

## THE UNITED NATIONS' FRAME WORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE AND N GERIA'S ADAPTATION STRATEGIES

# I MOMOE M ABEL YOUGHA ADP15/16/H6011 B Sc. (International Relations) O.a.

A THESIS WRITTEN IN THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, FACULTY OF ADMINISTRATION AND SUBMITTED TO THE POSTGRADUATE COLLEGE, OBAFEM AWOLO WO UNIVERSITY, ILE-IFE, N GERIA, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF SCIENCE DEGREE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

2019



#### ABSTRACT

This study investigated how climate change has affected N geria and examined N geria's institutional capacity to respond to climate change. Further more, the study assessed N geria's strategies in adapting to climate change and identified the effects of response by global actors to the Paris Agreement on N geria's ability and strategies in response to climate change. These were with a view to enhancing the understanding of the nature of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCO) and the ways N geria is affected by the frame work.

Primary and secondary data were used in the study. The primary data were sourced from in-depth interviews from 30 respondents. The study area included the Department of Climate Change, Ministry of Environment of the Federal Republic of Nigeria in Abuja and the Nigerian Environmental Study/Action Team (NEST) in Ibadan Descriptive qualitative analysis was used to analyze the data collected.

The results showed that climate change affected every region of N geria and could be seen in distorted patterns of rainfall, increased heat, drought and severe floods; which had dire effects, especially on the agriculture and health sectors. Further more, although N geria has established a number of institutions to respond to climate change, institutional capacity were inadequate as seen in available resources and ability to i mplement plans. Additionally, N geria has spelt out strategies for adaptation; however, these strategies were yet to be i mplemented. Finally, the study found that global actors' responses have not been adequate to achieve the goal of the Paris Agreement, and this will further aggravate climate change and raise the need for adaptation in N geria.



The study concluded that while the UNFCCC Paris Agreement established a more realistic approach to international cooperation on climate change, it has however delivered little concrete influence on climate change adaptation in Nigeria.



### CHAPTER ONE

### **INTRODUCTI ON**

#### **1.1** Background to the Study

There is now a global consensus that the climate of the earth is changing and this change creates a huge potential threat to the world and its entire population, whether now or in the future. The mainstream thought being that the shifts in the global climate are mostly due to human activities (CEPS, 2004: 4). This view has been confirmed not only by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), but by various assessment reports (CEPS, 2004). Nevertheless, dissenting views still persist. The United States Environment and Public Works Senate Committee (2009) issued a report documenting over 700 scientist-skeptics voicing a range of opposing opinions, most challenging the argument on the anthropogenic cause of climate change, although some are reported debunking climate change entirely. In 2010 that list was updated by Climate Depot Special Report (2010) to above 1000 sceptics.

Consequently, policy makers and experts largely agree that the United Nations Frame work Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is indeed a positive step in developing a holistic frame work for regulating the activities of the international community to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to the changing climate. The UNFCCCs al most universal membership is by farthe most prominent attempt at creating mechanisms for climate change. In May 1992, the UNFCCC was adopted and available for signature at the 1992 Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit. This came into force in March 1994 and had 197 Members (196 states and the European Union) as of May 2018. The



end goal of the Convention is to "stabilisation of greenhouse gas concentrations in the at mosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous ant hropogenic interference with the climate system" Two agreements, the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement (IPCC, 2018), adopt and enforce the terms of the Convention.

Nonetheless, States' cumulative commitments are inadequate to meet the convention's goal of achieving stability of ambient greenhouse gas concentrations at a rate which would discourage dangerous anthropogenic interference with the earth's climate. Additionally, doubt remains over the willingness of states to meet these pledges, much less increase them over time to the extent needed to reduce the average global temperature. Moreover guidelines and incentives to guarantee that these agreements are transparent and accountable have characterized international climate negotiations (Moncel, Joffe, McCall and Levin, 2011). Inimplementation, since Kyoto did not impose any responsibilities on developing states, and the United States did not ratify the agreements for a long period, its practical impact was limited, weak and essentially symbolic of the complexities that underscore the development of an adequate climate regime (Keohane and David, 2010).

The international community is now a ware of the severity of the threat to climate. The risks associated with unchecked climate change are also well reported and its impact increasingly affect humans and the ecosystems. However, following a global agreement by so many governments all over the world to stabilize anthropogenic greenhouse gases (GHGs) at acceptable levels, emissions are still on the rise and commit ments for possible action, in sum still fall short as to what evidence indicates is



required (Moncel, Joffe, McCall and Levin, 2011). Without a fully functioning global governance structure, international climate agreements can only be accomplished on a voluntary basis. Since protection against climate change is a global public good, no state can be excluded from enjoying climate security regardless of participation; these commit ments provide very strong opportunities for free-ride. Glimate change, like other global environmental negotiations, faces challenges related to the need for global cooperation, long-ter ms ust ainability, strong policy engage ments and free-riding (CEPS, 2004). Considering that climate change is far more complicated due to its high level of uncertainty and lack of technological solutions, the latest debates on the future of a global climate change regime in improving on important accomplishments that have already been made, focus on the problem of how agree ments are for mulated to guarantee:

- 1. Participation (and avoid free-riding) and
- 2. Compliance (CEPS, 2004).

Independent of the discussions concerning global climate policy, all countries will experience the effects of climate change, even though theimpact will vary. In the poorest states where vulnerability is higher due to geographical and climatic conditions and where the capacity to respond is very low these adverse effects will be felt most strongly. Stakeholders generally agree that climate change will impact all states, particularly the developing nations (N cholas, Maduk we, Enete, Amaechina, Onokala, Eboh, Ujah and Garforth, 2012). Generally, developing states have less favourable economic conditions, weaker structures, restricted access to capital, and are limited in exchange of information. The most vulnerable states to climate change are often the least ready to adapt or respond to it. Effective adaptation depends on advances intechnology,



or ganizational capability, expertise and training, and financial availability (Figueres and Maria, 2002).