

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 during the December COP21 meeting. ECO email: administration@climatenetwork.org • ECO website: www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters • Editorial/Production: Linh Do

Cycling Together

ECO has no doubt that parties came to Paris with the best of intentions, and are keen to make sure we stay below 2°C. The party spoiler is that we've been warned that we are on a more-than-3°C track. And ECO knows that even 2°C is too much. How can we increase the stakes to avoid settling for a 3°C world? ECO believes that many Parties, especially developing countries, can and are willing to go further than their current INDCs. But many will need extra support to do that.

The facilitative dialogue described in Paragraph 20 of the COP Decision Text is a great place to start influencing current INDCs before 2020.

After developed countries increase their pre-2020 ambition, wouldn't it be so much more interesting and effective if all countries come up with improved INDCs? Developed countries would lead the way with mitigation, and support developing countries by identifying additional conditional contributions they could make with such support. This would be the embryonic beginning of a 5-yearly process that links the gears of finance cycles closely to those of

mitigation reviews. The finance cycles would set targets for support in 5-year intervals, while the mitigation review cycles would start with the revision of INDCs and need to happen as soon as possible before 2020. Mere 'preparation' of subsequent INDCs is not enough—the current initial commitments must be revised and resubmitted to put us onto a 2°C path and keep 1.5°C in reach.

If ECO had a magic wand, it would make the same cycle apply to the identification of adaptation finance needs and set 5-yearly targets to meet them. This 'axle of ambition' would connect cycles of mitigation and adaptation, accelerated by finance and linked to the adequacy of mitigation ambition. This process should continue through the Article 10 post-2020 global stocktake, starting in 2023 and repeating and scaling-up every 5 years until a robust long-term goal is met. This sturdy connection allows these wheels to move fast—we're talking Tesla on the Autobahn.

Insure Loss and Damage in the Paris Agreement

Delegates, as you must be aware by now (although some of you do show some need for additional lessons), loss and damage has a range of elements, including slow onset and extreme events, and financial and non-economic elements. And loss and damage will impact the poorest worst.

ECO welcomes insurance initiatives, such as the G7 initiative and boosters from the US, and acknowledges that regional insurance initiatives CCRIF and ARC have provided benefits to countries in those regions. However, we feel it imperative to remind Parties that insurance is not a cure for all loss and damage.

ECO dares you to try to take out insurance for desertification. Or for rising sea levels. No insurance in the world will cover you for such slow onset—and permanent—impacts. And for the extremely poor, private insurance is not an option. Who on earth would expect poor and vulnerable people to pay for dealing with all the climate impacts they didn't cause?

ECO can already make some suggestions for elements to complement insurance: support to assess and plan for livelihood transitions, and address relocation needs to enable communities to rebuild, and not only physical infrastructure. In the face of relocation and loss of cultural and historical heritage, we should support post-disaster situations and reform humanitarian affairs to fit a world increasingly impacted by climate change.

The current text proposal on a process to explore irreversible and permanent damage seems like an opportune place to evaluate these elements and more that would complement insurance in the coming years. ECO hopes the proposal will stay alive long enough to fulfil this function.

The Right(s) Call

ECO has enjoyed hearing Parties' visions for the new agreement. Especially those that highlighted the need for an agreement that supports human rights, including the rights of indigenous peoples. ECO loved hearing from Parties who said that a Paris agreement will only be successful if it's rooted in gender equality and intergenerational equity, delivering food security, ecosystem integrity and a just transition with decent jobs.

The Philippines, Chile, Costa Rica, Mexico, and others (including Canada—welcome back!) recalled that human rights are at the core of the UNFCCC. These champions are working constructively to engage other countries and help sketch a positive shared vision for the future.

But ECO is disappointed that other countries do not want to be champions for human rights, and have expressed the opinion that human rights must remain non-operative. These non-champions refuse to recognise that an agreement neglecting human rights will struggle to garner the public support needed for its implementation.

ECO doesn't want to believe that the EU is not strongly committed to the principles of human rights. But so far they have shied away from expressing unequivocal support for operative references. With many champions already standing for this issue, how long will it take for the EU to get its act together and choose to join the progressive countries? As a key player in this discussion, surely the EU will not want to go down as a fence sitter when the fate of such crucial principles is being decided.

While we're speaking of non-champions, ECO wants to drop a note to Australia, New Zealand, Switzerland and the US. We're wondering if you will you follow Canada's Northern Light or go down a much darker path, stripping the agreement of what we all know is inalienable?

ICAO and IMO: Hiding from Their Responsibilities in a Bunker

You've heard about the Fossil: even with HUGE emissions, ICAO and IMO's contribution to COP21 are all recycled promises, delivered to the SBSTA.

The agreement must send ICAO and IMO a clear signal—they have to do their fair share to help us stay below the 1.5 or 2°C limit. They must increase their ambition, and deliver targets and measures that reduce emissions.

ICAO has launched a process to agree on a global market-based mechanism by next year. ECO will be watching to see if they get the job done, and include a mechanism to increase their ambition over time. It's time for you to deliver. You're the elephants in the room of these climate negotiations, and it's time for your special status to end.

ECO online

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

<http://bit.ly/GetECO>



Dirty Shipping and Aviation Set for Collision with Fossil Awards

Not a Party, but two international organisations received the First Place Fossil today: the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) and the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO).

Put your tray tables up and close the port holes—IMO and ICAO have the same emissions as Japan and Germany combined! These emissions are currently exempt from inclusion in the Paris agreement and IMO and ICAO are doing their worst here to keep it that way. Yet without action, emissions from bunkers will grow 270% by 2050—sinking any chance of limiting temperature rise to safer levels.

International shipping and aircraft enjoy tax free fuel to the tune of over 60 billion bucks, yet don't want to contribute to climate finance. No wonder the Foreign Minister of the Marshall Islands called the IMO Secretary General 'a danger to the planet'.

Coming in hot with today's Second Place Fossil of the Day award is Turkey. While other developing nations like Mexico, the Philippines and the 43 members of the Climate Vulnerable Forum are bringing lots of positive leadership to the table, Turkey is making a goose of itself.

It's pretty clear Turkey's role at these discussions is aimed at extracting as much climate finance as possible. However, its INDC suggests that Turkey's contribution is a 100% increase in greenhouse gas emissions (on 2013 levels)! You could call that money for nothing.

An EU of (WS)2 Minds

Did you know ECO can be in several rooms at the same time? Usually, ECO finds this quite helpful. Sometimes, though, it just leaves us thoroughly confused.

Take the case of the EU yesterday. In the contact group discussions, the EU stressed that Parties' targets are not strong enough and ambition needs to be increased to respect the 2°C guardrail, suggesting textual changes accordingly. ECO could not agree more on this point. In a different room at exactly the same time, the CMP was meeting, and ECO heard other Parties stressing that targets are not strong enough and ambition needs to be increased to respect the 2°C guardrail. So Parties suggested a contact group to consider pre-2020 targets and guess what: the EU forcefully rejected this proposal, even though they supported increasing ambition just down the hall.

Can you please just make up your mind?

Now, the EU might be concerned that a CMP contact group would only look at commitments under the KP, meaning those of a limited number of developed countries and not all Parties. If that were the case, ECO would be even more confused. Why has ECO not heard any support from the EU for a process on accelerated implementation in the Workstream 2 negotiations, which would be exactly the forum to discuss this?

We all know emissions need to peak before 2020 to stay below 2°C, so ECO hopes it will hear the EU and other Parties who opposed the CMP group (looking at you, Norway and Australia) support this process in the Workstream 2 decision today.