



Methodological Annex

Fact sheets on cooperative climate
initiatives



Methodological Annex

Fact sheets on cooperative climate initiatives

Authors

Janna Hoppe

Jan-Luka Scheewel

Editing

Laeticia Ock

Acknowledgement

The authors express their thanks for the review and feedback from Mia Moisio, Niklas Höhne, and Pablo Blasco Ladrero, as well as two external reviewers.

Disclaimer

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Climate, Infrastructure and Environment Executive Agency (CINEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Citation

NewClimate Institute (2026). Methodological Annex for fact sheets on cooperative climate initiatives.

© NewClimate Institute 2026

1 Background

The fact sheets aim to present key information on relevant cooperative climate initiatives in a condensed, structured and accessible manner.

A central feature of the analysis is the inclusion of country-level insights, addressing a notable gap in the existing literature. In particular, the assessment explores the interaction between international initiatives and national policy contexts, examining, for example, how participation influences domestic policymaking and how national circumstances shape engagement and outcomes.

The analysis further highlights differences within and between signatory and non-signatory countries. This includes variations in levels of ambition, the presence of enabling factors and progress achieved to date.

This document (Methodological Annex) provides more detail on the underlying assumptions, inclusion and assessment criteria, and initiative-specific data and calculations.

The analysis focuses on national governments rather than other non-state actors that are signatories or members of the initiatives. In our analysis, we refer to participating countries as 'signatories' and non-participating countries as 'non-signatories'. In most cases, the signatories of the declaration and the members of the implementing institution are the same. For example, when countries become members of the Powering Past Coal Alliance, they automatically become signatories to the PPCA Declaration. However, for the Glasgow Declaration on Forests and Land Use, there are more signatories to the declaration than there are members of the implementing institution. Here, we focus on signatories because our main interest lies in the quantitative targets that countries have pledged to meet. In the case of GlobalABC, participating countries are most commonly referred to as members, but we use the term 'signatories' to maintain consistency across initiatives.

2 Selection of initiatives

For an initiative to be included in the analysis, it needed to meet the following criteria:

- Active status (ongoing activities and high salience)
- The focus is on mitigation (primary objective is emissions reduction)
- High abatement potential (e.g. sectors responsible for a significant share of global GHG emissions or identified as high impact by authoritative reports or academic literature)
- Broad participation (notable number of government signatories)
- Quantified / quantifiable target (initiatives for which progress can be tracked using defined indicators or credible proxies)
- Availability of robust data (accessible, reliable data on progress indicators, preferably including annual reports from the initiatives themselves).

The five initiatives were selected for in-depth analysis: the Zero Emission Vehicles Declaration (ZEV-D), the Powering Past Coal Alliance (PPCA), the Global Methane Pledge (GMP), the Glasgow Declaration on Forests and Land Use (GDFLU) and the Global Alliance for Buildings and Construction (GlobalABC). These five initiatives were chosen as they represent a diversity of sectors and launch time points.

3 Analyses

3.1 Institutional robustness

Each initiative was assessed against eight indicators of institutional robustness. The selection and operationalisation of these indicators build on the framework developed by [Kuramochi et al. \(2024\)](#) and [Chan et al. \(2022\)](#). They were further refined further to suit the specific objectives of this analysis.

The scoring was conducted through expert evaluation, guided by a set of predefined assessment questions. To enhance consistency and reliability, the evaluation was carried out in two independent rounds.

For each indicator, an initiative could score 'high', 'medium', 'low' or 'no data'.

Indicator	Description
Staff & secretariat	Does the initiative have a physical address? Can it be reached by email / contact form? Presence of designated staff, individual team members or an organisation chart?
Governance structure	Does the initiative publish a governance structure on its web page or in its reports? Does the initiative have a steering committee or other bodies with dedicated functions?
Budget transparency	Does the initiative indicate a budget? Are annual amounts published? Are funding sources specified?
Openness	Are other actors able to join the initiative? Is there a web link providing such information?
Monitoring & reporting	Does the initiative indicate an explicit monitoring arrangement on its website? Does the initiative produce regular reporting on progress (general / emissions)?
Engagement & outreach	Does the initiative regularly publish news, including on ongoing activities? Is it actively involved in UNFCCC processes and events? Does it develop, commission or amplify research?
Target accountability	Are there clear and unambiguous targets, which include a specific baseline or reference period? Are the targets country-specific, or can countries otherwise be held accountable for meeting the targets?
Output effectiveness	Likelihood that an initiative will meet its goals, based on how an initiative's outputs match its functions Scoring of initiative on the CoAct database , whereby ≤ 0.33 = low, > 0.33 and ≤ 0.66 = medium and > 0.66 = high.

3.2 Abatement potential

To illustrate the potential impact of the initiatives, the fact sheets provide an overview of existing analyses. We conducted initiative-specific searches on Google Scholar, identifying between two and ten relevant scientific studies on the abatement potential of each initiative. We then used a snowballing method to identify further analyses and also consulted grey literature for additional estimates.

The findings are reported as they were presented in the original studies, meaning they differ in important ways, such as scope (e.g. annual vs. cumulative reductions), time horizons, underlying assumptions and groups of countries considered. Consequently, the findings are not directly comparable and should be interpreted with caution. The overall aim was to provide a useful high-level overview rather than a comprehensive assessment.

3.3 Global progress

Below, we provide additional information on the used indicators, sources, and additional initiative-specific methodological notes.

ZEV-D

Indicator: Share of zero-emission vehicles (BEVs and FCEVs) in light-duty vehicle sales (%).

Source: IEA (2026). *Global EV Outlook 2026*.

Methodological note: PHEVs are excluded, as they do not qualify under the initiative's target. Two separate lines are shown, using IEA's 'Advanced Economies' and 'Developing Economies excluding China' groupings as proxies for leading markets (100% target by 2035) and non-leading markets (100% target by 2040), respectively. Importantly, China is excluded from both groups as its combination of market size and comparatively high EV adoption rates would skew the trends and risk obscuring the pace of progress across the remaining countries.

PPCA

Indicator: Share of coal in total electricity generation (%).

Source: Ember (2026). *Yearly Electricity Data*.

Methodological note: Two separate lines are shown for OECD and non-OECD countries, reflecting the initiative's differentiated phase-out targets of 2030 and 2040, respectively. This grouping does not map directly onto signatory status.

GMP

Indicator: Global CH₄ emissions (Mt CO₂e).

Source: European Commission, Joint Research Centre (2025). *EDGAR Community GHG Database*.

Methodological note: A single global line is shown, reflecting the initiative's collective global target of a 30% reduction by 2030 relative to 2020 levels. Emissions are expressed in CO₂-equivalents using the AR5 global warming potential for methane (GWP100 = 28).

GDFLU

Indicator: Annual global deforestation (Mha).

Source: Forest Declaration Assessment Partners (2025). *Forest Declaration Assessment 2025*. Climate Focus (coordinator and editor). Accessible at www.forestdeclaration.org.

Methodological note: A single global line is shown, reflecting the initiative's target of halting deforestation globally by 2030 with no differentiation between country groups or signatory status.

GlobalABC

Indicator: Global building operational CO₂ emissions (Mt CO₂).

Source: IEA (2023). *Global CO₂ emissions from the operation of buildings*.

Methodological note: The analysis covers direct and indirect operational emissions only, excluding embodied emissions from construction.

3.4 Ambition

3.4.1 Background

The aim of the ambition analysis is to assess whether the country-specific targets set by the initiative for particular groups of countries can be considered ambitious for individual countries – at the time an initiative is launched. This is approximated by two factors: functioning of government and the gap between current levels of the key indicator (at the time of launch) and the target. Previous research suggests that OECD countries and countries with higher institutional capacity are more likely to participate in international initiatives ([NewClimate Institute, IDOS, Radboud University, 2022](#)). Additionally, evidence suggests that countries already on track to

meet a target or relatively close to doing so are more likely to become signatories (Jewell et al., 2019). Vice versa, the further a target is from being met, the more ambitious it can be said to be, as it would likely require additional policies. Implementing additional and effective policies is, again, typically easier in countries with a higher institutional capacity.

These two factors tend to group countries with similar characteristics together, and they have demonstrated some predictive power – for example in the case of PPCA (Jewell et al., 2019). However, it is important to emphasise that this analysis is descriptive in nature and does not allow for causal inference.

Note: all values reported refer to the launch (or base) year of each initiative. Some countries joined initiatives at a later stage, so their government's functioning or distance to the target may have changed by the time they became signatories.

For initiatives with collective and global targets, where we expect country-specific contributions to the global target, we present different data. For example, this could be related to relevant sector-specific policies in place (GlobalABC) or sources of greenhouse gas emissions, which indicate the ease or difficulty of abatement (GMP).

3.4.2 Functioning of government score

For the functioning of government score, we rely on an index by [Freedom House](#), which is published in its annual [Freedom in the World report](#). This index assesses the state of political rights and civil liberties in 195 countries. The assessment covers areas such as the electoral process, the rule of law, personal autonomy and freedom of expression. There are 10 political rights indicators and 15 civil liberties indicators, and a country is awarded between 0 and 4 points for each indicator. Higher overall scores indicate better government functioning.

3.5 Significance

To illustrate the significance of an initiative, we present data based on two key metrics:

- The contribution of the respective sector to total global CO₂ or GHG emissions.
- The signatories' share of the global total (e.g. share of the global market, total emissions, global forest area, etc.).

Together, these metrics provide insight into a) the extent of an initiative's coverage, as determined by its membership, and b) its overall importance in addressing a meaningful share of global greenhouse gas emissions.

3.6 Country-specific progress since initiative launch

We show two figures on country-specific progress. The countries displayed in both graphs were selected based on their relevance to this initiative, considering their indicator-specific emissions or market size. We present data on the ten most relevant signatory countries and the ten most relevant non-signatories. It should be noted that this selection does not equate to the twenty most significant countries globally.

The indicators used both to identify relevant countries and to track their progress are outlined below.

ZEV-D

Progress indicator: Share of electric vehicles (BEVs and FCEVs) in light-duty vehicle sales. PHEVs are excluded.

Source: IEA (2026). *Global EV Outlook 2026*.

Methodological note: Progress is quantified as the change in ZEV sales share between 2021 and 2025. Average annual change (percentage points per year) is compared against a required linear trajectory towards 100% ZEV sales by 2035 and 2040, respectively. The calculation assumes a constant rate of increase over time and does not account for potential non-linear adoption dynamics.

Country selection: Based on total fossil fuel road transport CO₂ emissions in the most recent year available (EDGAR, 2025).

PPCA

Indicator: Share of coal in total electricity generation.

Source: Ember (2026). *Yearly Electricity Data*.

Methodological note: Progress is measured as the change in coal's share of electricity generation between 2017 and 2025. Average annual change is expressed in percentage points per year and benchmarked against a linear reduction pathway consistent with phase-out timelines. The calculation assumes a constant rate of decrease over time and does not account for potential non-linear phase-out dynamics.

Country selection: Based on total energy combustion GHG emissions in the most recent year available (PRIMAP, 2025). For non-signatory countries, inclusion is limited to countries with a coal share of at least 10% in electricity generation ([Ember, 2026](#)).

GMP

Indicator: Methane (CH₄) emissions, expressed as a percentage of 2020 levels.

Source: European Commission, Joint Research Centre (2025). *EDGAR Community GHG Database*.

Methodological note: Progress is measured as the average annual percentage change in methane emissions over the period 2020–2024, using 2020 as the reference year. Values therefore indicate the relative rate of increase or decrease compared to baseline levels rather than absolute emissions changes. This observed rate is compared to a required annual reduction rate consistent with achieving the Global Methane Pledge target of a 30% reduction by 2030. The required rate is calculated assuming a linear pathway from 2020 levels to the 2030 target.

Country selection: Based on total methane emissions in the most recent year available ([EDGAR, 2025](#)).

GDFLU

Indicator: Deforestation, expressed as a percentage of 2020 levels.

Source: Forest Declaration Assessment Partners (2025). *Forest Declaration Assessment 2025*. Climate Focus (coordinator and editor). Accessible at www.forestdeclaration.org.

Methodological note: Progress is quantified as the average annual percentage change in deforestation between 2020 and 2024, expressed relative to 2020 levels. Both the baseline and latest values are constructed as three-year averages to reduce sensitivity to short-term variability. The observed rate is assessed against a required linear pathway to reach zero deforestation by 2030, expressed as a constant annual percentage reduction from the 2020 baseline.

Country selection: Based on natural forest area in the most recent year available ([Global Forest Watch, 2025](#)).

GlobalABC

Indicator: Operational carbon intensity of buildings, measured as CO₂ emissions per dwelling (tCO₂/dwelling), expressed as a percentage of 2015 levels.

Source: IEA (2025). *Energy End-uses and Efficiency Indicators Highlights*.

Methodological note: Progress is measured as the average annual percentage change in emissions intensity over the period 2015–2023, using 2015 as the reference year.

Country selection: Based on total buildings sector CO₂ emissions per country in the most recent year available ([EDGAR, 2025](#)).

3.7 Case studies

3.7.1 Case study selection criteria

Case studies were selected based on the following criteria:

- Relevance and data availability: preference was given to particularly insightful cases and those with sufficient, reliable data
- Independence from performance: selection was independent of whether a country is considered a frontrunner or not (i.e. best practice examples were not exclusively selected)
- Representativeness: cases were chosen to reflect diversity across dimensions such as geographical distribution or income level
- Membership focus: all case studies featured countries that are members or signatories of the respective initiative

3.7.2 Guiding questions

The case study analysis was informed by the following key questions:

- What domestic policies were in place prior to the country joining the initiative?
- Did participation in the initiative lead to the adoption of additional policies at the national level?
- To what extent can the initiative be said to have influenced progress, national policymaking or other national or international political processes?
- How do the targets of the initiative relate to the national context, for example enabling factors, domestic policy ambition or the country's NDCs?

3.7.3 Overview

Initiative	ZEV-D	PPCA	GMP	GDFLU	GlobalABC
	Chile	Morocco	Australia	Indonesia	Japan
	Kenya	Germany	Nigeria	Colombia	France

**NewClimate – Institute for
Climate Policy and Global
Sustainability gGmbH**

Cologne Office
Waidmarkt 11a
50676 Cologne, Germany

Berlin Office
Schönhauser Allee 10-11
10119 Berlin, Germany

Phone: +49 221 999 83 300
Email: info@newclimate.org
Website: www.newclimate.org