

ECO

THE RECOMMENDATIONS ISSUE

eco@climateactionnetwork.org • www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletter • November 4, 2021

ECO has been published by Non-Governmental Environmental Groups at most international conferences since the Stockholm Environment Conference in 1972. ECO is produced cooperatively by the Climate Action Network at the UNFCCC meetings in Glasgow, Scotland during the November COP 26 meetings.

Editorial/Production: Andrés Fuentes

Loss and Damage Finance: Code Red to G7 and G20 Countries

ECO still gets goosebumps listening over and over to Barbados' Prime Minister Mia Amor Mottley's powerful intervention on Monday: "Failure to provide the critical finance, and that of loss and damage is measured, my friends, in lives and livelihoods in our communities. This is immoral and it is unjust".

She was not the only one to call on G7 and G20 countries to acknowledge and fulfill their responsibilities: heads of states and governments from Honduras, Kenya, and Antigua and Barbuda, among others, echoed her call to action.

ECO hopes this is the very last time that these countries feel the need to deliver such desperate statements. Now is the time for Parties to show that they have heard the message and are ready to act.

To do so, three things need to happen at COP26:

Firstly, ECO urges the establishment of a permanent agenda item on loss and damage for UNFCCC Subsidiary Bodies. Indeed, despite being the third pillar of climate action recognised in the Paris Agreement (alongside adaptation and mitigation), loss and damage (L&D) is discussed under the UNFCCC negotiations only once a year, at the technical level, through the review of the WIM Executive Committee report to the COP. This is not enough. Having an agenda item on L&D would not only ensure that the topic is considered at each session but that it also gets the attention it deserves and is addressed under other tracks such as finance, capacity building and technology transfer.

Secondly, for the Santiago Network on Loss and Damage (SNLD) to deliver on its mandate (right, COP President Alok?), ECO calls on Parties to make significant progress on its operationalisation. Indeed if appropriately designed, the SNLD, established at COP25, has huge potential to catalyse concrete action and support to

the countries and communities most at risk of loss and damage. However, for now, the SNLD is...a website.

ECO wants a decision at COP26 that turns the SNLD into the technical component of the WIM. This means it needs a dedicated secretariat, and that a process is set up to fully operationalise it at COP27, with sufficient funding. Ongoing discussions under the SBI are going in the right direction - let's keep pushing to get to something that really helps vulnerable communities, and ensure that the SNLD is neither just a database nor a pure matchmaking entity.

Last, but certainly not least, ECO urges Parties to commit to providing new, additional and needs-based loss and damage finance and a system to deliver that finance to vulnerable developing countries.

Does that sound too complex? Parties should not feel like they have to reinvent the wheel as over recent years countries, country groups, civil society and academia have already put many proposals on the table. It's just that Parties never really took the time to actually assess them.

Options to secure new and additional finance include a tax on fossil fuel extraction (a "Climate Damages Tax") or a tax on emissions from maritime and aeronautical sectors. Options to channel the secured amount could range from a loss and damage fund or facility, to a Solidarity Fund and an L&D finance window under the Green Climate Fund. So the right move would be for the COP to task the WIM ExCom and its Expert Group on "Action and Support", in collaboration with the Standing Committee on Finance, with the design of the L&D finance system to be approved at COP27.

Parties, it's time to go from Code Red to Code Green on loss and damage finance!

Koronivia: Back To The Food-ture!

You'll remember the adventures of Marty McFly travelling back in time. (Yes, ECO is talking about movies - long before Netflix took over our lives.) You'll remember him struggling to return to his life and trying to fix the problems he had caused in the past.

Well, at Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture (KJWA), like McFly, we are also facing the past to imagine the future. We are chasing the objective of fixing the climate emergency caused in part by the food systems in place.

A proverb says, "When you don't know where you're going, look where you came from". We come from years of advocacy to make the UNFCCC recognise that agriculture is part of the problem but also part of the solution, which, in 2017 finally led to a COP decision on agriculture; and so the KJWA was born. Since then we've had discussion on manure, livestock, soil nutrients, socioeconomic dimensions and food security; 6 workshops (and 2 extra ones), 4 COPs and have come to the understanding that we work better when everyone is included and given a voice

(YES, that means observers in the room). Now, after 4 years, Koronivia's roadmap is coming to an end and a decision on its future is expected at this COP.

Meanwhile, we still face food systems that are not helping limit global warming to 1.5°C. The good news is that we know what we need and where we should be going. Agroecological practices, absolute emissions reductions in the livestock sector (particularly in large-scale factory farming systems), gender-responsive approaches, just transition and increased finance flows are where we need to be headed.

We know our past, we faced our present, it is now time to get back to the future!

The time has come to wrap up all the hours of workshops, reports and negotiations and adopt guidance to inform climate action in agriculture. Let's add the name "Glasgow" to a significant tool that can help today, to fix the food system problems caused in the past, by advising NDCs, LTSs and climate finance on agriculture.

Let's Make 'Energy Day' Efficient, Just And Renewable

Today is Energy Day at COP26, and ECO is expecting to see that the 'fossil fuels' elephant in the climate room will be eclipsed by renewables all day long.

For ECO, 'Energy Day' means one thing: a full transition to sustainable renewables. This means not only increasing the renewable energy supply but also thinking about energy efficiency, reducing overconsumption, sustainable use of renewable resources, a socially just transition, and ensuring energy access for all.

What is often overlooked is that the richer parts of the world use far more energy than they actually need, and so emit the majority of global greenhouse emissions. In richer countries, we need to power down our energy consumption, but 'powering down' is more than energy efficiency. It means re-thinking what we actually need to use, and how we go about using it. ECO is not convinced that using a lot more energy makes anyone a lot happier.

Renewable energy is far more equitably distributed than fossil fuels. For example, we can use the sun to heat buildings, to heat our water and to make electricity. Renewable energy is out there and with a good spread of technologies and the right infrastructure we can make renewable energy the norm, not the exception, and we can even overcome the problem of variable energy from the sun and the wind.

This means that we should focus on a fast transition to renewable energy and not spend the COP26 Energy Day on non-renewable 'false' solutions such as nuclear - that have proven to be too slow, too risky and of course too expensive. Who wants to pay tens of billions to address the radioactive pollution of water aquifers from uranium mining or the highly CO2 intensive digging of giant tunnels to try and store decommissioned nuclear power plants and waste underground?

Wind and solar already provide huge amounts of sustainable energy for us, and have the potential to provide far more. They are often cheaper than fossil fuels, and are much better for our health and that of our planet.



Promising Movement On Human Rights - It's Time For Everyone To Jump On Board

ECO loves to be pleasantly surprised. So yesterday was a winner. As discussions started on Article 6.2, we were pleasantly surprised to hear so much seeming support for the inclusion of human rights language in the text! It was great to hear so many Parties including AILAC, EIG, LDCs, LMDC, the EU, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Mexico, Antigua & Barbuda, Ecuador ... all voice their support (and if we forgot anyone, apologies, and we hope you all join).

But the devil is in the details and those details are important. ECO stands ready to provide any help we can give to Parties to ensure the protection of human rights and the rights of Indigenous Peoples.

We have some immediate suggestions for how to strengthen the language for human rights safeguards in the context of article 6.4. You can do this by including it in activity

design and ensuring that consultation with local holders is in line with rights such as Indigenous Peoples' right to free, prior and informed consent. These elements are critical to help prevent potential harms. Oh, and make the grievance mechanism – which communities can access to seek remedy if they are harmed – independent. That's a big human rights point that can't be forgotten!

ECO also supports the calls for human rights and the rights of Indigenous Peoples to be protected and included across all three parts of Article 6 (6.2, 6.4, and 6.8)! Rights should be protected in all climate action, whether under a market or non-market approach.

ECO is encouraged by this convergence and believes we can work together to deliver and ensure rights in Article 6, because that's the only option!

Fossil of the Day

So the 4th of November is energy day at COP26 but is that positive or negative energy – you decide...

The First Fossil of the Day Award goes to the United States of America (USA).

United States President Joe Biden, supported by the UK Government and others, launched the new 'AIM for Climate' (AIM4C) initiative at the World Leaders Summit innovation event. Did Joe think we'd be stuck in the line too long to notice that this is a sneaky scheme to reframe industrial agriculture and disruptive technologies as climate action? Come on Joe, we're not confused by lines, just frustrated. So it's crystal clear that it's the opposite and goes against any principles of justice, sustainable development and food security. Biden's 'gift' is really part of a cunning ploy to exclude farmers from agriculture - they don't even get a mention on AIM4C's website - and replace them with robots, gene-edited seeds and boost technology profits for the buddies in Silicon Valley.

AIM4C could also be a poisoned chalice for food policy, increasing energy use, pollution and strengthening the very industrial food chain that is harming the climate as the agri-giants redefine themselves as ag-tech and newcomers like Microsoft and Amazon begin to shuffle into the digital agriculture arena.

The Second Fossil of the Day Award goes to France.

According to President Macron, La France is one of the world climate leaders.

They're walking the walk and talking the talk - they are part of the High Ambition Coalition and the French Development Agency even announced they were officially

phasing out all fossil fuels, including gas, from their activities to get their finance flows aligned with the Paris alignment. So far so good.

But hold on - zut alors! - word has reached us from AFP that all may not be as it seems. Apparently, they're pushing for the integration of fossil gas and nuclear as 'sustainable' energies in the EU taxonomy. With partners in crime such as Poland, they're trying to destroy the classification system for sustainable investments inside the EU.

If their devious plan works, billions of euros, supposedly dedicated to the green transition, could flow to almost half of existing fossil gas power plants in Europe as they will be classed as "green" investment. This is madness and threatens the very implementation of the Green Deal in Europe and globally.

The Third Fossil Award goes to the International Emissions Trading Association

And third in today's line up of shame is ...the IETA. Their digital hamsters have boldly tweeted that they "represent fossil fuel companies such as Chevron, Shell and BP and have a delegation over 100-strong."

These dinosaurs have been a thorn in the UNFCCC's side from the get go. The UNFCCC's failure and the human misery and environmental destruction this leads to, is a ticked box for them. It should be a mark of shame, not pride, that IETA gives cover to these planetary destroyers in their delegation.

And it hasn't gone unnoticed that the big fossils are eyeing up carbon markets to give a thorough greenwash to their polluting activities with an endless supply of cheap offsets. A big fat Fossil Award for you too.