

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, Germany during the May SBSTA 44 meeting. ECO email: administration@climatenetwork.org • ECO website: www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters • Editorial/Production: Linh Do

How Do You Count to 100?

Transparent systems for accounting and tracking climate finance flows are fundamental to the success of the Paris Agreement. ECO notes how some naughty players are including some types projects where the relevancy to climate is, at best, questionable. Some are also relying heavily on reporting non-concessional finance that adds on new debt for developing countries, making their support look bigger. This does not fit with the spirit of Articles 4.3 and 4.4 of the Agreement.

ECO would like to remind Parties of paragraph 57 of Decision 1/CP.21, which calls for the elaboration of “modalities for the accounting of financial resources”. Fulfilment of this mandate can help overcome tensions about what counts and what doesn’t, alongside what kind of financial support has been delivered. ECO sees five fundamental elements of an accounting system:

1) We need to get agreement on what counts. Projects that promote the continued use of coal or non-conventional fossil fuels, such as shale gas, will only undermine credibility and must be excluded. Certain types of financial flows, such as export credits and market-rate loans, cannot be counted as assistance because they do not follow the meaning of Articles 4.3 and 4.4. To better understand the net value of support provided, all financial instruments should be accounted for in grant equivalent terms. The terms “new and additional” should have an internationally agreed definition, too.

2) Information needs to be provided at the project level, and should report on not only the promised money, but also the actual disbursement amount. Otherwise, how can we check the claims of “delivering on promises”?

3) Agreement is needed on what information needs to be supplied for each project (from the description to funding

volume or “geo-referencing”, so that we can map projects by location). The information should be up-to-date, complete, and of the highest quality.

4) Information on project plans and outcomes needs to be collected from a variety of perspectives: contributor nations, recipient governments, implementing agencies, as well as community and watchdog groups.

5) Transparent evaluation systems need to be developed so that we can all learn from experience.

The Agreement invited “other parties” to provide information about financial contributions. To facilitate this, Annex I countries must be able to show they are following good practices, including a sound set of accounting modalities that can provide a helpful template for others. ECO notes that some of those “other Parties”, such as Colombia, are already accounting and tracking their financial contributions.

With no time to spare, Parties should agree here to the work programme and its timetable. This should include a call for submissions from Parties in early 2017, followed by a zero order draft at SB46 in mid-2017, before it gets debated and revised at subsequent SB and COP sessions, until CMA1 finally adopts it.

ECO online

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

<http://bit.ly/GetECO>



What Do We Want? Climate Action! When Do We Want It? NOW!

In Paris, 195 countries agreed to limit global temperature rise to well below 2°C, aiming for 1.5°C. Yet, current INDCs are setting us on a pathway to around 3°C. To make matters worse, the remaining carbon budget even to stay well below 2°C might be used up by the time NDCs really begin to take effect. What we want is greater ambition now.

Parties have agreed that this issue will be high on the agenda at COP22 in Marrakech, with a high-level event on pre-2020 action and the facilitative dialogue on the implementation of pre-2020 commitments. This is all well and good, but we need to go beyond expert meetings, dialogues and events highlighting options if we are to close the mitigation and adaptation gaps. What we want is action now.

Delegates in Bonn must take the following steps:

1) Ensure that the Technical Expert Meetings focus on identifying

barriers to more rapid deployment of climate-friendly technologies, as well as the actions needed to overcome those barriers.

2) Mandate the co-champions to spell out, in a scenario note, recommendations for decisions that Parties can take at COP22 to build support for the implementation of these actions.

3) Initiate a process under both the SBI and SBSTA to develop criteria for these actions, to ensure that they deliver real mitigation or adaptation change, respect human rights and food sovereignty, have environmental integrity and fully assess the potential risks associated with new technologies.

4) ECO wants to remind Parties that more action in developing countries will require adequate support, including fully delivering the US\$100 billion promise. Developed countries need to come to Marrakech ready to put forward a clear and transparent roadmap on just how they plan to deliver by 2020.

Which Way Forward for the Technology Framework?

Paris delivered the Technology Framework to advance more rapid demonstration and implementation of climate-friendly technologies. This included building on existing efforts such as Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs) and the Technology Action Plans (TAPs), and improving the effectiveness of the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN). The first meeting of the TEC this year got down to business on that front, with a South-South/circular cooperation thematic dialogue.

We know that, under this framework, developed countries are not specifically on the hook to provide support, but demonstrations and implementation cannot happen without funding. As such, the SBSTA should put forward a sustainable funding model for the TEC and CTCN (e.g. through country pledges), as well as ways to support developing countries in their pursuit of financial support from the GCF and/or other UNFCCC financial mechanisms.

SBSTA should also delineate criteria on how to assess technologies that are ready for transfer, and mandate the TEC to carry out such an assessment, which, amongst other things, should report on the development stage of a technology, its commercialisation prospects, its current penetration in relevant developing countries' markets, and the risk assessment undertaken by producers and providers.

SBSTA should facilitate technology transactions by identifying ways to link domestic technology transfer offices based in universities or national research institutions to international platforms, such as WIPO Green. The Knowledge Platform at the CTCN could facilitate such linkages.

By taking these steps, Parties can help push climate technology to the scale required to support the Paris mitigation and adaptation goals. Parties, how far we can go on the technology transfer journey is up to you.

Driving Implementation Through Climate Education and Public Participation

In Paris, Parties committed to enhancing climate change education, training, public participation, awareness and access to information (collectively known as "Action for Climate Empowerment" or ACE). This commitment builds on Article 6 of the Convention and forms a fundamental pillar of the Agreement. Here in Bonn, the SBI is making preparations for the Doha Work Programme on Article 6 to undergoes a mid-term review at COP22 in Marrakech.

The result of this review should be national policies that enhance expert and local knowledge and, increase public awareness of both the challenges posed by climate change and the solutions. This is critical in cementing public support for decisive climate action.

ECO has some suggestions on how to use the review to further promote Article 6 implementation:

1) The Doha Work Program must include more concrete activities and guidance to ensure the effective implementation of Article 6. For example, multi-stakeholder workshops should be organised at the regional/sub-regional level and involve policy-

makers from relevant ministries, private sector, civil society, including women and youth representatives.

2) The role of national Focal Points for Article 6 should be strengthened, by increasing their interactions with national stakeholders and through the establishment of a robust network for international communication and collaboration. These focal points play an important role in promoting the implementation of climate education, training, public awareness, participation and access to information. By the way, Parties who have not yet done so should nominate their focal point as soon as possible!

To ensure that climate policies and programs benefit from public support and input, Action for Climate Empowerment should be integrated into national reports and in the next round of INDCs. Additionally, the scope of the in-session dialogues over the next four years should be narrowed to focus on the integration of Article 6 in selected policy areas such as adaptation and energy transitions, to ensure that this important pillar of the Convention plays its intended role as a solid foundation for concrete actions. Now is the time to ACE it.