

# ECO



*ECO has been published by Non-Governmental Environmental Groups at major international conferences since the Stockholm Environment Conference in 1972. ECO is produced co-operatively by the Climate Action Network at the UNFCCC meetings in Panama, October 2011.*

*ECO email: [administration@climatenetwork.org](mailto:administration@climatenetwork.org) – ECO website: <http://climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters> – Editorial/Production: Joshua Darrach*

## The Mandate

Yesterday, ECO noted that there are three groups of countries in the legal form negotiations that each need to bring proposals to the table at Durban: the KP developed countries, the non-KP Annex I Parties and the developing countries.

All the developed countries that have ratified their Annex B targets for the first commitment period should have their targets ready to plug and play for CP2. The non-KP Annex I Party[s] need to increase their ambition, be part of a common accounting system and MRV to bring forward the established KP systems - how else would the Bali Action Plan's agreed 'comparability' be achieved?

Many are suggesting that we are facing a transitional period, where the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol keeps alive an architecture that, through Article 3.1 and other elements, keeps a science-based approach at the core of the global response to the climate threat. Through this post-2012 period, the elements of a new comprehensive legally-binding agreement[s] needs to be developed. In ECO's view, this agreement needs to be in the form of a Protocol[s], or other such appropriate legal instrument, that respects the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities.

However, we will not attain comprehensive legally-binding

agreement[s] equal to the challenge we face unless Parties find common cause that such an agreement is needed. In ECO's view, in addition to KP Parties agreeing a second commitment period in Durban, all Parties must agree on a mandate to negotiate a legally binding instrument covering all Bali building blocks under the LCA. The necessary, vital and essential complement to agreeing the KP second commitment period in Durban will be Parties agreeing a mandate for a comprehensive legally binding agreement[s]. This mandate needs, at a minimum, to agree:

- what the result of the negotiations will be, specifying that Parties are working towards a legally binding instrument with legally binding commitments
- the end date (ECO would suggest 2015 would allow time for institution building and for experience of MRV to be enhanced)
- the scope
- the process, including forum
- principles to guide the negotiations

Without a mandate for the third period of the climate regime, we will again face a gap – between commitments, but also in ambition, and the resulting sense of the world moving forward together to avoid the worst that an human-altered atmosphere can throw at us.

## Reassessing Priorities on Long-Term Finance

Back in Bonn, ECO complained that the finance negotiations seemed more concerned with designing finance institutions than deciding where the long-term finance to fund them should come from. The result could be a Green Climate Fund that is an empty shell, and a Standing Committee that is left to stand still.

Paying a quick visit to yesterday's finance informal, ECO was pleased to see a number of parties stress the need to readdress this balance. When Durban draws to a close, the world's citizens will find it extraordinary if the African COP does not deliver the resources that poor and vulnerable people in Africa and elsewhere need to adapt to climate change and shift to a low-carbon development path.

A meaningful decision on long-term finance in Durban should cover at least three elements. First, a roadmap is needed for scaling-up climate finance from 2013 to 2020 to at least meet the \$100 billion per year commitment by 2020. This should include a commitment from developed countries that there will be no gap after the end of the Fast Start Finance period. The roadmap should recognise that \$100 billion is needed from public finance – mobilised first and foremost through assessed

*- Continued on Page 2, Column 2*

## Handing out Medals in the LULU-lympics

Looking at the new reports being posted on the UNFCCC website, ECO feels some empathy for the reviewers tasked with 'judging' the forest management reference levels.

Since there was no agreement on the rules for reference levels, each Party has had to do its own thing. And the results look as disjointed as a talent show. Some sang, while others danced. Some lifted impressive weights, while others performed magic tricks. Maybe some have shown real talent, but how can we judge the quality of their performance when we have no basis for comparison?

Perhaps Parties should take note of another multilateral, global process – the Olympic Games. In those Games, the rules are clear in advance, and thus the judges are able to score each performance on a set of common criteria – and those who don't play by the jointly agreed rules are disqualified.

It would have made the "judges" – the expert reviewers – job easier if Parties had agreed to a single method for setting reference levels back in Cancun. And of course, if that method had environmental integrity, the climate would be the ultimate victor. That didn't happen in Cancun, and now Panama may be the last chance for Parties to recognize that such global reference levels are in the interest of all of our "national circumstances". ECO says: "Go for the gold!"



*- Continued from Page 1, Column 3*

budgetary contributions of developed countries, and through supplementary sources of public finance, such as carbon pricing of international transport or financial transaction taxes.

Finally the roadmap should include a detailed workplan to drive towards the further decisions needed at COP-18, including technical workshops and submissions from parties, experts and observers.

But negotiators should not be satisfied with agreeing a roadmap alone. They must also get the finance car on the road and start driving down it.

The second key area to address in Durban is the initial capitalization of the Green Climate Fund. ECO wants to be clear that an initial capitalization should not merely cover the running costs of the Secretariat and Board of the new fund over the next year; but must extend commitment to a substantial first tranche of funding to enable the disbursement of climate finance to developing countries from 2013.

Finally, there should be a decision in Durban to move ahead with the most promising supplementary sources of public finance. ECO notes that the

International Maritime Organization is ready to get to work on designing an instrument to apply a universal carbon price to international shipping, which would both control high and rising emissions from the sector, and raise substantial new revenues. But the IMO process is waiting for guidance from the UNFCCC COP on how to do so while respecting CBDR.

There is no reason to delay giving that guidance to ensure the IMO gets down to work from March next year. A Durban decision should establish the principle that CBDR can be addressed by directing revenues as compensation to developing countries and to the Green Climate Fund. Further work will still be needed on the details of implementation, but better to start those discussions next year than wait another 12 months.

With progress on these elements in Panama, ECO is confident that Durban can yet deliver an balanced outcome on finance which helps both to operationalize the new finance institutions needed, and to mobilize the long-term revenues. The people watching the African COP will expect nothing less.

## Scientific Integrity in the UNFCCC

ECO appreciates the critical role of the IPCC, which provides scientific input to the UNFCCC process and led to the Convention itself and its Kyoto Protocol. But how will this link continue in future?

Yesterday's technical briefing by the IPCC was meant to explore how this link will continue in the future and how the 5th Assessment Report (AR5) will serve as a key input into the 2013-2015 Review.

ECO applauds the use of communication technology (Skype) at this technical briefing to cut down on emissions from air travel and foster lower-carbon meetings. The IPCC Chair Pachauri promised improved policy relevance of AR5 compared to any previous report, strengthening links between the IPCC Working Groups – especially on adaptation and mitigation- to address cross-cutting issues. So far, so good. But how about the actual input for

the Review process? AOSIS (Granada) asked this key question at the very end of the briefing: How will we merge the IPCC timeline with the Review's requirements? Will the IPCC Synthesis Report be published at least a month before the concluding COP20, allowing for preparation of a decision at COP21? Apparently, IPCC will ask this question at its next meeting in Uganda this November. For ECO there's only one possible answer: it must.

But ECO wonders if the Parties are clear on how the IPCC will input into the 2013-2015 Review. To ECO it seems that more opportunities for Parties to discuss the review with the IPCC are critical to help answer the many questions that remain unasked and unanswered on this key element of hope for our collective future.