

ECO



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 in Lima, Peru during December 2014 for the COP 20/CMP 10 meetings.

ECO email: administration@climatenetwork.org • ECO website: www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters • Editorial/Production: Fred Heutte

What We Need – Solidarity

Our Filipino colleague writes:

Before leaving for Peru, I hoped I'd see progress and unity at COP – especially given Lima's key role on the road to Paris. So far I've been disappointed, and to add insult to injury another typhoon is lashing through my birth country.

As I write, a million people are living in evacuation centres praying their houses and sources of income are not affected as badly as last year. While we don't yet know the extent of the devastation, we do know we will be counting bodies once again.

Year after year, devastating typhoons have slammed the Philippines during these negotiations. And year after year, negotiators express their sympathy and condolences – while bringing us ever closer to an unjust deal that will guarantee more extreme weather events.

And there is another perverse theme at

these climate negotiations: the continued presence and impact of the fossil fuel lobby. The WHO does not allow big tobacco to even attend their meetings, yet the UNFCCC is saturated with fossil fuel involvement. As a Filipino, this is outrageous and insulting. We pay the price for their continued influence in this process.

But as we continue to pay, we refuse to act as a poster child for devastation any longer. We are not drowning.

We are fighting.

We do not need sympathy – we need justice and solidarity. We need action now. We need an urgent pathway to a just and ambitious climate deal.

Let us not wait until it's too late.

Civil society invites all COP participants to gather for a minute of silence in solidarity with people impacted by climate change: 9:30 am in front of zone C.

High Level Finance Dialogue: Not Just Another Talk Shop, Please

Rolling into week two of COP20, ECO extends a warm welcome to Ministers and reminds that essential to success in Lima is concrete progress on climate finance. And what better time to do so than at Tuesday's High-level Ministerial Dialogue on climate finance? The Secretariat frames the Dialogue as a unique opportunity for Ministers to highlight that public finance is flowing and confirm their intention to scale it up.

Ahead of the event, however, there is a strong sense of malaise. Ambition is diminishing and the importance of defining pathways to reach 100 billion USD by 2020 is being set aside. So right here and now, let's get down to business.

Tip number 1: Draw up a roadmap to 2020

A 2020 finance roadmap is clearly essential to scaling up to reach the 100 billion level. This first step will reassure that public financial flows will not only continue but will also increase.

Tip number 2: Clarity and predictability

You've heard it before and you'll hear it again: financial flows need to be predictable in order to engage climate action effectively. Not only that, countries need to be clear on what finance is public and what is not.

Tip number 3: Spell out the details

Further reassurance can be secured by clearly spelling out the sources of finance as well as the channels and instruments to be deployed.



Building the Global Adaptation Goal

There's a lot of curiosity about the idea of a global goal on adaptation. As you know, ECO is all about clarity, so here's our short guide to this important proposition.

The global goal on adaptation should build the resilience of people and ecosystems to the impacts of climate change. Actions towards the goal must also protect human rights and address inequality, both of which are key to achieving sustainable development.

The pathway for achieving the goal must be dynamic, taking into account rising temperature levels and impacts. The goal should contribute to minimising residual impacts and loss and damage through scaled up adaptation and disaster risk reduction.

Here are key objectives for a global adaptation goal:

1. Adequacy of financial and technical resources. Adaptation is relevant to all countries, and all must develop adaptation strategies in order to deal with increasing climate impacts. However, it is the developing countries – and the most vulnerable countries in particular – that urgently need support through finance and appropriate technology. Developed nations must provide adequate and sustained support that complements the ongoing development and adaptation efforts of vulnerable developing countries. The scale of resources must be commensurate to the impacts of climate change.

2. Strengthening institutions. The global goal cannot be achieved without a strong

continued on p. 2

continued from p. 1

institution that links local, national and global efforts. All countries, and developing countries with assistance, should create or strengthen institutions enabling policy frameworks, including the implementation of National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), which contribute to building resilience. Regional and international institutions have an important role to play in terms of capacity building, enabling policies and trans-boundary issues. ECO also recommends international coherence across Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

3. Assessment and accountability. A set of clear milestones should be developed at all levels through participatory planning and involvement of relevant stakeholders. These should be based on the development status, institutional capacity and resources of countries. The capacity of regional and international institutions must also be assessed prior to developing targets and indicators. Developed nations must therefore commit to providing finance and technical support and remain accountable to these commitments. Developing countries on the other hand must use the resources in an effective, transparent and accountable manner that contributes to meeting the needs of their people, particularly the most vulnerable. A review should be conducted periodically to assess progress in conjunction with the mitigation trajectory, and close the gap to meet the adaptation goal.

Human Rights in the CDM

In June this year, the Santa Rita hydropower dam in Guatemala was approved under the Clean Development Mechanism despite grave concerns about human rights violations related to the project.

Communities in the Alta Verapaz region report that all those who were consulted on the project were actually the employees of the project. Requests for consultation from those affected by the project were ignored by the company. Even worse, conflict resulted in violence including the death of two children. In August, the company responded with a repressive operation involving more than 1500 police officers forcing indigenous families to take refuge in the mountains.

A complaint from the communities was accepted by the IFC Compliance Advisor Ombudsman, who is planning an investigation in January 2015. The financing banks are concerned and will investigate the situation in January 2015. But the CDM – intended to mobilise clean development – does not seem to be concerned.

To address this lack of safeguards, AOSIS, supported by Uganda, proposed to establish a CDM grievance mechanism to respond to issues of concern raised by stakeholders impacted by implemented projects. A grievance mechanism is the much needed step to start implementing the Cancun decision that Parties should fully respect human rights in all climate related actions. But shamefully, China, India, Egypt, Japan, Brazil and Togo want to delete the proposal.

ECO is dismayed: the Santa Rita project shows that climate action can result in human rights abuses if no accountability standards are in place. It also shows

Embracing Technology Assessment

ECO observes that the critical missing piece of the technology transfer puzzle is technology assessment. And why? Because all kinds of technology, even those we generally like, carry some level of risk. But some are much riskier than others, and that's the point.

Here's a well known example. Decades ago, lead became a common additive to gasoline despite its known properties as a human toxin. Narrow commercial interests and inadequate assessment allowed the practice to become widespread. As a result a generation or more were exposed to airborne lead and experienced health effects because basic principles of technological assessment and precaution were ignored.

In pursuing technology deployment and innovation to address climate change, we should not sacrifice safety for expediency. While the exposure to lead impacted only those countries that allowed the lead additive, technologies that have global reach can impact us all.

Here's what that means for innovative climate technologies. By mid-2013, 78 developing country Parties had prepared their Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs) reports and action plans including the technologies they need to address climate risks, and more are in the process of developing their TNAs.

This is a situation that demands technology assessment.

The first question that arises is where this should happen. The creation of a mechanism for technology assessment within the Technology Mechanism will provide a process that can assess technologies for their environmental, social and economic risks, and that process should prioritize the participation of civil society and other stakeholders. That will provide robust risk information to Parties and enable the best decisions on a broad range of technologies and insure that they are environmentally and economically appropriate and not socially rejected. And here are some important criteria.

- If there are 'unknowns' regarding the impacts of a technology, the precautionary approach should be used. The lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as an excuse not to bypass proper assessment.

- Technology Assessment should create

that all international obligations matter when addressing climate change, including the obligation to respect, protect, promote and fulfil human rights.

Dear delegates, stand by the international treaties signed by your respective countries and take the opportunity in Lima to establish a CDM grievance mechanism.

the least burden on the recipient country consistent with process integrity. Developing countries should be offered full support for the assessments they choose to undertake.

- Technology should be compatible with intergenerational equity, so as to meet our current needs and provide continuing availability for future generations.

- Assessment should be comprehensive but also based on the site-specific impact that the technology will have.

- Assessment should quantify the impact of the technology on the existing environment (including flora, fauna, cultural heritage and economy), and describe findings in detail.

- Technology assessment should be applicable to both adaptation and mitigation technologies and be included as appropriate in NAPs and NAMAs.

- Technology Assessments should be open to public inspection and submission prior to the approval of technology deployment, and should be reflected in the CTCN knowledge platform including results of the assessment as well as lessons learned.

In addition, criteria must be determined to define categories of technologies with the greatest risk. Those determinations should be based on existing work within the UN System where available, and extended with further science-based risk assessments. All of the above should be available to Parties and should be reflected in the qualifications for public finance.

Adopting Technology Assessment under these terms gives countries confidence that their technology choices will meet their low carbon strategies, while preserving choice and ensuring that countries are fully supported and enabled to conduct thorough assessments.



Oh, what a horrible dream! The Saudi delegation seem to be dreaming of a world made of men, only men . . . and a stream of pollution. Saturday's fossil went to Saudi Arabia for speaking out strongly against the recognition of gender equality in the implementation process. The European Union also fell in disgrace for supporting the withdrawal of the language. Dear, oh dear!