

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, June 2013.

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

ECO is printed on 100% recycled paper

ECO's "Compromise" Decision for Warsaw*

*By compromise, ECO mean somewhere in between what is scientifically needed and what YOU tell us is currently feasible.

The Conference of the Parties,

Recalling Article 4, paragraphs 1, 3, 4 and 5 and 7 of the Convention,

Reaffirming the unwavering commitment of parties to keep global average temperature increase well below 2 degrees C above pre-industrial levels and the continuum approach between mitigation, adaptation, loss & damage and finance that is required to ensure equity before 2020.

Reaffirming the urgency to address the current imbalance in mitigation and adaptation finance – in light of recent studies showing the adaptation and loss and damage costs in developing countries will very likely be well in excess of US\$100 billion per year by 2020.

Reaffirming the need to raise mitigation ambition levels between now and 2020, and achieving emission reductions on the order of 8-13 Gigatonnes of emissions in the pre-2020 period, beyond existing commitments and actions registered under the UNFCCC.

Supporting the authoritative assessments demonstrating that staying well below 2°C will require several hundred billion of incremental finance per year and the shifting of trillions of dollars of existing private sector investments into low carbon technologies and solutions.

Emphasising that the commitment by devel-

oping countries to provide \$100 billion for developing countries will be delivered in the form of new and additional public finance, through budgetary allocations from developed countries, supplemented by revenues from alternative sources of public finance

Emphasising the shortcomings of the main revenue stream for the Adaptation Fund in relation to the expected low price of CERs under the Clean Development Mechanism and the need for new and additional commitments by developed countries.

Decides:

1. That developed country Parties shall provide jointly new and additional public finance amounting to an average of US\$20 billion annually for the period 2013-2015, for mitigation and adaptation actions, including for REDD, technology and capacity building.

2. That for the periods of 2016-2018 and 2018-2020, developed country parties shall scale up financing in a linear manner from the current levels to reach \$100 billion annually in public finance by 2020.

3. That developed countries shall allocate at least 50% of overall public finance to meeting developing country adaptation needs.

4. To establish a formal process to capitalise the GCF with an initial collective pledge of (...)** by COP19.

5. To call on the relevant bodies to design

and implement global measures to raise new streams of public climate finance, particularly through:

i) Redirection of at least 100% of Annex 2 fossil fuel subsidies

ii) Carbon pricing mechanisms applied to the international aviation and maritime transport - in accordance with the principal of CB-DRRC and existing commitments under the UNFCCC.

Welcomes

1. The pledges to the Adaptation Fund of (...)** collectively made by Annex 2 Parties for 2013/2014, as contained in Annex C of this decision, and those made by other Parties.

2. The initial pledges to the Green Climate Fund of (...)** collectively made by Annex 2 Parties as contained in Annex D of this decision.

3. The recent declaration by 11 EU Finance Ministers to earmark at least 100% of the revenue raised through their Financial Transaction Tax to the Green Climate Fund.

Disclaimer

** "there is not enough space on this page to specify the number of billions ECO is expecting"

For official CAN positions, please refer to www.climatenetwork.org

Waiting on Whispers

ECO heard that GRULAC met yesterday and has had constructive discussions on an important issue for 2014. While ECO congratulates the region on a constructive environment for discussions, there is a lot of whispering in the corridors about it.

ECO hopes to hear officially and loudly what those whispers are ASAP so we can all get ready for it.

ECO's suggestion to resolve the Russian SBI issue – all Parties sign the following petition: Dear Russia, we promise not to gavel through an agreement without you being OK with it, because you are obviously more important than others, such as Bolivia, where in Cancun you gladly accepted an outcome without Bolivia being part of the consensus.



ADP Workstream 2 Roundtable – Talking, Yes, but Walking the Walk?

Listening to the ongoing discussions in the ADP Workstream 2 on short term mitigation ambition, ECO suspects that some might not have read—or have forgotten—the size of the pre-2020 mitigation ambition gap. For all the rhetoric in the room, one might be convinced that nations have forgotten that they have the power to decide whether the world will remain below the 2°C threshold scientists maintain as critical. Technologically and economically feasible trajectories to remaining below the 2°C level have been outlined. Without acting now, they are wilfully choosing to neglect the known mitigation ambition gap science has shown, as well as the opportunities that exist to bridge it.

In this context, ECO would like to remind delegates of what India, China and others have helpfully underlined during Workstream 2 (WS2) discussions thus far: the time has come for developed countries to do their “fair share” in reducing emissions by at least 40% by 2020 (and reflecting on their consumption patterns).

The 2014 Kyoto Protocol ambition review is one opportunity for nations to reflect on the comparable upward revisiting of pledges; for instance, the EU has achieved its 20% target years ahead of schedule but with no expressed intention, yet, to step up its own ambition until 2020; or Australia, for whom, recent research shows, upping their pledge from 5% to 25% comes at essentially zero net costs.

A cornerstone in WS2, clearly, are those In-

ternational Cooperative Initiatives, of which we need many, given the size of the gap - but (as suggested by a few Parties) those must lead to new ambition rather than window-dressing existing (low) ambition. Right-on! Addressing international bunkers emissions from marine and aviation transport would be two prime ICI candidates, if ECO was to suggest a few, alongside phasing-out HFCs under the Montreal Protocol, which would also allow for making use of its existing funding mechanism. Another additional initiative would be to start, in earnest, what South Africa has called for during the early days of this session: immediate phase-out of fossil fuel subsidies in developed countries. Doing so, notes ECO, would free up billions of Dollars, Euros, Pounds or Yen for climate finance, including support for developing countries to gradually shift their fossil fuel subsidies both to renewable energy and energy efficiency.

ECO continues to be pleased by the engagement of AOSIS and their pragmatic approach of a step-by-step technical process to identify best practices suitable for scaling-up, overcoming the barriers to, and creating incentives for, new action in the areas of renewable energy and energy efficiency. Moreover, ECO commends their calls to elevate the results of the technical analysis to the ministerial level for agreeing to concrete action in 2014.

Yes, surely there are other mitigation areas to cover, too. And ECO could not agree more with the Philippines (and others) that similar

approaches are needed in order to enhance pre-2020 adaptation – but ECO suggests this happens in parallel and need not stop us in advancing on other joint action. What ECO likes about the AOSIS proposal is that it could develop concrete plans to mobilise the entire UNFCCC architecture (e.g. for an action programme on renewable energy) with no new burdens for countries, yet the opportunity to participate in initiatives to expand renewable energy use. In that vein, ECO was pleased with Switzerland’s affirmation (from earlier this session, supporting India’s) that WS2 is not about shifting burdens from developed to developing countries. After all, such joint action to identify barriers and possible incentives could also help to better understand the financial and technological needs of developing countries, creating another pull for developed countries to deliver on their 100 billion per year by 2020 financing promise from Copenhagen and Cancun.

Funding, alas, remains key, as South Africa stressed yesterday once more, calling for scaled-up financing trajectories by developed countries in time for the Warsaw finance ministerial roundtable, and early and regular replenishment of the empty Green Climate Fund (GCF). The GCF could become a central pillar in the upward spiral of increased climate finance helping to trigger increased ambition. Meanwhile, the lack of clarity on scaling up short and mid-term climate finance is likely hampering ambition. Perhaps another theme for the upcoming Warsaw climate finance ministerial roundtable?



CAN Side Event

Tuesday, June 11

18:30-22:00

WIND (MoE)

Equity Reference Framework:

Enabler to a successful 2015 climate treaty

Less than 1000 days to the 2015 deadline. CAN is calling for a form-

al process to develop an Equity Reference Framework that embodies the Convention’s core equity principles, and is designed to maximize ambition and participation. Such an Equity Reference Framework would give us, finally, a workable framework with which a successful 2015 treaty can be agreed.

Speakers: Christian Aid (Mohamed Adow), Germanwatch (Rixa Schwarz), CAN-Europe (Meera Ghani), CAN-International (Julie-Anne Richards, Moderator)

Party Respondents invited: South Africa, Brazil, Norway, EU

Science Says: Civil Society in the Negotiating Room Adds Value

It is encouraging to note that Parties were satisfied with the progress they achieved during the previous ADP session. ECO also notes that observers were allowed in the rooms and invited to provide input in several sessions and roundtables. Contrary to popular belief that observers prevent Parties from having an open dialogue, this clearly shows an absence of a correlation between the presence of observers and ability of Parties to talk to each other in a constructive manner. Far be it for us to suggest that there could also be an extremely long list of “closed” contact groups and sessions in which Parties

have failed to produce any meaningful results.

This finding is actually confirmed by a recently published scientific study suggesting that “governments interested in increasing public support for ambitious climate policies could benefit from more CSO involvement” (Bernauer, T. & Gampfer, R. (2013)). Now that we have successfully debunked this theory that our presence could possibly distract some honourable delegates, ECO would suggest that Party delegates welcome our presence and our expertise in all sessions – including roundtables, expert meetings, and

informal consultations – with open arms (or at least not closed doors). When such a presence is not foreseen, the only thing standing between such a regrettable situation and an open and transparent process could be the courage of one delegate to bring this point to the attention of the facilitator of this gathering.

We would like to emphasise that NGOs are colourblind – we have never checked the colour of badges at the entrance of the NGO party. Delegates might want to think about this before deciding to institute such a check at the entrance of any negotiation room.