

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 Paris, France, November-December 2015.

ECO email: administration@climatenetwork.org • ECO website: <http://eco.climatenetwork.org> • Editorial/Production: Kyle Gracey

Non, Je Ne Regrette Rien

Non, Rien de rien

(No, nothing of nothing)

Non, Je ne regrette rien

(No, I regret nothing)

Dear Ministers: Welcome to Paris. As you have no doubt already seen, negotiating texts have been prepared for you. A bit chaotic perhaps, but good enough, and all the options are on the table.

You also have probably realized that two very different deals could be assembled out of these options. The first deal might be called the no-regrets deal. That's the deal that allows all of us to leave Paris with a fighting chance to keep warming to 1.5°C.

The other deal that could be pieced together out of these options is often referred to here in the hallways of Le Bourget as the 'minimalist deal'. But it might be more accurately called the 3-degrees deal.

ECO wants to make sure you leave COP21 with zero regrets, content and with the knowledge that you have done your utmost to deliver an ambitious and equitable outcome that addresses the needs of the most vulnerable.

There are many tell-tales for recognizing the 3-degrees deal. The most telling point might be the proposal that we don't return to the table to assess our progress and ramp up ambition until 2024. Under this deal, we accept the INDCs as the most we can get at this point, and we look to ramp up our efforts in 2030. Under that timeline, we'd be folding our cards and giving up on limiting warming to 1.5 (or even 2) degrees.

The mitigation ambition of the agreement, and the long-term direction of travel, needs to be anchored through a 1.5 degree target. 1.5°C as a direction of travel is pointless if we don't have the vehicles to make the journey. The Paris agreement has to include provisions that enable a consistent increase in ambition towards achieving the long term goals embedded within the agreement.

To avoid travelling too far down the wrong path, we need to accelerate our effort to move off the 3-degree pathway. Provisions within the agreement should synchronise, assess and ratchet up Parties' various commitments in 5-year cycles, including by matching conditional INDCs with means of implementation. All these provisions should build from the accelerated implementation within the pre-2020 period by revising and improving existing INDCs by 2018 at the latest. Taking stock of where we are every 5 years would provide the necessary flexibility in the regime to change course if needed. The stocktake should not just be oriented towards implementation. It should also inform future commitments. The scope of the stocktake needs to incorporate all elements of the agreement to get a truly holistic picture.

If we want to get onto the pathway that holds temperatures well below 2 degrees, we have to provide long term certainty on finance. This agreement can help provide that by setting collective targets for the provision of financial support that should be set and updated in 5-year cycles, with separate targets for mitigation and adaptation. The provisions must provide clarity on how developing country contributions are defined

and progress to give the confidence to enhance ambition.

And speaking of adaptation, we must ensure we don't leave anyone behind. Adaptation goals must be part of a Paris agreement to keep people and planet safe in the view of rising impacts. Adequate support is required to deal with them. This agreement must also increase adaptation finance with an improved balance between mitigation and adaptation finance, aiming to reach a 50:50 balance by 2020 under the US\$100 billion pledge.

Loss and damage must be anchored as a stand alone issue in the agreement. A robust institution is vital to develop approaches to address permanent and irreversible impacts and also coordinate the increasing climate-induced displacement.

Finally, none of this works without provisions that enable greater transparency—of action as well as support. Support and capacity building on MRV is a necessity in this regard; methodologies must be scientifically credible and fair.

The two deals are clear. We can have the no-regrets deal or we can have the 3-degrees deal. The question now becomes: Who will bring us to the no-regrets deal?

Ministers, for all of us to be able to look our children in the eyes, we must be able to demonstrate that we are taking care of their future, not just getting through today.

Car ma vie, car mes joies

(Because my life, my joys)

Aujourd'hui, ça commence avec toi

(Today, it begins with you)

OIL LOVERS WIN FOSSIL. MALAYSIA HONOURED.

Venezuela and Saudia Arabia received a fossil Saturday night for opposing decarbonisation in a crucial contact group.

Malaysia and LMDCs earned an Honourable Mention for championing civil society participation.

Read more at <http://climatenetwork.org/fossil-of-the-day>



Transparency: Just a Castle on a Cloud?

The French government made a commitment to civil society: this would be a transparent and participatory COP. Instead, from day one we have been banned from meetings where decisions are actually made.

Civil society's role is to shed light on this process, to ensure that our governments protect their people's best interests—not the interests of corporate lobbies resisting the transition.

Negotiating behind closed doors undermines the ability of civil society to ensure the accountability of governments and the UNFCCC process, thus pushing for a fairer and more ambitious agreement. It also adversely affects developing countries, which rely on civil society for technical support they cannot otherwise afford.

Behold, there is at least one defender. ECO is grateful to Malaysia for speaking on behalf of the Like Minded Group of Developing Countries, for its consistent call for greater transparency in this process. The EU, US, Australia and other industrialised countries are a different story. Not only have they failed to challenge the closed-door policy, they have hidden behind it.

We demand access to the negotiations.

SOS: Save Our 2050 Strategies

To keep global temperature increase to 1.5°C, and avoid the worst impacts of climate change, decarbonisation is an urgent need. We need national plans firmly set in place that focus on near-term action, coupled with long-term decarbonisation. Furthermore, climate resilience will help to avoid locking in high carbon infrastructure and address climate vulnerabilities.

In Cancun, Parties agreed that they would create low-carbon development strategies. ECO and others are again promoting this implementation tool. These plans must be a durable element of the Paris outcome, in the core Agreement, and not end up in the decisions. Of course, developing countries

must be provided with support to create and implement their strategies.

In these nationally appropriate strategies, countries should lay out a trajectory for decarbonisation by 2050, with indicative targets for 2030 and 2040. Details of the policies and measures to achieve low carbon and climate resilient development for the next 5 years should be aligned with the cycles in the UNFCCC.

Focusing on national implementation will also ensure that the plans are appropriate for each country's special circumstances. By doing this, we can ensure that there is confidence that all countries are participating.

Below 1.5—to Stay Alive

Last week's Joint Contact Group (JCG) on the 2013-2015 review failed to come to a single conclusion on its three year work, which had included the 'Structured Expert Dialogue' (SED). SED's findings were: 1) We are not on track to a 'below 2°C path'. 2) 2°C warming would be dangerous. 3) Keeping warming to below 1.5°C would avoid many disastrous impacts.

ECO points to the need to include the 1.5 degree goal in the new agreement based on common but differentiated responsibilities and strong financial support and technical assistance to developing countries. We are also seeing intriguing shifts. The EU said in

SBI last Friday that limiting warming to 2 degrees is not enough for vulnerable countries. Germany, France, Italy and Australia have announced in the last days that they want a 1.5° goal to be included in the agreement.

Article 3.3 of the Convention requires precautionary measures, and 'where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason' not to act. So let's act! Over to the COP President to take the results of these excellent three years of intensive work and make the conclusions public and official to COP.

The Gap In the Text

ECO is disappointed that Parties seem to have all agreed on the 'no text' options for the following numbers:

The emissions gap: [The emissions gap in 2020 is estimated to be 8-12 Gigatonnes] [The emissions gap in 2030 based on the current INDCs is estimated to be 12-18 Gigatonnes]

The adaptation gap: [The Adaptation finance needs alone will be USD 150 billion per annum by 2025 (even if we were on track for 2°C) yet the starting point for climate finance in 2020 is only USD 100 billion per annum]

The finance gap: [Recent analysis by the International Energy Agency finds that we need up to \$2 trillion annually worldwide by 2035 for the energy transition. This will require at least \$166 billion in public finance per year]

These numbers are real, even if they do not appear in any text. Without a strong process to address these gaps, the Paris outcome will be little more than an agreement to leave the leaders

of 2030 with an insurmountable challenge. Instead, the Paris outcome could ensure that the gaps are filled:

1) Parties should agree to a five-year cycle where intended targets (for finance and mitigation) and contributions (for adaptation) are submitted well in advance of each commitment period. These intended targets should then be collectively reviewed against equity and climate science with ample time to improve their efforts.

2) More important, we cannot wait for the next round of INDCs to be developed to increase ambition. Parties must agree that they will revisit their INDCs, from the perspective of science and equity through a facilitative dialogue in 2017 or 2018 so that they can work together to increase these pledges before implementation begins. For such a review to succeed, finance commitments and adaptation contributions need to be part of the consideration.

LPAA: No Gate Crashers

Saturday was the Action Day—a big party to celebrate initiatives by non-state actors, subnational entities and national governments. While ECO would like to dance the night away with some guests that promote real solutions benefiting people and climate, like renewable energy and energy efficiency, ECO would hate to have gate crashers. That includes false solutions and greenwashing big polluters, such as Total and other members of the Oil and Gas Methane Partnership.

Companies and initiatives that are not serious about the transition to a world without fossil fuel emissions simply should not be part of the LPAA, and business as usual in any of the 12 sectors of the LPAA is not acceptable.

Initiatives should have to provide real and significant benefits, in terms of emissions reductions or enhanced resilience. They should set themselves specific and measurable commitments and be willing to follow up on them with regular reporting. ECO wants to stress that initiatives also need to respect principles such as human rights, environmental integrity, and food sovereignty. Such criteria should be enshrined not only in the LPAA, but also in the Workstream 2 decision to inform high-level events in the future. And without a bouncer (ombudsperson), it won't be much of a party.