take into account the following aspects:

- a. The criteria for eligibility and definition of various approaches,
- b. The assessment of the approaches considering principles and standards that these approaches shall meet,
- c. The definition of mechanisms for the implementation of various approaches according with the previous assessment.

### **2. The scope of approaches to be included under the framework**

The scope of the approach should take into consideration the paragraph 56 of the Rio+20 document “The future we want”. This paragraph establishes the following: “*We affirm that there are different approaches, visions, models and tools available to each country, in accordance with its national circumstances and priorities, to achieve sustainable development in its three dimensions which is our overarching goal...*”

Also, the approach should take into account the 27/8 decision on green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication adopted by the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its first universal session. This decision states the following:

2. *Acknowledges that there are different approaches, visions, models and tools developed by Member States of the United Nations in order to achieve sustainable development, and in this regard takes note of the approach of Living-Well in balance and harmony with Mother Earth as a holistic and integrated approach to sustainable development that can guide humanity to live in harmony with nature and lead to efforts to restore the health and integrity of the Earth’s ecosystems”;*

Finally, the framework of various approaches should take into consideration the paragraph 2 of decision of the FCCC/CP/2012/L.14/Rev.1 adopted at Doha that states the following: “

*“2. Also decides that Parties’ efforts should be undertaken on the basis of equity and common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, and the provision of finance, technology transfer and capacity-building to developing countries in order to support their mitigation and adaptation actions under the Convention, and take into account the imperatives of equitable access to sustainable development, the survival of countries and protecting the integrity of Mother Earth”;*

Mother Earth is a distinctive concept than nature since this considers that nature is a living being or a living system. This means a move from an anthropocentric vision of the earth to a cosmocentric understanding, in which human beings and nature are similar; and therefore, it implies the recognition that human beings and nature have equal rights, and the importance to consider the universal recognition of the rights of Mother Earth.

Having recognized the need for the protection of the integrity of Mother Earth at the decision FCCC/CP/2012/L.14/Rev.1 the next step is therefore the recognition of the universal rights of Mother Earth as a living system, as one of the key issues to be discussed in the context of the framework of various approaches.

The approach should take into account the different approaches, visions, models and tools developed by country Parties in light of the “Living-well in balance and harmony with Mother Earth”, alternative to those based on market-based approaches because they are not able to fulfill the principles and standards oriented to achieve the ultimate objective of the Convention and the protection of integrity of Mother Earth, as established in section 3 below. Therefore, non-markets-based approaches are at the core of the development of various approaches.

The civilizational horizon of the “Living-well in balance and harmony with Mother Earth” is one of the key approaches to be developed on the context of the framework of various approaches. This is based on the operation of the “**Management of Environmental Functions**” (**MEF**), which is based on the articulation of a bundle of rights, historical responsibilities, obligations and duties at different levels. Therefore, the MEF should be achieved first at a global scale in order to be implemented at national and local scales. The MEF international scale can be depicted as follows:

- **Rights** are referred to the recognition of the rights of Mother Earth, and mainly the “right of Mother Earth to adapt naturally to climate change, taking into consideration the stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system”. This means moving the ultimate objective of the UNFCCC as a right of the Mother Earth.
- **Historical responsibilities**, refers to the responsibilities of developed countries to take the lead in reducing carbon emissions, in accordance to the principle of Common but Differentiated Responsibilities, its historical responsibility with climate change.

- ***Obligation of the States***, in order to promote the conditions at the country level for the achievement of the integral development and eradication of poverty of their citizens, taking as a main condition the transfer of finance and technology from developed country Parties to developing countries.
- ***Duties of the societies and citizens***, to ensure the protection of the environmental integrity of Mother Earth if previous parameters are met.

Consequently, the Management of Environmental Functions (MEF) is one the non-market-based approaches to be included on the framework, and one of its main tools to be considered is the “Joint Mitigation and Adaptation Mechanism for the Integral and Sustainable of Mother Earth and Forests “, as presented in the submission of the development of the work programme on non-market-based approaches.

### **3. A set of criteria and procedures to ensure the environmental integrity of approaches in accordance with decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 79**

A set of principles and standards should be taken into account in order to decide the feasibility of the approaches to be included in the framework to enhance the cost-effectiveness of, and to promote, mitigation actions and as well as adaptation to climate change.

The principles to be considered in the assessment of the environmental integrity of approaches should be the following:

- a) Principles of equity and Common but Differentiated Responsibilities of the Convention;
- b) Protection of the integrity of Mother Earth, including ethical responsibility, and change of unsustainable patterns of consumption and production;
- c) Non-commodification and non-financialization of the environmental functions of Mother Earth;
- d) Conceptual congruity with the basic science of climate change.
- e) Articulation of rights, historical responsibilities, obligations of States and duties of society and citizens in order to achieve greenhouse gas stabilization to prevent climate change.

The standards to be taken into account in order to ensure the environmental integrity of approaches with respect to the protection of the integrity of Mother Earth are the following:

- a) Social and environmental integrity and strengthening of governance of environmental functions according to their distinctive nature of jointness of use or consumption and excludability;
- b) Recognition of the need of compensation arising from accrued climate debt from developed countries to developing countries Parties through transfer of finance, technology and capacity building;
- c) Delivering of real, permanent, additional and verified mitigation outcomes by developed country Parties, including emission reductions, emission removals, and a real decrease or avoidance of greenhouse gases emissions through

- domestic means and actions, and in accordance with clear guidelines on the basis of robust standards;
- d) Enforcement of joint mitigation and adaptation practices.
- d) Achievement of Annex I country Parties mitigation commitments;

#### **4. Technical specifications to avoid double counting through the accurate and consistent recording and tracking of mitigation outcomes.**

Non-market-based approaches that strengthen the development of domestic reduction emissions through the fulfillment of the principle of Common but Differentiated Responsibilities are the only way to ensure avoiding double counting and an accurate and consistent recording and tracking of mitigation outcomes.

Among other things, one of the permanent problems or risks of market-based mechanisms is the double counting.

#### **5. The institutional arrangements for the framework**

The various approaches to ensure mitigation outcomes on climate change must consider the need to establish a polycentric institutional approach to cope with climate change.

The Plurinational State of Bolivia echoes an alternative approach to address the complex problem of climate change caused by greenhouse gas emissions that has been posed by Elinor Ostrom who won the 2009 Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences, arguing that “single policies adopted only at a global scale are unlikely to generate sufficient trust among citizens and firms so that collective action can take place in a comprehensive and transparent manner that will effectively reduce global warming”<sup>1</sup>.

Ostrom states (2009) that the initial relevance of the polycentric approach is the parallel between the earlier theoretical presumption that only the largest scale was relevant for the provision and production of public goods for metropolitan areas, and the contemporary presumption that only one scale is relevant for policies related to global public goods. Instead of the benefits derived from reducing greenhouse gases existing only at the global level, multiple benefits are created by diverse actions at multiple scales.

Since efforts to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions are a classic collective action problem that is best addressed at multiple scales and levels; therefore, the Bolivian proposal is to develop a polycentric approach at various levels with active oversight of local, regional, and national stakeholders. A polycentric approach has the main advantage of encouraging experimental efforts at multiple levels, leading to the development of methods for assessing the benefits and costs of particular strategies adopted in one type of ecosystem and compared to results obtained in other ecosystems.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ostrom, E. (2009). A Polycentric Approach for Coping with Climate Change. Washington, D.C.: World Bank: policy research working paper.

International institutional arrangements should be able to contribute to the ongoing efforts to scale up and improve the effectiveness of finance, capacity building and technology transfer for different non-market-based approaches and mechanisms oriented to achieve the ultimate objective of the Convention.

Therefore, the institutional arrangements should take into account the need to establish a multi-level system in order to cope with a multi-level problem, such as the following:

- **Local level.** Development of national initiatives in order to arrange a processes of adscription of local initiatives to a national policy and mechanism, so that enforcing local-level initiatives to cope with climate change.
- **National level.** Strengthening of national mechanisms oriented to mitigation and adaptation to climate change prioritizing non-market-based approaches.
- **International level.** A global coordination level encompassing a network of initiatives, in order to scale up the impacts of the transference of finance, technology and capacity building, and oriented to address and solve the leakage problems of actions oriented to manage climate change.