

# 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 at the UNFCCC meetings in Paris, France, November-December 2015.*

*ECO email: [administration@climatenetwork.org](mailto:administration@climatenetwork.org) • ECO website: <http://eco.climatenetwork.org> • Editorial/Production: Kyle Gracey*

## Heal the Adaptation Text

Prevention is better than cure when it comes to illness. So, it is crucial to scale up on climate change adaptation to reduce its harm.

As negotiations gain speed, ECO is not at the operating table, but would like to share some thoughts on key remaining topics. ECO is happy to see that some brackets were removed before the text was sent to the ministers, but many vital issues remain. ECO believes in the value of a global adaptation goal that includes the vision of protecting people, livelihoods and ecosystems.

The Paris Agreement should also build up a meaningful link between mitigation efforts and required adaptation actions. ECO is concerned that the relevant language is bracketed. It's a common sense relationship: less mitigation equals more climate change and higher adaptation needs.

ECO is impressed that many countries have

submitted an INDC component on adaptation. Building on this, Parties should agree that every country needs to submit some form of adaptation communication, with flexibility on the 'how'. ECO's view is that there is a benefit in a regular communication of planned adaptation actions, in conjunction with mitigation cycles, as is one option in the text.

Every country should promote the integration of climate risks into policies and planning, based on the agreement in the SDGs. This does not undermine the entitlement for financial support for vulnerable countries. Oh, and not to forget, for adaptation appropriate to the challenge, financial support must be scaled-up massively, based on the existing and continued Convention obligation for developed countries. But as a matter of solidarity, other capable countries' support will increasingly help to close the adaptation gap.

## The US, Its Silent Allies and the Compensation Phantom

ECO thinks there is quite enough to be dealing with at the moment without adding in non-things. So, we are getting tired of increasingly hearing that the US is pushing for specific language excluding liability and compensation behind the scenes, making it easy for other countries that want the same to play the silent partner.

Let's rewind a bit. In a loss and damage special edition of ECO last June, we supported LDC's calls for compensation language in the text. However, in a laudable response to concerns expressed by the US and other developed countries about this language—and in a powerful display of unity—the G77 agreed to remove this language from the text.

That really should have been the end of the story. Rather than seeing it as the constructive bridging proposal that it was, the EU stonewalled; others stayed silent, while the US, having wanted to exclude the text entirely, is now pushing for specific language in the text to exclude compensation and liability.

Are there legal reasons to do this? ECO says no. The lack of reference to compensation in both the bridging proposal and compilation text means, well, no reference to compensation. The language, with its talk of exploration and approaches, is far from anything that could be relied on to establish liability on a legal basis.

So let's be very clear—the rationale for this

## Show Love for the Adaptation Fund!

The Adaptation Fund (AF) is a UNFCCC success story: more than 50 adaptation projects are currently underway in Latin America, Africa and Asia, providing support to vulnerable people.

However, the AF operates under a high level of uncertainty. While more and more countries put forward project ideas—the last board meeting has seen an unprecedented amount of proposals—the AF will run out of money as early as 2016 with the resources available today.

Countries need to follow Sweden's pledge of US\$17.5 million and help the AF to meet its fundraising target of \$100 million in 2015.

While cash is required in the short term, countries also need to define a long-term perspective. Strengthening the AF in Paris would be a big help for supporting vulnerable people and countries. It would also safeguard one of its unique features—its ability to multilaterally harness alternative sources of finance for developing countries—as an option for the future.

language is rooted in politics, not law. And it seems that other developed countries, like the EU and Australia, are standing silently behind it.

ECO's message to these countries is clear: if you want to avoid liability for loss and damage, agree on strong mitigation, finance and tech transfer targets, so that your impact on the rest of the world is reduced. You must also support adaptation and loss and damage. You can show your goodwill by being constructive and engaging with what is on the table. Recognising responsibilities, including moral ones, is not a sign of weakness but a sign of true strength.

## The Lovely, Lovely Land

You won't solve climate change without forests. But, amid all the potential to address climate change from the land, we need to watch our step.

Land is not only about forests and mitigation. It's where food is grown, homes are built, cultures are rooted, water cycles are nurtured, and where biodiversity works its magic. *ECO takes a deep, calming breath, visualises waterfalls, diverse forests and birdsong. Ahh...*

Among exciting whispers of growing climate ambition, ECO wants to make sure that the lovely land that we all rely on is not accidentally trampled on in the rush to stay below 1.5°C. Climate approaches that would leave communities landless and nations hungry—for example by afforesting over hundreds of millions of hectares of African farmland—would undermine the purpose of the whole UNFCCC.

ECO reminds Parties that we need to watch our step when it comes to land. There hasn't been much time this week to talk about this properly.

Fortunately, lots of good work on land has been done in other relevant international processes. We need a mandate in the decision text to develop principles and establish guidelines to ensure that actions in the land sector are in line with all relevant obligations, rights and best practices, and that mitigation supports, rather than undermines, key obligations and social protections.

This will help us to keep that discussion alive as we strengthen the Paris outcome towards 2020. By doing so, we can make sure that your full belly, your favourite forest hike, **and** your 1.5°C target can all be secure in the decades to come.

*'[Monday's] first place Fossil of the Day Award goes, once again, to Saudi Arabia! In the high-level Ministerial discussions Ali al-Naimi the Saudi Oil Minister (come again?) said we cannot discriminate between clean and dirty fuels, a statement that fundamentally undermines what everyone is trying to achieve at the Paris Climate Summit.*

*This statement totally ignores the science that says we have to keep 2/3rds of fossil fuels in the ground to prevent catastrophic climate change and fails to acknowledge the reasons for the shift to renewable energy that is happening around the world. The Saudi's have attempted to block a meaningful long term goal that could serve as a guiding light*

## ECO's Idea on Funding for Loss and Damage

ECO understands that the rich, polluting countries are not keen to put money on the table to help vulnerable, developing countries affected by climate change. ECO heard of a very attractive mechanism that could lower their bill—let the industry most responsible for climate change pay for the damage their product is causing.

Fossil fuels are responsible for roughly 70% of emissions. Just two of the biggest fossil fuel companies – Chevron and ExxonMobil – made US\$50 billion in profit last year.

Coincidentally, that's probably how much loss and damage LDCs are facing right now.

Collectively, all vulnerable countries face \$100 billion in loss and damage, the same as the annual profits of the top 13 fossil fuel companies. On top of these obscene profits, Chevron is planning to spend \$35 billion exploring for new, completely unnecessary sources of fossil fuels.

Idea: make the fossil fuel industry pay a levy into the loss and damage mechanism. Problem solved.

## Crystal Ball of Climate Finance

Running from one meeting room to the next and eating many a crêpe must be tiresome for ministers. But fear not, ECO is here to summarise the crucial things on climate finance for our new arrivals.

If ECO had a crystal ball for climate finance in future years, this is what it would show:

1. Climate finance needs a level of certainty. In a post-2020 world, this could be met by setting collective targets for financial support. To keep us on track, these targets should be reviewed and updated every five years, with separate targets for mitigation and adaptation. This leaves no room for error in our crystal ball predictions.

2. Developed countries should continue to lead the way in providing financial support after 2020. In fact, ECO's crystal ball foresees that starting with at least US\$100 billion annually provided by developed

countries.

3. The crystal ball envisions the growing role of other countries, with an accent on South-South cooperation, to complement developed countries — based on comparable responsibilities, capabilities and stages of development.

4. Flows of finance that align the goals of the Convention. In other words, moving all money out of dirty, polluting energy and into low-emission, climate resilient actions — something we can all look forward to.

Last but not least, there's our forecast for the years before 2020. Our crystal ball has indicated that adaptation finance needs to take higher priority in these years. The figure \$50 billion is floating in front of us. Something to seriously consider this week.

So go forth, ministers, and make these predictions a reality.

## Oil Minister Wins Fossil Award for Saudi Arabia



*for the fossil fuel phase out and a shift to 100% renewable energy for all. On top of all this Saudi Arabia pushed back on a 1.5C degree temperature target - despite the climate impacts already being felt across the region.*

*On a positive note we have a Ray of the Day to award to the Philippines for taking the stage during today's Ministerial statements, soon after Saudi Arabia, to promote a meaningful long term goal to stabilise global temperatures and to decarbonise our economies. Strong stuff, well done!*

*The USA gets the second place fossil for its moral high ground being lost and damaged. Climate change is an existential threat for*

*many of the most vulnerable countries already facing loss and damage. Despite this, these countries have been negotiating positively and in good faith. Ahead of Paris they took compensation off the table, removing it from their proposal, knowing that rich countries would not agree to compensation.*

*Yet the US keeps banging away at the issue of compensation. Outrageously it is now insisting that vulnerable countries take compensation off the table for all time and never bring it up again. This flies in the face of basic fairness and the whole concept of negotiating. Face the issue on the table not your bogey-man, United States.'*