



Legislating the Paris Agreement

London 27 & 28 September 2016

Summary report of the meeting

The Paris Agreement has now been ratified by a sufficient number of parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) representing over 55 per cent of global greenhouse gas emissions and, as a result, will enter into force on 4 November 2016. In collaboration with the Climate & Development Knowledge Network (CDKN), LRI hosted a two-day event in London to develop approaches and ideas for supporting developing countries in their legislative efforts to respond to climate change and implement their commitments under the Paris Agreement. The event combined an evening panel discussion with a hands-on legal expert workshop the following day.

1. Panel discussion

The public panel discussion took place at PricewaterhouseCoopers on 27 September. Two different panels focused, first, on the Paris Agreement and, second, its domestic implementation in developing countries. Moderated by Edward King of Climate Home this led to a vibrant discussion between around 90 representatives of development organisations, donor agencies, the legal profession and foreign missions based in London:

1.1 The **first panel**, composed of Marianna Bolshakova (UNFCCC), Kate Cook (LRI and Matrix Chambers), Chukwumerije Okereke (Reading University) and Kiran Sura (CDKN) reflected, amongst other things, on the robustness of the Paris Agreement (PA). Most agreed that it could be stronger in protecting the interests of poor and climate vulnerable countries. Its core elements, however, offer an opportunity for transformational change if parties subsequently create a strong set of rules to implement the agreement. The lack of a “rulebook” impedes implementation. The process of developing the modalities, procedures, guidelines etc. envisaged under the Paris deal must, therefore, start without delay. Other issues highlighted by panellists and members of the audience included:

- the emphasis on the urgency of action in the COP decision adopting the PA, and in the PA’s preamble;
- the new long term temperature goal to limit global warming to 1.5 °C;
- whilst commitments are voluntary the review process that requires all countries to demonstrate progress should help to ensure a degree of accountability;
- the PA does not address climate justice and historic responsibilities, and is weak on support to developing countries;
- as a result (of the lack of financial and other support), developing countries will face significant challenges in implementing their nationally determined contributions (NDCs);
- to overcome those challenges climate finance but also technical support and sustainable capacity building are crucial;

- the UNFCCC, in collaboration with other agencies, is exploring avenues for assisting countries with domestic implementation – through e.g. information exchange or supporting champion countries (in Africa); and
- in the international legal context, the PA is part of a wider picture and supplements existing legal concepts and tools (e.g. human rights or transboundary environmental impact assessments).

2.2 The **second panel**, consisting of Michael Burger (Sabin Center for Climate Change Law), Maria Socorro Manguiat (UN Environment), Seth Osafo (Legal Adviser to the African Group of Negotiators), and Kiran Sura (CDKN) built on the preceding discussion and identified the missing “rulebook”, the complexity of the implementation task combined with a lack of capacity as key challenges. While the availability of climate finance is key for developing countries, the complexity of the existing funding architecture makes access difficult. In this connection, developing country governments may, for example, struggle to identify clear priority needs and put in place robust plans underpinned by legislation that attracts donors and private investment. It was suggested that integrating NDCs in the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction may be a way forward.

The 2008 UK Climate Change Act was mentioned as a potential template for the implementation of the PA in other jurisdictions. Developing countries that have, to date, adopted specific climate change legislation include, amongst others, the Philippines, Kenya, Ghana and South Africa. It was generally acknowledged that while existing legislation or broad templates may provide useful guidance for lawmakers, there would be political constraints in replicating existing approaches and the law of other countries. In general, a tailored approach, reflecting the specific needs and circumstances of different developing countries (and their legal systems) is needed.

Focusing on African countries, it was noted that most already have national policies and strategies on climate change but no legislation. The lack of legal capacity, e.g. lawyers who can review and revise a set of complex rules in different areas, often hinders the process of translating policy into law. In this context, UNEP and other international organisations and initiatives may have an important role to play: UNEP has already given technical assistance to some countries on e.g. how to measure vulnerability or the PA ratification process, and is also beginning to assist countries in defining their legal priorities and needs. In collaboration with the UNFCCC secretariat and LRI, they are also exploring the possibility of developing a legal toolbox. This might include advice on best practice in relation to the procedural components of NDCs.

Several participants noted the importance of legislation in the climate change context to provide legal certainty (e.g. beyond one government’s policy) but also give legitimacy and authority to regulate citizens’ activities in various areas. For the serious pursuit and accomplishment of NDCs it may be useful to enshrine commitments in the domestic law. This could help to hold governments accountable, provide for citizen enforcement and allow for robust compliance regimes. In this connection, however, it was also suggested that economic incentives (e.g. tax breaks if the industry meets certain energy efficient targets) are more effective than a command and control approach. A final longer exchange of

opinions concerned the extent to which the PA may be subject to judicial review by an international court of tribunal. Several potential avenues for climate change cases at the international and also the national level were discussed.

Survey results

During the panel discussion participants were invited to respond to some questions online.

Which approach should the international community focus on to support countries in developing new legislation – based on 31 “votes”:

National capacity building	71%	Provision of external experts/expertise	16%
Direct financial support	13%	International initiatives	0%

The greatest challenges to developing domestic climate legislation (36 participants selected 2 issues each – in a few cases 1 only):

Lack of political buy-in	75%	Fragmented domestic legislation	42%
Lack of expertise	39%	Complex international framework	25%

In addition, we asked some of our government contacts in developing countries (mainly officials of the national environment agency/ministry/department) to provide their own statements on the following issues. Based on 14 non-representative responses:

What do you consider your country’s priority for climate change legislation?
Pollution control/mitigation: 5; Adaptation/livelihood protection: 5; Forest protection: 4

A body/organ driving climate legislation should be associated with the:
Ministry of Environment: 7, Prime Minister’s/President’s office: 6; other: 1

2. Workshop

Key issues raised during the panel discussion were considered further at an expert workshop on the following day at Simmons & Simmons. Almost 40 participants from private practice, academia, intergovernmental organisations, donor agencies and NGOs met to explore how developing countries can best be supported in legislative activities to implement the PA.¹ A set of eight presentations with discussion in the morning, was followed by breakout groups and short reports back to the “plenary” after lunch. The core of the discussions took place during the morning and was broadly split into two parts: Mapping current initiatives and approaches; and specific examples of work on legal drafting, existing legislation, stakeholder engagement and other substantive areas that may inform the development of climate or climate relevant legislation in the future.

2.1 Mapping initiatives and approaches

a) The early entry into force of the PA sends a positive message but also creates challenges for parties faced with the task of domestic implementation. The PA is essentially a

¹ A list of participants is attached (annex).

framework agreement and the rules on how it will be operationalized have not yet been drawn up. In addition, the country-driven approach of the PA means that in comparison to other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) it provides little guidance on what national legislation should look like. Any domestic legislation that is developed over the next 2 to 3 years, therefore, needs to be flexible enough to allow for compliance with future rules that are still being developed at the international level. The process of formulating and implementing NDC related legislation could be coordinated with other relevant frameworks such as the SDGs, the 2030 agenda and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.

To facilitate the process of implementing NDCs and catalysing action, the UNFCCC secretariat is working with UNDP and UNEP which can deliver support on the ground. For the above reason, they recognise the need to avoid being prescriptive and that it will be up to each country to determine priorities. They are working to develop a toolbox that would allow countries to choose elements of legislation and policy that suit their national needs. This toolbox might outline what a country's climate change legislation can potentially cover and, in limited instances, also provide sample clauses, but it will not be a model law.

b) The Commonwealth Secretariat is undertaking a range of activities to support member countries. This includes developing a climate finance access hub, and collaborating with The Dickson Poon School of Law, King's College London (KCL) to map national climate change laws and examine intersections of climate policy with other legal and governance areas, such as taxation, energy, transport or forestry, as relevant to a particular country's legal, economic, social and environmental circumstances. This work may also lead to a capacity building toolkit based on the experience of Commonwealth countries. The rationale for the initial mapping exercise is the need to first understand the existing regulatory landscape before mainstreaming and/or developing specific legislation on climate change. The initial project is therefore focused on identifying and aggregating relevant laws.

However, climate change defies easy legal categorisation, operates at multiple levels of governance, and is accommodated in a range of different legal cultures. A clear methodology to assess a jurisdiction's legal framework and compile relevant laws and regulations that govern responses to climate change is therefore crucial. As a key aspect of this method, the KCL study distinguishes between direct and indirect legal intersections. Direct intersections are national laws that explicitly address climate change policy, such as climate targets or renewable energy regulation, or take into account climate change within a separate legal framework such as transport or planning. Indirect intersections are laws that can significantly affect or potentially undermine mitigation and adaptation goals whilst pursuing a different regulatory function, such as land management laws. Further work is now to be done on assessing the distinctive features of different legal cultures in which these disparate regulatory frameworks are embedded.

c) The next presenter strongly believed that a model law is necessary and has been working on such a draft law for African jurisdictions. In many African countries, there is limited legal knowledge and expertise on climate change and only few universities teach it as a separate subject area. As a result, it will take time to build a body of lawyers who have the expertise needed to review and develop climate laws. A model law will help to fill this gap. This law will be fairly comprehensive, providing elements that countries can pick and choose to suit

their national circumstances. It would include objectives, options for institutional arrangements and, in the main body, thematic issues such as adaptation, agriculture, food security, early warning systems, land and waste management.

Many countries already have laws and regulations that deal with facets of climate change. In order to meet countries' obligations under the PA, these laws will need to be reviewed and brought up to date. For this, there needs to be a strong collaboration between the ministry of environment and lawyers in e.g. the attorney generals' office or other government departments. In this connection, there may be opportunities to mentor lawyers and enhance legal expertise in a sustainable manner.

d) The following discussion, first focused on the question of how national decision makers should assess whether legislation is needed or policy may be sufficient. Some participants felt that if there are comprehensive and robust strategies and national policies in place formal legislation (which has to go through a parliamentary process) may not always be needed and hamper quick, efficient and flexible responses to climate change. Others generally favored legislation over policy for a number of reasons: Legislation locks countries in a policy direction that cannot be easily reversed; national accountability and enforcement mechanisms will be more readily available; it creates legal certainty which, for example, attracts investors; and encourages the coordination of different policy spheres across government agencies.

If countries decide to pass formal legislation related to climate change, the next question may be whether to develop specific climate framework legislation or review and amend existing laws. If there are already comprehensive governance frameworks it may be politically challenging to create further institutions and laws; while amending existing legislation may be particularly cumbersome and subject to political and institutional resistance if there are many vested interests. It may often be less contentious to integrate climate concerns into laws that focus on other priorities; and secondary legislation (e.g. government order, decree or regulation) can be an adequate tool (e.g. to determine technical requirements) too. The same basic questions (concerning national implementation) arose after the adoption of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

There is no "one-size-fits-all" approach. The specific circumstances and legislative processes of different jurisdictions will ultimately determine whether e.g. new framework legislation, sectoral legislation, or the revision of existing laws is required and what an adequate mix of laws, policies and strategies looks like. Given the great variety of national circumstances, it may make more sense to think in terms of model modules of common elements, rather than model laws. Modules, common elements or approaches could be presented in toolkits with variants built into them. Such toolkits could include good practices from different regulatory experiences. Law and decision makers could pick and choose according to the specific circumstances and needs of a country.

2.2 Examples, techniques and lessons learnt in developing legislation

a) The Sabin Center for Climate Change Law at Columbia Law School monitors climate legislation worldwide. Their findings show the diversity of countries' approaches to climate legislative action: Some have comprehensive flagship laws; others a patchwork of new and old laws; some only policies but no laws; whilst others still need to develop relevant policies and laws. Notably because of the overlap between mitigation and adaptation to climate change in many areas, comprehensive law and policy approaches are generally the most effective - but they are not always possible.

The scale and layers of governance (national, sub-national and local) as well as the division and balance of powers in a particular country (roles of the executive, legislative and the courts) are important factors in determining appropriate avenues for the development of law. In addition, one also needs to consider the range of regulatory techniques available. With regard to the mitigation of GHG emissions, for example, the main ones are: quantitative targets, pricing emissions (taxes, cap and trade), command and control mechanisms, subsidies and tax incentives and information disclosure.

b) The Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment (at LSE) is developing tools for parliamentarians and policymakers to measure their country's national effort against the requirements of the PA. This will help to identify gaps, good practice and adjust strategies accordingly. With regard to the implementation of NDCs, there appears to be a number of elements that are important for a country's ability to meet its commitments. This includes mechanisms for stakeholder involvement, a climate-aware public and a good performance in delivering previous climate commitments. Effective rules and procedures, including comprehensive legislation and policy as well as transparent, inclusive and effective decision making processes with enough political authority to limit reversal are also important.

In this connection, the question of how one assess the quality or legal strength of regulatory interventions, such as legislation, executive order or policy, arises. This assessment is likely to depend on a number of factors, such as the legal form of the intervention, whether there is a compliance and enforcement mechanism, the justiciability of provisions and decisions, and also the allocation of financial resources to secure its implementation in practice.

c) The question of how to assess the quality of legislation is also one that the Sir William Dale Centre for Legislative Studies (Institute for Advanced Legal Studies) had to consider repeatedly. Their current approach is to analyze it in terms of effectiveness. Effectiveness is measured against several criteria including efficiency, clarity, precision, plain language etc. Experience shows that especially in the developing world it will be difficult to assess the effectiveness of climate change legislation as there are no generally accepted criteria. Due to the lack of local expertise, it is often common practice in developing countries to transplant a law from one country to the next. This does not work. An assessment of a country's needs and circumstances has to be carried out and drafters for a particular jurisdiction have to be trained. Different areas of law have also different methodologies for drafting. Tailor made training should, therefore, be offered to future drafters of climate change legislation.

d) Lessons can also be drawn from legislative work in other areas. SOAS (University of London), for example, has been involved in the research and development of water laws in India where water (e.g. water supplies, irrigation and canals, drainage and embankments) is subject to the legislative authority of the states (not the Union). As a result, the regulatory focus is at the sub-national level and there are layers upon layers of legislation. Laws in this area have been developed over many decades, and, to date, there have been few attempts to consolidate them and coordinate their application. Water laws are wide-ranging but do not cover all areas. For example, drinking water is dealt with by policy instruments. A new model law is being developed by the national (Union) government but the lack of expertise at the state level means that the competent state institutions rarely engage with it.

Potential lessons learnt for the climate context are: It is essential to be sensitive to the country and sub-national contexts. Lawmakers should, as a priority, seek to integrate different sectors rather than introduce new laws that add new layers of rules. Legislation is often created by foreign consultants and ends up sitting on a shelf. It is therefore crucial to build local expertise and for countries to have ownership of the process of developing legislation.

e) The need and challenge of involving a wide range of national stakeholders is put into sharp focus in a country like Guyana. Here, for example, indigenous peoples are actively engaged in the law making process. As a result, however, consultation exercises can take a long – e.g. if decisions are taken by consensus. There can be language barriers if the relevant terminology (e.g. “protected area”) is not easily translated into local languages and different stakeholder groups have different perceptions of what it means. Guyana recently developed a national low carbon strategy. This process was initiated and initially driven by NGOs but insufficient consideration was given to traditional practices and lifestyles. Consequently, there was very limited local buy-in. This – once again – emphasizes the relevance of legislative developments to engage in a meaningful way with the reality on the ground and the cultural context of a jurisdiction.

The following 4 PowerPoint presentations are available from the LRI website at <http://legalresponseinitiative.org/legislating-the-paris-agreement-two-days-of-discussions-in-london/> (1) Analyzing climate change legislation, a (2) Brief typology on national climate change legislation, (3) Consistency of national efforts with the PA, and (4) Legislative drafting.

f) During the following discussion participants underlined the need for awareness raising, public consultations and serious engagement with stakeholders concerned. This (potentially time-consuming and resource intensive) process needs to reflect the national context. If its timing and format are defined by donor agencies draft laws are more likely to end up sitting on the shelves. Funders, therefore, need to carefully coordinate their interventions and initiatives with the relevant government authorities. In this connection, support should be provided on a long-term, sustainable basis to cover the complete law making process. “Parachuting in experts” rarely works, instead South-South collaboration between experts and national capacity-building should be priorities. To enhance the capacity of civil society and local communities to engage in law reform process (in a number of focus countries),

ClientEarth provided them with specific legal advice and training under the Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) initiative.

2.3 Break-out groups

Following the deliberation in “plenary”, participants divided into four groups, each focusing on a specific theme. Their main findings are summarized here.²

a) Mitigation, GHG emission and pollution control

Participants discussed the role of the private sector in developing legislation. Business is a stakeholder and there should be formal procedures in place to ensure that their views are heard (or things get rolled back). From a donor perspective, there is a need for soft laws and guidance on how to mainstream climate change concerns across all donor activities and development agencies’ practices. This could take the form of a checklist to ensure coherence between different programmes and initiatives. Efforts to develop new and review existing legislation may be framed as new designated projects or “piggy back” ongoing initiatives.

The group then went on to consider how national approaches to mitigation and pollution control should be implemented and supported. Five key areas were specifically highlighted: Reporting requirements (MRV); reduction targets; adaptation; the provision of finance; and the necessary governance mechanisms and institutional arrangements (e.g. a command and control approach, or economic incentives such as cap and trade and carbon pricing). An increasingly relevant regulatory tool in the private sector that can trigger behavioural change within companies is the need to disclose information on their carbon footprint. While self-regulation by the industry is an important part of the picture but to ensure national commitments, targets and long term goals are durable and enforceable these should be embedded in legislation.

Participants also noted that there has been a shift in the discourse around climate change from burden sharing to new opportunities for positive change. To realise the potential benefits national legislation related to climate change may employ a combination of different approaches – sticks and carrots, cap and trade schemes, or other economic incentives – depending on the political and legal context. Finally, the group felt that, in order to avoid some of the pitfalls of expert interventions (highlighted during the morning) a key role for lawyers and think-tanks is to make reliable and rigorous information widely accessible and easy to use.

b) Clean technology investment and markets

The members of the group felt that there was a significant scale of finance available internationally to support low carbon development. Green bonds to fund projects that have climate benefits, programmes of the Multilateral Development Banks, bilateral aid etc. but also the new market mechanisms envisaged under the Paris Agreement all have an

² Unfortunately, there was no break out group on adaptation (as planned).

important role to play in this connection. In their experience, investors were often chasing good projects but also needed to be more sensitive to the different requirements or forms of project finance depending on national circumstances and specific requirements of the domestic markets.

Information contained in NDCs and national technology needs assessment (TNAs) can be a useful starting point to understand a country's needs, political economy and potential risks. Countries could include more detailed proposals and credible project pipelines in their NDCs. Other useful sources of information are, for example, the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA) or the International Energy Agency (IEA). From a donor or investor's perspective different avenues of financing, for example, climate adaptation technology transfer and development which is not cutting edge but would boost employment and increases a country's overall technical capabilities, can be appealing.

To improve conditions for markets and investment, law making at the national level is important, but other forms of regulation, such as industry standards and voluntary codes (e.g. Equator Principles) also play a part. General legislative objectives (that are not climate specific) include: Application of the rule of law, legal certainty and an effective judicial system. Other climate specific subject areas where new or revised domestic laws could help to attract external investment were also discussed. This potentially includes the regulation of energy markets, intellectual property rights, promotion and operation of the clean development mechanism, the planning and implementation of transboundary projects and investor-state dispute resolution (ISDR). Legislation should be flexible enough to allow and encourage different funding and investment models.

c) Balancing interests and civil society stakeholder engagement

The group began by considering what is meant by "stakeholders" and agreed that the definition must be nationally driven and include not only people in cities but also a wider range of actors throughout the country. Some noted the difficulty of engaging with some stakeholders, such as rural communities in developing countries, and it was suggested that, to encourage participation, communities should be supported in organising themselves. Communicating the concept of benefit-sharing (from the use of resources) can also be problematic if communities do not hold formal titles (e.g. to land).

Codifying stakeholder participation as part of the law was recognised as an important and necessary measure. But it does not guarantee meaningful involvement without additional efforts to raise awareness and support the wider enabling environment. In Australia, for example, the protection of indigenous peoples' rights is enshrined in the law. However, in practice legislation is often imposed on indigenous peoples and not adapted to their specific circumstances and needs. This, in turn, raises the issue of how to best involve indigenous peoples and other often marginalised groups in the legislative consultation process.

To balance climate change objectives with other societal and environmental concerns participatory decision making frameworks that reflect the reality on the ground and the local context are important. It was suggested that if the public is sufficiently aware of climate change impacts this may affect a society's national development pathway. It could

help to leapfrog traditional stages and integrate low carbon activities – e.g. the use of public transport or continued cycling – into infrastructure and transport development strategies and programmes.

d) Strategies and initiatives to support developing countries

There are a number of barriers for developing an effective strategy or initiative to support legislative activities (not unique to the climate change context). From the perspective of developing countries, this includes the complexity and fragmentation of the existing funding structure, failure to follow-through on promised assistance, lack of local expertise and limited understanding of local needs and context, particularly by foreign consultants. From the donors' perspective, the challenges tend to revolve around the questions of how to use scarce resources effectively, provide the range of expertise required to support a cross-cutting programme on climate change, ensure local buy-in and who to partner with.

The question of how to target support was controversial. Some participants suggested taking a regional approach, allowing specific needs to be identified, and working initially with one prominent country in that region. Others preferred to use the idea of "flagship countries" (e.g. Mexico) that have already gained a certain expertise and experience in climate legislation. Identifying suitable countries or regions would depend largely on evidence of long term commitments and political buy-in. Alternatively, it may be more appropriate to focus on cooperation around certain issues.

To address the lack of understanding of the local context, expertise and local buy-in, two ideas were put forward: (1) to have a database of actions (failed and successful) for as many countries as possible. There would need to be a local champion (e.g. a senior government representative) to collect the information on the ground. This might be done using a questionnaire or decision tree relating to socio economic issues (food, water, land use etc.) to identify key issues and the required legislation. (2) A "state of affairs" assessment could be carried out by experts (e.g. from donor agencies or local universities) on the basis of conversations with government, civil society, academia and the private sector. This assessment would recommend a plan of action which – if agreed by the government – could form the basis to request donor funding.

Participants agreed that donor agencies and beneficiaries should work together to diminish existing confusions, identify areas of complementarity and adopt a strategic and scalable approach to assistance over the medium to long term. They identified a set of potential measures to launch a wider initiative for the support of developing countries. All group participants expressed a willingness to progress this plan as a matter of urgency. UNEP and the Commonwealth Secretariat offered to host an initial meeting.

A possible action plan

1. Relevant organisations (donors, beneficiaries, others) establish a network, which would map current activities, and identify gaps and synergies;
2. The network would cooperate in developing a common document to (a) define the scope of the cooperation, (b) help conceptualise the cross-cutting nature of "legislating

the Paris Agreement”, (c) assist developing countries in understanding the nature of the challenge and in identifying potential approaches appropriate to the local context;

3. The network would attempt to agree a strategic, scalable approach to assistance;
4. It would then identify appropriate regions/countries/champions (or issues) to work with (or on);
5. It would send a multi-disciplinary team to the country to meet stakeholders from government, academia, civil society and the private sector and conduct a technical assessment to get a sense of where the country is at and what its priorities are;
6. The team would produce, in conjunction with the relevant government, an agreed initial Need Analysis; and
7. The Need Analysis will provide the basis for seeking the funding necessary to implement activities.

Annex (List of participants)

Alina Averchenkova	Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment, LSE
Amir Sokolowski	Legal Atlas
Benjamin Ichou	Client Earth
Billy Hamshaw	California Carbon
Caroline Haywood	Client Earth
Christoph Schwarte	LRI
Chukwumerije Okereke	University of Reading
Constantin Stefanou	Institute for Advanced Legal Studies
Daniel Wiseman	LSE
Don Phuwadon	University College London
Eliza Northrop	World Resources Institute
Eloise Scotford	King's College London
Helen Bowdren	Dentons
Huzi Ishaku	Clean Energy Consult
Kiran Arora	Berwin Leighton Paisner (BLP)
Kirsty Schneeberger	Children's Investment Fund Foundation
Linda Siegele	University College London
Lovleen Bhullar	SOAS, University of London
Maria Socorro Manguiat	UNEP
Marianna Bolshakova	UNFCCC
Marie-Aure Perreaut	International Federation for Human Rights
Melinda Janki	SOAS, University of London
Michael Burger	Sabin Centre for Climate Change Law
Michal Nachmany	Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment, LSE
Olga Hancock	Simmons & Simmons
Olivia Tattarletti	Simmons & Simmons
Pascale Bird	LRI
Philippe Cullet	SOAS, University of London
Ruth Mackenzie	Westminster University
Sam Unsworth	CDKN
Sarah Jones	LRI
Seth Osafo	African Group of Negotiators
Stephen Minas	King's College London
Steven Malby	Commonwealth Secretariat
Tim Crossland	Plan B
Tobias Hausotter	GIZ