

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 Bonn, Germany during the May SBSTA 44 meeting. ECO email: administration@climatenetwork.org • ECO website: www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters • Editorial/Production: Linh Do

Marrakech: Going Beyond Shoulder Patting to Action

The past year was tremendous for climate action. The Paris Agreement entered into force on Friday. HFCs are finally on their way out., The international shipping and aviation industries have started to reduce their emissions. With this success echoing through the COP halls, there couldn't be a better time for a pep rally for COP22.

But, we are up against our greatest rival, and cannot afford time-outs. 2016 is set to be the hottest year on record, with a disastrous El Niño and massive coral bleaching in tropical seas. Carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere passed the dangerous 400ppm threshold and continues to rise.

While the NDCs that were pledged in 2015 bend emissions into a downward trajectory, we're still not on a safe path. UNEP's Emissions Gap Report shows that our climate curve remains on a pathway towards 3.4°C warming by 2100. It confirms that global emissions in 2030 will still be 25% higher than they should be for a 2°C pathway.

In ECO's view, Marrakech should be the start of the process to strengthen countries' ambition, in line with 1.5°C and national long-term strategies.

The facilitative dialogues in 2016 and 2018, and the first global stocktake in 2023, are built-in mechanisms to assess progress and scale up ambition. They are the action points. COP22 should get the ball rolling on these by successfully concluding the 2016 facilitative dialogue and setting up a process to define modalities for the

2018 dialogue. This is a team strategy, and one that is set to win.

While we work on improving the NDCs, time is running out to keep warming to 1.5°C. Additional action pre-2020 is critical. We need all hands on deck to deliver additional efforts under the Global Action Agenda and through a revised TEP process.

Other key issues that require significant progress include long-term adaptation finance goals and improving rules for accounting for climate finance, in the context of the US\$100 billion roadmap. The need for real balance between mitigation and adaptation expenditures — as well as finding ways to finance loss and damage — are essential to move the finance agenda forward.

Indeed, the Warsaw International Mechanism for loss and damage will be evaluated for the first time here, and gives Parties an opportunity to take steps to strengthen it and give it financial muscle.

Finally, due to the unanticipated speed of entry into force, Parties still need time to finalise most of the decisions. To actually benefit from early entry into force, most of the rules to start implementation need to be finalised by 2018.

COP 22 must capitalise on the achievements of 2015 by delivering an ambitious agenda on NDC ambition, the pre-2020 process, and the WIM, to deliver a 1.5°C future.

Unfacilitated Dialogue

There's an elephant in the room at COP22. While the Paris Agreement sets ambitions, goals and a common cause for the planet, there is major concern with respect to the level of ambition in the NDCs. Ramping up ambition of the current NDCs is something everyone knows we have to address. So, let's talk about it, shall we?

Last year, we agreed to a facilitative dialogue to ratchet up ambition in 2018. We have to get this right, otherwise we will not just have elephants but an entire savannah of weighty issues unaddressed. If NDCs are not increased around 2018, we will be stuck with inadequate targets until 2030, seriously jeopardising our ability to achieve Paris's essential temperature goals. If the main outcome of the dialogue is just another recognition of the huge gap between current commitments and what must be done to cut emissions to stay below 1.5°C, we will have failed. We have to face the elephant and deal with the issue directly.

However, there isn't a clear agenda item at COP22 to discuss this 2018

moment. The Paris decisions rightly recognise the importance of scaling up climate change efforts, but fail to provide direction on how country efforts should be increased over time. Critical questions that remain unanswered include: What will the format for discussion be? Who will participate? Who will be represented? And, what factors will influence the tone of the talks? For example, we know the IPCC 1.5°C special report will have a major impact, but what else?

ECO believes the issue deserves a proper place for discussion. Parties should be creative about creating a slot for this topic. As a first step, the COP22 President should host transparent and inclusive consultations with Parties and observer organisations. Most importantly, we need clarity on the expected outputs of the dialogue. What actions will result from this process to close the ambition gap? Without concrete outcomes, this process will represent a huge missed opportunity. In two weeks' time, we expect to at least have a decision that calls for Parties and observers' views on how FD2018 should be conducted.

WIM: The Next Generation

Loss and damage (L&D) has earned its place in the climate change playbook, alongside adaptation and mitigation. With its own stand-alone article (8.31), as well as a commitment that there will be international support for loss and damage, COP22 can boldly go where no COP has gone before.

And bold steps are sorely needed. Despite having “action and support” in its mandate since 2013, the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage (WIM) has not yet even come close to delivering bold actions to protect vulnerable people. The WIM framework for a 5-year plan is a good starting point, but needs political rocket-fuel to deliver real benefits in the near term. ECO applauds the WIM ExCom for listing finance as their top priority. However, we wonder how finance for L&D will be scaled up if the

WIM’s current framework only contains a “placeholder” for finance. Loss and damage will need significant finance separate from adaptation finance. The first logical step would be for the WIM and the SCF to work out how much finance is required, and to put an appropriate strategy in place to raise the necessary funds. This plan has to also consider innovative sources. Levies from aviation and fossil fuel sales could provide a significant, predictable source of finance that need not come from taxpayer contributions.

In order for the WIM ExCom to deliver on their mandate, they will require additional resources. ECO suggests that the WIM should receive increased resources to roll out institutions. A world without loss and damage: make it so!

Shipping Emissions: Sailing in Circles

The UN’s shipping body, the International Maritime Organization, had a mixed meeting last month. Where does this now leave the sector’s pledge to act? The IMO met to discuss air quality, as well as GHG emissions, but how does this level up from agreements made in Paris? We saw long awaited action on air quality, but it is disappointing that Parties couldn’t show equal ambition when it came to shipping’s climate impact.

The key issue at stake was whether the sector—with a CO2 impact greater than Germany — will pull together an emissions target in time for the 2018 facilitative dialogue. One proposal was to set a provisional target, and then update it when more data became available. But we are currently going down with this ship.

Following huge opposition from a group of member states and the industry, the IMO eventually settled for an “IMO Strategy” document to be developed and submitted to COP24. Under the agreed roadmap, the strategy includes neither a provisional target nor clear emission pathways and measures for

international shipping. Rather it looks to short-medium-long term efficiency opportunities for international shipping. This is a euphemism for no action at least for the next 7 years, and a certainty of no wind in its sails.

While agreeing on a roadmap that looked into efficiency opportunities in one area, IMO failed in the other to make progress on reducing emissions by tightening the energy efficiency standards (EEDI) for ships. Current ships already meet the incredibly weak EEDI requirements for 2020. Thus, the only climate measure currently at the disposal of the shipping industry is having no impact on reducing emissions.

With IMO failing again, action at the European level may be required instead — something ECO hears European lawmakers are already working on. Outmoded policies, like ageing ships, need an overhaul from time to time.

Unpaved Roadmap

After much anticipation, a few weeks ago the long-awaited “Roadmap to US\$100 billion” was finally released by 21 developed countries. The plain white cover of the report led ECO to hope the report’s authors were saving money on design to meet their commitments made back in Copenhagen and Cancun!

ECO’s hopes were only half met by what was inside the drab exterior. Last year’s OECD/CPI report claimed that these countries had delivered \$62 billion in climate finance in 2014. The “Roadmap” that has been tabled this year is a bit more carefully worded, but still fails to give sufficient direction and impetus to spur further discussion on climate finance.

ECO has some suggestions for what a climate finance roadmap should look like to secure an outcome that would give all Parties clarity and confidence.

At COP22 Parties need to work together to clarify:

- An adequate scale-up of adaptation finance
- Which portion of counted climate finance will be grants or grant equivalent
- How the most vulnerable countries are being prioritised
- Climate finance that will be provided by 2020 (for those countries that have not submitted any INDCs)
- The role developed nations foresee for private capital
- Work on how to provide loss and damage finance, over and above \$100bn

Country parties should use the current negotiations about modalities of climate finance accounting under the SBSTA to agree on a common, clear methodology that would ensure transparency and accountability.

Capacity Building, Another Brick in the Wall

Hey Teacher! Capacity building is the missing brick in the wall. For the Paris Agreement to be truly universal, effective capacity building is critical to enable developing countries to facilitate fulfilment of their new requirements and transition towards decarbonised and climate-resilient economies.

That's why Article 11 matters. It stems from the recognition that the "business as usual" approach to capacity-building does not work. We can no longer measure effectiveness by relying on international consultants to fly into a developing country, conduct a workshop and fly out again. Article 11 acknowledges that capacity-building is a process. To be sustainable, it requires a longer-term and integrated approach, one that mobilises and strengthens national institutions in

developing countries, such as universities, think-tanks and private companies.

The Paris Agreement set up the Paris Committee on Capacity Building (PCCB) to be up and running by the end of COP22. That should foster a much needed paradigm shift from short-term to long-term mobilisation and building-up of national capacity. If allowed the PCCB will develop a more detailed roadmap to support country efforts to fill their policy, institutional and technological roles. In turn, it will promote best practices and lesson-sharing, encourage ownership, enhance cooperation (north-south, south-north, south-south and triangular), as well as instituting better monitoring. So all in all, maybe not just another brick in the wall.

It's easy as 1, 2,3:

There's a simple truth for what's needed in technology transfer at COP22. Here are some suggestions on how to make it so:

1. The massive scale of technology deployment that is needed to meet the 1.5°C goal with pre and post 2020 action requires that the Climate Technology Centre and Network, the operational arm of the Technology Mechanism, is ready for a sharply rising influx of country requests. The CTCN needs to use its resources wisely, for example, by improving the transparency of its funding, and by prioritising the Network provider of services, by the member with the most closely-related experience and reasonable, but not necessarily lowest cost. Quality and local knowledge do matter. Add the periodic assessment of the TM and a solid draft for the Technology Framework for a winning combination.
2. We need to create a "Stakeholder Cooperative Technology Assessment Space" to take a hard look at both the co-benefits and risks of projects, particularly "unknown" or "unknowable" negative impacts when a technology is untested or can only be properly tested in the open atmosphere or ocean.

Cooperative Technology Assessment engages all stakeholders and endeavours to answer a range of questions:

1. How do we know which technologies' emission reductions and/or increased resilience/co-benefits are worth the risk that they might pose?
2. How do we protect communities, particularly the most vulnerable, against unforeseen cross-boundary impacts?
3. How can we best apply the precautionary principle to climate technology research and development in order to channel the safest and most effective innovations?
3. We need to stress the "soft side" of technologies — the capacity building, training, and stakeholder engagement — that empowers communities to fully utilise and champion their deployment for a long useful life.

There – was that so hard?