ECO

End the Genocide. End the Siege. End the Occupation.

econewsletter@climatenetwork.org • www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletter • June 18, 2025

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 Bonn during the SB62 meetings.

Just Transition isn't just a buzzword — it's an urgent call for action

As delegates rush between meetings, let's remember the people who keep our societies functioning—those who power our homes, care for our families, grow our food, and manage our waste. Their contributions are irreplaceable, yet too often, their needs are sidelined in global climate discussions.

A meaningful Just Transition is about fairness, not upheaval. It means ensuring workers, vulnerable communities, and First Nations as well as developing countries have a real voice in shaping policies that affect their futures. It's about reshaping trade, finance, and technology systems so they work for people, instead of exploiting them—delivering good jobs, stable and prosperous economies, and a healthier planet.

By Belém, the Just Transition Work Programme (JTWP) must move from talk to action. The time for vague commitments is over—we need clear, cooperative steps to integrate just transition principles into national planning instruments. Importantly, it must be eligible for climate finance. A *Belém Action Mechanism* (BAM) can offer a practical path forward, ensuring no one is left behind as we build a global economy rooted in justice and sustainability.

This isn't just idealism—it's smart policy. When workers thrive, economies thrive. When communities are resilient, countries are resilient. The JTWP can be a turning point, but only if we act with urgency and collaboration.

The message is clear: Listen to those most affected. Bring all ideas to the table. And let's deliver a Just Transition that works for everyone.

Struggling to imagine it? ECO heard that frontline communities and workers will be gathering outside the venue this evening to share their testimonials, ideas and aspirations. Show us we can still believe in this process: heed the call from those most impacted and make the Just Transition happen!

Global South pushes back as rich nations duck and dodge

There are fights that are worth having, and ECO loves a good comeback for justice!

Remember the NCQG debacle in Baku, when developed countries thought they had successfully dodged their climate finance obligations? We were ready for the fightback in Bonn, and… Developing countries are putting their foot down. If anyone is asking: ECO thinks that G77 and China were right to fight for getting Article 9.1 - which is all about developed countries' obligation to provide public finance for climate action - back on the table.

Why? Due to an outsized focus on private finance mobilization, this obligation has not been reflected in the NCQG and the Baku to Belem Roadmap. This delayed the opening plenary, but this should come as no surprise after the utterly insufficient NCQG decision in Baku. Ignoring this call here will only lead to more failures in delivering the quantity and quality of finance that's needed to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement.

Without the provision of climate finance to implement the treaty obligations and decisions taken , some Global South countries are starting to question why they are even here. Many countries are drowning in debt.

And what do the EU and other Global North countries offer? Crumbs. They have caused the climate crisis and continue to drive fossil fuel expansion, and instead of committing real finance to help address the problem, they only pledge more debt-inducing loans and weave a fairy tale of private finance solving all problems. But the fairy tale is more of a horror story – private finance has limited to no accountability, it typically does not reach those who need it most, and only increases the debt burden of countries already facing crippling debt crises. This side-stepping of responsibility by the Global North is not just happening here in Bonn; the same game is being played at the Financing for Development negotiations in New York, where Northern negotiators deleted texts that dealt with their climate finance obligations.

Let's not be fools: The scandalous legacy from Baku will continue to hold up progress on all other negotiation tracks, unless rich countries face up to their responsibilities now.

Who wants free Dubai chocolate?

ECO remembers the heady days of Dubai, where Ministers lined up to demand an outcome on fossil fuel phase out, swore they stood for justice, equity, guided by the science of 1.5°C. How ambitious! How visionary! What a photo-op for the whole world (and your domestic media)!

After such a display of ambition, and the unprecedented commitment to transition away from fossil fuels in a just, orderly and equitable manner, ECO fully expected that we might witness the beginning of the end of the fossil fuel expansion. The Global North committing to lead in phasing out all fossil fuels and providing the trillions of dollars necessary for others to transition to renewable energy. After all, that's what an equitable phase-out requires.

Today, ECO is very confused to learn that you have done (checks notes) none of those things and that you are, in fact, doubling down on wrecking the planet. New data from Oil Change International shows that emissions from the planned expansion of oil and gas in just four Global North countries - the US, Canada, Norway and Australia - would be equivalent to three times the annual emissions of all the world's coal power plants combined. Together, these four countries will account for 70% of the CO2 coming from new oil and gas between now and 2035.

ECO gets it now. For these countries the fossil fuel phase out is like going to the gym: Something everyone supports as long as you don't actually have to do it. Except in this case, the damage is not limited to the Global North. The reckless expansion jeopardises vulnerable communities everywhere, and puts millions of lives at risk.

Fret not, dear Global North negotiators, ECO has a few suggestions on how you can reclaim a modicum of credibility. First, submit a new NDC that implements the promises you made in Dubai, end fossil fuel expansion and commit to a just transition to renewable energy? This would do wonders to reassure people around the world that you actually keep your promises. Second, work with the COP30 Presidency to land an outcome to agree on equitable phase-out dates for fossil fuel production and use?

Agreeing to transition away from fossil fuels was great, but not agreeing who should do it by when is clearly not working out.

Dear developed parties, ECO is always happy to help. You're welcome. A Dubai chocolate for all who deliver, from ECO, promised.

WIM review: Let's make it transformational!

WIM…what? WIM…who? WIM… hmm???

The WIM is not just another acronym on the list. Since 2013, the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage was until recently the only place where Loss and Damage could be discussed within the UNFCCC. It has advanced our collective understanding of what Loss and Damage is, who is affected, and what interventions are needed. The last time the WIM was reviewed, it became clear: action and support were lacking.

That review led to the creation of the Santiago Network to provide technical assistance on loss and damage and, eventually, to the establishment of the Fund for Responding to Loss and Damage (FRLD) to resource the mechanism.

The (under) estimated needs for L&D are in the region of US$ 400 billion per year. The response has been less than inadequate: The FRLD has US$ 340 million in its coffers and can only allocate USD250 million, despite pledges reaching US$ 720 million by COP29, .

The good news is that the WIM is up for review here at SB62In the words of Vanuatu's Prime Minister, SB62 needs to "do more than accept the status quo, and make this WIM review transformational." Parties must finally make the WIM an institution that is fit for purpose.

The WIM review must look closely at the means of implementation, or the lack thereof, and push developed country parties harder to pay their fair share for the impacts suffered by communities.

A Global Loss & Damage Report is needed on economic and non-economic impacts of loss and damage, policy innovations and practical solutions, and the means of implementation available that put resources in the hands of the very people most impacted. Without knowing the extent of loss and damage, mapping how much finance is needed and what is available, meaningful action remains difficult.

Fifteen years ago, it was ECO calling for more honesty from Parties on the gigatonne gap. This resulted in the emissions gap report, since complemented by an adaptation finance gap report, so what are we waiting for? It's time to seriously address the loss and damage gap, especially where finance is concerned.

Justice in addressing loss and damage truly matters. The WIM review must integrate human rights across all its work. The WIM should produce guidance on human rights and equity-based approaches for all UNFCCC L&D mechanisms and institutions, including on how Parties can meaningfully include loss and damage in their NDCs. Les Parties forget, this requires meaningful consultations of rights-holders and UN human rights institutions.

So, let's go…let's make the WIM transformational.

No Band-Aids for a Burning Planet: Health Demands Real Climate Action

Climate change is bad for your health! Heatwaves and stress, wild fires and air pollution, communicable diseases, extreme events such as crop failures. Health impacts are finally being recognized in climate policy making, with it another health risk arises: healthwashing.

Some governments exploit health to deflect from their failure to take real climate action.

At last month's World Health Assembly, WHO member states adopted the Global Action Plan on Climate Change and Health (GAP). It is a landmark agreement that demands comprehensive action on mitigation, adaptation, and health system resilience. It affirms health is a victim of climate inaction and can be a driver of transformative change. It necessitates concrete commitments, comprehensive action, and rapid delivery.

Despite this, pockets of resistance remain. Some countries from WHO's Eastern Mediterranean region and Russia sought to delay adoption of the GAP, having earlier blocked clear language on fossil fuels. The UAE abstained entirely, despite having claimed at COP28 to prioritise health. Australia, Canada, the UK, and Norway distanced themselves from a GAP reference to common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC for the nerds), citing concerns over the ability to apply the principle in the health context. In contrast, African nations supported the plan as a development imperative.

Any serious climate response must deliver on health, development, and climate justice. Communities are already facing overwhelmed hospitals, toxic air, famine, and deadly heat. More resources are needed. Increased resilience is achieved by action across adaptation, mitigation and loss and damage. Any delay in ending the production and use of fossil fuels, and failure to stand up for equity, all directly translate to more suffering and loss.

As COP30 nears, Brazil promotes the Belém Health Action Plan. It must now reconcile its green rhetoric with its fossil fuel expansion. Health lip service must not mask weak climate action. Otherwise, we are just prescribing band-aids while the planet burns, and calling it care.