

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 SB 46 meeting.

ECO email: administration@climatenetwork.org • ECO website: www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters • Editorial/Production: Andrés Fuentes

TIME FOR CLEAR COMMUNICATIONS ON ADAPTATION COMMUNICATIONS

When countries submitted their INDCs, which later became their NDCs, ECO was very pleased to see that nearly all developing countries included adaptation components. This was because it provides a more complete picture on the significant and yet unmet needs that many vulnerable countries face to advance adaptation. ECO encourages Parties to move constructively forward on the adaptation communication discussion here in Bonn. This could finally lift the political attention given to adaptation to the level of attention given to mitigation.

Overall, ECO would like to see the following elements being addressed in adaptation communications:

- National sustainable development circumstances;
- Impacts, risks and vulnerabilities, at different temperatures including 1.5 and 2°C;
- Current trajectories and worst case temperature scenarios;
- Legal, institutional and policy frameworks;
- Decision-making processes and application of adaptation principles (based on Art. 7.5);
- Costs of adaptation and support needs;
- Monitoring and evaluation of adaptation.

ECO feels that the purposes of different instruments, to be used for adaptation communications, can be clearer: NDCs are key to outlining forward-looking objectives and targets for action that are related to the overall NDC submission and the Global Stocktake; National communications focus on providing information on adaptation actions and policies already undertaken; National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) can, as a primarily

national planning tool, provide a roadmap towards achieving the objectives outlined in the NDCs. For the latter two, clear guidance already exists and Parties should not waste time discussing these.

ECO believes that the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA) is a centrepiece of the Paris Agreement. The discussion on the adaptation communications is a key place to underpin the GGA. Because, yes, adaptation is complex, location-specific, and unlike mitigation, does not have a simple result metric. However, complexity must not stop Parties from undertaking work on practical approaches, which can help “aggregating” (not in a simple 1+1 approach) the progress on adaptation achieved in various countries.

To identify the gaps we must understand both what adaptation actions are needed to protect societies, and understand what is actually happening. The Global Stocktake must then initiate additional action and support to close the gaps. Countries should explore how indicator frameworks, such as those agreed in the Sustainable Development Goals, can inform their work in this regard. However, it is important to note, that the SDG indicators need further climate-proofing in areas sensitive to climate impacts when applied nationally.

ECO online

Remember you can read ECO online or on your iPhone, iPad or Android!

<http://bit.ly/ReadECO>



FINDING OUR FEET ON LAND AND FOOD

After a satisfying feast at last night's reception – thank you! – ECO feels truly grateful for food security. But don't be fooled by the reception. In the real world, a free lunch takes hard negotiations.

The Paris Agreement has set us some key challenges when it comes to issues of land, food, and agriculture. As the climate clock continues to count down, and after the awkward lack of progress on agriculture in Marrakesh, we hope that Parties have come to Bonn keen to find common ground and build momentum.

We all know that it is challenging to find a way forward because agriculture is more than a sector in which to reduce emissions. It is the basis of food security, a source of livelihood for over three billion people, a contributor to nutrition and health, and a foundation of identity. A sector this complex must be approached carefully.

It's therefore time for SBSTA to set up a work programme on agriculture and food security, to discuss these issues in depth, and make important recommendations as the APA process writes the Paris rulebook.

Parties must consider a number of key challenges. How can we safeguard food security and human rights in the face of climate change? How can we help our food systems and our food producers adapt? And how can we ensure equity and sustainable development in relation to the role of land and agriculture in climate action?

ECO pondered the issue over last night's vegetarian treats and has some ideas.

It will be no surprise that we want to see meaningful support for adaptation. But Parties must consider how to use the Transparency Framework of the Paris Agreement, so reporting on safeguarding food security and human rights is included in NDCs. What guidance can APA give for reporting on emissions and removals from the land sector? And isn't it time to belatedly address those low-profile but high-impact non-CO2 emissions methane and nitrous oxide, resulting from agriculture?

With Paris Agreement implementation on the horizon, the SBSTA agriculture negotiations are more relevant than ever. The new rulebook must ensure rights and food security. So let's finally get down to farming in Bonn.

FAMILY MEMBERS PITTED AGAINST EACH OTHER

Is this the latest trashy TV soap? No, just the day-to-day inner workings of the Trump administration.

The US administration may make a decision on its continued participation in the Paris Agreement today (though we've heard that a few times before). Pulling the U.S. out of Paris would be wildly out of step with what the vast majority of Americans say they want (among them, numerous mayors, governors, senators, members of congress, business leaders civil society and faith leaders). It's easy to get lost in the craziness of the never-ending White House soap opera -- Ivanka and Jared versus Steve Bannon and Scott Pruitt, and on and on.

While the White House stumbles toward some sort of action on Paris, ECO know this much already: backing away from climate action would hurt the U.S. It will damage America's diplomatic ability to cut good deals on trade, security, and development (and this American president really likes cutting good deals, or so we're told). It will isolate the U.S. Government and U.S. companies when competing in the ever-expanding market for clean energy. And it makes will make it much harder for allies and partners to trust whenever the U.S. makes a commitment -- who's to say they won't back out again next time, the thinking will go.

The Paris Agreement can and will endure. No one party can wreck the Agreement. No one party can undermine the immense and overwhelming collective will that helped birth this agreement in 2015. Indeed, we all play right into Trump's hands when we react shocked and indignant every time he does something stupid and terrible for the global environment. Instead of giving him what he wants -- a bunch of headlines about how Trump defies the international community yet again -- let's show him how damaging this decision really is – both economically and politically. A race to the bottom in our efforts to address climate change benefits no one, as climate change affects everyone.

Parties need to do more, to translate the Paris Agreement's goals into reality. The Paris Agreement is bigger than any one country and bigger than any one individual.

eco En Español

Lea la versión de ECO en Español - <http://bit.ly/ReadECO>