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Foreword

The year 2015 will stand out in the history of multilateral negotiations as a year of infinite ambition and heroic endeavour. Five major international, and intertwined, processes were concluded which have set the world onto a path of sustainable development by conscious design.

Whether the high ambition of 2015 results in delivery of the global goals by 2030 depends ultimately on the strength of collective efforts. But with the evidence of 2015 before us, as a result of the many constituencies which came together to support governments in concluding agreements in Sendai and New York in March, Addis Ababa in July, New York in September and Paris in December, one can hope to be optimistic.

The focus of this discussion paper is on a key constituency that will be instrumental to the success of the 2015 agreements. These are the national lawmakers, namely, parliamentarians and legislators. Parliamentarians and legislators will have a unique role in transposing the international agreements reached in 2015 into actionable national laws and regulations. As elected representatives of the people, they will have to ensure that commitments made by governments are delivered through effective policies and measures, with adequate resources, and ongoing scrutiny to assure oversight and accountability.

The effective engagement of lawmakers in international environmental processes has been a core focus of UNEP and GLOBE’s partnership over the years. Since 2015 we have combined our efforts to promote more integrated approaches towards sustainable development governance by legislators, working in partnership with other key constituencies.

Our efforts have included improved awareness raising and capacity building of legislators, as well as dialogue with other branches of government - the executive and the judiciary - to improve mutual understanding of each other’s respective roles in the delivery of international commitments such as the 2015 agreements.

With this joint publication, we look forward to supporting legislators advance this agenda and play their important role in bringing the 2015 Agreements home for national implementation actions through the adoption of appropriate laws and regulations.

Elizabeth Maruma Mrema
Director
Division of Environmental Law and Conventions (DELC)
UNEP

Malini Mehra
Chief Executive
GLOBE International secretariat
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Executive Summary

Bringing the 2015 Summits home: an action agenda for legislators is a collaboration between GLOBE International, the worldwide network of environmental legislators, and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). It provides an overview of the cascade of significant developments including in the adoption of several multilateral environmental agreements adopted in 2015 and explains their relevance for legislators, and why parliamentary engagement is crucial to their success.

Covering disaster risk reduction, financing for development, gender, sustainable development and climate change, these global summits and processes of 2015 have charted a transformational course for human societies for the coming decades. Their significance cannot be over-estimated and the importance of parliaments to their implementation cannot be under-estimated.

As not all of these agreements are household names, awareness raising amongst legislators is the first task this paper sets itself. Explaining the background and key features of each major 2015 summit and process, it makes the case for a stronger role for legislators in ensuring that the outcomes of all these summits are implemented at a national level in an integrated and synergistic manner to ensure coherence and the desired impact.

The paper offers guidance on the Top 10 Things Legislators Can Do to bring the 2015 summits home, and illustrates action taken by legislators across the world to implement GLOBE’s Coherence & Convergence approach to the 2015 summits. These efforts show that parliaments have a critical role in translating the multilateral frameworks agreed into meaningful national legislation that is locally owned, enjoys public trust and can be implemented.

The paper holds that while implementation must be a collective effort engaging all stakeholders, it is the duty of parliaments to assure democratic accountability and oversight. Members of parliament should be at the heart of the Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) function demanded by this epic new generation of international agreements. The paper concludes that the active and informed engagement of legislators will be a crucial factor in the success of the 2015 agreements, and parliaments everywhere must rise to this historic challenge and ‘Bring the 2015 Summits Home’.
CHAPTER 1  The 2015 Summits

When historians look back at the 21st century, 2015 will stand out as a landmark year. Both for the setting of global goals, as well as a new narrative for a more sustainable future for humanity. 2015 will mark the dividing line between an old way of approaching development and a new more inclusive way. One that recognizes biophysical limits to resource-fueled growth on a finite, shared planet with growing numbers, growing inequality and growing expectations.

2015 produced a remarkable set of global agreements which broke with past conventions. They set universal and inter-connected goals on shared planetary responsibility, intended to guide national priorities and action until 2030.

This paper sets out the story behind the confluence of processes that led to the historic ‘2015 moment’ which resulted in major outcomes such as the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction, the Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement on climate change. It makes the case for an integrated approach to implementation of these agreements, and argues that proactive parliamentary engagement and leadership will be crucial to success.

2015 became an important year for international summity more by default, than by design. In a fortuitous set of coincidences, the United Nations summit calendar for 2015 saw a number of key landing points in some major intergovernmental processes. Whether it was disaster risk reduction in Sendai, Japan; or progress on the rights of women and girls as part of Beijing+20; or the Third Finance for Development conference in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; or the Sustainable Development Goals in New York; or the Twenty First Conference of the Parties of climate change in Paris, each of these UN processes had a different history and background in international affairs. Yet their confluence in 2015 made for a momentous agenda and created exciting new opportunities for system-wide synergy and cooperation.

UN leaders seized on this and a new brand - the ‘2015 moment’ - was born. Neither was this brand short on ambition. It is no exaggeration to say that the 2015 moment was about a global reset: consciously setting the political needle in the direction of global sustainable development by 2030.

1 To this list of key events in 2015 can be added the World Trade Organisation (WTO) Doha round of trade negotiations. The WTO conference was less well integrated in the other summit processes and does not form a part of this analysis.
“2015 IS A MILESTONE FOR GLOBAL ACTION”

The year 2015 is a milestone for global action: we will come to the end of the time frame in which we have been guided by the MDGs; we are launching a transformative development agenda, including a set of sustainable development goals (SDGs); and we are aiming for a meaningful and universal agreement on climate change. The transition from the MDGs to the SDGs presents a once-in-a-generation opportunity to advance prosperity, secure the planet's sustainability for future generations, and unlock resources for investments in education, health, equitable growth and sustainable production and consumption.

Ban Ki-moon, Secretary-General of the United Nations
MDG Gap Task Force Report 2015

As with other UN processes, the Executive branch of national governments led on the diplomacy and negotiations. National parliaments were, by and large, not engaged directly. This is a fundamental democratic lacuna caused by separation of powers and mandates that can be addressed, and corrected by engaging parliaments, if the new world aspired to so eloquently in the 2015 agreements is to materialize.

To that extent this paper is an exercise in awareness-raising and advocacy for parliamentary engagement - a constituency too long seen as discretionary to inter-governmental processes historically dominated by the Executive branch of national governments. The premise of this paper is that in modern democracies, legislatures (at all levels) matter and without them there can be no effective or long-term implementation of Agenda 2030 or other 2015 agreements.

Why 2015 matters ...

- DRR - Sendai
- FFD - Addis
- SDGs - New York
- Climate - Paris
- Beijing+20
Going back in time … context for the 2015 moment

The roots of the 2015 agreements lie in the 1990s. This was an epic era of UN summitry relating to sustainable development which saw a cascade of UN conferences after the 1987 Brundtland Commission adopted a report on ‘Our Common Future’ linking environment and development and defining for the first time ever the term ‘sustainable development’ as development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. This was followed by the UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in 1992. Popularly known as the Rio Earth Summit, the outcomes included Agenda 21 the Plan of Action and the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development both called for participation of all stakeholders including legislators. UNCED led to the emergence of the three Rio conventions on biodiversity, climate change and desertification. Legislators have been involved in the process of ratification, preparing implementation legislation and implementation of these three Rio Conventions.

Quickly on the heels of Rio came the UN Conference on Population and Environment (1992) in Cairo, the 4th World Conference on Women in Beijing (1995), the Habitat summit in Istanbul (1997), the UN climate change conference in Kyoto (1997), and the ill-fated Seattle summit of the World Trade Organization in 1999. This was a definitional decade for international development and the year 2000 was set up by the United Nations as a major milestone, heralding an ambitious set of eight Millennium Development Goals to mark the new epoch.

While each of these international processes were led by governments, there were domestic echoes of issues at stake through debates in national parliaments, shadow reports and broader civil society engagement. By and large, however, legislators were the odd ones out. There was no specific structured entry point for parliamentary engagement in these UN processes and parliaments were not identified as one of the 9 Major Groups formalised by Agenda 21, adopted at the Earth Summit in 1992, as the main channels through which broad participation would be facilitated in UN activities related to sustainable development are: women, farmers, workers & trade unions, local authorities, business, non-governmental organisations, children & youth, indigenous peoples, scientific & technological community. More at: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/majorgroups/about

As one response to this, the GLOBE International network of legislators was created by parliamentary leaders such as Senator Al Gore, Senator John Kerry, Russian

---

2 The nine Major Groups formalised by Agenda 21, adopted at the Earth Summit in 1992, as the main channels through which broad participation would be facilitated in UN activities related to sustainable development are: women, farmers, workers & trade unions, local authorities, business, non-governmental organisations, children & youth, indigenous peoples, scientific & technological community. More at: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/majorgroups/about
physicist and Duma member Nikolai Vorontsov and Japanese Diet leader, Akiko Domoto, to provide a platform for structured and meaningful engagement by national legislators on agenda-setting intergovernmental processes. Many other parliamentary networks emerged during the decade to follow as the normative and policymaking importance of these summits became apparent, and the engagement of legislators deemed essential.

If one fast forwards to today, the situation is better but there are still no structured platforms for parliamentary engagement within the UN system on par with the Major Groups and other Stakeholders systems, other than through NGO representation and agency-specific parliamentary outreach (e.g. UNISDR, World Bank parliamentary network, etc.). Greater efforts have been made in the last few years – e.g. parliamentary involvement at the UN Secretary-General’s Sustainable Development Summit and Lima climate change COP20 in December 2014 – but full legislative integration remains a work in progress.

A new millennial agenda emerges...

If the 1990s put new challenges on the international agenda through UN summits and gave them formal structure, the 2000s refined them further and added yet new ones. At the top were the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in 2000, which set global goals for development and directed aid flows towards targeted anti-poverty interventions in the developing world.

Regrettably the MDGs were not universal and did not apply to advanced industrialised countries or address issues of internal inequality or unsustainable production and consumption patterns. A UNDP review of the MDGs in 2013, assessing the role of Parliaments’ noted that lack of accountability was a major weakness in MDG implementation and concluded:

“A stronger accountability scheme requires that parliaments and others – including local level elected representatives and institutions – engage throughout the policy-making process and the associated stages of the budget cycle to promote and deliver the post-2015 goals. Such an approach will strengthen political commitment and offer incentives for better service delivery for all.”

Such shortcomings became recognized and a broad review process of the MDGs in 2010 addressed many of them. This resulted in a mandate that year to the UN Secretary-General Ban-ki Moon from the General Assembly to initiate the

---

3 In 2012 at the Rio+20 conference, governments added a number of other stakeholders to participate in UN processes on sustainable development – namely, local communities, volunteer groups and foundations, migrants and families, older persons, and persons with disabilities. Parliamentarians were not included as specially recognized stakeholders, nor members of the judiciary.

4 Parliament’s Role in Defining and Promoting the Post-2015 Development Agenda, UNDP Brief, January 2013
Post-MDG process to advance the UN development agenda beyond 2015.

Now, this Post-MDG process is not to be confused with a separate SDG Process, that was launched in 2012 at the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD/Rio+20). This conference saw the 20-year review of the Rio Earth Summit and resulted in a major outcome document, *The Future We Want*, and a decision by Member States to launch an intergovernmental process, through broad consultation, to establish “global sustainable development goals to be adopted by the UN General Assembly” in 2015.5

These two processes reflected different hinterlands and the crudely bifurcated environment and development communities with ‘their’ separate intergovernmental processes – the MDGs and UNCED – which now had a common convergence point in 2015. Consequently, these processes became shoehorned together, if somewhat uneasily, following the Rio Earth Summit in what became known as the Post-2015 Agenda.

Another major issue, Finance - or the Means of Implementation - to put these intergovernmental commitments into practice had long been a subject of concern, especially for developing countries unable to mobilize adequate domestic financial resources and facing reduced aid flows. With few industrialised countries meeting the 0.7% Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) target agreed by the UN back in 1970, and reaffirmed at major UN conferences throughout the 2000s, finance became a major bone of contention between developed and developing countries.

---

5 A fuller account can be found in *The Role of Parliamentarians in Advancing the Sustainable Development Agenda*, a Parliamentary Handbook by EPFPD and UNEP, June 2014; 3
The Addis process (3rd Conference on Financing for Development) was rooted in these debates and sought to provide a modern 21st century set of solutions to the issue of Finance for Development, mindful of rapidly changing economic and geopolitical realities and global financial trends. The importance of a resolution on finance was seen as such a sticking point for success at the UN’s summit in New York later that September to adopt the post-2015 agenda (including sustainable development goals), and the climate summit later in December, that Addis was front-loaded with high expectations of a financial breakthrough. The resulting 37-page Addis Ababa Action Agenda in July 2015 agreed to a “global framework for financing development post-2015” bringing together the financing for development and the post-2015 development processes into a more unified and rigorous implementation effort. 6

Of the major 2015 summits, however, the UN Sustainable Development Summit in New York in September and COP21, the UN climate change summit in December in Paris, were by far the most prominent with the greatest media and political attention, and global campaigning behind them. The climate summit was seen as a moment of redemption following the spectacular failure of the last major climate summit in Copenhagen in 2009.

The process went back to first UNFCCC Conference of Parties in Berlin in 1995 which resulted in the Berlin Mandate. But it was COP3 in Kyoto (1997), where the

6 Importantly, Member States agreed in the Addis Action Agenda that “We will also enhance coordination, promote the efficiency of United Nations processes and avoid duplication and overlap of discussions” in addition to calling for a UN inter-agency task force to report and advise on intergovernmental progress.
world had last agreed legally-binding greenhouse gas emission reduction targets that most people remembered. Paris therefore was pregnant with both history and expectation.

**Beijing+20**

1995 was another significant year in the journey to the 2015 summits. It marked the United Nations 4th World Conference on Women held in Beijing. This was the first time that a newly-emerging China had hosted a major global conference and opened itself up to 45,000 international NGO observers as attendees.

For the cause of women’s rights, Beijing was a landmark intergovernmental conference that set in train two decades of awareness-raising and mainstreaming of gender equality, and formal commitments on the empowerment of women and girls at every level and in every country. These were articulated in the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action adopted in 1995.

The **Beijing+20** process, undertaken twenty years later by the UN Commission on the Status of Women in 2015, reviewed implementation of the Beijing outcomes as well as the related outcomes of the 23rd session of the General Assembly in 2000.

A major new body, UN Women, was established in 2010 to advance gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls. Ensuring integration with major global processes is a key objective of UN Women. In September 2015, the gender agenda was taken forward at the Sustainable Development Summit in New York, with the adoption of the UN’s 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which prioritizes gender equality as both a stand-alone goal, as well as an integral part of other sustainable development goals (SDGs).

**Sendai Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction**

If the SDGs and climate change were the poster child summits of 2015, the Sendai conference on disaster risk reduction was the orphan child. Marking the 10th year review of the UN’s decade for disaster risk reduction (2005-2015) and the Hyogo Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction adopted in 2005, the process was virtually unknown outside of a small specialist community of policymakers, officials, humanitarian agencies, disaster professionals and NGOs. Forged as a response to the catastrophic natural disasters of the previous decades, in particular the deadly Mexico earthquake of 1985 and Japan’s Kobe earthquake of 1995, the Hyogo
process initiated the first global emergence of a coordinated approach to disaster risk response and reduction.

Japanese leadership in the process had been important from the start and the end point of the decade, hosted by Sendai - a city devastated by the Great East Japan Earthquake and tsunami of 2011 - was highly resonant as was the presence of both the Japanese emperor and empress at the opening ceremony on the anniversary of the 2011 earthquake.

The resultant Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (March 2015) emerged as the first major intergovernmental summit agreement of 2015, with an especially clear linkage to climate change and climate risk. The summit coincided with the ferocious battering of Vanuatu by Category 5 Cyclone Pam. In his opening address at the Summit, Laurent Fabius, French foreign minister and president of COP21 in Paris, made clear references to the unequivocal links between climate change and disaster risk, noting that 70% of disasters in the past decade had been related to climate change; and that in the next ten years, 90% would be. The links between Sendai and Paris – tragically illustrated by the devastation of Vanuatu - had been established.

CHAPTER 2 Implementation Mechanisms

Each of the international processes entered into by UN Member States have distinct legal forms and implementation mechanisms. Each of the negotiated outcomes of the Sendai, Beijing+20, Addis, New York and Paris processes respectively – whether a non-binding declaration or an international treaty – are different and hard to
compare from a legal perspective.

The challenge for legislators concerned about implementation is to discern the intent behind the negotiated outcome documents and identify how this intent can be translated into practical domestic action. In some cases this may involve new domestic legislation or reform of existing laws, or more vigorous enforcement of current laws through a multi-agency, multi-stakeholder approach.

Taking each of the key 2015 agreements in turn, it is clear that each presents a different challenge in terms of obvious implementation mechanisms.

**SENDAI FRAMEWORK ON DISASTER RISK REDUCTION 2015-2030**

As with its predecessor, the Hyogo Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (2005-2015), the Sendai framework is not a legally-binding document but sets out the world’s most comprehensive framework for disaster risk reduction for the next 15 years. By signing up to the Sendai Framework, however, countries have committed to comply with its seven global targets (see box xx) within their capacities and to measure their progress in reducing risk through national plans of action and / or policies to reduce disaster risk. These are essentially voluntary commitments undertaken by governments. Over the years more non-state actors such as cities, companies, NGOs and others have begun to engage with the DRR process. This more multi-stakeholder process was evident at Sendai with a number of non-state actors undertaking voluntary commitments to advance the objectives of the Sendai Framework.

The UN’s disaster risk management body, the UN Office of Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) compiles self-assessment reports from local, national and regional levels. These reports from cities, central governments and regional bodies are voluntary exercises which are further analyzed by UNISDR through its GAR (Global Assessment Report). This reporting mechanism allows comparisons to be made between implementation at the city and country level. Ideally, city reports should feed into national report implementation reports, but this is not always the case. The need for inclusive DRR policy-making at all levels of government, and in open dialogue with the different stakeholders, has long been stressed by UNISDR and other actors.7

With a voluntary agreement such as the Sendai Framework, implementation depends to a large extent on local demand, capacity and leadership. As risk

---

7 The East African Community brings together Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan, United Republic of Tanzania and Uganda in a regional intergovernmental alliance.
management is essentially a core duty of government, public law arguments can seek to compel government compliance with international commitments. This is where both legislators and the judiciary have a role to play in enabling domestic implementation of voluntary international agreements.

Regional institutions such as legislative assemblies also have a role to play as the East African Legislative Assembly (EALA) has shown. In March 2016, this legislative body of the East African Community (EAC) passed the landmark Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Bill, the first of its type in Africa, representing a significant response to both the Sendai and Paris agreements. The EAC act calls for a “legal framework for the intervention and assistance for people affected by climate change and natural related hazards and to protect the natural environment through integration of comprehensive disaster risk reduction and management practices in the East African Region.”

**ADDIS ABABA ACTION AGENDA**

The Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the 3rd international conference on financing for development takes the form of a non-binding resolution adopted by the UN General Assembly on 27th July 2015, endorsing the conference document agreed in Ethiopia on 16th July 2015.

At that meeting heads of state and government agreed to a “global framework for financing development post-2015” with a “strong political commitment to address the challenge of financing” with the “goal to end poverty and hunger and sustainable development in its three dimensions through inclusive economic growth, protecting the environment and promoting social inclusion”.

As a political commitment, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda is not legally binding but the document does specify a number of tasks at the intergovernmental level which can be seen to constitute normative implementation mechanisms.

For example, it calls for the establishment of a “new forum to bridge the infrastructure gap”, including the $1 trillion to $1.5 trillion infrastructure gap in developing countries, involving a range of international financial institutions.

This new forum, led by the multilateral development banks was held alongside the spring meeting of the IMF and World Bank in Washington DC in April 2016. The AAAA also specifies a number of domestic actions ranging from mobilizing domestic financial resources, to tackling tax evasion and corruption, improving

---

8 [http://www.unisdr.org/archive/48230](http://www.unisdr.org/archive/48230)
disclosure and reducing illicit financial flows by 2030.

Across its 37-pages there are a number of references to voluntary implementation at the national, regional and global level that merit further scrutiny by national lawmakers to assess alignment with domestic objectives.

**BEIJING+20**

The Platform for Action adopted at the UN’s 4th World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995 is, in the words of UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon “...the most comprehensive global policy framework for gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights of women and girls”. The 20th review of implementation of the Platform for Action in 2015 was led by the UN Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) and included national-level reviews.

164 Member States submitted national reviews and a key objective of Beijing+20 was to focus on the linkages between the implementation of the Platform for Action and the opportunities for strengthening gender equality and the empowerment of women in the post-2015 development agenda.”

As with the other 2015 processes, there was a strong effort to establish linkages between these agreements and mainstream issues such as gender equality. Also as with both the Sendai and Addis outcome documents, Beijing+20 resulted in a political declaration whose intent can only ultimately be realized through domestic implementation at the national level and partnership at the regional and global levels.

**SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS**

On 25 September 2015 the UN General Assembly adopted *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, the outcome document of the UN Summit on the adoption of the post-2015 agenda. The 35–page “plan of action for peace, planet and prosperity” was agreed to by 196 UN member states and comprised 17 Sustainable Development Goals and 169 targets. These are
intended to be “integrated an indivisible and balance the three dimensions of sustainable development: the economic, social and environmental”.

Unlike the Millennium Development Goals, the Sustainable Development Goals are universally applicable. In adopting the SDGs, which came into force on 1 January 2016, 196 world leaders agreed that they would “guide the decisions we take over the next 15 years” in their countries. As with other UN pledges the SDGs are a political commitment by governments and implementation is left to the capacity and discretion of sovereign national governments. In adopting the SDGs, governments explicitly stated they “reaffirm our commitment to international law and emphasize that the Agenda is to be implemented in a manner that is consistent with the rights and obligations of States under international law.”

Governments are encouraged to establish national processes for implementation and to integrate the SDGs into national planning mechanisms. The SDGs also set out a structured review process through the UN’s High-level Political Forum on Sustainable Development that meets every four years; with the first review of the SDGs slated for 2019. Governments are also expected to conduct “regular and inclusive reviews” to measure progress at the national and subnational levels, using a system of national indicators and enhanced data collection systems. At the global level, the UN’s Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Indicators has been tasked with developing a global indicator framework to monitor progress towards the goals and targets will also be used to measure the exact area of progress envisaged.

Helen Clark “2015 a generational opportunity”

“Every time a law is made, MPs can call attention to whether it is consistent with the SDGs, and move amendments if it is not. Parliamentary committees can ensure that their scrutiny procedures hold Ministers and officials to account for national progress on the SDGs. And parliamentarians, in representing those who elected them, can ensure an ongoing dialogue with civil society over such progress.”

Speech to the Fourth World Conference of Speakers of Parliament. Aug 31, 2015
PARIS AGREEMENT ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Of all the 2015 agreements, the one whose status and legal form has been the subject of most sustained scrutiny and speculation has been the Paris Agreement on Climate Change. Negotiated under the auspices of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Paris Agreement dates back to a decision taken at the UNFCCC’s Durban climate conference in December 2011. This established a subsidiary body called the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) with the mandate to “develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention applicable to all Parties, which is to be completed no later than 2015 in order for it to be adopted at the twenty-first session of the Conference of the Parties (COP) and for it to come into effect and be implemented from 2020.”

The deal that was struck on 12 December 2015 was effectively an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention, to be enforced domestically by member state. The primary means of implementation of the Paris Agreement is through the national pledges – the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) – submitted to the UNFCCC by 190+ government parties to the Convention. ⁹

These constitute national action plans on climate change mitigation and adaptation which would collectively seek to limit global emissions rise to the Paris Agreement’s language on “well below 2 degrees Celsius” above pre-industrial levels. The Agreement’s inclusion of a new more stringent reference to pursuing efforts to limit global temperature rise to 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels, could set the world on a path to net zero emissions by the end of the century.

The 1.5 degree Celsius reference was an unexpected but crucial win for the most vulnerable countries, dating back to 2009 when it had been adopted by the Least Developed Countries (LDC) bloc comprising the world’s poorest 48 countries.

In addition to the long-term goal the Paris Agreement also includes a ratchet and review mechanism every five years to ensure that momentum is kept up and there is no backsliding on the temperature goal of financial commitments such as the totemic $100 billion annually by 2020 in adaptation finance for developing countries.

⁹ Technically speaking, while INDCs can be considered as NDCs for purposes of the Paris Agreement, there is an option for a Party to the Convention to submit a new NDC upon ratification of the Paris Agreement (see the clarification on the UNFCCC website: http://unfccc.int/focus/ndc_registry/items/9433.php).
So, how does the Paris Agreement enter into force? According to Article 21, paragraph 1, of the Agreement, it will enter into force once at least 55 parties to the Convention, representing at least 55 per cent of total global greenhouse gas emissions, ratify it. In fact, the Agreement can enter into force as early as this year, if the conditions set out above are met. Contrary to what some believe, the world does not have to wait until 2020 for the Agreement to take effect. Indeed signatory parties can begin to implement their nationally determined contributions even before formal ratification by action taken on a voluntary basis.

Some developing countries have broken down their INDCs into actions that can be undertaken domestically without international aid, and enhanced climate action if supported by aid. Some countries, such as Mexico and the European Union are already embarking on their INDCs without waiting till 2020.

The Paris Agreement represents a new, universal and ambitious international climate regime. As a “framework agreement”, the detail remains to be worked out in the coming UNFCCC sessions. According to initial analysis of the Paris Agreement by the Legal Response Initiative, many key issues remain couched “... in very general terms without defining specific rights and obligations.” For example, “large parts of the agreement are worded like COP decisions (e.g. “recognize”) rather than an international treaty.” Clearly there will be much work for both lawyers as well as national legislators in interpreting the Paris Agreement and translating it into substantive decisions and actions.

10 Source: Legal Response Initiative http://legalresponseinitiative.org/preliminary-legal-assessment-of-the-paris-agreement/
CHAPTER 3  Interconnection between 2015 Summits

Despite the accidental nature of the confluence of the 2015 summits, their convergence provided an opportunity for an unprecedented effort at harmonization throughout the United Nations development system. The year opened with the Sendai conference on disaster risk reduction in March and the resulting Sendai Framework made explicit reference to the need for convergence with other key summits due to take place in 2015:

“The intergovernmental negotiations on the post 2015 development agenda, financing for development, climate change and disaster risk reduction provide the international community with a unique opportunity to enhance coherence across policies, institutions, goals, indicators and measurement systems for implementation, while respecting the respective mandates. Ensuring credible links, as appropriate, between these processes will contribute to building resilience and achieving the global goal of eradicating poverty.”

In his keynote address at the Sendai conference, Laurent Fabius, the French foreign minister and president of COP21, threw a direct link between Sendai and Paris as the major opening and closing summits of 2015, drawing an arc between the common themes of disaster risk and climate risk.

Why coherence matters ...

“...The conference at Sendai today and the Paris Conference in December will deliberate on two seemingly separate matters: disaster risk reduction on the one hand and combating climate change on the other. In fact, these 2 matters are inseparably linked. Today, it is estimated in fact that more than 70% of natural disasters are linked to climate change, twice as many as 20 years ago, and this figure will increase in the future.”

Laurent Fabius
Foreign Minister, France
President, COP21

Not to be left out of a more science- and data-driven process of global monitoring and review, the Sendai Framework also called for conscious coordination in this regard, calling on the UN General Assembly to include a review of “…progress in the implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030 as part of its integrated and coordinated follow-up processes to United Nations conferences and summits, aligned with the Economic and Social Council, the High-level Political Forum for Sustainable Development and the quadrennial comprehensive policy review cycles …”
Following on the heels of Sendai, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda reassured “We will develop and implement holistic disaster risk management at all levels in line with the Sendai Framework” and stated positively “We acknowledge that the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Conference of the Parties thereto is the primary international, intergovernmental forum for negotiating the global response to climate change.” The AAAA is also replete with references to the Sustainable Development Goals and the need to integrate and mainstream gender at every level.

There were similar cross-references to disaster risk, climate change, finance, gender and the SDGs across the 2015 summit documents and processes. For example, the Beijing+20 review process highlighted both the proportionate impact of natural disasters and climate change on women as well as their key role in building resilience and leadership on these issues.

As a comprehensive omnibus document the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in September 2015 is meticulous in referencing these issues and processes. As with the other outcome documents however it was circumspect not to prejudge the outcome of the Paris climate negotiations, but included several nods towards the UNFCCC negotiations at COP16: “We acknowledge that the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change is the primary international, intergovernmental forum for negotiating the global response to climate change. ... Looking ahead to the twenty-first session of the Conference of the Parties in Paris, we underscore the commitment of all States to work for an ambitious and universal climate agreement.”

The eventual Paris Agreement negotiated on 12 December 2015, book-ending as it does a momentous year for global summity, is able to take the key 2015 summits and reference them squarely on its frontispiece. The very first page of the Paris Agreement contains the following paragraph:

---


As the Beijing+20 review process did not produce a formal negotiated outcome document, none is referenced in the Paris Agreement, but the need for gender equality and women’s empowerment is highlighted throughout the text.

An examination of these four key intergovernmental processes and their outcomes shows multiple points of intersection and cross-reference, with a clear intent to promote an integrated response to implementation of these intergovernmental agreements.

“For the first time, every country in the world has pledged to curb emissions, strengthen resilience and join in common cause to take climate action. What was once unthinkable has become unstoppable.”

Ban Ki-moon
UN Secretary-General

CHAPTER 4  Convergence and Coherence between 2015 Summit outcomes

2015 stands out as a watershed year because of an unprecedented alignment of key, interconnected summits on human development, climate and environment in one year. On their own each of the different summit processes attract different constituencies and professional communities.
Finance ministers go to the finance for development conferences, development ministers to MDG-related conferences, environment and energy ministers to climate change conferences, and so on. Disciplinary and professional silos keep these communities apart and get in the way of integrated approaches and implementation frameworks emerging.

2015 was different because of the opportunity provided by the post 2015 development agenda and COP21 to define a truly sustainable human development agenda. This opportunity was seized upon by leaders within the UN system who created a new narrative around 2015 as a ‘Generational Opportunity’ to set a global agenda for sustainable human development. Leadership by UN Secretary-General Ban ki-moon and Helen Clark, Administrator of United Nations Development Programme, was particularly important in creating the sense of a ‘2015 moment’.

Three things stood out about the 2015 summits that made seeking the linkages between them, and arguing for coherence, more than a cynical conference packaging exercise or an effort to spread the risk of failure.

Firstly, there were real and obvious connections between the subject matter of the four conferences. Climate change was exacerbating the risk of natural disasters with 90% of disasters in the past decade related to climate impacts.

Investment in climate risk management was therefore an investment in disaster risk reduction. Without strong climate action, development gains around the world would continue to be undermined, especially in vulnerable countries facing repeated extreme weather events such as small-island developing states and least-developed countries.

Gender equality is an essential factor for success with the SDGs. Women comprise the majority of the poor worldwide. Without raising the status of women and empowering girls there is no chance of meeting the SDGs. This point was underscored recently by David Nabarro, UN Special Advisor on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, who stated: “We have a plan for the future…and right at the center is girls and women.”

The NDCs will be an essential element of the fulfillment of Goal 13 of the SDGs. The mobilization of finance from existing and new resource streams – public, private and philanthropic – to support action on climate, environment, gender and

---

13 David Nabarro speech at UN Foundation’s Women Deliver conference, 16 May 2016 Copenhagen Quoted in: http://unfoundationblog.org/8-key-themes-from-women-deliver-socialgood/
development is critical to implementation across all these agendas. These and many other inter-locking linkages between the 2015 agendas made cross-referencing an essential starting point to the goal of building efficiency and coherence across the agendas.

Secondly, unlike in the past, both the SDG summit and the climate change summit were universal – their outcome documents are not intended for one group of countries, they are universally applicable and set a new collective trajectory. This marks a major shift in approach and ownership from previous intergovernmental efforts. Hence the reference to the much broader Transformative’ 2030 agenda for sustainable development. The MDGs had been addressed to the development needs of developing countries, as so defined within the UN system. The Kyoto Protocol of the UNFCCC was only applicable to advanced industrialised countries (Annex 1), whereas the Paris Agreement of COP21 is a universal agreement applicable to all 196 member states. Through the Paris Agreement’s INDCs there is now more national ownership of domestic climate action agendas than at any time in the past.

Thirdly, the 2015 summits saw an extraordinary range of non-state actors and stakeholders engaged in these processes. Business, industry, finance, mayors, cities and regions engaged as never before in such processes. Indeed as the Paris Agreement’s Agenda for Solutions showed, their involvement along with that of civil society and other more traditional actors in these processes, proved to be game changing. In her call to governments at Sendai in March 2015, Margareta Wahlstrom, former head of the UN’s Office for Disaster Risk Reduction, had noted that it was the “primary responsibility of states to prevent and reduce disaster risk” but emphasized the need for an “all-of-society and all-of-State institutions engagement” to deal effectively with disaster risk.

Without a broader confluence of motivated and empowered stakeholders, the significant challenges of meeting the climate and sustainable development challenge would not be realizable. This recognition is embedded in the 2015 agreements and presages a very different way of working and approaching implementation and delivery with a view to improving outcomes.

---

**CHAPTER 5  Relevance for Legislators**

At its Legislators Summit in December 2014 in Lima, GLOBE International members resolved to adopt a unique ‘Coherence and Convergence’ approach to
the upcoming intergovernmental summits in 2015. The rationale was obvious: the momentous and agenda-setting nature of the summits called for a coherent approach to addressing them and convergence in their implementation. This approach has guided GLOBE International’s engagement in these processes since, but it is still novel and represents a marked departure from ‘business as usual’.

The traditional silo approach to international summitry has been to view each process as separate, each with its own specialist community of policymakers, negotiators, NGOs and advocates – its own operating space. The risk is when the operating space becomes a self-referential bubble, impervious to other relevant processes or trends.

It would be an overstatement to suggest that 2015 pricked the bubble and forced integration, but - as the last chapter indicates - there is now greater formal recognition of linkages and a genuine effort to integrate agendas that are mutually-reinforcing.

What role for parliamentarians?

7 March 2014: The UN General Assembly released the summary report of the 2013 parliamentary hearing, titled ‘Rethinking sustainable development: the quest for a “transformational” agenda in 2015.’

It concluded that:

- parliamentarians should: push for fulfillment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); engage in framing the post-2015 development agenda; participate in designing national strategies for sustainable development and aligning national budgets; rally public support around national development goals; and use the post-2015 agenda as an opportunity to increase their participation in the UN.

The lessons are there for legislators also, who are not immune from professional and disciplinary silo-thinking and ways of working. There is no question that the 2015 agreements on disaster risk, finance, gender, sustainable development goals and climate are relevant for legislators. Taken individually they clearly set out an intent by governments to achieve a particular set of goals through a process of international consensus building.

But executive intent can be severely limited without parliamentary engagement. Implementation of the 2015 agreements will require legislative as well as executive
action setting out enabling national frameworks of laws and policies, supported by adequate financial resources and broad public support.

Without parliamentary engagement, there can be no effective long-term implementation. This is all the more true for the 2015 agreements, given their level of ambition and multiple and cross-cutting objectives and linkages. The previous graphic highlights quotes from the UN General Assembly’s 2014 report illustrating this conviction well.

As noted earlier, 2015 represents a step-change in global governance with the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development and the Paris Agreement on climate change both universally applicable. Unlike in the past, every government has now committed to adopt the 2030 Agenda’s 17 Sustainable Development Goals and 169 targets, and the Paris Agreement’s 2°/1.5° long-term emissions reduction targets and its Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) which will help to contribute to the SDGs.

The challenge for legislators, as well as others, is to look across the four 2015 frameworks and seek out synergies which can enable faster, more efficient implementation. Leveraging these will help deliver co-benefits for both human development as well as the environment, especially when budgetary considerations are also taken into account. A win-win in times of austerity and financial uncertainty for resource-poor economies.

Just as sustainable development requires a whole-of-government approach to deliver, the challenge for legislators is to step out of thematic silos and find
synergies across legislative and policy agendas. This will require the development of new skills and a willingness to work in multidisciplinary teams with complementary knowledge bases. Daunting but necessary in an age of complex, interrelated challenges – including for governance as we know it.

For example, disaster risk and gender being integrated within the work of parliamentary committees on climate change as is already the case in the Philippines. Or connecting national climate adaptation and public health agendas as in the United Kingdom. Or engaging local enterprise in domestic delivery of the SDGs at a parliamentary constituency level. Or mobilizing migrant or diaspora communities to support rural renewable energy efforts. The list is endless and provides an opportunity for new conversations, new partnerships and empowered local action to translate the global into the local.

CHAPTER 6  Bringing coherence to international summitry

For the world’s 50,000 legislators whose electoral mandate comes from local people, the ultimate test is whether the 2015 agreements deliver for local people. Although many seek to speak on behalf of local people, it is their elected representatives – legislators and Members of Parliaments – who are required to speak on behalf of, and act in, their interests.

Importantly, it is the duty of legislators to not only pass laws, approve budgets and exercise scrutiny over governments, but crucially, to hold governments to account for commitments made - including at international fora such as at Sendai, Addis, New York and Paris in 2015.

For example, in the context of climate change, GLOBE International has advocated that parliaments are the most appropriate venues for MRV (monitoring, reporting and verification) of climate and related agreements.

Yet, ironically, it is this constituency that is among the least visible or adequately represented in intergovernmental negotiations such as in 2015.

The United Nations system state-centric and only recognizes the executive branch of government, not legislators or the judiciary. As chapter 1 noted, legislators do not feature as a Major Group in UN parlance and are relegated to NGO status to gain admission as observers to UN negotiations. Few Members of Parliament are included in national delegations and those who attend tend do so as NGOs. A clear
case for reform can and should be made.

Traditionally this executive bias of the international system has meant that the role of national parliaments has been misunderstood if not wholly ignored in UN intergovernmental negotiations. In the last few years, however, as attention has broadened to embrace ‘non-state actors’ legislators have begun to come in from the cold.

Bodies such as the Inter-parliamentary Union (IPU) are now referenced in intergovernmental agreements, such as the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction, and parliamentary engagement is now actively sought by many UN agencies and multilateral bodies such as the OECD. Specialist leadership networks such as GLOBE International provide an opportunity for cross-party legislative engagement in global processes such as on climate change.

As GLOBE’s work tracking climate legislation has shown, this is an area where MPs have manifestly shaped the agenda by developing national climate legislation. At the time of the Kyoto climate conference in 1997, there were only 54 climate and energy policies and laws worldwide. By December 2014, this number had gone up to 804 largely as a result of national legislative efforts.14

Coherence, however, has not been a forte of such engagement and legislative communities have also worked in silos at the international level. The 2015 agreements and the 2030 Agenda, provide an unprecedented opportunity – indeed an invitation – for pro-active, coherent and convergent engagement by regional, national and sub-national legislators to help deliver these ambitious goals.

Where to start can be daunting and the obvious first step is to find out more about the 2015 agreements and what they mean in the domestic context. It is the prerogative of legislators to interrogate the implications of these agreements for their constituents, and generate a positive national debate that can aid effective implementation over time.

Fortunately there are resources in every national context through government and multilateral agencies, including the United Nations, World Bank, OECD, NGO, academia and other bodies, to inform and assist in this deliberative process.

---

Top 10 Things Legislators Can Do To Bring 2015 Home

The following is a 10-step guide to things legislators can do to bring the 2015 agreements home and build for delivery on the 2030 Agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Learn about the Sendai, Addis, New York and Paris agreements and the Beijing+20 process. There will be dedicated governmental departments responsible for each process and a range of non-governmental experts to call on. There may also be parliamentary committees following specific processes. The relevant UN country offices will also be an important resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identify and engage with the key governmental institutions responsible for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Call the relevant ministers or senior government officials to address your committee or all-party group on post-2015 actions, timetables and accountabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ask for a cross-departmental response to how post-2015 actions are being implemented (including financing) and whether a whole-of-government approach is being followed. Consider proposing one if not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ratify the Paris Agreement to enable it to come into force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Call a public hearing on the 2030 Agenda and post-2015 commitments – ideally with other relevant parliamentary committees - to raise public awareness, increase engagement and integrate the 2015 outcomes into national development planning, with budgetary allocation acting as an MRV (monitoring, reporting and verification mechanism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Examine each agreement to identify alignment with existing national legal frameworks and lacunae requiring legislative, regulatory or enforcement action. For example, the Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) under the Paris Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Develop this into a National Strategy and Action Plan for coherent implementation of the 2015 agreements consistent with the national development planning process. Translate this into a Parliamentary Action Plan, within a defined committee structure, to hold the government to account for delivery on this integrated 2030 Agenda, with regular review and reporting mechanisms included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Call for a Treasury estimate of budgetary requirements to implement each agreement at the national level (maximizing synergies across them) and resourcing of international obligations, to ensure fiscal planning takes accounts of necessary outlays for effective implementation. Subject this to structured scrutiny by the abovementioned committee to oversee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Develop a multi-stakeholder platform engaging leaders from civil society, business, cities, local government, academia and others to keep public focus on implementation of Agenda 2030 and hold government to account.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This paper has made the case for a stronger role for legislators in ensuring that the outcomes of all the summits of 2015 are implemented at a national level in an integrated and synergistic manner to ensure coherence and impact.

One of the three Rio conventions, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) provides one model for lawmakers to consider. The CBD’s principal instruments for national implementation are the Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs). Under Article 6 of the Convention all member state signatories are required to:

"prepare a national biodiversity strategy (or equivalent instrument) and to ensure that this strategy is mainstreamed into the planning and activities of all those sectors whose activities can have an impact (positive and negative) on biodiversity."

The compliance rate with this requirement is high. According to the Convention on Biodiversity, to date a total of 185 of 196 (94%) Parties have developed NBSAPs in line with Article 6.15

**Walking the Talk – GLOBE Parliamentarians in Action**

Whatever the model used, the core message of increased parliamentary awareness raising and engagement for more coherent planning and implementation of the 2015 agreements is gaining ground. This is beginning to become visible across the GLOBE International membership.16 Emerging efforts by parliamentarians across Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America are showing the connection between the Coherence & Convergence approach and national planning processes. The following profiles illustrate this trend.

In Nigeria for example, Senator Abubakar Bukola Saraki, President of the Nigerian Senate and President of GLOBE Nigeria, recently stated: “...the historic line-up of interdependent international agreements sealed in 2015 on disaster risk reduction, financing for development and climate change, the historic Paris Agreement, underline the need for a coherent, holistic national implementation strategy that is furthered and protected by legislation which delivers on the

---

15 Source: https://www.cbd.int/nbsap/

16 For example by GLOBE International board member, Deputy Stella Bianchi in the Italian parliament: https://stellabianchi.it/2016/05/27/clima-la-sfida-del-g7/
https://blogstellabianchi.files.wordpress.com/2016/05/0001.jpg
critical political-will needed for progress in Nigeria.”\textsuperscript{17} He noted “The National Assembly which I lead is at a pivotal crossroads to anchor the pursuit of these new SDGs and of related commitments on disaster risk reduction, development financing and climate change with a level of collaboration and defining political will that could undoubtedly steer Nigeria towards a greater good. I find it necessary that we prioritize them according to realistic targets and develop indicators to measure our performance, as we proceed.\textsuperscript{18}

In Senegal, the GLOBE Focal Point, Deputy Cheikh Oumar Sy is promoting efforts to bridge the international 2015 summits agendas with Senegal’s national development plan, Senegal Development Emergent (PSE). He has called for a reassessment of the PSE in light of the Sendai and Paris agreements with a particular focus on addressing disaster risk and resilience for the West African country.\textsuperscript{19} Similarly, the President of GLOBE Colombia, Senator Fernando Duque has emphasized the need to ensure that the climate change bill he has introduced in parliament take account of common undertakings of the 2015 summits, and further advance the integrated cross-governmental planning process that the country has become well-known for.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{17} http://senatepresident.gov.ng/building-an-integrated-approach-to-the-implementation-of-the-sdgs-and-the-paris-agreement-with-the-nigerians/

\textsuperscript{18} Op Cit


\textsuperscript{20} Source: http://www.senado.gov.co/historia/item/24393-tras-el-acuerdo-de-paris-la-integracion
Box 3: “Coherence and Convergence: Key to Managing Risks and Achieving Sustainable Development”

Senator Loren Legarda
The Philippine Star - May 31, 2016

In 2015, two dominant themes that guided multilateral work were that of sustainable development and managing risks better as a global community. There were four framework agreements that resulted from four separate multilateral processes – the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (Sendai, March); the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on Financing for Development (Addis Ababa, July); the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (New York, September); and the Paris Agreement on climate change (Paris, December).

All of these agreements have one overriding objective – that of achieving inclusive, sustainable and resilient development for all. The 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda sets out 17 sustainable development goals, including climate action. Addressing the climate change and sustainable development nexus requires a firm grip on financing and resilience issues. Setting a development agenda is just one part of the story. Delivering the agenda into action, in a way that builds a more resilient global community, is the more important part. Without realistically addressing the problems of today’s climate realities and its risks, as well as financing, the lofty goals we have established on paper will remain just that – goals!

Global warming has already breached the 1°C level and its impacts have been massive. Clearly, sustainable development can no longer be discussed without equal consideration given to disaster risk. There are points of convergence across these agreements on a number of issues, but the real test of these agreements come in the form of delivery at the state and community level.

At the national and local levels, legislative measures are needed to translate the principles enshrined in these instruments into action. In the Philippines, we have a National Development Plan covering different sectors, that serves as guide post to policy making and program delivery. The long-term view is vital as we chart a course of action to address the problems of today and create a resilient and progressive future. The thrust should be no different at the multilateral level. We take inspiration from the goal of realizing inclusive, sustainable and resilient development as forged in the international arena. This needs to be translated, however, into action through effective legislations, governance, and service delivery at the national and local levels. Education Act, Climate Change Act, Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act, and the People’s Survival Fund Law. These are national instruments that have carried our international commitments into practical application at the national and local levels.

It has been a productive collaboration between the Senate Committee on Climate Change, which I chair, and the Global Legislators Organization for a Balanced Environment (GLOBE International) in raising the bar for climate and sustainable development policy making and advocacy in the country through our various fora and roundtable discussions. These are vital steps to realizing policy and legislative alignment.

GLOBE’s ‘Coherence and Convergence’ approach, supported by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), calls for ‘mutually reinforcing’ outcomes from the 2015 agenda-setting summits and provides focus and direction for legislators. Nothing less is required. By doing so, we can confidently say that that, we may be vulnerable, but we are not incapable of collective action... Now is the time for coming together... for managing risks together as a global community.
In the Philippines, Senator Loren Legarda, chair of the Senate committees on Finance, Climate Change and Cultural Communities, wrote in a major national daily recently\(^{21}\) (see box 4) of her ambition to ensure not only that the lofty ideals of the 2015 agreements are anchored in national and local legislative measures and the country’s National Development Plan, but that they are also adequately financed to “translate the principles enshrined in these instruments into action.”

She speaks for many no doubt, when she states “Coherence in all these summits and their outcome documents, most specially, the frameworks they produce, are required if these are to guide national and local legislation. No issue is ever more important than the other. No international body is more relevant than the rest. ... we may be vulnerable, but we are not incapable of collective action. Now is the time for coming together... for managing risks together as a global community.”

As the examples show, legislators across the world are seizing on the action agenda presented by the historic summits of 2015. Parliaments have a critical role in translating the multilateral frameworks agreed into meaningful national legislation that is locally owned, enjoys public trust and can be implemented. While implementation must be a collective effort engaging all stakeholders, it is the duty of parliaments to assure democratic accountability and oversight. They should be at the heart of the Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) function demanded by this epic new generation of international agreements.

The active and informed engagement of legislators will be a crucial factor in their success and parliaments everywhere must rise to this historic challenge.

\(^{21}\) Source: Excerpts from longer article by Senator Legarda at: http://www.philstar.com/opinion/2016/05/31/1588549/coherence-and-convergence-key-to-managing-risks-and-achieving-sustainable-development