

# 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](mailto:administration@climatenetwork.org) • ECO website: [www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters](http://www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters) • Editorial/Production: Fred Heutte*

## Ministers: Your Guide to Success with the Text

The Christmas stores are open all over Lima and the trees and decorations are going up. Early yesterday morning, ECO got a taste of the Noche Buena feeling when the co-chairs delivered not one but two new texts.

So here we are, ready to check out the high-lights on display and note some missing ornaments. While there is both candy and coal in ECO's stocking, overall the new texts provide for cautious optimism.

The draft COP decision text zooms in on the INDCs and pre-2020 ambition (a more evocative phrase than "WS2"). On the latter point, the sentence urging developed countries to scale up their commitments to 2020 seems to have got lost. ECO thinks it rolled under the couch and can easily be retrieved and put back on the tree.

The text is also rather quiet on spelling out how to deliver the funds that we need to move pre-2020 ambition to action – the roadmap to scale up finance to \$100 billion. That one may be stuck under an armchair cushion, but it's within easy reach. Something nice on the tree, though, is that finance being included as part of the INDCs.

On the matter of countries doing their fair share, that is referenced but it's not detailed enough. We've kept the idea of assessing our commitments, but how we do it has been watered down.

For example, the ability for observer organizations to be involved with the assessment does not go far enough and should be extended to involvement in the dialogue. Let's not overlook that proper and complete assessment depends on sufficient accompanying information from Parties with their contributions, and some level of commonality to how that information is presented. A common base year and time-frame (2025 targets for all!) – surely that's not too much to hope for in this convivial season?

And here's another thought. It would not be good to bring on holiday headaches by putting

the call for robust information on the scope and content of INDCs into an annex. Let's just say that this process doesn't always have a good memory for where it puts its annexes. Countries are due to table their INDCs early next year – so it seems a good idea to decide first what should be in them and how to present them. Just like getting the right string of lights for your holiday tree.

Now on to the festive occasion of the week – the High Level Segment. Ministers should use their time here to discuss four key issues within the draft decision text – differentiation, finance, assessment and upfront information. Strategic direction on these could even result in us going home on time for the holidays. That's a present we can all look forward to!

Now we turn to the other package under the tree – the new elements text on the 2015 agreement. In many ways stronger than before, the co-chairs streamlined the text, pulling together much of the input from Parties in the first week. The question, of course, is which of the options will remain. Some are good, some are weak and some are just plain ugly – but at least the text does set them out as clear options.

On the positive side, under mitigation, the text retains a number of options for ensuring that the ultimate goal of the Paris agreement is to get to zero carbon. It invites countries to consider what this would mean for their climate action plans over the long term. It also contains several hooks to push investments away from fossil fuels, ranging from divestment to ending fossil fuel subsidies. Note to Parties: keep these but also consider the transformative change of phasing in 100% RE – that's the other side of the goal.

Next, to put this long-term goal into action we need to do more sooner and ensure that enough resources are mobilized. But there's a pretty mixed picture on finance within the text. There are options to include collective

global finance targets for both adaptation and mitigation, but the role of public finance needs to be strengthened, particularly the establishment of quantified public finance goals.

The co-chairs are presenting weak text on the adaptation goal and have failed to link adaptation to rising temperatures and the scale of finance. Developing countries are asking for loss and damage and this needs to be distinct from the treatment of adaptation within the text.

So that's our list, and yes indeed, we checked it twice. To all the arriving ministers, a fond welcome. We know Lima takes the Christmas season seriously, and with ECO as your shopping guide there are ways to secure all our wishes and get us on the right road to Paris.



## Multilateral Assessment: Lessons for MRV

Unnoticed by most, a precedent was set this Saturday and Monday in Lima. Over the course of two days, the first sessions of the Cancun MRV workshops – the multilateral assessment of the first Biennial Review reports by Annex I Parties – unfolded in Plenary Cusco.

Sixteen countries and the EU bloc participated in this new transparency process, reporting progress on policies and measures in fulfilment of their Cancun pledges, and responding to questions raised by fellow negotiators.

But ECO felt a bit let down. These workshops promised to deepen the understanding of the situation of each presenting country whilst demonstrating that they are acting in good faith and working hard towards meeting their commitments.

But despite the fact that MRV primarily aims at promoting transparency and trust, the workshops were designed in something of an exclusive manner – with representatives from civil society sitting in the back of the plenary with no opportunity to contribute to the discussions.

ECO wonders who would be better placed than civil society organizations and national research institutions with relevant experience to contribute to a better collective understanding of the respective domestic circumstances and policy developments in each developed country? Yet instead of taking part in a lively dialogue over these two days, the delegates put themselves through long and technical discussions, sidelining other vital inputs.

Parties should assess the shortcomings of this event as they design the MRV processes that will apply in future under the Paris agreement. Excluding the voice of observer organizations does not encourage the best quality dialogue and obstructs ‘buy in’ and clarity on Parties’ emission reduction plans and goals.

The future MRV framework should call upon the unique expertise and experiences of civil society and research institutions. As negotiators go through the second version of the draft elements for the Paris agreement, they have a direct opportunity to strengthen future transparency mechanisms by opening up the process to all with salient expertise to contribute.



Image: Climate Action Network

## Time to Get It Right on Adaptation

Yesterday morning, ECO was hardly awake when the much anticipated new ADP texts popped up. With glacial melting in Peru and yet another catastrophic typhoon in the Philippines, it was imperative to look at the adaptation and loss and damage section carefully. A number of good elements are still in there but also a few new ones are evident – for example, that loss and damage seems to be on equal footing with adaptation, and a separate section speaks to the reality that it goes beyond adaptation.

ECO likes the proposal to have new and additional finance for the loss and damage mechanism independent of adaptation budgets. Also good is the proposal for a clear adaptation finance figure, though the link to INDCs and adaptation needs is missing. It’s also good to see the inclusion of adaptation in the INDCs in conjunction with National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), but on a different legal footing than mitigation. The decision text should speak clearly on the need of finance for the preparation and implementation of INDCs.

There are a few issues where concerns remain. For example, the mere mention of a global goal on adaptation is not enough. It needs to be defined as outlined here yesterday.

Also, limiting support to adaptation in line with the long-term temperature limit could fall well short, unless parties give convincing evidence that their efforts are actually going to meet that goal. As the temperature continues to rise, leading to catastrophic impacts, we need to adapt to the real world – not so hard to imagine given the greenhouse effect in the overheated sheds at this conference.

Other good elements include key adaptation principles referencing participation, gender-sensitivity (although we would prefer gender-equitable) and taking into account vulnerable groups. But it’s hard to understand why it is only suggested in one option – surely this should be uncontested, since it was agreed by all Parties in Cancun.

What ECO definitely doesn’t like (really, really doesn’t) is the option inserted to have “no

reference to loss and damage”, which would be a slap in the face to poor and vulnerable peoples who face climate impacts on a day to day basis and have already reached the limits of adaptation.

The elements paper also misses a clear link between loss and damage and the historic emissions that have caused them.

ECO thinks that an annex to the ADP decision clearly spelling out the need for strict comparability between the different mitigation INDCs – to avoid comparing apples and oranges – is crucial. This will also help assess associated adaptation and climate risk challenges. For adaptation, the information requirements should be relevant to the context and be flexible, building on the guidance provided for National Adaptation Plans.

We need to build an agreement that delivers real hope for people who are already suffering from climate change impacts, and also future generations who deserve a just, safe and bright future.



*What a drag! The Peruvian Ministry of Environment has done some impressive work as the President of COP 20.*

*But other elements in the government of Peru are undermining broad, national efforts to tackle climate change, and have pushed through the Ley Paquetazo which severely weakens environmental supervision – which is why Peru gets the Fossil of the Day.*

