

ECO

THE GOOD COP OR BAD COP ISSUE

eco@climateactionnetwork.org • www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletter • November 12, 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

The Article 6 Hulk: Will Ministers Create a Greenwashing Monster?

High-level ministers have finally arrived in Glasgow and are discussing Article 6. Hooray! Surely they've been paying attention to all of ECO's asks, and will quickly agree on an extremely robust Article 6 package! Right? Except, well, that's not quite what we're hearing...

Obviously it can be hard to tell what's happening behind closed doors in ministerial discussions that observers are largely excluded from, but fear not! ECO has its ways, and has been privy to some of the deals that are currently being hashed out.

ECO would normally joke about the absurdity of some of the options on the table, but we are increasingly very worried that ministers are actually willing to compromise on grave issues... like whether corresponding adjustments should apply to all Article 6 transactions or not.

ECO really wished it wouldn't need to spend its time explaining why double counting, including double claiming, is a monster. However, some Parties are strongly lobbying to drop corresponding adjustments from being applied to "other international mitigation purposes" (OIMP).

ECO heard that it's coming from you, US and Japan, and that the COP Presidency, Brazil and others are keenly embracing it. ECO hopes that's not true. And apparently this proposal is worryingly gaining traction among ministers.

Excluding corresponding adjustments from being applied to "other international mitigation purposes" allows an emission reduction to be counted by both the country where the reduction took place and by a private company financing it. So how do you know that the reduction paid for by the private company is not simply replacing another reduction that the host country was going to achieve anyway to reach its NDC? Well, you don't, and that's a major problem.

This compromise would create a massive greenwashing machine whereby private companies are allowed to brand themselves as carbon neutral, even though there is no certainty that they have really paid for extra reductions (setting aside all the other issues around offsetting which ECO is clearly not a fan of).

If companies want to pay for reductions and help countries meet their NDCs, that's great. But they must call it what it is: results-based finance. These non-adjusted credits cannot be used to claim carbon neutrality or any other misleading green claims. The bottom line is: either corresponding adjustments are applied, or the credits cannot be recognised for offsetting/compensation and must only be described as climate finance support.

ECO fears that, amid widespread pressure to finalise a deal, ministers who have been quickly and selectively briefed

on complex Article 6 issues are seeking quick and dubious compromises without considering, or caring about, the real-world impacts of these hurriedly concluded deals.

Human rights shall not be traded off

The UK Presidency and some big polluters want the negotiations on Article 6 to be concluded in Glasgow, but we are here to remind Parties: no rights, no deal. The current proposals on the table fail to adequately protect human rights and Indigenous Peoples' rights, for example by excluding the important requirement of Free, Prior and Informed Consent. As if this wasn't enough, the lack of an independent grievance mechanism denies communities impacted by these harmful projects their right to justice and redress. The absence of these provisions led to blatant human rights abuses in relation to projects implemented in the name of the Kyoto Protocol. And we know that there is no way to gather the political consensus needed to strengthen rights aspects once the provisions are adopted.

So we ask: **Is the Presidency – are Parties – ready to attach the name of Glasgow to a mechanism that could lead to forced eviction, intimidation and targeted assassination like as those reported under the Clean Development Mechanism?**

Parties Need To Get The Chemistry Right On Loss And Damage Finance

ECO was always a fan of chemistry lessons at school. Understand the elements correctly; consider compounds, composition, structure, and you can get the reaction you are looking for on your litmus test.

And as set out in ECO first COP26 issue, finance to support addressing (including recovering from) Loss and Damage, will be ECO's litmus test for COP26. Parties must respond to climate-induced losses and damages around the world, and deliver new and additional financial resources to address it.

But the proposed solution is not looking good. So ECO would like to remind ministers and negotiators how to get the perfect formula for addressing Loss and Damage.

Globally, we have already entered the era of Loss and Damage. ECO appreciates that, at least in the last draft cover decision ECO saw, parties reiterate the urgency of scaling up action and support, including finance, technology transfer and capacity-building, for averting, minimising and addressing loss and damage, and urge contributors and funds to provide enhanced and additional support. And that Parties also welcome agreement on functions and processes for the operationalisation of the Santiago network. The proper operationalisation of a needs-based Santiago Network will be an important catalyst for action on loss and damage. To get that catalytic action right parties need to remember to fund the Secretariat adequately.

But without commitments to add in new and additional financing, or to set up the right financing structures, we're going to

continue to abandon people hit by climate disasters, particularly women and girls, leaving them with huge losses and damages. A disastrous reaction.

Luckily, ECO has heard that there are proposals for a Glasgow Loss and Damage Finance Facility floating around. The facility should be designed to be gender responsive and to handle the scale of financing needed to support addressing, including recovering from, loss and damage (and not merely sit under the Santiago network to fund no more than technical assistance). Parties don't need to do all the hard-thinking now; they can task the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism and the Standing Committee on Finance to get that work underway for COP27. Such a work programme should include an initial assessment of the scale of finance needed, which should be regularly assessed through annual Loss and Damage finance gap reports. An even more important element is the identification of existing and new sources of finance, over and above the annual US\$100 billion climate finance goal.

Finally, parties should ensure that loss and damage finance is included as a separate category, alongside mitigation and adaptation in the post-2025 finance goal, and must be reported separately in the common tabular format used for recording support provided to developing countries. Parties should also ensure the Global Stocktake includes an assessment of progress made towards addressing loss and damage.

ECO is waiting with its litmus paper for the finalisation of the negotiations, and looks forward to the right outcome.

Taking COP26 Back Home

ECO is happy to share this part of our publication with the Indigenous Peoples Caucus (IPO) to help amplify their voice. This article reflects the views of the IPO.

As we push forth in the final hours of COP26, there is a feeling in the air of "what now? What have we accomplished? Where have we compromised? And most importantly, how do we take this story of COP26 back home?"

Sometimes it feels like you need a law degree just to follow a single negotiation item here, and the rigid structures and inaccessibility of this space are a harsh reminder that this colonial system was never designed with our participation in mind. As we follow negotiation updates under harsh fluorescent lighting, with little to no sleep, it's easy to get caught up in the versions, the paragraph numbers, and the square brackets, soon perpetuating the same exclusive "in club" jargon we felt so excluded by on arrival. Our moods synchronise with the negotiation outcomes, and it can be hard to see beyond the disappointment of important language and references being stripped from texts.

But for Indigenous Peoples, COP26 doesn't end on Saturday or Sunday.

We can't lose sight of the bigger picture, because we are here for our people back home. We have both the privilege and the pressure of representing communities who will never see the inside of a plenary hall, and so for many of us, a different kind of COP26 work begins when we leave Glasgow.

We have to stand up in our community gatherings and share "This is what was on the line, this is what we did about it, and this is where we can go from here."

While others can put COP26 behind them, for us, it's our aunts, our elders, and our babies that we are accountable to. It's up to us to take this messy, complex, jargon-filled beast, and make sense

of it with them. We have to share the incremental progress that never happens fast enough for our communities, but which represents critical bottom lines that give our frontliners the space and safety to do real climate action back home.

We have to sit with duality that the COPs are often an abysmal failure and a resounding success at the same time.

While we would all like to return to our communities with international standards like Free, Prior, and Informed Consent, and our rights throughout 6.2, 6.4, and 6.8, we must also acknowledge the victories that Indigenous folks in this space have long strived and struggled for.

Do we celebrate the bread crumbs, or do we shout from the roof that it's not enough?

We do both. That's the duality of the COP that we must now take home.

We must celebrate the LCIPP Work Plan, and get our communities excited about the opportunities it entails for them to share their knowledge under the safety of Indigenous leadership and protocols. We must mourn the gutting of human rights from ACE, and how our rights are dropped so easily in favour of a timely decision. The stories we will tell our communities back home about Article 6 remain to be seen.

Whatever the final outcome, the space we have been able to take up at this COP has been carved out by the elders who have gone before us, and those who work beside us, guiding us along the way. This is all fuelled by the passion, love, and support of our communities back home.

The effort that Indigenous Peoples have brought forward to this COP, in the middle of a pandemic no less, must be celebrated as a victory in itself.

Mauri ora.

Uncommon Time Frames: Snatching Defeat From the Jaws Of Victory

Just as momentum was building towards agreement on 5-year Common Time Frames (CTFrS), with an end date of 2035 for the next NDCs, a new text takes us back to square one.

The EU came around to 5 years just before the COP, and this week the China-USA statement said they would both submit, in 2025, an NDC for the period to 2035. The vast majority of countries, including AOSIS, LDCs, AILAC, and the Africa Group, all supported 5 years, and most of those wanting to keep the window open for 10 years either showed flexibility or likely had merely tactical motivations.

A clear decision on 5-year CTFrS for NDCs from 2031 onwards appeared to be a slam dunk.

But a new text out late-Thursday proposes that countries could opt out of submitting an NDC in the next round by 2025, while thereafter observing 5-year common time frames.

Along with exempting countries from raising their ambition by 2025, this would appear to be in violation of Article 4.9 of the Paris Agreement, which requires parties to submit an NDC every 5 years. Or at the very least, it provides no guidance for 2025.

The below version of the proposed paragraph 1 in the new text does the job nicely, and is all that is needed:

1. Decides that each Party shall communicate in 2025 a nationally determined contribution with an end date of 31 December 2035, in 2030 a nationally determined contribution with an end date of 31 December 2040, and so forth every five years thereafter;

A note appended to the bottom of the document also proposes an interesting idea - calling for submission by 2025 of a revised version of the current NDCs with an enhanced and more ambitious 2030 target. This would be a welcome addition in the CMA overarching decision.

Fossil of the Day

The UK ranks first place in today's Fossil of the Day

Fossil of the Day goes to the UK for sticking their heads in the sand on loss and damage finance.

You know that feeling when you've had an absolute age to study for that crucial exam and you leave it to the very last minute to get stuck into the revision - all nighters/lots of coffee with extra sugar.

Such an ostrich-like approach to exam preparation is what we've seen from Boris and chums over loss and damage finance in the run up to the delayed COP26.

Not only did they have an extra year to get their house in order after the postponement, but wasn't it blindingly obvious to everyone that there was quite a bit of groundwork to put in or did they just not get the memo?

The many calls from vulnerable countries and civil society for loss and damage finance to be a top COP priority fell on deaf ears. It was so far down the list that it didn't even make it into the list of presidency goals.

Such inadequacy leaves us facing a frantic and dramatic conclusion to this COP (coffee with three sugars please?).

Thankfully, the halls are now alive with the talk of loss and damage finance and the most vulnerable countries are waiting for their cries for climate justice to be answered.

It may go to the wire and beyond - weekend supplies may be needed around the negotiation tables - but the presidency, and richer countries, have to show true ambition, leadership and solidarity with those already suffering from extreme climate impacts. They need to deliver on the finance so desperately needed or the price of failure on this exam will affect billions of people - it better not be too little too late.

New Zealand finally won a well deserved fossil award and comes in second place

The draft text, quite rightly, calls on Parties to revisit their NDCs and give their 2030 targets some real bite and backbone to haul them into line with Paris temperature goals by the end of next year. Given that we're at the eleventh hour of negotiations, we assume this to be a reasonable request - clearly not when New Zealand's Climate Minister, James Shaw, is involved.

We nearly fell off our chair when Mr. Shaw (who also chairs the transparency negotiations and is co-leader of the NZ Green Party btw) quite literally said that just because a refreshing of the NDC has been asked of countries "it doesn't mean we have to." This comes from a country that gives off the 'greener than thou' vibe at the drop of a hobbits hat.

Maybe we shouldn't be surprised when it was brought to our attention that he's also the guy who put out a revised NDC the night before COP. That one wasn't worth the wait, unfortunately. Civil society commentators widely regarded it as a Grade A hatchet job, inconsistent with Paris temperature goals, wholly unambitious on 2030 target and relying heavily on carbon markets.

And there's more to make them truly deserve this Fossil of the Day award. Good old Aotearoa also stood in the way of setting limits on carbon offsetting in Article 6 and recently issued two new fossil fuel exploration permits. They were severely burned today, and it's no surprise given the evidence above, when they were awarded the humiliating title of "Associate Member" for the signature statement on climate ambition for BOGA - not the things up your nose - but the Beyond Oil And Gas Alliance.

There is precious little time left and we need to turn up the heat on countries not taking their domestic emissions reduction roles seriously. Lead by example Kiwis, do the right thing and stop the greenwash - and skip the spin cycle while you're at it.



No Action Without Science - 2022 Is Crucial

It is bloody late for deep emissions reductions to stay on a 1.5°C trajectory. Nevertheless, this is still needed and the IPCC had made an effort this summer to quantify how to do so. In its first report of the 6th assessment cycle, focusing on the physical facts of where we stand today, the results are really sobering.

Atmospheric CO₂ concentrations and the rate of ocean surface water acidification, resulting mainly from burning fossil fuels over the past two hundred years, are the highest they have been in at least two million years. Indeed, some indicate the highest in the last 10 million years. The last time CO₂ concentrations were this high, global temperatures were at least 2.5°C warmer and sea levels several meters higher. Such data clearly indicates the dangerous carbon legacy humankind is injecting into the atmosphere day by day. But the full impacts of this legacy will only be revealed in the future, because of the delayed response of the global climate and earth systems.

The world must **immediately** start to phase out fossil fuels; and protect and restore carbon in natural ecosystems in this decade to limit the increase of atmospheric CO₂, the key driver for global warming. Otherwise any real net-zero targets by mid-century are not achievable in a credible and sustainable way. Nor, even if they were achieved, would they keep warming below 1.5°C.

Even with the deep fossil fuel reduction pathway assessed by the IPCC that results in an approximate 1.4°C of warming by the end of the century, the world might overshoot 1.5°C in about 20 years before returning thereafter. That is why adaptation, resilience building and Loss & Damage provisions for the poor and vulnerable communities are crucial.

The IPCC explored the risks of “low probability” and “high impact” events that will increase exponentially with future warming. What once was a centurial event like extreme flooding becomes an annual event. And sea level rise might turn out to be much higher than anticipated today. Super-fast deglaciation of major parts of Greenland and North-West Antarctica, skyrocketing sea level rise, die-off of the Amazon forest and full degradation of warm water coral reefs. These are those dreadful threats of irreversible or run-away climate change also known as “Tipping Points” governments shall avoid under all circumstances.

The IPCC also alerts us that net zero by mid-century is not good enough for 2100. For a 1.4°C pathway as outlined by the IPCC in its strongest scenario the world needs to not only virtually eliminate GHG emissions, but also reduce atmospheric CO₂ **concentrations** significantly. ECO urges that carbon dioxide removal should happen primarily through the protection and restoration of ecosystems and sustainable forest, agricultural and land management. ECO thinks we should have begun yesterday.

In February next year, ECO will observe and provide input as appropriate to the Second IPCC Working Group's report, “Adaptation, Impacts, Vulnerability” final conclusions, the Summary for Policymakers (SPM). ECO has already started to identify the key issues that should be at the forefront of the report. These include, but are not limited to, addressing the “limits to adaptation”, which the IPCC had done several times recently, laying out the reasons why Loss and Damage is an appropriate and equitable response

mechanism to disasters and analysing what the tipping points could be for global and regional ecosystems. The IPCC must identify more clearly the amount of investments needed in the next decades for general adaptation to irreversible and unexpected changes such as exponential sea level rise from polar deglaciation, soil erosion from droughts, health impacts by heatwaves etc. and to compare this price tag against the societal, including financial, costs of doing nothing.

ECO calls on the IPCC to be bold and outspoken on the necessity of taking proactive measures to address the already unavoidable impacts of climate change in the coming decades, and the resultant adaptation needs. In that context, food security issues and climate migration must be brought forward. The IPCC must also be clear about the impact of climate change on the world's ecosystems and biodiversity, which are already critically threatened by human activities and intrusion. We are currently experiencing the highest rate of species extinction in a millennia, over and above climate impacts.

ECO recommends that the IPCC assesses the potentials of system Tipping Points under comparably low but continued temperature rises of about 1° - 2°C. Some system components like ice sheets, the monsoon dynamics and ecosystems like corals are highly vulnerable to very small temperature changes.

Last but not the least, the IPCC should clearly define the linkages between climate change, inequality and the need for, and obligation to provide, community resilience building and training for frontline communities.

In March, the IPCC will finalise its last Working Group 3 report focusing on mitigation. ECO strongly endorses all approaches that prioritise deep and early emissions reductions through sustainable technologies and policies, such as solar, geothermal and wind energy, supportive infrastructure and cross-economy energy efficiency. ECO also supports the need for the report to examine potential means and the plethora of benefits to eradicate energy poverty and deadly air pollution for millions of people in the Global South by 2030 as agreed in the SDGs, while providing adequate access to clean energy sources to the “energy poor” of developing nations. All of these points must be examined in the context of the national and regional frameworks for a Just Transition. In all sectors a great transformation is necessary to fully implement the Paris Agreement – incremental changes are not enough. ECO calls on the IPCC to be very critical in evaluating the potential of large-scale carbon dioxide removals such as Air Capture and Bioenergy CCS and to maintain its critical position on the very unsustainable use of nuclear power.

In the summer of 2022, the IPCC will combine all three reports into one “Synthesis Report” that, hopefully, will be the bedrock for a strong, convincing, appealing Global Stocktake by the UNFCCC.

To conclude, ECO reiterates its strong endorsement of the science-based paradigm whose precondition is the rapid phase out of fossil fuels and speedy phase in of renewables and large scale ecosystem protection and restoration, while leveraging significant means for adaptation and Loss & Damage.

Nicola Sturgeon - Whose Side Are You On?

In the final edition of COP25 in Madrid, ECO looked ahead to COP26, the Scottish COP, the Glasgow COP. Back then we anticipated that the story of Glasgow and Scotland could give a new lifeline to the UNFCCC and breathe some fire into the negotiations. We had hoped that the story of Glasgow, the furnace of the industrial revolution and a city famed for reinvention and resistance, might shape a COP that finally delivered the political ambition we know the world needs to see.

You could say that the UK has tried its hardest to prevent this. Distinct from Madrid, Katowice, Marrakesh or Paris, this COP has been branded by the UK very clearly as the UK COP rather than the Glasgow COP. Union Jacks rather than Scottish saltires are plastered across the venue. Pathetically, at short notice, the rooms for COP26 (originally all named after Scottish geographical features) were changed to geographical features from the whole of the UK. Since COP25, Johnson & his government have continually tried to ensure that Nicola Sturgeon, First Minister of Scotland, should be excluded from the talks.

Despite this, it seems like negotiators do really know they are in Scotland. On Monday of week 1, the First Minister broke the Loss & Damage taboo, becoming the first developed nation leader to commit to finance for people who have already suffered irrevocable impacts of climate change. Since then, she's championed climate justice, talked of the need to "shame" countries into paying their climate debt, and made it clear that climate finance is not charity but reparations.

Her calls have reverberated around these halls. Whether they will have a quantifiable impact or not remains to be seen in these last few hours, but they have certainly given a much needed injection of energy to the calls for finance for Loss & Damage.

Nicola Sturgeon has committed to play the role of a "bridge" at these talks, between the unheard and most impacted and the powerful people within the COP walls. In these last few hours, she now needs to choose which side of that bridge she sits on.

We saw a very mixed picture on Thursday. Standing shoulder to shoulder with those most impacted by climate injustice, the Scottish Government decided it wouldn't just double its Climate Justice Fund, but triple it. This included a doubling of its commitment to Loss & Damage from £1 million to £2m, the First Minister directly crediting this decision to the engagements she has had with actors from the Global South, including through the Glasgow Climate Dialogues that the Scottish Government co-hosted with Stop Climate Chaos Scotland over the past few weeks.

But just a few hours before CAN presented her the Ray of the Day for her commitment to Loss & Damage, her Government snubbed the opportunity to join the Beyond Oil & Gas Alliance. This was a missed opportunity for real leadership. This was a missed chance to really double down on the climate justice narrative at COP26. This was a missed chance to prioritise the lives of the most impacted people and areas and of future generations. This was a missed opportunity for the First Minister to stop business as usual and really separate herself from the fantasist net-zero colonial illusionists that have no regard for the debt they owe the Global South. The wrong side of the bridge.

So perhaps Scotland has delivered at COP26 all we could have hoped for: the contradictions of progressive world leaders hooked on business as usual. The Scottish Government has championed climate reparations and challenged other countries to up their climate finance, especially for Loss & Damage. At the same time, it has failed to live up to its climate rhetoric on the issue of oil & gas in the North Sea, missed its climate targets 3 years in a row, and did not commit to revising its own indicative Nationally Determined Contribution to ensure it's aligned with equity and 1.5°C. But time has not yet run out.

Nicola Sturgeon, on the last day of COP26, with all the impact you've already had in the climate change theatre of COP26, we need to ask you, whose script are you following? What side of the bridge will you be on?

Coffee at the Aussie Pavilion

With Emissions Reductions Minister Taylor back in Australia, the role of Head of Delegation was passed onto the coffee machine in the Australian Pavilion.

Australia has shown very high ambition with its coffee game at this COP, receiving net zero complaints from the hundreds of caffeine hungry delegates stopping by the Pavilion for their daily hit. However, not all have been impressed by this new tactic of coffee diplomacy.

"Clearly the Government hopes that the quality and volume of free coffee being dispensed will distract from Australia's woeful lack of action on climate change," said Skippy the Kangaroo.

"We set a national target for our coffee queue to be longer than the queue to enter COP26 at 8am, and I think we achieved that ambition without loss or damage," said an Australian Government diplomat.

Speaking earlier, the coffee machine was also able to provide some insight into the details of the Government's new climate finance pledge, confirming that Australia plans to count the millions of dollars in free coffee towards fulfilment of its contribution to the \$100b goal. The machine is yet to be informed of the escalating impacts of climate change upon coffee production.

A spokesperson for Minister Taylor said that Australia was proud it was meeting and beating its coffee target for this COP and has been dispensing coffee at a faster rate than any other country. "It's great Aussie tech, on display here in Glasgow, making sure we're caffeinating Australians but also fuelling the developing world to get the job done too." Asked what kind of coffee he likes to drink himself, the Minister said that he wasn't actually a fan and that he and the delegation preferred to drink the Kool-Aid.