



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, Germany during the May SBSTA 44 meeting.

ECO email: administration@climatenetwork.org • ECO website: www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters • Editorial/Production: Linh Do

From Promises to Delivery

The Paris Agreement sets a clear vision for the world to keep global temperature rise to 1.5°C, through a full decarbonisation of the global economy. It also provides a framework to improve action on mitigation, adaptation and finance through regular reviews and renewed commitments - for all countries simultaneously.

With the Paris Agreement clearly setting out the task that lays ahead, this year Parties need to create provisions under the Paris Agreement that will enable, incentivise and enforce action at a national level. This requires a delicate balancing of provisions that enable national action and those that create obligations. Civil society has an important stake in this process and must be listened to.

We cannot forget that current commitments are wholly inadequate to keep warming to 1.5°C. At current emission levels, we will use up our entire 1.5°C compatible carbon budget by 2020. Urgent action is needed now. The Technical Examination Process (TEP) should focus on identifying actionable solutions that can close the gigatonne gap and the barriers to these solutions. But identifying solutions is not enough - the newly appointed champions for pre-2020 action should produce a scenario note for the next 2 years showing how they intend to address barriers and enable actual implementation.

The next best opportunity to rectify the current shortfall from the inadequate (I)NCDs will be at the 2018 “facilitative dialogue to take stock of the collective efforts of Parties”. Parties must start preparing themselves from now for the (re-)submission of NDCs in 2018. This review must take relevant findings from the upcoming IPCC Special Report on 1.5°C and the INDC synthesis reports into account.

Additionally, countries need to dial up the ambition of their INDCs in line with climate objectives, with adequate support to developing countries and a clear view on the economic, social and environmental co-benefits that come with low carbon development.

The question mark over finance needs to be removed. Uncertainty in scale, delivery and scope of climate finance is and has been the biggest impediment towards progress. A roadmap to the US\$100 billion annually is urgently required. This roadmap must close the financing gap in preparing for and addressing rising climate impacts, be rooted in predictability and based on transparency between developed and developing countries. The result must be support for the most vulnerable in dealing with impacts through adequate and predictable climate finance, especially via the loss and damage mechanism.

The success of COP21 and Paris Agreement is not a given – history will judge it based on the scale of results achieved by countries in the following years and decades. These results depend to a great extent on the scale of financial flows between countries for enabling national action. ECO hopes that countries will be true to their word, and the Agreement will be fully implemented.

ECO online

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

<http://bit.ly/GetECO>



Paris's Unfinished Business: Climate Finance

While the Paris Agreement achieved some milestones; it did not in climate finance. Assistance to poor countries, especially for adaptation to defend the livelihoods of their peoples against a warming climate, remains unfinished business. The future is bleak. Based on announcements made by developed countries last year, ECO has seen estimates that adaptation-specific support (if counted on grant or grant equivalent basis) is likely to be just US\$6-9bn a year by 2020.

ECO's hopes now lie in paragraph 114 of 1/CP.21 that urges developed countries to prepare a 2020 roadmap to demonstrate how they intend to meet the \$100bn promise. Unless those countries intend to damage the good spirit we've seen in and since Paris, they ought to heed ECO's advice and get working, so that COP22 can welcome a finalised roadmap. If ECO had a go at it, the roadmap would offer scenarios for the variety of instruments and channels available, and indicate how much annual adaptation support will amounted to by 2020. It's a no-brainer that the roadmap would be prepared jointly with developing countries, starting at this week's LTF workshop.

Then again, the value of roadmaps depends on how the finance itself is counted. Work on that front is spread across the agendas of all the three bodies. APA will work on the PA's transparency framework, SBSTA is aiming to have an agreement on the modalities of the PA's accounting of finance by 2018, and SBI is looking at the finance tables for the biennial reports.

A lot can be said about the need for a rigorous MRV system on climate finance, but let's start with two fundamental points: count only those funds, or proportions thereof, that are specifically targeted at climate. And count only actual assistance, abandoning the bad practice of inflating numbers, by counting all sorts of instruments at face value. Luckily, developed countries expressed their firm intent to do so in the future (in footnote 44 of the OECD \$100bn report), and count on the basis of provisions from budgetary sources and/or grant equivalents. ECO can't wait to see the results.

Making the Right(s) Choices

Monday morning, and back in Bonn.

Paris sent a strong signal on the need for urgent action to tackle climate change to protect the most marginalised peoples and communities. It's time for parties to start the hard work of translating language on human rights, into actual protections on the ground.

Last year, countries explicitly recognised that all climate actions must respect human rights, the rights of indigenous peoples, gender equality, ecosystem integrity and intergenerational equity, while ensuring for food security and a just transition to a clean energy economy.

The first step is to find a space for a cross-cutting dialogue about how human rights are integrated. The French and Moroccan presidencies should join forces to seek a specific outcome in Marrakesh.

Second, governments must promote cooperation to integrate human rights into national climate actions. The review of guidelines for Annex-1 national communications and the ongoing capacity building work provide opportunities for Parties to exchange best practices. This also includes supporting developing countries with the implementation of rights-based policies and measures.

Finally, Parties should ensure that all policies and projects implemented under the UNFCCC respect human rights. For instance, the Sustainable Development Mechanism must have robust safeguards, monitoring and accountability processes.

Civil society is eager to work with countries to ensure the promise of Paris becomes a reality, starting now.

Aviation and Shipping: Friends or Foes of Paris Goals?

When the Paris Agreement failed to specifically mention international aviation and shipping, these industries assured ECO that they would deliver ambitious measures in 2016. With these emissions falling outside of NDCs, these commitments had better be included because if they either were counted as countries, they'd each rank as top ten emitters! Both are projected to double or even treble by 2050, and keeping warming to 1.5°C is impossible unless they are both on board.

Five months on and these commitments are very shaky. In February, ICAO adopted an efficiency standard which delays action until 2028! In ICAO's talks last week on a global offsetting scheme, talk of delays and exemptions threatens to fatally undermine the measure's ambition.

Despite support from industry and most of the governments present, recent IMO negotiations for a fair contributions to global efforts were also rocky. Attempts at progress were thwarted by BRICSA countries, a few other larger developing countries, and the Cook Islands. They argued for waiting until the IMO's currently non-existent system of MRV for ship emissions start to produce data, at some unknown point in the distant future. ECO isn't convinced, given the abundance of data available thanks to recent IMO and IPCC studies.

Ask your delegation – are they as ambitious in ICAO and IMO as they are in UNFCCC? With important meetings for both agencies in October, let's make sure sectors step up and come to Marrakesh as friends, not foes, of the Paris Agreement!