

ECO

16
JUNEThe Zero
Issue

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, June 2011.

ECO email: administration@climatenetwork.org – ECO website: <http://climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters> – Editorial/Production: Joshua Darrach

Getting to Know the MRV

ECO was excited that Parties started to discuss the more technical aspects of MRV. Has someone finally noticed our cries for progress? Of course, ECO is dismayed that except for some older agenda items in the SBI, none of these meetings have been open. The discussions around biennial reporting, IAR, and ICA (you know, the alphabet soup...) have been about as transparent as a brick wall. We might agree that MRV is a geeky exercise, but that doesn't make it any less important. That said, ECO requests that certain developed-country Parties do not use MRV to impede progress on core issues.

On MRV itself, ECO has a lot of ideas – we've spent time getting up to speed on technical issues and attending side events while we were locked out of the negotiations. While Durban may be too soon to figure out the entire MRV system, there are some baby steps that can be taken. In no particular order, they are:

1. *Guidelines for Biennial Reporting* – We've heard that there's some confusion on this point. For now, ECO will say that whether it is a developed-country biennial report or a developing country biennial *update* report (based on national circumstances), guidelines still need to be agreed. Separate guidelines, mind you – but in both cases an enhancement over the current ones, which are well overdue for revision. Developed countries, this does mean you actually have to step up and provide adequate support, not only for domestic systems, but also for the actual reports! And while we're on the subject of support, let's not forget the need for delivering *and* reporting on support obligations (CRF anyone?)

2. *Accounting* – First, the KP rules! KP Parties must commit to a second commitment period and follow the MRV rules contained there. Developments in the LCA should complement, and in no way replace, these rules. Indeed, it would be great if the KP rules we know and love are strengthened in the KP track. Oh, and for the one remaining non-KP developed-country Party (we haven't forgotten about you), you really need to agree to common rules.

3. *IAR/ICA* – Here, we ask that if you can't take a baby step, then at the very least crawl. An outline of the scope and functions needs consideration in tandem with the reporting discussions. Again, this should complement and not replace the verification and compliance processes for KP Parties.

4. *Take a leaf out of the REDD+ negotiators' books* – the REDD+ discussions in the LCA and SBSTA have been open for the most part. Also, some of it actually dealt with accounting and reporting on REDD+ activities and the information-sharing system for safeguards! While you discuss the value of openness with your REDD+ colleagues, you may also want to touch on how the REDD+ monitoring system and the information-sharing system for safeguards fit into the overall MRV framework. (Hint: Consider putting on your biennial reporting caps.)

ECO welcomes some serious technical thinking on these points. Maybe some technical workshops or expert meetings are in order? This would certainly be money well spent. We ask that you keep this in mind as you finalize plans for the next few months.

Shared Vision Needed Before Durban

ECO loves workshops, and luckily, there more are to come! For instance, the facilitators of the shared vision informal have keenly noticed an interest by Parties to hold one more workshop on what a long-term global goal for emission reductions might mean for developing countries – and ECO would add – global peaking year.

Here ECO offers two smart observations: (i) if the workshop is held only in Durban (rather than, as ECO would suggest, at the tentative Fall/Spring session) Parties will not be able to adopt a COP decision on the much-needed long-term goal just a few days later (as if at these talks anything was ever dealt with at the urgency and speed it deserved); and (ii) the experience of Copenhagen shows that it doesn't take a workshop to know that negotiating a long-term goal without understanding who contributes what and what's the fair share of their responsibility, will be very difficult. ECO believes that this understanding, at least in some principled form, needs to be in the Shared Vision outcome of Durban.

The long-term goal itself, as well as the peaking year, requires a look in the science books rather than negotiations or workshops. The potential to act on the outcome of the review, which could recommend a strengthening of the temperature target to 1.5°C (for the sake of millions, future generations, and many islands and their inhabitants) must be kept in sight. This calls for an emissions pathway that keeps 1.5°C within reach while allowing a high probability for keeping warming well below 2°C.

When the Rubber Hits the Road, Will Civil Society be Left Behind?

Last week, ECO wondered if Parties would "walk the walk" on supporting civil society participation. The full-day workshop

included many nice words and sentiments, but ECO has heard a lot of those and is rather interested in whether those words would be followed up with action.

Now the rubber is hitting the road in the SBI Contact Group discussions. Unfortunately, to ECO's dismay, the answer remains unclear.

In yesterday's SBI Contact Group, Saudi

Arabia came out strongly against enhancing civil society participation. While appalling, this is perhaps not unexpected, given how much Saudi Arabia has to hide when it comes to their own climate policies. But Saudi Arabia was not alone in rejecting improvements on transparency and participation.

- Continued on the Middle of Page 2

AFB: Making the Case for Public Engagement

Civil society engagement is vital to ensuring vulnerable communities benefit from climate finance. Next week, the Kyoto Protocol Adaptation Fund Board (AFB), at its 14th meeting, will consider the approval of further projects and applications for direct access. Of crucial importance to ECO is the revision of the Operational Policies and Guidelines, which presents the opportunity to improve guidance on how relevant and affected stakeholders should be consulted in the design as well as the implementation of projects at the country level. This is crucial, because so far the quality of consultation varies significantly from project to project.

ECO recognises that the Adaptation Fund itself has already taken significant steps towards ensuring strong stakeholder engagement and transparency. Civil society presented its views at AFB's well-attended side event yesterday, and next Sunday AFB members will meet civil society representatives. The general procedures of the AFB also adhere to good practice: all

meeting documents are available well in advance of meetings on the website; and meetings are usually open to all accredited observers and webcasted (though ECO sees room for further improvement by limiting closed sessions and allowing access to Committee meetings).

ECO urges other funds and processes, including the Transitional Committee, to ensure strong civil society engagement. This also holds for developing countries drafting project proposals to the AF and other funds. The question "how can our most vulnerable communities benefit from the AF?" must be at the heart of their considerations and investment in meaningful engagement of civil society must be prioritised.

ECO is disappointed that most developed countries have not yet pledged resources into the AF. Without money the AF will run dry. In 2011 no new funding pledges have been made. ECO urges all developed countries to come forward with such pledges (and fund disbursements) as soon as possible.

Series Part 5: Come on Australia!

Lurching from the worst drought in a millennium to floods that have caused \$30bn damage to the economy, with crop-damaging tropical cyclones in between, Australia is the developed country that has the most to lose from climate change. Australians understand this – 45,000 of them rallied for putting a price on carbon on June 5.

Prime Minister Gillard's minority left leaning government has learnt the lessons of its diabolical 2010-election campaign – an unpopular backflip on climate change and backslide on implementing an emissions trading scheme contributed to the loss of a record number of seats in Parliament. The Labor Government now holds power with the support of the Greens and Independents who, ECO notes, support climate action.

The Australian population has sent a clear message to stay true to decisive climate action. If ECO were to give any climate advice – backing down on climate change would be political suicide for PM Gillard's Government.

Australia has set conditions on moving from 5% to 15% to 25% targets, and conditions on ratifying a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. As a leaked government paper indicated – the conditions to move to 15% have already been met. In fact, recent reports from Oxfam, the Garnaut Review and others show how developing countries' efforts are putting Australia in the shade. In ECO's view, there is nothing stopping Australia moving to 15% now. As a first step, ECO would encourage Australia to go even further! Recalling that developed countries need to reduce their emissions by more than 40% by 2020 from 1990 levels.

One of Australia's stated conditions to agreeing a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol is that major emitters are also included in a legally binding agreement. ECO finds that the fastest and most efficient way to ensure this happens is if Kyoto Parties agree in Durban to engage in a second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol and agree to move forward with negotiations on a legally binding agreement in the LCA track.

Australia – your hand will be forced at Durban! Don't be left behind with the climate laggards – it will cost you more and your voters won't allow it!

Developed country UNFCCC climate finance commitments in 2013

0

\$ billion

- Continued from Page 1

They were supported by India as well as Antigua and Barbuda on at least some of the issues. These three countries opposed language to encourage more informal consultations to be open to observers – and ECO noted that they were the only ones to oppose.

ECO is forced to wonder, what are Saudi Arabia, India, Antigua and Barbuda hiding? Well, we know what Saudi Arabia is up to, but why would India, Antigua and Barbuda want to shut civil society out?

The SBI Chair's draft text provided a solid foundation for enhanced civil society participation and transparency and ECO was pleased to hear Australia, the European Union, Colombia, Mexico, and Bolivia all emphasize the need for transparency and the productive role of civil society organizations, and brought some common sense to the matter.

Civil society wants to support countries in their collective efforts to save "Mother Earth" from climate change, if only parties would create the space for their support.



Youth Presenting their CVs to an EU delegate as part of yesterday's Push Europe Action.