Welcome to Bonn, Ministers! While it would have been nice to be in warm and sunny Fiji, the beautiful city of Bonn has welcomed us with its first snow of the season. If the weather is forcing you to take time away from statement writing for coffee breaks, we at CAN have taken it upon ourselves to provide you with a cheat sheet to make your lives easier. While there is much talk on transforming conceptual discussions to technical work here at COP23, many items seem to be at risk of becoming more political. Unfortunately, the progress made so far lacks the urgency required and we need your help to clear these roadblocks. With two full days left of technical negotiations, we hope that your negotiators work effectively as a team to manage this task. Here is a list of things that we will all be taking note of and assessing you on.

Talanoa Dialogue:
The Talanoa Dialogue is critical in determining our pathway towards achieving the 1.5 degrees limit set in the Paris Agreement. Talanoa must be a process that will unlock further ambition in the pre-2020 and post-2020 period. Both the Fijian and Polish presidencies will play a major role in making this a success. We hope that the Talanoa spirit of inclusiveness and transparency will expand cooperation with all stakeholders and be defining features of the Talanoa from Bonn through to Katowice.

Paris Agreement Implementation Guidelines:
Two years down, one to go. The Paris Agreement is an essential tool as we work toward our common goal of 1.5. With the non-negotiable 2018 deadline on the horizon, Parties need to accelerate discussions to ensure a robust set of guidelines for adoption in COP24. We need to come out of COP23 with streamlined draft texts that capture convergence around common ideas while ensuring that no issue is left behind. Progress in the implementation guidelines would send a strong signal to markets in the real economy and provide certainty that the world is moving in a positive direction.

Pre-2020:
With extreme weather events and other climate impacts already being felt by the most vulnerable, concrete signals of support and recognition of the urgent need to step up action now are crucial. While we must recognize the efforts that developed countries have already made, much more is needed to answer the needs of developing countries. We need an outcome at COP23 that will lay the groundwork for greater progress and concrete actions towards enabling conditions for implementing climate action in developing countries.

Climate Finance:
Climate finance plays a key role in enhancing trust and confidence between Parties and it is essential for continuous progress that climate finance remains high on the political agenda in the lead up to COP24. While we have seen some steps towards fulfilling the US$100 billion goal, the finish line is not yet in sight. Developed countries need to show commitment to delivering on this promise and take a bolder approach to financial contributions. In addition, to increase overall finance for climate change, countries need to finally and fully shift finance away from fossil fuels and exercise innovative solutions such as engaging and leveraging Multilateral Development Banks and private finance institutions. Climate finance plays a key role in enhancing trust and confidence between Parties and it is essential that climate finance remains high on the political agenda in the run up to COP 24 to ensure that progress is continuous.

Adaptation Fund:
The mandate from Paris is clear that the Adaptation Fund will serve the Paris Agreement. Working on technical and legal issues should not be a barrier, nor a leverage, to a decision affirming this. Excuses for delay on this issue, which has a clear mandate from the Paris Agreement, will gravely affect trust and confidence between Parties.

Loss and Damage:
Loss and damage is not a concept waiting in the distant future but a reality that millions of people already deal with in their everyday lives. Efforts must be stepped up to support the most vulnerable to build resilience while averting, minimizing and addressing losses. Five years from its establishment, the Warsaw International Mechanism (WIM) has minimal achievements to show for its efforts. The first Pacific COP must provide for greater progress and concrete actions towards loss and damage issues, including finance. Further support to the WIM Executive Committee is essential.
Argentina Must Maintain G20’s Climate Momentum

Like it or not, the G20 is an important political space where leaders of the top 20 economies of our world — who account for about 3/4 of global emissions — make political statements that attract a lot of attention, particularly from the business and finance communities. ECO would like to acknowledge the great job that Germany did this year in making the climate crisis, and the implementation of the Paris Agreement, a core issue of its G20 presidency. Of course, this upset one country in particular (you can imagine who). But after very tough negotiations in Hamburg, agreement was reached and there were several climate related outcomes.

As far as ECO knows the next G20 presidency: Argentina, is committed to ensuring that addressing the global climate crisis stays on the G20 agenda. At least that is what Chief of Cabinet and President Macri stated publicly several times during the Hamburg summit including in the middle of a concert next to Shakira and Prime Minister Trudeau. No doubt about it, Argentina is in a great position to push for an ambitious G20 agenda on climate and energy: it was one of the first countries to update its NDC and is experiencing the benefits of renewable energy deployment like never before.

Unfortunately, that was not the impression a number of negotiators and civil society organizations got during last week’s side event with the Argentinian G20 Sherpa Villagra Delgado. Being rather evasive, he left ECO with the sense that climate was just another issue amongst many, and that the climate agenda was not really confirmed. Ambassador Villagra Delgado did mention that Argentina plans to make infrastructure development and financing a key priority. But how can countries develop truly sustainable infrastructure if not by making sure it is climate resilient, fit for the low carbon transition, and in line with the SDGs? ECO worries it may find the G20 sliding back into the trenches of pitching development against sustainability, instead of supporting and embracing the many opportunities of a Paris-compatible future.

With only three weeks remaining before Argentina officially takes on the G20 Presidency, ECO is very discouraged by this seeming lack of a clear climate focus, particularly coming from a country whose economy has so much to gain from sustainable development.

We all know 2018 is a crucial year for climate and that all G20 countries should (and will, right?) support the incoming presidency to ensure next year’s G20 boosts climate action in the lead-up to COP24. In the meantime, Argentina: the floor is yours.

We Ain’t Wastin’ Time: Time to Get Real About the Adaption Fund

It seems as if developed nations spent the first week of COP 23 listening to the song “Sitting On The Dock Of The Bay” by Otis Redding. ECO is astonished! At this Pacific COP, developed countries have been wasting time looking for arguments to avoid recognizing the urgency to increase support for loss and damage. Are you going to sit at the dock of the bay while millions suffer the worst impacts of climate change?

ECO hopes that this week developed countries won’t just watch the tide roll in, but recognize that loss and damage is more than just an article in the Paris Agreement. Ideally, countries will come to a consensus on a transparent process that will allow future ongoing discussions on loss and damage finance.

Some of the richer nations seem to be resting their bones on the basis that they have plans to provide US$100 billion per year by 2020. This still remains a promise as the quality of all funds to be provided depends on how predictable, adequate, transparent and sustainable they are. Are rich countries forgetting the current imbalance on adaptation finance and the lack of adequate transparent rules to track their commitments? Building trust is dependent on how developed countries demonstrate their progress by being more rigorous in the way they ensure predictability and transparency of financial support.

Finally, let’s say it. We are ready. The Adaptation Fund shall serve the Paris Agreement. ECO says: let’s not make it complicated.

Ministers, the world needs to hear that we ain’t wastin’ time. At this Pacific COP; concrete guidance on loss and damage, clear decisions on pre-2020 financial action for support, and a decision on the Adaptation Fund will help catalyse trust to continue the momentum on the Paris Agreement.
Make Our Planet (Gr)Eat Again
Why Implementation of Agriculture Discussions is Critical to Climate Talks

The Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) agriculture negotiations have been focused on the way forward for a long time. Over the years, Parties have compiled their shopping lists and proposed recipes. Last week they came into the kitchen and properly started cooking.

ECO was looking forward to tasting G77’s offering, a nutritious (and not particularly exotic) dish called “implementation”. Our stomachs rumbled when G77 put together the ingredients for SBSTA negotiations to deliver meaningful action on the ground, by linking specifically with the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI).

ECO thinks that “Implementation” is delicious, nutritious and necessary - especially when food systems are at such risk of climate impacts, and industrialised agriculture is contributing to climate change. But EU, New Zealand and Australia raised all sorts of objections. It seems they just don’t like “Implementation”. Not even with ketchup. So, they won’t let anyone else eat either.

ECO hopes that when Parties return to the kitchen today, developed countries will remember that climate action is all about implementation. Perhaps Parties would like to try ECO’s suggested dish of “Joint SBSTA/SBI Work Programme”. At any rate, we encourage them to stay in the SBSTA-Agriculture kitchen. Bonn appétit, everyone!

This is Not a Drill: Geoengineering is on the Rise

As carbon emissions remain prominent across the globe, a group of entrepreneurs and researchers at Harvard University backed by venture capital are planning to expand their research on geoengineering through Solar Radiation Management (SRM). SRM techniques aim to block sunlight from entering the atmosphere, or reflect solar radiation back into space, thus – according to speculative models – creating a cooling effect on the planet. However, SRM potentially opens the door to negative impacts, such as disruption of the life-sustaining hydrological cycle like the Monsoon in Asia. In the past, planned real-world experiments have been cancelled after a public outcry, but this new initiative claims to be different.

The research, also known as a stratospheric controlled perturbation experiment (ScOPEx) is the first formally announced outdoor geoengineering experiment, and plans to spray water, sulphates, and chalk into the upper reaches of the atmosphere over the southwest United States in order to test their effectiveness in blocking sunlight. Though the experiment itself may not be harmful, it could build momentum for large scale SRM experiments and eventual deployment and to entrench the technology as a “viable” solution to climate change in the public’s mind.

ECO recalls that in addition to ethical concerns about manipulating the Earth’s thermostat, SRM does not reduce GHG emissions, air pollution, or marine acidification; and it could undermine sustainable development goals. Furthermore, if SRM deployment were to begin on a significant scale it would be hard to stop, since its postulated effects of cooling are not permanent and it could trigger resurgent global warming if greenhouse gas concentrations continue to rise or remain at historically high levels.

Though the scientists involved are not climate sceptics, they are, at best, naive and play into the hands of a fossil fuel industry that attempts to sabotage all strong decarbonisation efforts. It is no surprise that the Trump-party dominated US Congress held an Energy and Environment Committee meeting on geoengineering earlier this week, where members supported geoengineering research and were willing to provide consistent funding for it as a tool to address climate change impacts, instead of adopting politically-unpalatable (to them) mitigation measures.

Among other options, transparent, inclusive, and multilateral governance regimes under the UN could be established to consider whether experiments like these should proceed. If ScOPEx moves forward with its proposed tests in 2018, it could bring full-scale SRM deployment closer. Unpredictable ecological impacts of modifying weather patterns on a mass scale are a grave concern; even more so the risk that SRM is examined for military use, and the diversion of funding away from real solutions to the climate crisis.
Getting the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform right at COP23

The Fijian presidency has rightfully stressed that the operationalization of the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform is a critical outcome that must be delivered on at COP 23. For more than 20 years, the UNFCCC has failed to allow indigenous peoples to have their voice adequately heard. This is despite the value of indigenous peoples’ experiences and traditional knowledge for mitigating and adapting to climate change in harmony with ecosystems. Recognising the need to strengthen the participation of indigenous peoples in the process and the value of traditional and indigenous peoples’ knowledge, Parties agreed in Paris to establish a Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform. They agree that this platform will deliver three functions: knowledge, capacity for engagement, and climate change policies and actions. Most importantly, the Platform will be operationalized at COP 23.

Parties have now only 5 days left to agree to the structure of this platform. These discussions must be guided only by two bases: ensuring the effective delivery of the three functions, and respecting the five principles laid out by the indigenous peoples Caucus — including the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples both in the design of the platform and its structure.

In negotiations during the past week, one Party attempted to undermine the rights recognized in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples despite the fact that these rights have been endorsed by all UN member states for a decade. The parties must oppose attempts to instrumentalise the UNFCCC and to undermine the rights of indigenous peoples and should not tolerate any attempt to use these rights as negotiation bargaining chips.

ECO will be watching closely the negotiations over the coming days and stands with indigenous peoples in calling on Parties to operationalize the platform at this COP in a manner that responds to the rights and demands of local communities and indigenous peoples.

For all the policy geeks out there, while decision 2/CP19 provides the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage (WIM) with a mandate to ‘enhance’, ‘facilitate’, ‘mobilize’ and ‘secure’ finance for loss and damage, in the negotiating room, our fossil recipients, consistently refer it to the Standing Committee on Finance or even higher levels, where it is also absent from the discussion. Basically, they were seeking to twist, water down, and delete references to finance from the loss and damage decision text. We would have thought that the US Administration - with its own territory of Puerto Rico still recovering from the devastation of Hurricane Maria – would, perhaps, have rediscovered at least one empathic bone in its body. But apparently, this was waaaaaaay too much to ask for; as it aggressively led the charge to delete references to finance in the loss and damage text. Some might think this level of intervention was a bit rich coming from a country that has talked about pulling out of the Paris Agreement – would, perhaps, have rediscovered at least one empathic bone in its body. But apparently, this was waaaaaaay too much to ask for; as it aggressively led the charge to delete references to finance in the loss and damage text. Some might think this level of intervention was a bit rich coming from a country that has talked about pulling out of the Paris Agreement, but it looks like they plan on taking others down with them. Australia has long lacked many things – sympathy, support, and solidarity among them – with its Pacific Island neighbors (flashback to Day 2 anyone?), but these bullying tactics are over the line, even for them.

And Canada - we had hopes! At the beginning, you were so amazing in standing up for civil society and proposed newly-constructive ways to advance on this urgent matter. Why join with your Annex 1 friends in this shameful way on the issue of finance? We expect you to move closer to the good side, and then stay. It’s nice here, we promise, and you’ll be warmly welcomed!

EU - really? We can’t say we’re surprised. But disappointed, yes. You stepped up to assist Fiji in hosting the COP - now vulnerable countries need you to step up on the vital and super important issue of providing finance to the most vulnerable people on the front line of the worst climate impacts. At this Pacific COP, with many Caribbean Islands in ruins and other devastating climate impacts around the world, we need solidarity from rich countries. We need you to live up to the promises made in 2013 in the wake of Typhoon Haiyan, and the promises made in the Paris Agreement. Don’t let six years go by before you do anything to live up to your promises at Warsaw. Put in place a two-year work-plan on loss and damage finance. This week. In your heart of hearts, you know it’s the right thing to do…right?