

# 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 November/December COP21 meeting. ECO email: [administration@climatenetwork.org](mailto:administration@climatenetwork.org) • ECO website: [www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters](http://www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters) • Editorial/Production: Linh Do*

## 1.5°C Means Serious Long Term Goals

This week is kicking off with a major focus on vulnerable countries and resilience. As Obama's opening speech said, 'no nation large or small, wealthy or poor is immune to the impacts of climate change'. That is why today's declaration by the Climate Vulnerable Forum (CVF)—a platform of 20 countries whose people, economies and ecosystems are at risk of irreparable damage as a result of rising temperatures—is of huge importance.

These 20 countries have not only pledged to fight for climate justice, but also to demonstrate how such justice can become a reality. Making 1.5°C real will require a clear and rapid transition away from fossil fuels. It means that countries must agree to decarbonise globally and transform to a 100% renewable energy system by 2050. It also means a Paris Ambition Mechanism that will ensure targets are reviewed before 2020 and then renewed and revised upwards

on a 5-year rolling cycle—to keep survival and a just transition within reach. It requires richer nations both to fulfil their promise of providing US\$100 billion of climate finance by 2020 and to take the lead in making this the floor for future support for mitigation, adaptation and loss and damage.

ECO wholeheartedly supports countries' demand to limit the global temperature rise to no more than 1.5°C. If our goal is not to secure the survival of whole countries, then what is it? This is a simple moral imperative that should unite us all.

If ECO had only one wish, it would be that the voices of the most vulnerable should resonate through the negotiating halls of Le Bourget and their demands be supported and championed by all Parties, especially the EU, US, and other countries that pride themselves on being partners in global solidarity.

## Dead Heat in First Fossil of the Day Awards of the Paris Climate Summit



As world leaders up the ante on the opening day of the Paris Climate Summit, the first place Fossil of the Day award is a double-act. New Zealand claims a top spot for rather hilariously, or not, urging countries to phase out fossil fuel subsidies while shelling out big bucks to prop up fossil fuel production, to the tune of US\$80 million.

Prime Minister John Key showed a degree of hypocrisy by claiming, at a Friends of Fossil Fuel Subsidy Reform event, that New Zealand is a leader on fossil fuel subsidy abolition—despite the country's fossil fuel production subsidies increasing seven-

fold since his election in 2008. His phony grandstanding came just a week after claiming that New Zealand 'doesn't need to be and shouldn't be a leader in climate change'. Are you getting mixed signals too?

Joining New Zealand on the winners podium (drum roll please) for a First Place Fossil Award is Belgium! With environmental leadership as murky as a tall glass of Weisse beer, its four regional governments from four different parties are still bickering over how to implement the EU climate and energy package since 2009. Today, Belgium is lagging behind on their carbon pollution reduction and renewable energy targets. Because of this bickering blocking a Belgian climate agreement, the country also lags behind in providing sufficient and durable climate finance. The severe state of gridlock in the Belgian environment office makes ECO wonder if some of the political bigwigs are having 5 boxes of Guylian Chocolates in one sitting whenever progress is to be made. That probably also led to the Environment Minister missing the train to Paris. Why? Because the government was negotiating the restarting of old nuclear power plants that were canned over a year ago.

And look, only a couple of hours after receiving the Fossil, Belgium reached an agreement. Not one on climate, noooo. One on more old nukes for the coming decade. Belgium is moving...backwards.

## Will Rich Countries Answer Africa's Adaptation Call?

One message that transpired from Monday's leaders' event was that developed countries claim to have a lot of solidarity with vulnerable countries. Good. ECO assumes they are now planning to turn warm words into action—and answer Africa's call to double the share of adaptation finance in overall climate finance, from today's 16% to 32% by 2020, a call first heard at the pre-COP a few weeks ago.

This would lead to US\$32 billion a year by 2020 for adaptation, within the \$100 billion promise, so (good news) no new money would have to be found. Rather, such a target would be a qualification of the \$100 billion promise, and likely find support among vulnerable countries from all continents and contribute to the building of an alliance of ambition here in Paris.

However, when ECO spoke to developed countries about this, some offered rather lame excuses (so much for solidarity). One negotiator said setting such a target was too prescriptive—as if developing countries haven't been asking for increased adaptation finance for ages. Another tried to dodge the challenge, claiming there are not enough adaptation projects in the pipeline, although admitted that if poor countries would be provided with readiness and capacity building support, that pipeline would get clogged in no time, and demand for finance would skyrocket.

To be clear, needs are much higher than \$32 billion a year. Adaptation costs in developing countries alone are set to rise to around \$500 billion a year by 2050, even in a below-2°C scenario. Against this, Africa's call seems rather modest, actually; getting 50% of the \$100 billion by 2020 channelled to adaptation would be more appropriate, ECO thinks.

In any event, adopting such a pre-2020 adaptation finance target would be a political move—of which the next two weeks will require quite a few. Answering Africa's call on adaptation finance might turn out to be one of the easier ones.

## Fast for the Climate

ECO is happy to see that 'Fast for the Climate' is back at the climate talks. ECO is sure that readers will remember Warsaw, when former Filipino climate ambassador Yeb Saño's impassioned speech sparked a movement of thousands to abstain from eating for periods of time to demand climate action.

Fast for the Climate has taken quite a journey around the world, even reaching the far away of Tuvalu, where they fasted during the Lima COP. ECO even heard about how a different person has fasted for the climate every day since the Lima COP, up to the start of Paris.

Today, Fast for the Climate has grown to 10,000 people worldwide. It includes people from all walks of life and many religious backgrounds. Tonight, when they break their fast, these 10,000 people will feast together in celebration of how their actions have brought awareness to their call for a 100% renewable world by 2050, in solidarity with vulnerable countries, robust support to poor countries, addressing loss and damage—and for us all to rethink our lifestyles and lead by example.

If people from all religions, continents and backgrounds can come together to fast, can't the world's leaders also stand together to make this COP the one moment in his-tory where the world started to get serious about dealing with climate change?

## Shipping & Aviation: Elephants in the Room

The sense of momentum that kicked off the COP Monday seems to have left out two major sources of emissions: international aviation and shipping. Emissions from these sectors fall outside national targets and are therefore separate from the INDCs submitted to-date. So, while most countries have come forward with pledges, these sectors are not included in those contributions.

If aviation and shipping were a country, they would be a top ten emitter, with their emissions expected to grow a whopping 270% by 2050. This would undermine efforts made by states and other sectors, whilst making the 1.5/2 degrees C objective almost impossible to achieve. This should not be an option. These sectors also pay zero tax on their fuel. This is a fossil fuel subsidy that is partly responsible for driving their emissions growth.

Two UN agencies are responsible for regulating emissions from these sectors—the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) for shipping and the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) for aviation. Since Kyoto tasked them with limiting or reducing emissions from these sectors, their emissions grew instead of decreased—80% between 1990 and 2010, compared to 40% for the rest of the global economy.

The Paris Agreement needs to provide ICAO and IMO with the momentum and ambition that they are so woefully lacking. It should require them to set emissions targets in line with their fair share of the 1.5/2 degree target. It should ensure these targets and efforts are subject to the same review processes that will be created to review national efforts. Ending their tax-free fuel status is also a no-brainer. It can provide climate finance while at the same time driving efficiency gains in these sectors.

Later today, ICAO and IMO will present their failed efforts to SBSTTA. It will be another recital of green washing, excuse making, and inaction. Let's make this the last COP where ICAO and IMO turn up without doing their homework. They are the climate "elephants in the room". Let's use the agreement to end their special (polluting) status.

Visit [www.elephantsintheroom.eu](http://www.elephantsintheroom.eu) for more information.

## Do You Recognise Me?

On the first day of any COP, ECO always finds itself wandering the halls, orienting where the best coffee is, or where the plenaries will be. It goes without saying that ECO is pleased to see old friends and familiar faces working towards a safer climate future. But, with so many people in Le Bourget, there were certainly a few moments today trying to place people. Is that the Guardian reporter, or the delegate from India?

This is also sometimes the case when looking at the many pieces that will make up the Paris package. For example, most people see the Lima Paris Action Agenda (LPAA) as a forum to bring together state and non-state actors to accelerate cooperative climate action.

Yet, from another perspective, the LPAA could also be seen as something else—the first test for a more permanent high-level action agenda that Paris should establish. A permanent high-level engagement platform would be a key element of a strong Workstream 2 decision. As proposed by AOSIS, this action agenda would be led by two high-level champions, who are prominent global individuals with the stature and connections to rally the world to close the emissions gap to 1.5°C. Given the important example the LPAA would set, it needs to get off on the right foot. This would start with excluding initiatives involving fossil fuel companies. And areas like energy efficiency, renewable energy, cities and forests (which all currently have a prominent space in the LPAA) should continue to be the focus of the permanent action agenda.

To ensure that we have an action agenda in 2016, which focuses on transformational outcomes that help close the gap, the Workstream 2 decision should set a clear criteria for future initiatives. Additionally, there should be provisions to track progress and hold stakeholders accountable for making progress after the cameras and lights go off.

So, as you watch the LPAA action days this coming week, remember that there is more than meets the eye.