

ECO

THE LOOK AT ALL THESE BRACKETS ISSUE

eco@climatenetwork.org • www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletter • December 13, 2018

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 Katowice, Poland during the COP 24 meeting.

Editorial: Andres Fuentes Production: Verity Martin

12 Years Left: What Have You Done to Respond to the SR1.5?

After a year of telling stories and sharing experiences, the Talanoa Dialogue came to an end yesterday. While the talking may have stopped, the need to act more decisively remains.

The purpose of the Talanoa Dialogue was two-fold: to take stock of the collective efforts of Parties in relation to progress towards the long-term goal and to inform the preparation of their NDCs. It is clear from the IPCC SR1.5 that current mitigation pledges are insufficient to limit global warming to 1.5°C. In other words, we are a long way from our collective goal.

ECO appreciates all the hard work the Fijians have put into making the Talanoa Dialogue a success. We hope that the call to action issued by the Presidents today will motivate people around the world to act now. Nonetheless, it alone is insufficient. The second task - to inform the preparation of their NDCs - must be a key focus of all Parties in 2019. The extent of damage caused by each additional 0.1°C of warming should be enough to spur Parties into action. However, ECO knows you all so well and recognizes that Parties may need

a bit more prompting, so here we go: a COP24 decision which reiterates Parties' commitment to strengthen their NDCs by 2020 (remember paras 23/24 of 1/CP.21?) and initiate domestic processes to undertake such strengthening, is essential.

ECO is thrilled that Fiji and the Marshall Islands have already strengthened their NDCs and is looking to others to follow suit ASAP! As the UN Secretary-General said in his closing remarks, not only would it be immoral not to take the necessary actions here in Katowice, it would be suicidal.

Equity – Into the Future

Soon, as we all know, the horse trading will get serious. But though ECO can only stand on the sidelines and shout advice, here we go: A short term compromise that hobbles our long-term prospects would be a disaster, and must be avoided at all costs. This is true across the spectrum of critical issues – from finance to loss & damage – but it's true in particular when it comes to the Global Stocktake, which is critical to the legitimacy of the regime and – in particular – critical to the effective functioning of the ambition mechanism.

When the smoke clears, if we're to respect the clear Paris mandate for a meaningful stocktake that is conducted "in the light of Equity," the related modalities must ensure that equity—for example how parties consider their contributions to be fair and ambitious—is considered across all items. Ensuring Observers' inputs into the stocktake can help in getting this right, especially since they aren't subject to the same constraints as Parties, who aren't always able to

speak freely. Civil society can—as will be obvious to anyone who attends today's side event on the new report from the Civil Society Equity Review coalition (hint: 3PM, Wisla). Nor is this coalition alone in the stocktake business. Brilliant and experienced analysts from around the world are sweating bullets to ensure that Paris delivers on its promises, and the Parties can only benefit from their inputs. And what's to be lost by taking those inputs seriously? The Parties have the ultimate authority, and they should use it well and wisely. This means many things, but listening is surely among them.

There's more at stake than just inputs, of course. The stocktake is going to be critical, and equity is needed in all of its modalities. This goes for NDC guidance, and technical analysis, and transparency, and the processes by which debate and deliberation unfold within the stocktake's processes, however they evolve. None of this can be finally settled today, but it will all matter a great deal tomorrow. Keep the doors open!

ECO Welcomes New Ambition Coalition to Fight for COP Decision on Ambition

ECO welcomes the High Ambition Coalition declaration released yesterday in a packed EU Pavilion. ECO is looking forward to these countries making strong statements in the negotiations shaping the COP decision outcome on ambition.

Argentina, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ethiopia, EU Commission, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Grenada, Italy, Jamaica, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Lucia, Spain, Sweden, UK...

Welcomes the IPCC special report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5 °C;

Notes with grave concern the significant gap between the aggregate effect of Parties' Nationally Determined Contributions and aggregate emission pathways consistent with having a likely chance of holding the increase in global average temperature to 1.5 °C above pre-industrial levels;

Welcomes the Call to Action

by the COP23 and COP24 Presidents from the Talanoa Dialogue;

Recalls paragraphs 23 and 24 of decision 1/CP.21 for Parties whose Nationally Determined Contribution contains a time frame up to 2025 to communicate a new Nationally Determined Contribution by 2020 and for Parties whose, Nationally Determined Contribution contains a time frame up to 2030 to communicate or update these contributions by 2020;

Invites Parties to initiate or intensify domestic preparations to review and step up their Nationally Determined Contributions, informed by the outcomes of the Talanoa Dialogue, in a manner that facilitates the clarity, transparency and understanding of the contributions and reflects the Party's highest possible ambition, reflecting its common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities, in the light of different national circumstances;

Urge developed country Parties to step up their actions to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions

and to increase technology, finance and capacity building support to enable increased mitigation and adaptation ambition by developing country Parties, addressing any gaps in such support, and underlines the importance of achieving the goal of collectively mobilising US\$100 billion annually by 2020.

Welcomes the initiative of the UN SG to convene a Summit in 2019;

Calls on Parties to participate in the Summit;

Calls on Parties that wish to participate in the Summit to demonstrate their increased ambition in action to address climate change and the provision of related support.

Invites Parties to communicate their mid-century, long-term low greenhouse gas emission development strategies in accordance with Article 4, paragraph 19 of the agreement well in advance of the twenty-sixth session of the Conference of the Parties and to use the development of these strategies to inform their Nationally Determined Contributions.

• LOSS AND DAMAGE • SLOW ONSET • DISPLACEMENT • SLOW ONSET • LOSS AND DAMAGE • SLOW ONSET • DISPLACEMENT • LOSS AND DAMAGE •

Voices From the Front Lines

After her wedding, Sahia moved in with her husband and father-in-law to her new home in Singpur – a riverside village in Bangladesh, only a couple of hundred kilometers from the capital, Dhaka. She had been living there for a year when she witnessed her first home collapsing into the river. Riverbank erosion usually happens slowly, but occasionally a larger chunk of land suddenly falls into the water. When she noticed the deep cracks in the ground, she started carrying out her family's belongings to safety. A few hours later, the house vanished.

Sahia and her family moved in with her husband's uncle for a while. But it was not long before his house was swallowed by the river too. "We then moved into an abandoned house, but are still living too close to the river," Sahia tells me in a worried voice.

Sahia's husband was a fisherman and the family got by on what he managed to catch. One day, everything changed. "My husband used to catch fish, but when the fish got some disease, he had to stop fishing.... Nowadays, there is hardly any fish left in the river", tells Sahia.

Once their main income stopped sustaining them, the family was forced to change their livelihood. They decided to migrate seasonally to work in a brick factory in Aliganj, further up the river. Nowadays, they leave Singpur for six months every year during the rainy season to avoid being there when the village is flooded.

When the family returns to Singpur, they manage to live off of their savings from the brick factory. The work is hard and dangerous. The children miss out on school to work in the factory and it is only a matter of time before someone ends up getting hurt or sick from the hard work. Their savings would not sustain the family through a crisis.

By Sonja Ayeb-Karlsson, UNU-EHS Gibika Project

• LOSS AND DAMAGE • SLOW ONSET • DISPLACEMENT • SLOW ONSET • LOSS AND DAMAGE • SLOW ONSET • DISPLACEMENT • LOSS AND DAMAGE •

Tap 46 Million Times

Over the past eight days, ECO was quite pleased to hear that all negotiators seem to agree on the added value of the Adaptation Fund (AF). Quick reminder: the AF is a successful institution with well-functioning governance which provides full-cost grant financing to small-scale concrete adaptation activities. It is focused on the most vulnerable populations, very often through direct access for developing country institutions. This is exactly the kind of adaptation funding we need — and we need much, much more of it!.

ECO was surprised that some developed country Parties are pushing to have additional seats on the Fund's Board for contributors. Though strangely, these are the same Parties opposing a decision encouraging contributions. But contributors who are willing to engage in the Fund's Board can easily do so through the seats assigned to their region or constituency. Why change something that works?

For ECO, one thing seems very obvious: there is a need to take a clear decision here in Katowice to secure the Fund's future serving the Paris Agreement. And there is no need to change the AF's well-functioning model.

The AF does not need changes to its operating model – but it will need sustainable, adequate and predictable resources to operate.

ECO notices that for many negotiators, the favourite talking-point on resource mobilization for the AF seems to be the VISA crowdfunding installation at the COP24 main entrance. ECO wanted to find out more, so it passed by the

installation and tapped a card, which resulted in €3 going directly to the Adaptation Fund. ECO knows that the Fund has estimated that it would need an average of US\$158 million annually to implement its new Mid-Term Strategy. So, a quick calculation showed that all it would take would be 46,333,333 taps with a Visa card, or 3,861,111 per each COP day, to secure adequate funding.

Problem solved, ECO thought. But then it learned that Visa's contribution is capped at \$75,000. So, we still need a solution for the other 99.9% of the money. That's why ECO was encouraged to see contributors pledge over US\$129 million for the Fund at this COP, more than ever before. And yet, some contributors are much more ambitious than others, while some of the richest countries are still missing. It is pastime to step up!

The other source of funding many delegates have in mind is a link to Article 6 of the Paris Agreement. That could work, but it will take time to see how well it works and would subject the Fund to the ups and downs of the carbon market fluctuations. Ask anyone at the Adaptation Fund how well that has worked so far. The AF needs stable and predictable sources of funding to be able to play its unique role in the international finance architecture – more stable than a link to the carbon market and more predictable than purely voluntary contributions. At the very least, a COP24 decision on the Adaptation Fund must encourage Parties to contribute to it.

Word Search Challenge: Find Human Rights

ECO has been searching the text of (former) APA agenda items and other PAWP agenda items (we're looking at you, Article 6) for mentions of human rights and was dismayed to find these references few and far between. It seems that somewhere on the way to Katowice, Parties have forgotten entirely about their commitment to rights even though they have all signed on to at least one human rights agreement, not to mention the Paris Agreement. Is there an amnesia epidemic?

As ECO has pointed out, a respect for human rights, Indigenous Peoples' rights, gender equality, public participation, just transition, ecosystem integrity and protection of biodiversity, food security, and intergenerational equity should drive the implementation of the Paris Agreement. Efforts to address climate change shouldn't violate people's rights or destroy the environment. Respecting and protecting rights goes hand in hand

with climate actions and will enhance it, not impede it. Market mechanisms are no exception. They should respect rights, protect the environment, serve people and create (co-)benefits, not the opposite.

In its word search, ECO was pleased to see human rights references in Article 6, but this joy was brief upon realizing that every mention was in brackets. Parties seem to be questioning what human rights have to do with carbon markets. Some have even suggested that a reference to human rights is not appropriate because we have to seek to ensure the respect of each Party's respective obligations. Don't worry, ECO is here to remind you. Think Barro Blanco or Bujagali. The current market mechanism (the Clean Development Mechanism) certainly has caused human rights violations, so it is confusing to ECO that some Parties do not seem to think human rights are relevant in Article 6. Please contact ECO

if you didn't do your homework before coming to Katowice and want a refresher course complete with case studies of past projects and their harms. Calling something a "sustainable development mechanism" does not magically mean that communities won't be harmed. It must come with environmental and social safeguards. Including a stakeholder consultation and a grievance process is a good step, but ECO thinks that Parties can do better in including guidelines that say market mechanisms shouldn't involve projects that do not protect and respect human rights. And if Parties cannot agree that projects only count if they don't threaten human rights then maybe they shouldn't use the Article 6 mechanisms at all.

ECO appreciates the improvements related to participation, but hopes that the next time it searches the text for rights it doesn't come up empty.



They thought they could hide behind the soot and smog of Katowice, but not today! Let's welcome back Australia to the scoreboard – where have you been?

The Aussies are big on transparency and have a robust system of greenhouse gas accounting and reporting on emissions at home, which is why we know they have had four years of rising emissions after scrapping a successful emissions trading system. So how will they meet their target?

Through carbon credits, of course! While their neighbour New Zealand came out this week and announced they will not use Kyoto Assigned Amount Units (AAUs) to meet their Paris

target, Australia has remained silent in transparency and accounting in anticipation of using its hundreds of millions of credits to meet its target in a canter.

Let's be clear: Australia is not interested in reducing emissions. It saddled up to the Trump sideshow on coal to promote its fossil fuel exports as well as Carbon Capture and Storage technology. At home, its Energy Minister is fast tracking plans to use taxpayer dollars to build new coal-fired power stations!

So, welcome back, Australia – don't you think it is finally time to wake up and smell the smog?

The Arab World's Diamond in the Rough

So far, it is safe to say that the Arab Group has not covered itself with climate ambition glory in Katowice. With Saudi Arabia at its helm, the Arab Group has been fighting fiercely to strip the impending COP decision of ambition, notably by refusing to recognize the importance of the IPCC Special Report on 1.5°C.

However, against all odds, a little Arab country is standing up to its bigger and richer brothers by refusing to reject the science.

In a somewhat unnoticed intervention during the Talanoa Dialogue, the Lebanese delegation declared that it "strongly welcomes" the IPCC report and committed to both revise its NDCs and develop a long-term decarbonisation strategy by 2020.

The head of delegation concluded their story by stating that "ambition is contagious, so let's spread it!" ECO hopes that some of this ambition will pollinate other Arab countries. It won't have to travel far...

A Few Transparent Comments

We're nearing the end and we're not quite sure how much progress you've made in advancing the transparency negotiations. So we won't take so much of your time, we just want to provide a couple of comments on the important issues in the transparency discussions.

- ECO is quite concerned with the proliferation of "encouragement" in the transparency text instead of 'should' or 'shall' requirements. Having strong transparency rules is a way to increase ambition and that is something we all 'shall' do!
- Flexibility and providing support are key to facilitating improved reporting and transparency over time – and that's the goal, right? Flexibility should be provided to those Parties that do not have the requisite capacity, but, once Parties have the capacity, they should no longer use flexibility. Improvement plans are a great tool to help Parties plan to build their capacity over time.
- It is important to transition to the Paris Agreement's enhanced transparency framework as soon as possible. ECO suggests that the first biennial transparency reports should be submitted in 2022 in order to inform the first Global Stocktake and to show the rest of the world that you are moving forward and building momentum for the Paris system.
- ECO hears concerns about overburdening the Secretariat and the review process. Of course, we understand these concerns. However, simplified reviews represent a form of backsliding when we need to be enhancing the process all around. By signing the Paris Agreement, Parties committed to maintaining

at least the quality and frequency of reporting and reviewing of the Convention. ECO urges them to stick to this pledge.

- Loss and damage is an important element of discussions throughout the COP. We urge Parties to find a way to incorporate loss and damage into both sections of the transparency framework – action and support.
- Observers are valuable contributors to any transparency process. If any Parties are in doubt as to the contribution, please refer to our past issues in which ECO asked questions to Parties undergoing a multilateral assessment and the facilitative sharing of views, some of which Parties answered. It would be a real enhancement to be able to ask these questions directly to Parties!
- Being transparent about one's actions can contribute to raising ambition, however, sometimes it is not enough. Perhaps, ECO missed it in 35 pages of detailed text, but where is the link to the Article 15 committee to facilitate implementation and promote compliance? It is important that the technical review reports feed into the Article 15 committee.

And if you'll allow us to get wonky for one final point, ECO is disappointed to see text for sectors and gases allowing Parties to avoid reporting on emissions and removals in the land sector if it's not technically possible. That sounds to us like an excuse to avoid robust reporting!

We're here to support you in building and implementing an enhanced transparency framework. We hope you're up to the task.