Dear Ministers,

Your shared vision and political will urgently needed here:
Mitigation Like You Really Mean It

Ministers, when these meetings are over, will you be able to say you did all in your power today to protect present and future generations from dangerous climate change?

ECO is feeling another bad hangover coming on. The updates from behind closed doors suggest we are heading toward Copenhagen Accord (Light).

It’s inconceivable that we could waste another year, and may even be stepping back from Copenhagen. But there it is.

We’ve been talking a lot about the UNEP gap report, and for good reason. The Copenhagen Accord pledges leave a gap of 5 to 9 Gigatonnes – and that only gets us a 66% chance of keeping global temperature rise to only 2°C and limiting impacts. That sounds pretty dangerous. And now, to make matters worse, it seems possible that the COP will only “take note” of these wimpy pledges. Can’t you even decide to actually implement what little is on the table?

Worse still, the Climate Action Tracker reports that with the proposed LULUCF rules and no change in the AAU hot air loophole, developed countries could end up on the business as usual path until 2020. But everyone knows in the back of their mind that we need a peak of global emissions no later than 2015.

Dear Ministers, all is not lost! In our last crucial day in Cancun, you can:

* Agree a strong Shared Vision, with the goal of keeping global temperature increase below 1.5 degrees;
* Formally acknowledge that the pledges on the table will not prevent dangerous climate change and much more is needed;
* Establish a process, with a deadline in Durban, to strengthen targets and actions.

Ministers, you can still do it. If you need a boost, coffee is on ECO.

Ray of the Day

**AOSIS, SIDS and LDCs**

For successfully restoring the reference in the Shared Vision text to a global goal of a 1.5°C maximum global temperature increase.

REDD+ Going Green

As negotiations draw to a close, ECO is greatly disappointed with the overall progress of these climate change talks.

However, there has been progress on REDD+. And while the negotiations still have some way to go at press time, political will has enabled Parties to achieve compromise and move in the right direction toward a framework that can contribute to global emissions reductions.

A REDD+ decision is within reach, but good decision-making is at a premium in these final hours, and there are danger signs of slippage on key principles. We must establish a REDD+ mechanism that reduces emissions, protects rights and biodiversity, and provides sustainable, predictable and adequate financing to do so.

The compromise on REDD+ has required contributions by everyone. Developing countries have demonstrated a willingness to protect their forest resources, but have stalled any agreement to establish a robust monitoring system. Developed countries have started to make pledges for finance, but how much and over what time period is still unresolved. NGOs, indigenous peoples and others have campaigned tirelessly to maintain environmental integrity and protect rights.

And action is starting to happen. Mexico, DRC, Ecuador, Costa Rica, Brazil and Indonesia have made important progress on their national REDD+ programs. Look for example at Mexico’s recently launched REDD+ Vision, which reinforces the need to support community-based sustainable use and management of forests, to respect indigenous peoples’ rights, and to conserve biodiversity and ecosystem services, all developed in open and participatory processes. While these are good steps forward, there still needs to be more work both on optimizing policies and developing clear modalities for actions on the ground.

As we enter the last day of negotiations in Cancun, there is still everything to play for on REDD+.

First is the need to fully address that dirty word – leakage – where forest destruction in one area simply moves to another.

Second, a commitment is needed on providing long term, adequate and predictable funding as well as guiding when and how the financial support will be used.

Third, REDD+ programs must respect and protect the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, while conserving natural forests and biodiversity, and establishing robust monitoring and reporting systems incorporating safeguards.

The safeguards must be designed to ensure REDD+ achieves these multiple benefits while establishing a foundation of good governance.

If agreement could be achieved on these fundamental elements, then REDD+ is ripe for a positive decision. And if agreement can be reached on REDD+, why not elsewhere in the negotiations?

The mitigation potential of REDD+ depends on the viability of natural systems which are at risk unless significant emissions reductions are agreed in other areas of the negotiations. In these final hours, a good Cancun package is still possible. Let’s follow the REDD+ path and paint Cancun green!
### AFB Update

This week has been intense for the Chair of the Adaptation Fund and its Secretariat. They hosted a signing ceremony with the German government to formalize the Adaptation Fund Board’s legal capacity, the missing element to advance the direct access approach.

There was a well-attended side event where the AFB introduced a new toolkit to assist developing countries in the direct access procedure. Representatives from the three accredited National Implementing Entities (NIE) in Senegal, Jamaica and Uruguay shared the experience of their accreditation processes.

The report of the Adaptation Fund Chair shows good progress. The AFB adopted the terms of reference for the review of the AF. And the UNFCCC Secretariat has been requested to organize regional workshops to facilitate applications for NIE.

These workshops can help promote direct access as they build the capacity of developing countries to identify appropriate institutions and work through fiduciary management requirements. ECO notes that attendance at the workshops should be focused on potential NIEs rather than the UNFCCC focal points.

Furthermore, civil society should have a role to play, and NIEs should have a good track record in responding to civil society and local community needs.

Australia has now joined the club of AF supporters, pledging AUS $15 million of its fast start finance to the Fund. Other developed countries which have kept their pockets closed so far, like Japan, France or the UK, should do likewise, and well before COP 17.

Next week, the Board will meet in Cancún for its 12th session. AFB members and the Secretariat deserve a toast to congratulate them for their 12th session. AFB members and the Secretariat deserve a toast to congratulation on their progress this year. The meeting will likely pave the way for more countries to benefit via approval of adaptation projects and potentially the accreditation of additional NIEs.

And for the first time, AFB members will have a joint session with civil society representatives. This can lead to further improvements on stakeholder inclusion and consideration of the most vulnerable communities in project proposals and increased transparency on project decisions.

The Adaptation Fund has proven the skeptics wrong. We are sure that the AFB will set an even better example in 2011 as a well functioning, democratic and pro-poor multilateral institution.

### Advancing Backwards

In a bold move toward locking in the Colosal Fossil for the 4th consecutive year, Canada earned a Fossil of the Day for yet another colorful remark by its colorful Minister of the Environment, John Baird.

In a briefing with journalists yesterday morning, the minister dismissed the principle of ‘historical responsibility’ as a ‘sidecar’ issue.

Historical responsibility defines the need for developed countries to acknowledge their higher emissions historically, and the obligation for them to act first and do more to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions.

ECO ventures that the minister might have it backwards. Historical responsibility isn’t on the side, it is at the core of responsibility for developed countries such as Canada.

Let’s take a moment to look at what’s been happening there over the last few years:

- Emissions in Canada have risen more than 30% above 1990 levels.
- Canada is the country which promised something in Copenhagen, came back home for the holidays and after some serious soul-searching, decided to submit an even lower number than in Denmark.
- Canada has stopped providing incentives for the production of wind energy.
- The Harper government has given more money for R&D in CCS that the oil companies were even asking for.
- The same Minister Baird who stood in plenary yesterday announcing new measures to regulate dirty coal also announced, in his previous time in the post in 2007, ‘one of the most aggressive plans to fight climate change and air pollution’ – and has done nothing to implement it. At least you could say he is consistent.

The minister and his government clearly believe that this is a race to increase, not decrease emissions. What other explanation could there be for the position Canada has taken in these negotiations, the muzzling of its scientists, the marginalization of the ENGO community, and the disregard for all motions and laws that were adopted in the House of Commons since 2006 calling on the government to reduce emissions? The list goes on and on. It tires ECO even to think about it.

The question is, can the Harper government ever come to its senses and take action before the clock runs out on protecting the climate, nature and human society?

### Human Rights

It is appropriate that these negotiations are ending on International Human Rights Day.

Over the past year, the world has experienced too many devastating human impacts from climate change. Floods, landslides, fires and storms have undermined the rights to life, livelihood, water, food and health, among others. On behalf of vulnerable peoples around the world, ECO would like to remind Parties of their international human rights obligations.

* The Shared Vision must include an ambitious target that will prevent irreversible human harm. This will reaffirm the UN Human Rights Council’s findings that climate change has a range of direct and indirect implications for the full and effective enjoyment of human rights.

* Adaptation and mitigation measures must protect the rights of affected individuals, communities and peoples, and safeguard the most vulnerable. Measures taken in response to climate change must not undermine human rights.

* Finance must be new and additional, adequate and predictable, to enable all governments to protect the rights of their citizens.

Internationally recognized human rights, including rights of information, participation and redress, must be given their rightful place in all aspects of the text.

ECO was greatly disappointed to see specific references to human rights disappear from the negotiating text in the aftermath of Copenhagen. These resurfaced in Tianjin, only to disappear again. We note with relief, however, that the Shared Vision text currently contains a clear reference to the obligation of all Parties to fully respect human rights.

ECO ventures that the minister might have it backwards. Historical responsibility isn’t on the side, it is at the core of responsibility for developed countries such as Canada.

Let’s take a moment to look at what’s been happening there over the last few years:

- Emissions in Canada have risen more than 30% above 1990 levels.
- Canada is the country which promised something in Copenhagen, came back home for the holidays and after some serious soul-searching, decided to submit an even lower number than in Denmark.
- Canada has stopped providing incentives for the production of wind energy.
- The Harper government has given more money for R&D in CCS that the oil companies were even asking for.
- The same Minister Baird who stood in plenary yesterday announcing new measures to regulate dirty coal also announced, in his previous time in the post in 2007, ‘one of the most aggressive plans to fight climate change and air pollution’ – and has done nothing to implement it. At least you could say he is consistent.

The minister and his government clearly believe that this is a race to increase, not decrease emissions. What other explanation could there be for the position Canada has taken in these negotiations, the muzzling of its scientists, the marginalization of the ENGO community, and the disregard for all motions and laws that were adopted in the House of Commons since 2006 calling on the government to reduce emissions? The list goes on and on. It tires ECO even to think about it.

The question is, can the Harper government ever come to its senses and take action before the clock runs out on protecting the climate, nature and human society?

### Fossil of the Day

**#1 - Canada**

For dismissing its historical responsibility as merely a ‘sidecar’

**#2 - Papua New Guinea**

For opposing REDD safeguards

**#3 - US**

For stalling progress on adaptation, capacity building and technology
Japanese Prime Minister Naoto Kan is living in a fantasy—imagining he can refuse a new Kyoto Protocol commitment period without wrecking hopes for a global climate treaty. As UN talks in Mexico bog down, the world needs Kan to wake up: if he abandons Kyoto, the climate treaty will be washed away!

AVAAZ.ORG & TCKTCKTCK.ORG, in association with ALL LIFE ON EARTH, at this world-in-the-balance moment, urges NAOTO KAN and THE GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN to recommit to the KYOTO PROTOCOL to prevent us all from being WASHED AWAY
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