

# ECO

## NO CLIMATE JUSTICE WITHOUT HUMAN RIGHTS

eco@climateactionnetwork.org • www.climateactionnetwork.org/eco-newsletter • November 6, 2022

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 Sharm el Sheikh during the COP 27 meetings.

*Editorial: Andres Fuentes*

### The 30-year Wait for Loss and Damage. It's Time to Deliver.

Dear delegates, do you know this meme? ECO is pretty sure you don't want to be that restaurant.

Meaning that the pledges you made must be implemented and trust rebuilt after all your broken promises.

But guess what? To address Loss and Damage, people have not been waiting for 30 minutes but for over 30 years. It's been that long since the small island states brought the issue of Loss and Damage to the international negotiations. Rich nations did just enough to be able to say that they would not completely abandon them, some technical assistance here, some dialogue there, but never has the issue been addressed properly.

After 30 years of inaction, this COP, on African soil, after witnessing one of the warmest years in one of the most vulnerable regions of the world, it is time to finally deliver on Loss and Damage. COP27 must set up a Loss and Damage Finance Facility to coordinate information on the needs to address Loss and Damage and provide the financing mechanism to address it.

Pay up for loss and damage now. As in any restaurant, someone will have to pay, and ECO recommends innovative finance with a subsequent process to map this out. So far, people have literally paid with their lives for this inaction. ECO knows some delegates like to play games and will say "these are the early stages of negotiations". ECO would like to kindly - no, actually **angrily**- remind you that it has been 30 years already. It is long overdue to change that, it is time to deliver!

Another overdue promise is the delivery of the US\$ 100 billion per year in climate finance. Leaders from rich countries must ensure that this pledge first made in 2009 is finally



delivered upon and that the shortfalls since 2020 are compensated for. Developed countries must also implement their commitment to double adaptation finance by 2025, and then go beyond the doubling, reaching a full 50% share of climate finance going to adaptation. The COP27 cover decision must not only deliver a milestone on the Glasgow-Sharm el-Sheikh Work Programme on the Global Goal on Adaptation, but send a strong political signal that starts with a sober recognition of the glaring adaptation finance gap. ECO is sure that a roadmap specifically for the delivery of adaptation finance, which includes time-bound milestones, will help you to deliver on this promise and build trust. The first step will be to finally fulfill the outstanding adaptation fund pledges. And please stop cooking some rather dubious ingredients into your \$100b delivery, such as loans at market rates.

Yet, to deliver on the Paris Agreement, ECO knows you must think bigger. Ultimately, this struggle is not only about who gets which slice of the cake, but it is about reforming the entire bakery (which includes exchanging some bakers, goodbye World Bank President Malpass!). COP27 must send a strong signal on finance system transformation. ECO applauds the vision of Prime Minister Mia Mottley of Barbados and believes this COP must send really strong signals

not only on fundamental reform of the MDBs but of the wider finance system as well.

Finally, leaders must keep their promise and deliver on limiting global warming to 1.5°C. As the IPCC continually reminds us, halving global emissions by 2030 is not only needed but also doable with the right set of enablers. COP27 outcomes need to reflect this reality. Looking towards the first Global Stocktake, COP27 must call on countries – particularly large and rich emitters – to raise their NDCs in line with the temperature goal and principle of equity. We need a strong and functional Mitigation Work Programme (MWP) that enshrines equity and enables discussions on sectoral approaches to accelerating decarbonization, lasting until 2030. And do not forget, the more mitigation actions you put in place, the less you'll need to do on adaptation and loss and damage, and vice-versa – the less mitigation, the bigger the adaptation and loss and damage burden.

Speaking of the energy transition, it is fossil fuels that got us into this mess. Dependence on oil, gas, and coal drives wars, inflation, biodiversity collapse and human rights abuses. The MWP can also be the landing zone for following up on the crucial energy transition decisions from COP26, promoting renewables and cutting fossil fuels. This *climate* COP is definitely not the place to promote dirty fossil fuels as either a short or a long term solution. And while protecting and restoring nature is important, nature cannot pick up the climate bill created by fossil fuels. This is a COP where countries must acknowledge and act on the IPCC's key finding that an immediate and rapid reduction in fossil fuel-based emissions is a prerequisite for climate-resilient development pathways.

# Climate Justice is Human Rights

As COP27 launches, ECO takes this opportunity to remind our dear readers that climate justice is indistinguishable from human rights. Climate impacts affect many rights – the rights to health, livelihoods and decent work, adequate housing, and ultimately the right to life itself. But there can be no progress towards equitable and fair solutions to the climate crisis unless civil society – and that means people everywhere – has space for speaking up, protesting and joining together with others to do so. In the lexicon of human rights, that's the right to freedom of expression, peaceful assembly, association and public participation. These are

fundamental and inalienable rights set out after the devastation of WWII, drafted by people from all regions, political and religious beliefs and accepted as legal obligations which states must abide by.

But what we see is all too many countries locking up people who speak their minds or who go out in the street to protest. This is not acceptable wherever it happens, and civil society stands together in solidarity with our imprisoned, harassed, and threatened sisters and brothers who are trying to create a better world and have suffered as a result. We are watching and we demand an end to these

practices.

Negotiators have a responsibility to ensure that human rights are fully reflected in every discussion, every proposal, and every outcome in this process. To do less is to sell everyone's interests short.

While we are physically convening here in Sharm El-Sheikh to demand climate justice, our hearts go out all those deprived of liberty or facing repression around the world. We collectively refuse to pretend that climate justice and the struggle for rights are disconnected, and we stand together in solidarity with our brothers and sisters who cannot be here with us.

## The Broken Telephone Game of Ambition

When we last met at the very ambition-less SBs to discuss how to deliver ambition through the vehicle of the Mitigation Work Program (MWP), we were not in a good place.

In Bonn and in the 5 months since then, ECO has noticed something quite strange: it seems that instead of focusing on ways to narrow the massive ambition and implementation gap, Parties have been playing at the broken telephone game.

For those who don't know, the game is quite easy: The first player conveys a message to the second player, and this repeats until the last player on the line then has to announce out loud the message they heard to the entire group.

So, in the MWP telephone chain, Science is the first player putting forward the message, a very clear message: We are not on track. We have just received the NDC Synthesis and Emissions Gap

reports, which have painted a very stark warning to the world. The remaining carbon budget to stay within 1.5°C is shrinking and we are on a trajectory for as much as a 2.8°C warmer world. Our total emissions in 2030 are currently on track to be approximately the same as in 2019, but instead we need to be cutting emissions by 8 per cent a year to be in line with science and the Paris Agreement. Meanwhile the oil and gas industry has garnered USD \$2.8 billion a day in pure profit for the last 50 years.

This message has been clearly understood by civil society who, instead of whispering, is screaming: WE ARE NOT ON TRACK.

The 2030 ambition gap is not only sizable, but shameful. This trajectory will worsen impacts and will cause further injustice. For an approximately 50 per cent chance of limiting

warming to 1.5°C this century, it's estimated the gap amounts to 23.9 Gt CO<sub>2</sub> eq.

But then something happens and the message starts getting distorted when it reaches Parties. Some countries envision the MWP as an opportunity to re-open the principles of the Paris Agreement and others as a mere talk shop for one or two years. The decisiveness of this decade is lost in the telephone chain.

Let's focus and make sure to bring science's correct messages to the table and act on them! Let's have an ambitious MWP that is connected to the pre-2030 annual ministerials, that offers a sectoral-based approach to rapid decarbonization that can lead the world to transition away from the fossil fuel era, and that reflects equity, justice and fair shares, based on the principles of CBDR-RC.

## Even Limiting Warming to 1.5°C is NOT Safe

There's no escaping the hard science on 1.5°C at this COP27.

On Monday delegates will be presented with a crystal clear set of key fundamentals on 1.5°C. Their findings include the following:

- At 1.1 °C warming, the world is already experiencing extreme climate change
- Achieving the long-term global goal without overshooting the 1.5°C limit is imperative. It would reduce the risk of crossing tipping points and triggering potentially irreversible changes in the climate system.
- Climate impacts and risks, including risk of irreversible impacts, increase with **every increment of warming**.
- **It is still possible to achieve the long-term global goal of 1.5°C** with immediate and sustained emission reductions.
- Rapidly falling costs of renewable energy present new opportunities for pre-2030 emission reductions.
- The window of opportunity to achieve climate-resilient development is rapidly closing

- The world is not on track to achieve the long-term global goal
- Equity is key to achieving the long-term global goal.

As you know, ECO LOVES specificity and hates fossil fuels. Here are a couple of things which didn't quite make it to the Synthesis Report:

- The IPCC, in the first SED meeting, emphasized that: "immediate rapid reduction in fossil fuel-based emissions is a prerequisite to climate-resilient development pathways".
- The IEA, in the same meeting, underlined that concrete, time-bound near-term milestones for fossil fuel phase out and clean energy increase are needed to get on track for long-term targets. The IEA, consequently, presented many such 1.5°C aligned benchmarks.

The extent and magnitude of climate change impacts are larger than past estimates. Some losses are already irreversible, such as the first species extinctions driven by climate change. The short and med term projections for future climate impacts in coming decades might be exceeding the

short-, mid, and long-term projections even under low emissions scenarios.

This brings us closer to Tipping Points that might trigger a complete instability and extinction of entire ecosystems, major changes in weather, irreversible changes in other patterns and resilience of human communities - even before exceeding 1.5°C.

Finally ECO wants to put attention to the need of a rapidly phase out fossil fuels (to meet the goal with little to no overshoot) as this is not directly captured by the 10 key messages in the SED Synthesis Report.

I would make it simpler: ECO encourages delegates to ensure that these findings are covered in the conclusions of the second periodic review.

ECO believes this decision should, in any case, reflect that limiting global warming to 1.5°C is not safe – therefore all efforts should be taken by Parties to limit warming even below 1.5°C. In this context it is worth reminding negotiators of the call by UN Secretary-General António Guterres for an "end to our global addiction to fossil fuels."