BBI MODEL UNITED NATIONS

Chapter 11

BLUE BELLS MODEL SCHOOL
SECTOR - 4, GURUGRAM
3rd & 4th October 2026

UNEP

BACKGROUND GUIDE

Agenda:

"Holding Developed Nations Accountable for Climate Commitments to the Global South."

Letter from the Executive Board

It is an honor to chair UNEP at the BBIMUN'26 . This letter shall also serve as a concept note for the committee. Our expectations from the committee are that it will function. MUNs, as a concept, are designed to be a simulation more than a conference. This difference is inherent and more obvious in each country's representation through its delegation. The head of this delegation is usually a diplomat who first represents the government and its goals and is hence tasked with the responsibility of engaging other countries in their own goals and using diplomacy effectively to achieve the aforementioned goals.

The end of the simulation, then, is different for each diplomat, and it is the means to that end that shall define the quality of the simulation. Apart from the simulation part, it is important to remember the inherent limitations of every student in terms of using or applying international law, or such. This then implies that it is not necessary to indulge in highly technical discussions that ensure no learning for the delegate. It is rather imperative that all discussions be integrated with logic that has graciously been gifted to mankind through collective wisdom.

It is thus expected that this concept note also serves as a very important starting point for the simulation, and the delegates can infer a lot more than what is shown at face value. The agenda has multiple facets and can take a national or international viewpoint. For the benefit of the delegates and the quality of the simulation, the background guide shall give small introductions and an important starting point to your research. It is important to remember that although this has been emphasized throughout your MUN careers, this is only the starting point, and this is just a quick start to your research, while the end awaits you all.
All the Best, Everyone!

Sincerely,
The Executive Board - UNEP (BBIMUN'26)
Anshika Singh - Chairperson
Agamdeep Singh - Vice Chairperson
Rudransh Tyagi - Substantive Director

Points To Remember

1. Procedure:

The purpose of putting procedural rules in any committee is to ensure a more organised and efficient debate. The committee will follow the UNA USA Rules of Procedure. Although the Executive Board shall be fairly strict with the Rules of Procedure, the discussion of the agenda will be the main priority. So, delegates are advised not to restrict their statements due to hesitation regarding the procedure.

2. Foreign Policy:

Following the foreign policy of one's country is the most important aspect of a Model UN Conference. This is what essentially differentiates a Model UN from other debating formats. To violate one's foreign policy without adequate reason is one of the worst mistakes a delegate can make.

3. Role of the Executive Board:

The Executive Board is appointed to facilitate debate. The committee shall decide the direction and flow of the debate. The delegates are the ones who constitute the committee and hence must be uninhibited while presenting their opinions/stances on any issue. However, the Executive Board may put forward questions and/or ask for clarifications at all points in time to debate further and test participants.

4. Nature of Source/Evidence:

This Background Guide is meant solely for research purposes and must not be cited as evidence to substantiate statements made during the conference. Evidence or proof for substantiating statements made during the formal debate is acceptable from the following sources:

United Nations:

Documents and findings by the United Nations or any related UN body are held as credible proof to support a claim or argument.

Multilateral Organizations:

Documents from international organisations like OIC, NAFTA, SAARC, BRICS, EU, ASEAN, the International Criminal Court, etc., may also be presented as credible sources of information.

Government Reports:

These reports can be used in a similar way as the State-Operated News Agencies reports and can, in all circumstances, be denied by another country.

Valid Evidence In the Committee

Evidence or proof from the following sources will be accepted as credible by the Executive Board:

- **State-operated News Agencies:**

These reports can be used in support of or against the State that owns the News Agency. These reports, if credible or substantial enough, can be used to support or against any country, but in that situation, they can be denied by any other country in the council. Some examples are,

I) RIA Novosti (Russia)
II) IRNA (Iran)
III) BBC & Reuters (United Kingdom)
IV) Al Jazeera (Qatar)
V) Xinhua News Agency (PR China)

- **Government Reports:**

These reports can be used in a similar way to the State-Operated News Agencies reports and can, in all circumstances, be denied by another country. However, a nuance is that a report denied by a certain country can still be accepted by the Executive Board as credible information. Some examples are:

1. Government Websites like the State Department of the United States of America or the Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation
2. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of various nations, like India or China
3. Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Reports
4. Multilateral Organizations like NATO

- **United Nations Reports:** All UN Reports are considered credible information or evidence for the Executive Board.

I) UN Bodies like the UNW, UNHCR, UNHRC, UNGA, etc.
II) UN-affiliated bodies like UNICEF, the International Committee of the Red Cross, etc.
III) Treaty Bodies like the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, etc.

Please note: Reports from NGOs working with UNESCO, UNICEF, and other UN bodies will be accepted. Under no circumstances will sources like Wikipedia, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, or newspapers like the Guardian, Times of India, etc. be accepted.

Introduction of the Rules of Procedure

The committee will follow the UNA-USA Rules of Procedure. While the Executive Board maintains these rules to ensure an organised and efficient debate, the primary focus remains on the agenda. Delegates are encouraged to participate freely and not let procedural hesitation restrict their statements.

Start of Committee

- The Dias (Chairs) begin the session with a roll call.
- Delegates may respond with either "present" or "present and voting".
- The Dias will then ask to hear any points or motions from the floor.
- If there are no points or motions, the Dias will recognize the next speaker on the Speakers' List from the previous session.
- During the first committee session, a delegate must move to open the Speakers' List.
- The agenda must also be set during this first session (If there's more than one agenda)

The Speakers' List

- The Speakers' List serves as the default format of the committee when no points or motions are on the floor.
- A country may only appear on the list once at any given time.
- Delegates can request to be added by raising their placard when the Dias asks, or by sending a written note to the Dias.
- The individual speaking time is established by the delegate who moves to open the Speakers' List, though another delegate may move to change this time later.
- If a delegate finishes their speech with time remaining, they must yield their time.
- A delegate may yield their time to the Dias (which ends the speech), to another delegate (which allocates the remaining time to them, though they cannot yield it further), or to questions (which allows for feedback from other delegates).
- If the Speakers' List is exhausted and no other delegates wish to be added, the committee moves immediately into voting procedure on any draft resolutions that have been introduced.

Moderated Caucus

- A delegate may introduce a motion for a moderated caucus while the Speakers' List is open.
- This is a less formal debate format designed to discuss a specific subset of the topic.
- The motion must include a set topic, total duration, and individual speaking time, all of which will be voted on.

- There is no set speaking order; each new speaker is chosen by the Dias after the previous speaker concludes.
- A delegate may not yield their time during a moderated caucus.
- If a delegate finishes early, the committee simply moves to the next speaker.

Unmoderated Caucus

- A delegate may introduce a motion for an unmoderated caucus while the Speakers' List is open.
- This is the least formal debate format.
- Delegates are permitted to move around the room and speak freely to one another in order to draft resolutions.
- Delegates may not leave the room without obtaining permission from the committee director.

Points and Motions

- Points and motions are tools for delegates; points are used to ask questions about the proceedings, whereas motions change what the committee is doing and generally require a vote.
- Points do not require a vote.
- Delegates may only introduce motions while the Speakers' List is open and between speakers.
- Motions that require a vote may be substantive or procedural.
- Depending on the motion, a simple majority or a two-thirds majority is required to pass.
- Points may be raised during caucuses, and certain points may be used to interrupt a speaker.

The Four Common Points:

1. **Point of Inquiry:** Used to ask a question about parliamentary procedure.
2. **Point of Order:** Used when a delegate believes the Chair has made a procedural error.
3. **Point of Personal Privilege:** Used to express concerns about comfort, such as the temperature of the room or the inability to hear a speaker.
4. **Point of Information:** Used to ask a clarifying question about the content of a speech or statement. This is only permitted during the Speakers' List.

Note: Only a Point of Order and a Point of Personal Privilege may be used to interrupt a speaker.

ABOUT THE COMMITTEE

Introduction: The Voice of the Planet

Imagine the Earth is a giant, complicated spaceship that we all live on together. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) is essentially the head mechanic and safety monitor for this spaceship. Created in 1972 after a major global conference in Stockholm, Sweden, UNEP is the leading "voice" for the environment within the United Nations. Headquartered in Nairobi, Kenya, UNEP's main job is to coordinate environmental efforts all over the world, helping countries work together to protect nature. Before UNEP existed, there was no single global organization totally dedicated to looking after the planet. Today, led by Executive Director Inger Andersen, UNEP takes charge in fixing environmental problems, sharing important scientific discoveries with developing countries, and helping nations write laws that keep our ecosystems healthy. Its ultimate mission is to improve the quality of life for everyone today without ruining the planet for future generations.

The Mission and The "Triple Planetary Crisis"

In the past, UNEP tackled many different environmental issues separately, but today, they focus their energy on what they call the "Triple Planetary Crisis". Think of this as the three biggest boss battles our planet is currently facing at the exact same time. The first crisis is *Climate Change*: The rapid warming of the Earth is caused by burning fossil fuels, which leads to extreme weather and rising seas.

The second is *Biodiversity and Nature Loss*: The tragic extinction of animal and plant species, and the destruction of forests and oceans.

The third is *Pollution and Waste*: The dangerous chemicals, plastics, and dirty air that are harming human health and choking our natural habitats.

UNEP's current mission, laid out in its official "Medium-Term Strategy," is to provide solutions to these three massive problems. They do this by encouraging countries to use clean energy, protect endangered ecosystems, and safely manage chemicals and waste.

Governance and Structure: The World's Environmental Parliament

How does an organization big enough to cover the whole world actually make decisions? UNEP is governed by a massive gathering called the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA). You can think of UNEA as the world's "parliament for the environment." Every two years, leaders, scientists, and activists from all 193 UN member states travel to Nairobi to discuss urgent environmental threats and agree on new global rules. In the past, only 58 countries were

allowed to vote, but in 2012, they changed the rules so that *every* single country has a seat at the table. This is incredibly important because it means smaller, developing countries have just as much of a voice as wealthy ones. Recently, in December 2025, the world gathered for the seventh session of this assembly (UNEA-7). During this major meeting, countries focused deeply on finding sustainable solutions to make our planet more resilient against natural disasters and climate shocks.

Scientific Research and the Global Environment Outlook

One of UNEP's biggest superpowers is science. You cannot fix a problem if you do not understand it, so UNEP gathers the smartest scientists in the world to figure out exactly what is happening to the Earth. In 1988, they helped create the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), a famous group of scientists that releases massive reports on exactly how fast the climate is changing and what we must do to survive it. UNEP also publishes its own major report card on the health of the planet, called the Global Environment Outlook (GEO). The newest edition of this massive report, GEO-7, was just released in December 2025. This updated report involved nearly 300 scientists from over 80 different countries. It gives world leaders the exact data they need to make smart, Earth-saving choices. While UNEP doesn't force countries to pass specific laws, providing these undeniable facts heavily influences how governments act.

Taking Action and Creating Global Treaties

UNEP does much more than just study the environment; they take real action and helps write binding international treaties. One of their most famous early victories was the 1987 Montreal Protocol, an agreement where the whole world agreed to stop using certain chemicals that were tearing a hole in the Earth's ozone layer. (Thanks to this treaty, the ozone hole is actually healing!) Today, UNEP continues to help countries agree on huge modern goals. For example, they played a major part in the recent Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, a massive global agreement to protect huge chunks of the world's land and oceans by the year 2030. They are also deeply involved in intense negotiations to create a legally binding global treaty to completely end plastic pollution. On the ground, UNEP helps developing countries pay for green projects, like building solar panels or preparing for droughts, by acting as a main partner for funding groups like the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

ABOUT THE AGENDA

Introduction

Imagine a massive, shared school cafeteria where everyone goes to eat. A small group of older students gets there first. They take over all the cooking equipment, turn all the stoves up to the highest heat, and cook enormous, luxurious meals for themselves. In the process, they make a terrible mess, accidentally start a small grease fire, and fill the entire room with thick, dark smoke. After they are full and happy, the younger students finally arrive. The younger students just want to make a simple piece of toast or boil some water, but the room is too smoky to breathe, the stoves are damaged, and the fire is starting to spread to their tables.

When the younger students look at the older students and ask them to help put out the fire and pay for the damages they caused, the older students reply, "Well, it is everyone's cafeteria! We should all clean up the mess together."

This situation is incredibly frustrating for the younger students, who did nothing to cause the fire but are now suffering the most from the smoke. This simple story is exactly what is happening on planet Earth right now with climate change, but instead of a cafeteria, it is our global environment. Instead of older and younger students, we have "Developed Nations" (the rich countries) and the "Global South" (the developing countries).

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) is like the world's most important environmental club. It was created by the United Nations to look after the planet, make sure nature is protected, and help countries work together to fix environmental problems. In a Model United Nations (MUN) simulation, sitting in the UNEP committee means you are taking on the role of a world leader, scientist, or environmental expert trying to solve the biggest challenge of our time.

The agenda before this committee is about fairness. It is about looking at the history of the world and realizing that the countries suffering the most from terrible storms, massive floods, and extreme heatwaves are usually the countries that did the least to cause global warming. The challenge is figuring out how to make the rich nations (who built their wealth by burning massive amounts of coal, oil, and gas for over a hundred years) actually keep their promises to help the poorer nations survive and rebuild.

This is not just a scientific problem about weather patterns or carbon molecules in the atmosphere. This is a massive human problem about justice, money, and survival. It is about making sure that when a promise is made on the global stage, it is actually kept. Throughout

your time in the UNEP committee, you will have to think deeply about how to create strict rules, how to track trillions of dollars, and how to protect the lives of billions of people who are watching the water levels rise at their front doors.

Background of the Agenda

To truly understand this agenda, we first need to understand the basic science and history of climate change, and why it is deeply unfair.

Our planet is surrounded by a blanket of gases called the atmosphere. Certain gases, like carbon dioxide and methane, act like the glass walls of a greenhouse. They let the sunlight in, but they stop the heat from escaping back into space. This is called the "greenhouse effect." A little bit of this effect is perfectly natural and necessary; without it, Earth would be a freezing ball of ice. However, human beings have been pumping billions of extra tons of these greenhouse gases into the sky. Because of this, the blanket around the Earth is getting way too thick, trapping too much heat, and causing the entire planet's temperature to rise. This is what we call global warming, and it completely messes up the weather, making storms stronger, droughts longer, and oceans higher.

But where did all these extra gases come from? Starting in the 1700s and 1800s, a period called the Industrial Revolution began in places like Europe and the United States. These countries started building massive factories, steam trains, and eventually cars and airplanes. To power all these amazing inventions, they burned fossil fuels: mainly coal, oil, and natural gas. When you burn fossil fuels, it releases huge amounts of carbon dioxide into the air. By burning these fuels for over two hundred years, these countries became incredibly rich, built modern cities, and created strong economies. They are what we call "Developed Nations" today.

On the other side of the world, many countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Pacific Islands did not go through this massive industrial burning phase at the same time. Many of them were busy fighting for their independence or dealing with poverty. Today, they are working hard to build schools, hospitals, and basic electricity networks for their people. These countries are often grouped and called the "Global South." The Global South has produced a very tiny fraction of the historic pollution in the atmosphere.

Here is the most tragic and unfair part of the story: the impacts of climate change are hitting the Global South the hardest. Because of where they are located on the map (often near the equator or on low-lying islands) and because they do not have trillions of dollars in their bank accounts to build massive sea walls or air-conditioned cities, they are incredibly vulnerable. When a

super-hurricane hits a rich country, the government has the money to rebuild. When a super-hurricane hits a poor country, it can wipe out their entire economy for a decade.

For years, the Developed Nations have looked at this unfair situation and made big promises. At massive global meetings, the rich countries have stood up and promised to give billions of dollars to the Global South. This money is called "Climate Finance." The idea is that this money will help the poorer countries build clean solar panels instead of dirty coal plants, and help them build stronger houses to survive the coming storms.

However, making a promise and keeping a promise are two entirely different things. The Developed Nations have consistently failed to give the full amount of money they promised on time. Furthermore, when they do give the money, they often give it as a loan (which must be paid back with interest) instead of a grant (a gift). The background of this agenda is rooted in a deep lack of trust. The Global South is tired of empty promises, delayed payments, and unfair loans. They are demanding a system that forces the Developed Nations to open their wallets and pay the debt they owe to the planet and to the people they have put in danger.

Agenda Breakdown

To fully conquer this topic, we must take the agenda ("HOLDING DEVELOPED NATIONS ACCOUNTABLE FOR CLIMATE COMMITMENTS TO THE GLOBAL SOUTH") and break it down piece by piece. Understanding every single word will give you the superpower of clarity during committee debates.

Holding

In this context, "holding" means grabbing onto something and not letting it go. It means creating a firm grip on a situation. When we talk about holding someone to a rule, we mean we are not going to let them slide or make excuses. We are setting up a system where they must do what they said they would do, and if they try to sneak away, we pull them back.

Developed Nations

These are the rich, industrialized countries of the world. Think of countries like the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Japan, France, and Canada. They have very high standards of living, lots of money, advanced technology, and modern infrastructure. More importantly for this agenda, they are the ones who became rich by burning fossil fuels for over a century. They hold the historical blame for the majority of the carbon dioxide currently trapped in our atmosphere.

Accountable

Accountability is a very important word. It means taking responsibility for your actions and accepting the consequences. If you accidentally break a window while playing baseball, being accountable means you admit you did it, and you use your own allowance money to pay for a new window. In global politics, being accountable means a country cannot just say "we are sorry" and walk away. They have to prove they are fixing the problem, show their receipts, allow experts to check their work, and face penalties if they fail.

Climate Commitments

A commitment is a serious promise or a pledge. Over the past thirty years, world leaders have met at big UN conferences and signed international treaties. In these treaties, they made specific promises. They promised to cut down their pollution (so they stop making the problem worse); they promised to share green technology (like wind turbine designs) with poorer countries, and most importantly, they promised to send billions of dollars every year to help fix the damage. These promises are their climate commitments.

Global South

This is a term used to describe the developing and less wealthy countries of the world. Even though it has the word "South" in it, it does not mean the southern half of the globe strictly. It is a political and economic term. It includes countries in Africa, Latin America, the Caribbean, Asia, and Oceania. These nations are still growing their economies. They have millions of people who still need basic things like clean water and reliable electricity. They are the victims of the climate crisis, suffering the worst heat, floods, and storms, despite doing almost nothing to cause it.

Putting It All Together

When we read the entire agenda as one complete thought, it is a call to action. The agenda means: *How do we create strict, unbreakable rules that force the rich, polluting countries to finally pay the money and provide the technology they promised to the poorer, vulnerable countries, without any more excuses, delays, or cheating?* Your job in the committee is to build the systems, the tracking tools, and the rules that turn those broken promises into real, measurable action on the ground.

Keywords

To speak like a true diplomat and environmental expert, you need to know the specific vocabulary used in the United Nations. Here are the most important terms you will use, explained simply.

1. Greenhouse Gases (GHGs)

These are the invisible gases in the air that trap the sun's heat. The most famous one is carbon dioxide (CO2), which comes from cars and factories. Another is methane, which comes from cows burping, landfills, and natural gas leaks. Think of GHGs like adding extra, heavy winter blankets onto a bed. The more GHGs you add, the hotter the Earth gets.

2. Fossil Fuels

These are energy sources buried deep underground, made from the crushed remains of plants and dinosaurs from millions of years ago. Coal, oil, and natural gas are the big three. Burning them gives us massive amounts of energy to run our modern world, but it also releases all the trapped carbon directly into the sky.

3. Climate Finance

This is the money that is needed to fight climate change. It costs a lot of money to build massive fields of solar panels, to invent electric airplanes, or to build giant sea walls to hold back the ocean. Climate finance is the cash that rich countries are supposed to send to poor countries so they can afford to protect themselves and grow cleanly.

4. Mitigation

Mitigation means trying to stop the problem from getting worse. It is the act of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. If your bathtub is overflowing, mitigation is reaching forward and turning off the faucet. For the planet, mitigation means shutting down dirty coal factories, planting more trees to suck up carbon, and driving electric cars.

5. Adaptation

Adaptation means changing how we live to survive the new, warmer world. Even if we stop all pollution today, the Earth will still be warmer for a long time. If the bathtub has already overflowed, adaptation is learning how to mop up the water and buying waterproof shoes. For the planet, adaptation means breeding new types of seeds that can grow in severe droughts, or putting houses on stilts so they do not flood.

6. Loss and Damage

This is one of the most intense debates in the UN right now. Sometimes, you cannot adapt. If the ocean rises so high that a small island completely disappears underwater forever, you cannot adapt to that. It is gone. "Loss and Damage" refers to the irreversible destruction caused by climate change; things that are permanently destroyed, like historical monuments, native lands, or human lives. Developing countries want rich countries to pay for these permanent losses.

7. Historical Emissions

This refers to the total amount of pollution a country has put into the sky since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution. Even if a country like the United Kingdom has low pollution today, its "historical emissions" are huge because it started burning coal over 200 years ago. Developing countries point to historical emissions to prove that rich nations are the main culprits.

8. Carbon Footprint

This is a measurement of how much pollution a person, a company, or a country produces in a given year. If you fly on private jets every day and leave all your lights on, your carbon footprint is gigantic. If you ride a bicycle and use solar power, your carbon footprint is tiny.

9. Greenwashing

This is a sneaky trick. Greenwashing is when a company or a country pretends to be doing great things for the environment, but it is actually just a lie or an exaggeration to look good on television. For example, a country might claim they are giving $50 million for "climate finance," but they are actually just taking money from their old healthcare charity budget and putting a green sticker on it. It is fake environmentalism.

10. Concessional Loans

A loan is money you borrow and have to pay back. Usually, banks charge you a high "interest rate" (extra money) as a fee for borrowing. A "concessional loan" is a loan with super low interest, or a loan that gives you a very long time to pay it back. It is gentler than a normal loan, but you still end up owing money.

11. Grants

A grant is a gift. It is money given to a country that never, ever has to be paid back. The Global South is constantly fighting to receive Climate Finance as grants, not loans. They argue it is deeply unfair to make them go into debt to fix climate problems they did not create.

12. The Debt Trap / Debt Distress

Many developing countries are incredibly poor and already owe billions of dollars to global banks. When a climate disaster hits, they have to borrow even more money to rebuild. This traps them in a cycle of endless debt. They end up spending all their money paying back the banks instead of building schools or hospitals. This is called the climate debt trap.

13. UNFCCC (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change)

This is the master treaty, the ultimate rulebook signed in 1992 by almost every country on Earth. It is the foundation for all global climate action. Its main goal is to stabilize greenhouse gas levels in the atmosphere so humans can survive.

14. COP (Conference of the Parties)

Every year, all the countries that signed the UNFCCC gather in a massive, two-week-long meeting to argue, negotiate, and make new rules. This meeting is called the COP. They are numbered based on the year. For example, COP21 was in Paris in 2015, and COP29 took place in Baku, Azerbaijan.

15. Vulnerability

This word describes how easily someone or something can be hurt. In climate change, highly vulnerable countries are those that are in the direct path of hurricanes, rely heavily on rain for farming, or are located right at sea level. They are the most fragile in the face of nature's wrath.

16. Common But Differentiated Responsibilities (CBDR)

This is a very famous UN phrase. It means: "Yes, we all share a common responsibility to save the Earth, but we have different levels of responsibility based on who caused the mess and who has the money to fix it." It is the legal way of saying the rich countries must do the heavy lifting.

17. Net Zero

Net Zero is the ultimate goal. It does not mean producing zero pollution (which is almost impossible). It means balancing the scales. If a country puts 100 tons of carbon into the air, they must also remove 100 tons of carbon from the air (by planting massive forests or using giant carbon-sucking vacuums). If what goes up equals what comes down, you have reached Net Zero.

Historical Context and Developments

To understand why countries argue so passionately about climate finance today, we have to travel back in time and look at how the problem grew, and how the world tried to fix it. It is a history of big promises and missed deadlines.

The Era of the Industrial Revolution (1750s – 1900s)

In the mid-1700s, everything changed. People figured out how to dig coal out of the ground and burn it to boil water, creating steam power. This led to factories, trains, and eventually massive ships. The countries in Europe, along with the United States, embraced this new technology. They built gigantic, wealthy empires. The skies above cities like London and New York were

choked with black soot, but nobody knew at the time that the invisible carbon dioxide was slowly thickening the Earth's greenhouse blanket. By the time scientists realized what was happening in the late 1900s, the Developed Nations had already pumped a staggering amount of pollution into the sky. The Global South, meanwhile, had contributed very little to the problem.

1992: The Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro

As the science became undeniable, world leaders finally panicked. In 1992, they all flew to Rio de Janeiro in Brazil for the "Earth Summit." It was here that they created the UNFCCC (the big climate rulebook). At this summit, the countries officially recognized the idea of "Common But Differentiated Responsibilities." The rich nations formally admitted, on paper, that they were mostly to blame for the crisis and that they had a duty to help the poorer nations. It was a beautiful moment of unity, but they still needed strict rules.

1997: The Kyoto Protocol

To put the UNFCCC into action, nations met in Japan and signed the Kyoto Protocol. This was the very first time the UN tried to set strict, legal limits on pollution. The genius (and controversial) part of the Kyoto Protocol was that it only required the Developed Nations to cut their emissions. The developing countries were allowed to keep growing without limits because it was seen as unfair to punish them for a problem they didn't create. However, countries like the United States hated this idea and eventually refused to participate fully, making the Kyoto Protocol much weaker than intended.

2009: COP15 in Copenhagen (The $100 Billion Promise)

This is one of the most important dates for your agenda. World leaders met in Copenhagen, Denmark. The negotiations were incredibly messy and almost ended in disaster. To save the conference, the Developed Nations made a monumental promise. They looked at the Global South and said: "If you agree to start reducing your pollution too, we promise to gather and send $100 billion every single year by the year 2020 to help you." The Global South agreed. This $100 billion a year became the golden number, the ultimate promise of Climate Finance.

2015: COP21 in Paris (The Paris Agreement)

The Paris Agreement is the most famous climate treaty in history. Instead of telling countries exactly what to do, the Paris Agreement asked every single country (rich and poor) to make their own voluntary pledges, called Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). The ultimate goal was set: the world must work together to make sure the Earth's temperature does not rise more than 1.5 degrees Celsius above what it was before the Industrial Revolution. If it goes past 1.5 degrees, scientists warn that coral reefs will die, ice caps will melt uncontrollably, and storms will become apocalyptic. During Paris, the Developed Nations reconfirmed their promise to deliver the $100 billion per year, though they were already falling behind schedule.

2020: The Missed Deadline

The year 2020 arrived, the deadline for the $100 billion promise. Did the Developed Nations deliver? No. When the UN and economic experts counted the money, the rich nations had fallen short by tens of billions of dollars. Furthermore, much of the money they did provide was in the form of loans, not grants. The Global South was furious. The trust was broken.

2022: COP27 in Sharm El-Sheikh (The Loss and Damage Victory)

The anger from the Global South boiled over at COP27 in Egypt. For thirty years, developing nations had been begging the UN to create a special bank account for "Loss and Damage", money specifically meant to compensate countries for permanent destruction caused by climate change. For thirty years, rich nations refused, terrified they would be sued for trillions of dollars. But the pressure became too great. In a historic victory, the nations finally agreed to establish a Loss and Damage Fund. It was a huge win for accountability, even though the fund started with very little actual money in it.

2024: COP29 in Baku (The New Finance Goal)

By the time the world met at COP29 in Baku, Azerbaijan, the old $100 billion goal was expiring. It was time to set a brand new target, known as the New Collective Quantified Goal (NCQG). The developing countries, backed by scientific math, stated they needed at least $1.3 trillion every year to survive. The negotiations in Baku were incredibly tense, chaotic, and dramatic. In the end, the Developed Nations agreed to triple their old promise, setting a new goal to channel "at least" $300 billion a year into developing countries by the year 2035. They also agreed on a looser roadmap to try and reach the full $1.3 trillion from a mix of public and private sources.

However, the Global South left Baku bitterly disappointed. Representatives from countries like India and Nigeria felt the $300 billion was far too low and criticized how the deal was rushed through. They argued that shifting the goalpost to 2035 and relying heavily on private businesses instead of direct government money was just another way for rich countries to avoid being held truly accountable. The history of this agenda is a history of the Global South asking for a lifeboat, and the Developed Nations throwing them a pool noodle, promising a lifeboat will arrive in a few more years.

Detailed Analysis of The Problem

Why is holding developed nations accountable so difficult? If everyone agrees the planet is burning, and everyone agrees the rich nations caused it, why don't they just pay? The problem is incredibly complex and has several layers. We will break down the biggest hurdles you must solve in committee.

Problem 1: The Broken Promise and The Math of Survival

The absolute core of the problem is trust. The $100 billion a year promised in 2009 was not fully met by the 2020 deadline. While rich nations claim they finally reached the $100 billion mark recently, developing nations point out that the math is flawed. The new $300 billion goal set at COP29 in 2024 is seen as a slap in the face by many developing countries who mathematically proved they need $1.3 trillion annually just to keep their heads above water. Imagine needing a life-saving medicine that costs $1,300, but the person who made you sick only hands you $300 and tells you to ask private banks for the rest. The gap between what is needed and what is provided is terrifyingly large.

Problem 2: The Nightmare of Loans vs. Grants (The Debt Trap)

This is perhaps the most unfair part of the entire global system. When you hear that Developed Nations provided $80 billion in climate finance, it sounds wonderful. However, you have to look closely at *how* they provided it. More than 70% of climate finance given to the Global South comes in the form of loans.

Imagine a massive hurricane destroys the only hospital on a small Caribbean island. The island needs $10 million to rebuild it. A rich, developed country offers them the $10 million, but says, "You have to pay us back $12 million over the next ten years." The island has no choice, so they take the money. They rebuilt the hospital. But now, all the tax money collected from the island's citizens has to be sent back to the rich country to pay off the debt. The island becomes poorer. They cannot afford to build schools or roads because they are trapped paying off a loan for a disaster they did not cause. The Global South is demanding that climate finance must be "Grants" (free money), not loans. Making a profit off the suffering of poor countries is a massive failure of accountability.

Problem 3: The Adaptation Deficit

Climate finance can be spent on two things: Mitigation (stopping pollution, like building solar panels) and Adaptation (surviving the weather, like building flood walls).

Private companies and banks love Mitigation. If a bank loans money to build a massive solar power plant in India, that solar plant will generate electricity, sell it, and make a profit. The bank gets its money back easily.

But nobody wants to pay for Adaptation. If a country needs $50 million to build a giant concrete wall to stop the ocean from flooding a village, that wall does not make any money. It just sits there, blocking water. Private banks will not fund it because there is no profit to be made. As a result, the vast majority of climate money goes toward mitigation, leaving the poorest countries

with absolutely no money to build the walls, raise the roads, and dig the storm drains they desperately need to survive today. This missing money is called the "Adaptation Deficit."

Problem 4: The Trickery of Greenwashing and Double-Counting

How do we actually know if a rich country is paying what they promised? Right now, the system relies mostly on the honor system, and countries cheat. This cheating takes the form of greenwashing and double-counting.

For example, a rich nation might have a regular charity budget where they send $10 million to an African country to help build basic schools. When the UN asks the rich nation for its climate finance homework, the rich nation might take that same $10 million school project, put solar panels on the roof of one school, and report the entire $10 million as "New Climate Finance." They did not actually spend any new money; they just changed the label on the old money. Because there is no super-strict, independent global police force checking every single dollar, developed nations get away with making themselves look much more generous than they actually are.

Problem 5: Loss and Damage – The Unpayable Price

We mentioned Loss and Damage earlier, but it is a massive analytical problem. How do you put a price tag on a lost culture? If the island nation of Tuvalu sinks completely into the Pacific Ocean, all its citizens will have to move to other countries as refugees. What is the monetary value of a country ceasing to exist? How do you calculate the price of a farmer's ancestral land turning to dry dust?

Developing nations fought hard to get the Loss and Damage fund created, but now the terrifying problem is figuring out who is forced to put money into it. The United States and other developed nations are terrified of the word "compensation." In legal terms, if they admit they owe "compensation," it means they admit they committed a crime, and they could be sued for trillions. Therefore, they insist that any money they give to Loss and Damage is just "charity." Holding them accountable means breaking through this legal wall and making payment a mandatory obligation, not a charitable donation.

International Legal Frameworks

In a Model UN committee, you cannot just say "it is unfair." You have to use the law. You must point to the specific treaties, articles, and legal documents that prove the Developed Nations are legally required to help. Here is your legal rulebook.

1. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC - 1992)

This is the mother of all climate laws. Almost every country signed it.

- **Article 3.1 (The Golden Rule of CBDR):** This article literally writes the concept of Common But Differentiated Responsibilities into law. It states that parties should protect the climate system on the basis of equity and in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities. It legally commands that "the developed country Parties should take the lead in combating climate change and the adverse effects thereof." If a rich country refuses to pay, you quote Article 3.1 to them.

- **Article 4.3 (The Money Clause):** This article specifically states that developed countries "shall provide new and additional financial resources" to meet the agreed full costs incurred by developing countries. The key words here are "new and additional." It means they cannot use old charity money (greenwashing). It must be fresh money.

- **Article 4.4 (The Adaptation Clause):** This clause legally binds developed nations to assist the developing countries that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change in meeting costs of adaptation.

- **Article 4.8:** This clause demands that all actions taken under the convention must give full consideration to countries that are highly vulnerable, like small island countries, countries with low-lying coastal areas, and countries prone to natural disasters.

2. The Paris Agreement (2015)

The modern rulebook that everyone currently operates under.

- **Article 9 (The Finance Mandate):** Article 9.1 clearly states: "Developed country Parties shall provide financial resources to assist developing country Parties with respect to both mitigation and adaptation." It is not a suggestion; the word "shall" means it is mandatory. Furthermore, Article 9.4 demands that the provision of scaled-up financial resources should aim to achieve a balance between adaptation and mitigation. (Remember the Adaptation Deficit problem? This article proves they are legally required to fix it).

- **Article 8 (Loss and Damage):** This is the article that recognizes the importance of averting, minimizing, and addressing loss and damage. It gives legal standing to the victims of irreversible climate destruction.

- **Article 13 (The Transparency Framework):** This article builds an "enhanced transparency framework for action and support." This is the legal basis for tracking the money. It requires countries to honestly report what they are doing and how much money they are actually sending.

3. The ITLOS Advisory Opinion (May 2024)

This is a massive, brand new legal development that you must use in your committee. The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS) is a global court that makes rules about the oceans. In May 2024, ITLOS issued a historic, 153-page legal opinion. The judges ruled that greenhouse gas emissions from cars and factories are officially classified as "marine pollution" because they cause the oceans to warm and become acidic.

Because of this, the Tribunal declared that states have a strict legal obligation under the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) to protect and preserve the marine environment from climate change impacts. The court also emphasized the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, meaning developing states are especially vulnerable and wealthy states have a heavier burden to act. This means that failing to cut emissions and failing to help poor countries protect their coastlines isn't just a broken climate promise; it is now considered an illegal act of polluting the global oceans.

4. The International Court of Justice (ICJ) Advisory Proceedings

Right now, the UN General Assembly has asked the highest court in the world, the ICJ, to rule on the exact legal consequences for countries that have caused significant harm to the climate system. While the final ruling is still pending, the fact that the highest court is analyzing this shows that climate accountability is moving from "political promises" to "strict legal consequences."

Important and Major Case Studies

To make your arguments powerful, you cannot just talk about numbers. You must talk about human beings and real countries. When debating in the UNEP committee, use these case studies to prove why holding developed nations accountable is a matter of life and death.

Case Study 1: The Nightmare Floods of Pakistan (2022)

If you want to explain the absolute injustice of climate change, look no further than Pakistan in the summer of 2022. Because of extreme global warming, massive glaciers in the northern mountains melted rapidly, while at the same time, unprecedented, monster monsoon rains poured from the sky. The result was apocalyptic.

At the peak of the disaster, one-third of the entire country of Pakistan was completely submerged underwater. Imagine taking a country the size of the United Kingdom and putting a third of it at the bottom of a lake. Over 33 million people lost their homes, their farms, and their livelihoods. The water washed away thousands of miles of roads, destroyed over 400 bridges, and caused an estimated $30 billion in total economic damages.

Here is the heartbreaking accountability fact: since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, Pakistan has contributed less than 1% of the world's total historical greenhouse gas emissions. It did almost nothing to cause the warming of the planet, yet its country was nearly wiped off the map. When Pakistan asked the global community for help, the Developed Nations sent millions in emergency aid, but it was just a tiny drop compared to the $30 billion they lost. Furthermore, Pakistan was already in deep debt to international banks, meaning it had to borrow even more money to rebuild its shattered bridges. Pakistan is the ultimate symbol of why Loss and Damage funds must be made mandatory, not charitable.

Case Study 2: The Sinking Sovereignty of Tuvalu and Vanuatu

Tuvalu and Vanuatu are Small Island Developing States (SIDS) located in the Pacific Ocean. They are literal paradises, but they are incredibly flat. The highest point of land on Tuvalu is only about 15 feet above the ocean. As global warming melts the ice caps in Antarctica and Greenland, billions of gallons of extra water are pouring into the oceans, causing sea levels to rise.

For Tuvalu and Vanuatu, climate change is not a problem about weather; it is an existential threat. Within this century, these entire countries are projected to vanish entirely beneath the waves. Vanuatu has been hit by monstrous, super-charged cyclones that wipe out its entire Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in a single afternoon.

These nations are so desperate that they are taking extreme measures. Vanuatu led the brilliant legal campaign to take the climate crisis to the International Court of Justice, demanding the court make it a legal crime for big countries to destroy the climate. Meanwhile, Tuvalu is literally trying to upload its entire country to the internet. They are creating a "Digital Nation" in the metaverse, scanning their monuments, trees, and culture, and changing their own laws so they can remain a recognized country even when their physical land no longer exists. They are begging the Developed Nations for accountability before they are erased from the map.

Case Study 3: The Horn of Africa and the Endless Drought

While Pakistan had too much water, the Horn of Africa (a region that includes countries like Somalia, Ethiopia, and Kenya) has had none. Driven by climate change shifting global weather patterns, this region recently experienced its longest and most severe drought in over 40 years. For five consecutive rainy seasons, the rain simply did not fall.

The results were devastating for a region that relies entirely on farming and herding animals. Over 10 million livestock (cows, goats, camels) died of thirst and starvation. Without the animals, the human populations faced severe famine. Millions of children suffered from acute malnutrition. The Global South argues that this drought was artificially worsened by the carbon pollution of the Global North. Despite this, the climate finance sent to help African farmers build better irrigation systems or buy drought-resistant seeds is severely lacking. Most money goes to building solar panels in middle-income countries rather than saving dying farmers in the poorest ones.

Case Study 4: Bangladesh and the Saltwater Invasion

Bangladesh is a densely populated country nestled in a low-lying river delta in South Asia. As sea levels rise, the problem isn't just flooding; it is the silent invasion of salt. When ocean water creeps inland, the salt from the sea seeps into the soil and the freshwater rivers.

Because of this, the drinking water becomes toxic and causes severe health issues, especially for pregnant women. Furthermore, the salt ruins the soil, making it impossible for farmers to grow rice, the main food staple of the country. Millions of people in Bangladesh are being forced to abandon their ancestral homes and move into massive, overcrowded slums in the capital city of Dhaka, becoming "climate refugees." Bangladesh needs billions of dollars in adaptation finance to build desalination plants (machines that take salt out of water) and breed new salt-resistant crops, but the Developed Nations are failing to deliver the promised funds.

Relevant Discussions of the UN in the Real World

To sound like an expert, you must know what the UN is talking about *right now*. Here are the major reports, negotiations, and discussions currently taking place regarding this agenda.

1. The Operationalization of the Loss and Damage Fund (COP27 and COP28)

While the Loss and Damage Fund was successfully agreed upon at COP27 in Egypt, agreeing to buy a wallet does not mean there is money in the wallet. At COP28 in the United Arab Emirates, the massive argument was about who controls the fund and who pays into it. The UN eventually agreed to let the World Bank host the fund temporarily. The Developed Nations pledged around $700 million to start it off. However, $700 million is less than 0.2% of the money actually needed every year for irreversible damages. The current, furious UN discussion is how to legally force rich countries to put hundreds of billions into this fund regularly, rather than just tossing in loose change for good publicity.

2. The New Collective Quantified Goal (NCQG) at COP29 Baku

This is the most up-to-date and critical discussion for your agenda. In November 2024 at COP29 in Baku, the primary mission was to replace the old $100 billion target with the NCQG. Developing nations presented a united front, stating that the true mathematical cost of their survival is $1.3 trillion per year by 2035.

The developed nations pushed back, arguing their own economies were struggling and they could not provide that much taxpayer money. They wanted private businesses and wealthier developing nations (like China or Gulf oil states) to chip in. The final agreement was a deeply compromised $300 billion annually by 2035 from developed nations, with a vague "call" to all actors to try and reach the $1.3 trillion mark. Developing nations felt railroaded; they argued that setting the goal to 2035 was too late, and relying on private investments meant the money would likely be high-interest loans instead of grants. Nations agreed to launch the "Baku to Belém Roadmap" to try and figure out how to actually find the rest of the trillion dollars before COP30 in Brazil. This bitter division over the NCQG is exactly what you will be debating in committee.

3. The UNEP Emissions Gap and Adaptation Gap Reports

As a delegate in the UNEP committee, you must quote UNEP's own documents. Every year, UNEP releases two terrifying report cards.

- *The Emissions Gap Report* measures the difference between what countries promised to cut, and what they are actually cutting. The recent reports show that despite all the promises, global emissions are still hovering near record highs, pushing the Earth toward a disastrous 2.5 to 3 degree Celsius temperature rise.
- *The Adaptation Gap Report* measures the difference between the money needed for survival walls and drought-seeds, versus the money actually given. UNEP's latest numbers show that the adaptation finance needs of developing countries are 10 to 18 times bigger than the international public finance currently flowing to them. The gap is widening, not shrinking.

4. The Bridgetown Initiative

Led by Mia Mottley, the brilliant Prime Minister of the small island nation of Barbados, the Bridgetown Initiative is a massive discussion currently rocking the UN and global banks. Mottley argues that the entire global banking system (like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund) was built in the 1940s and is completely broken for the climate era.

The Bridgetown Initiative demands that these massive banks change their rules. First, they want to pause all debt payments for any country immediately after they get hit by a climate disaster (so it can spend money on rescuing people, not paying banks). Second, they want the global

banks to print trillions of dollars in low-interest or zero-interest loans specifically for the Global South to build green energy, removing the risk of the "debt trap." This initiative is gaining massive support in the UN General Assembly.

Questions To Ponder Upon

As you prepare to debate this incredibly complex agenda, you should not look for a simple conclusion. Instead, ask yourself these deep, challenging questions. Your answers to these questions will become the foundation of your speeches, your alliances, and your final resolutions in committee.

1. **The Nature of the Money:** Should climate finance from developed nations be legally classified as a "charitable donation" or a "mandatory tax/reparation" for historical damages? How does changing that legal label change the power dynamics?

2. **The Grant vs. Loan Dilemma:** Is it morally acceptable for global banks or developed nations to charge interest and make a profit on loans given to developing nations for climate disaster recovery? Should the UN ban loans for adaptation and insist only on grants?

3. **Tracking and Honesty:** Right now, countries self-report how much climate finance they are giving. How can UNEP create an independent, strict global auditing system to catch "greenwashing" and stop rich nations from double-counting old aid money?

4. **The Billion vs. Trillion Gap:** At COP29, developing nations asked for $1.3 trillion, but rich nations only committed $300 billion in public funds, hoping the private sector covers the rest. Can we rely on private, profit-driven businesses to save the world, or must this money come strictly from governments?

5. **The Accountability Enforcement:** If a Developed Nation signs a treaty promising to cut emissions by 50% and send $10 billion, but they fail to do so, what is the punishment? Can the UN create economic sanctions or trade penalties for climate failures, or will rich nations simply leave the treaties if threatened?

6. **The Adaptation Priority:** Since private businesses only invest in mitigation (because solar panels make a profit, while flood walls do not), how can the UN force developed countries to redirect at least 50% of all public climate finance strictly to adaptation?

7. **The New Wealthy Nations:** Historical emissions blame the US and Europe. But today, countries like China and Saudi Arabia are incredibly wealthy and have massive emissions. At what point does a "developing" country graduate and become responsible for paying climate finance into the Global South pool?

8. **Loss and Damage Payouts:** Who gets to decide which country receives money from the newly formed Loss and Damage Fund? If two countries are hit by hurricanes, but the fund only has a small amount of money, how do we calculate who suffered the most?

9. **Sovereignty vs. Oversight:** When developed nations give billions in climate grants to the Global South, they often want strict oversight on how the money is spent to prevent political corruption. However, developing nations argue this violates their sovereignty and slows down emergency relief. How do we balance anti-corruption checks with the need for immediate, no-strings-attached survival money?

10. **The Next Generation's Burden:** If the current system of high-interest climate loans continues, the youth in the Global South will spend their entire adult lives paying off debts for disasters they did not cause. How can the resolutions you write today legally protect the economies of future generations from climate bankruptcy?