This document is supplementary material to the Summary of the Report “Fair Shares: A Civil Society Equity Review of the INDCs” (the “Summary”) – it is intended be read after the Summary and should not be understood as a stand-alone document.

The Summary features, in Figure 2, Figure 3 and the associated discussions, a comparison of the INDCs of 10 countries that are broadly representative of countries at different levels of development. The comparison in the Summary does not include Canada. To be relevant for the Canadian context, we show below Figures 2 and 3 with Canada included. The context-setting text for these Figures is contained in the Summary and not reproduced here.

The charts in figures 2 and 3 clearly demonstrate that the mitigation pledge contained in Canada’s INDC (30% reduction below 2005 levels by 2030) is not ambitious enough to meet its fair share of the global mitigation effort.

In absolute terms, Canada falls short of its fair share by 730 to 840 million tonnes of Carbon Dioxide equivalents (CO₂ eq) of reduction in 2030 below Canada’s baseline (a “no climate action” reference scenario). On the individual level, this equates to a shortfall in mitigation ambition of 18 to 21 tons of CO₂ eq per capita in 2030.

It is important to note the chart shows that Canada appears to pledge a modestly larger fraction of its fair share than other developed countries, such as Japan, the European Union and even the United States. However, in absolute terms, Canada is in fact still left with one of the highest per capita shortfalls of ambition (18 to 21 tons per capita; as indicated above), greatly exceeding the EU and Japan, and roughly equivalent to...
Australia’s (17 to 24 tons per capita; not shown) and surpassed only by the United States (20 to 30 tons).

It is worth noting that this assessment might be somewhat lenient toward Canada, insofar as it is based on an approach that is very forgiving in the way it deals with the past. While past emissions are included in the calculations of fair shares (see the Summary for details), it gives complete “amnesty” for past and recent free-ridership. In other words, the fact that Canada made negligible efforts toward its reduction target under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (to return emissions to 1990 levels by 2000), has allowed emissions to skyrocket in the intervening time, missed its 2008-2012 target under the Kyoto Protocol and is on track to miss its 2020 Copenhagen target is not considered when assessing future pledges. This makes a target that is pegged against a past base year (as is the case with all the developed countries mentioned here) appear more ambitious when assessed against a future reference case.

It is also important to note, that Canada’s fair share under both equity benchmarks (1850/High Progressivity and 1950/Medium Progressivity) substantially exceeds its entire domestic emissions (see Figure 4), and even under the 1990/Low Progressivity reference case Canada’s fair share is nearly equivalent to domestic emissions.

This highlights the fact that even in the most ambitious scenario imaginable, Canada could not possibly take responsibility for all of its fair share by increasing domestic mitigation ambition alone; rather, it would also have to pledge a significant amount of financial resources and support in technology transfer and capacity building to enable additional emissions reductions in other countries where emissions reductions potential exceeds that country’s fair share. Ultimately, Canada’s fair share can only plausibly be met by both emissions reduced domestically plus emissions reductions enabled with the help of Canadian support in other countries where the potential for emissions reductions exceeds the fair share of the country.

Figure 4 also features vertical bar where the green portion shows the level of ambition that would be required to meet or exceed a country’s fair share at least according to the less stringent of our equity benchmarks (contributing to its characterization as a “leader”) while the red section indicates that a country falls short of either of the equity benchmarks, making it a “laggard”.

Because Canada’s INDC target falls short of its fair share by 730 to 840 Mt CO\textsubscript{2}eq, in order to improve its pledge to meet the level indicated by its fair share of the global effort, Canada would have to increase the impact of its pledge by 730 to 840 Mt CO\textsubscript{2}eq through a combination of considerably deeper domestic reductions and supporting emissions reductions in developing countries.

For this reason it is important for Canada, when submitting a strengthened INDC, to not only indicate how it will deepen the domestic mitigation portion of its INDC but also indicate what level of support in terms of finance, technology transfer and capacity building will be made available between 2020 and 2030 as a Canadian contribution toward enabling the level of international cooperation needed to bring the world on a 2°C or 1.5°C pathway.
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1 The Summary can be found online at http://civilsocietyreview.org/summary; the full report is at http://civilsocietyreview.org/report