

ECO

NO CLIMATE JUSTICE WITHOUT HUMAN RIGHTS

eco@climatenetwork.org • www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletter • November 16, 2022

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 Sharm el Sheikh, Egypt during the COP27 meetings.

Editorial: Andres Fuentes

Decarbonize the COP

ECO's worried that sleep-deprived Parties are mixing up their cappuccinos and their carbon, thinking that it's possible to decarbonize oil and gas like we decaffeinate coffee. Wake up, wake up, wake up!

There's no such thing as carbon-free or low-carbon fossil fuels.

We cannot decarbonize oil, gas, and coal. We need to decarbonize the economy, by ending reliance on fossil fuels.

Fossil fuel producers are falling over themselves to sell their products as the cleanest dirty energy around. ECO's not buying it. Nor are many others in this venue.

Carbon capture and storage (CCS) cannot make gas green, oil clean, or coal climate-safe. CCS is not a climate solution - so we should not be baking it into our climate plans. Ample evidence demonstrates that CCS is unnecessary for the rapid emission cuts we need, unproven at scale, and unjust for communities on the frontlines of fossil fuel extraction and the buildout of carbon pipelines and CCS infrastructure. It's no surprise that the most recent IPCC report ranked carbon capture as one of the costliest and least effective mitigation options for reducing emissions

by 2030—the most critical period for avoiding further catastrophic harm.

Of course, oil and gas companies know all this. They're not interested in CCS as a way to take climate action - for them, it's a greenwashing scheme to protect their business-as-usual of digging up fossil fuels and stalling the energy transition. Despite being around for 50 years, CCS hasn't made a dent in global emissions. It has repeatedly failed to deliver the emissions reductions promised by its promoters and included in models. Instead, CCS has mostly helped to pump more oil out of the ground, through enhanced oil recovery. No wonder it's the fossil fuel industry's favorite false solution.

No amount of investment in CCS can bring about the needed transition to a fossil-free future. By design, CCS prolongs reliance on fossil fuels, literally and figuratively locking in place the polluting facilities onto which it is applied.

ECO knows that the only "clean" oil, gas, and coal is the oil, gas, and coal we leave in the ground. **There is no fixing fossil fuels, we need to ditch them.**

MWP Choir

It's the MWP choir and ECO is concerned that Parties are not singing in tune. Your time for rehearsal is almost over. ECO is curious to ask Parties — what is the outcome you want from the MWP? Be honest, do you want it to be a talk shop? It didn't seem so during the High-Level Ministerial Roundtable on pre-2030 ambition when many Ministers sang to the pitch of keeping 1.5°C alive. You spoke about urgency and the need for

means of implementation. We also heard about an annual report to be presented to Ministers which would then be presented to the CMA. This was music to our ears! In order to deliver the necessary reduction, the process must; lead to recommendations for implementation, make available incentives, and report on its achieved reductions. In the end, the success of the MWP must be visible on the annual synthesis report you agreed

to in Glasgow (CMA para 30)! This political signal will enable you to rise up to the ambition we need for a climate safe world for all. So, what is stopping you?

We heard from Japan, Chile, Bangladesh, Argentina, the EU, UK, Bolivia, and more...that the MWP can lead to incentives and opportunities to create ambition. Mitigation is not a burden, it is clearly an opportunity. And this tune is in harmony with 1.5°C.

The Climate Change Performance Index (CCPI) 2022 Proves What We Already Know

Annually, for the past 18 years, Germanwatch, New Climate Institute and CAN International have released the CCPI at the COP. ECO appreciates the wide participatory process of 450 experts from the 59 countries and the EU, representing more than 90% of all GHG emissions.

CCPI looks at four indicators, each of which has a set of sub-indicators, when rating a country's performance: (1) GHG emissions (per capita) and trends (40% of the rating using 2021 data); (2) Renewable Energy; (3) Energy Consumption (efficiency); and (4) National Climate Policy (data for 2022 and which each represent 20% of the overall rating).

ECO notes that much like in last year's assessment, no country raised climate ambition progressively enough to be ranked between 1 and 3. Basically, countries did not perform well in ANY of the categories the CCPI considers in awarding the highest rankings of countries.

Denmark and Sweden are at the top (4th and 5th). The European Union is only 19th, while several developing countries scored better, like Chile (6), India (8), Morocco (7), and the Philippines (12). The biggest surprises this year were: Estonia, jumping up 23 places (9), Belgium +10 (39), the Philippines +11, France -11 (28), Thailand -11 (42), and China -13 (51), which is now in the red zone thanks to its

worsening coal addiction.

In addition to China; Japan, USA, Hungary, Poland, Australia, Malaysia, Chinese Taiwan, Canada, Russia, South Korea, Kazakhstan, Saudi Arabia and Iran, in this order, are all in the red 'climate despair' zone, with rankings between 50 and 63.

Quite logically, these 14 climate losers include 9 out of the 16 largest fossil fuel producers, collectively mining about 70% of all fossil fuels globally. All of them, except for Canada, have low or very low Renewable Energy shares.

ECO hopes that in the coming years CCPI sees some of the results from recent implementation of clean energy policies in Australia, China, Brazil, the EU and the USA. ECO, however, sees no light at the end of the tunnel for the Republic of Korea (60) the only country globally that reduced its renewable target earlier this year, as well as Saudi Arabia and Iran.

ECO urges all countries to adopt ambitious climate policy in line with a 1.5°C pathway, which includes: leaving fossil fuels in the ground; removing obstacles for a pathway to 100% renewables; pursuing radical energy efficiency; and providing and guiding public and private finance for clean energy with strong legislation and not voluntary commitments.

Sister Calling Sister: We Need [a 'Paris Moment' for] Biodiversity!

Parties and friends, did you really think ECO would let you forget that today is Biodiversity Day here at COP27? Today is about far more than minimizing the climate impacts on ecosystems (although we hope that massive species extinction might worry you, just a little bit). We are here to remind you that there is currently no pathway to 1.5°C without halting and reversing biodiversity loss NOW. We need Parties and all actors, following the example of the stewardship of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, to keep protecting nature in its amazing complexity to help us fight climate change. Sadly, some of you prefer to ignore that.

Science and traditional knowledge show us that nature is not just a nice "add-on" but essential in **mitigating**, helping **adapt** to, and preventing **loss and damage** from the climate crisis. Do you recognize these pillars? Of course, you do. They've

been central to your conversations over the past 10 days, as well as the 7 years since the adoption of the Paris Agreement. Your Paris text, and your COP decisions (most recently in Glasgow), refer repeatedly to the importance of biodiversity, forests, the ocean and ecosystems in climate action. You say publicly that you are committed to these texts, but actions speak louder than words. Some of you still drag your feet, and look for excuses when it comes to mainstreaming biodiversity and ecosystems in this process and in NAPs, NDCs and LTSs. ECO has also been hearing things like "Nothing outside the UNFCCC process in the cover decision?" OH, COME ON!

Well, ECO is here to say that without biodiversity, there will be no social and climate justice. Nature cannot pay the bill for fossil fuels; and it must be able to...well...just BE, and get on with

supporting life on Earth - which includes us, by the way...right?

So, we're looking at you, members of the Cartagena Dialogue, the High Ambition Coalition, the High Ambition Coalition for Nature and People, the Leaders' Pledge for Nature, the Glasgow Leaders' Declaration on Forests and Nature, and the Lisbon Declaration: Our ocean, our future, our responsibility. We're looking at you, USA and China, and thinking of the 'Paris Moment' that the UNFCCC's sister, the Convention on Biological Diversity, will have in Montreal in just a few weeks. However, the CBD negotiations have foundered over the last two years. We need a strong political signal in the cover decision at COP27 to bolster the collective push for a robust and ambitious post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. So, how about giving your sister a helping hand in Sharm El Sheikh? The world will thank you.

MDBs – Time for Fundamental Reform to Respond to the Climate Crisis

In the corridors of COP27, ECO has heard loud and clear (even over the noise of the aircon) the repeated calls to reform the International Financial Institutions and for more finance from public development banks to fund the energy transition. Prime Minister Mottley, Al Gore, and the V20 are just some of the voices calling for the need to reshape the international financial system to respond to the climate crisis. The need for more concessional finance and more grant-based finance to kickstart a just transition in many Global South countries has been heard again and again.

Meanwhile, billions of dollars (even more than the cost of a hotel room in Sharm for a COP27 delegate) have continued to flow from the MDBs to fossil fuels. Between 2019 and 2020 US\$55 billion per year flowed from MDBs to fossil fuels, while clean energy only received US\$29bn per year.

The MDBs' Paris Agreement alignment methodology includes only a full exclusion for burning thermal coal and peat. But the door remains open to oil, fossil gas and other fossil fuels which are considered on a case-by-case basis and with restrictions. As it is at COP27, gas is the 'elephant in the joint-MDB room' with many MDBs considering it a 'transition fuel'. **But a transition to where exactly?** Fossil fuel lock-in, stranded assets, increased climate impacts, more loss and damage, and energy insecurity? ECO thinks that is not a bridge we want to cross.

ECO fully agrees that urgent and fundamental reform of the MDBs is needed to enable them to align with the Paris Agreement. As part of transformative change the MDBs must:

- **Phase-out all direct and indirect finance and policy support for fossil fuels** including gas, across all levels of the institutions. (Only the EIB seemed to get the memo about signing the Glasgow

Statement on Clean Energy).

- Support a **just transition** to a low-carbon renewable energy model. This must include the whole economic sectors' support to consider decent jobs, economic alternatives, appropriate policy and finance and energy access for all.
- Implement renewable energy projects with environmental and social safeguards including strong human rights due diligence, upholding Indigenous Peoples' right to **free, prior and informed consent**, and planning processes that are inclusive of and take leadership from local governments, workers, communities, women, CSOs, and trade unions.
- Support strategies to scale up grant and concessional finance to kickstart the green transition. Debt cancellation is also necessary for some climate vulnerable countries to give them the fiscal space to implement their climate plans.
- Include a **science-based taxonomy** that will enhance the reputation of renewable energy, de-risk investment and build national and local support.
- **Rule out support for Carbon Capture, Utilisation and Storage (CCUS)**, which locks the world into prolonged fossil fuel dependence and does not address fugitive emissions at the production and transportation stages.
- **Rule out high emitting technologies or fuels (including gas)** that will hinder rapid decarbonisation trajectories beyond 2030, including infrastructure for fossil fuel production, transport, terminals, power plants and downstream markets for households and business users

ECO considers this an essential to-do list for these institutions to finance the energy transition and respond to climate breakdown.

COP27 Is Still Looking for a Cover Decision

Three days away from the scheduled end of COP27, the cover decision that should send a strong signal to guide implementation is still out of sight. ECO has been looking for actual textual proposals but has only found a list of bullet points so far.

It was encouraging, though, to hear many Parties urge that the 1.5°C limit should be enshrined in the cover decision. Next is to convert this goal into what this means for action and decision language. ECO has your back: *"to revisit and strengthen NDCs with a timeframe up to 2030, including through incorporating new and strengthened sectoral and non-carbon dioxide targets or actions, to align with 1.5°C by at least 43% aggregate reductions by 2030 over 2019 levels to be in line with equity."*

And while that list of topics was quite long, some absolutely critical elements were notably absent or pretty incomplete. So, here are ECO's top three suggestions to include (more clearly):

First, establish a Loss and Damage finance facility at this COP.

Second, agree on a roadmap for doubling adaptation finance by 2025 including timebound tracking, ensuring \$100bn a year in climate finance on average over 2020-2025 as committed to in 2009/2015.

Third, initiate financial system transformation. ECO knows this is not an easy one, so here is some text for it: *"Highlights the need of and urges Parties to undertake efforts toward financial system transformation to shift trillions for zero-carbon climate-resilient development pathways – including through adequate, predictable, new, and additional needs-based public finance that is not debt-inducing; reform of the international financial architecture and its institutions including multilateral development banks, debt sustainability reforms and debt cancellation and other debt relief, and innovative sources such as taxing windfall profits of polluters."*

Time is running out to address the climate crisis, and COP27 is quickly coming to an end. A cover decision that is an actual textual proposal is urgently needed.

Just Transition, or Just a Transition?

Some parties seem confused about the concept of Just Transition, so ECO thought it would give them a little history lesson, in collaboration with our friends at TUNGO. In 2015 the term 'just transition' landed in the Paris Agreement. Firmly fixed in the preamble, Parties agreed to *'take into account the imperatives of a just transition of the workforce and the creation of decent work and quality jobs in accordance with nationally defined development priorities.'* This was a great win for trade unions representing workers worldwide who are affected by both the effects of climate policies as well as climate change impacts themselves.

The term 'just transition' was coined by labour and environmental activist Tony Mazzochi in the 1970s and has been built upon by the labour movement and trade unions ever since. The core has always been about securing workers' rights and livelihoods and giving them a say in their changing future due to a transitioning economy.

Have Parties forgotten that after the Paris Agreement, the ILO defined the meaning of Just Transition more precisely in its 'Just Transition Guidelines', specifying that social dialogue (involving government, labour and employers), decent work, labour rights and social protection are key elements? With this, the ILO provided a solid framework for Parties to build just transition into further agreements and the implementation of the Paris Agreement.

At first glance, this seems to be successful. Just transition is mentioned more and more each year, with this COP including a Just Transition Pavillion and a Just Transition Day. However, as more Parties reference the term, they seem to forget where it came from. This 'jargonisation' risks broadening it so that it is diluted and loses its meaning, or even that it becomes a 'catch-all' term used to describe any type of transition that just so happens to be convenient for a particular Party.

ECO is looking at you and your CCS plans- Saudi Arabia; at UAE and your "decarbonization plans", and at your fossil fuel lobbyists trying to gas Africa. In this process we see the language expanding, blurring, being redefined and sometimes workers' perspective being completely left out. This is extremely worrisome for the 210 million workers that need their rights firmly protected in the international agreements on climate change.

So ECO and TUNGO urgently stress: **workers have always been, and need to remain, at the heart of agreements on just transition.** We cannot allow this term to be hijacked by those that want to use it as glossy packaging to push their own, sometimes fossil friendly, agenda. ECO and TUNGO therefore urge Parties to be alert to any such attempts while finalizing the text and drafting the cover decision. Only with workers' rights fully cemented can we have a just transition, instead of just a transition.

Three Principles to Make the Santiago Network Fit for Purpose

The Santiago Network is the proposed catalyst for delivering technical assistance to the countries and communities on the frontlines of the climate crisis. If there is one thing that is clear following week one at COP27, it is that no one is in denial about the scale of the need, and the fact that we need new and additional resources to confront this problem. But it's not just about resourcing, it's also about how these resources are applied—and the best possible technical expertise must be mobilized to respond to this growing challenge. This is in the form of technical skills, as well as in local competency: those community scale organizations who understand the local issues, but that are all too often overlooked in global processes and international funding calls.

As new draft text arrives, ECO has noticed some progress. We have text, but sadly this text has three major shortcomings. First, **where are Human Rights?** The Santiago Network needs to operate on human

rights principles and these should be enshrined as a central precept upon which the entire network, including the advisory board and the secretariat, operates. Second, **where is the environment?** Why are the Environmental NGOs not included in the membership of the advisory board? How can the advisory board do its job when biodiversity and environment are not represented? We have heard throughout this COP about the importance of biodiversity and the fact that actions to address loss and damage must be built on healthy natural ecosystems—which themselves face escalating loss and damage if they are ignored. Finally, **where's the money?** How do we ensure that the funding of the Santiago network is reliable, predictable and appropriate to the scale of the need? Come on contributors, we cannot have a ceiling on the funds for the Santiago Network, especially when we don't know the true scale of the challenge that the Santiago Network is expected to face.

CIVIL SOCIETY CLIMATE JUSTICE HUB

CONNECT, CO-CREATE, & RE-ENERGIZE

 SANAFIR (PACHA) HOTEL
WWW.CSCJHUB.COM