



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 Bonn, Germany during the September ADP 2.11 meeting. ECO email: administration@climatenetwork.org • ECO website: www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters • Editorial/Production: Linh Do

#KeepUsInTheRoom

Civil society has been left with little choice but to spend the last three days camping out in the basement of the conference centre. Despite the strong objections of the G77+China and Mexico—that's 135 Parties out of a possible 195—the co-chairs have still barred observers from the negotiations. Rumours abound when all that can be done is wait for scraps of news, often delivered third- or fourth-hand.

The decision to exclude observers is troubling for three reasons. First, the co-chair's justification rewrites history. They stated that this is the process we agreed to in Doha. Some Parties repeated this due process argument. In reality, the

SBI in Doha did not consider the participation of observers. The only relevant decision of the SBI actually encourages public participation; it recommends, at a minimum, that where no contact group exists, observers attend the first and last meetings during informals. It provides a floor for observer participation, not a ceiling. Second, excluding civil society runs counter to the international principles and norms surrounding public participation. The Convention itself provides that Parties: "shall ... encourage the widest participation in this process, including that of non-governmental organisations." The negotiations leading to the

adoption of the Nagoya Protocol, a supplement to the UNFCCC's sister convention, the CBD, involved stakeholders through the entire process. Third, the decision ignores the vital role that civil society and indigenous peoples play in the negotiations. Contrary to Japan's argument, the absence of stakeholders is what truly impedes effective negotiations, not their presence. We provide technical support, thought leadership, bridging solutions, and amplify the voices of the people who are most vulnerable to but least responsible for the climate crisis.

We have deep appreciation for the Parties that continue to advocate to #keepusintheroom

A Climate Symphony

Symphonies are works of genius. Composing them requires foresight, precision and consideration of the role of every individual within the orchestra. In the context of ambition and climate change, ECO has been thinking about how we can all play from the same music sheet. Ideas like a global review strike the right chord, but Parties remain out of tune. Bonn's slow staccato of progress is not moving toward the great symphony where the world moves to close the gap in ambition that the Parties have put forward for up until 2020. But that's not all—the INDCs don't sound any better. By Paris, Parties need to be in harmony.

A Paris Ambition Mechanism (PAM) must conduct all of the right sounds in this global orchestra. Here's a three point plan:

1. A strong process agreed, in COP decisions, to review the implementation and sufficiency of the Kyoto targets and Cancun pledges, as well as the level of support. Parties, particularly developed countries, must check their efforts and ensure that they scale these up to close the pre-2020 ambition gap. The WS2 decision must also build a process that can unlock additional mitigation and adaptation action through continuous collaboration between Parties.

2. The COP21 decisions on INDCs must require that Parties assess their proposed efforts and come back with greatly increased NDCs before 2020 to get on at least a 2°C pathway, or better, 1.5°C. One way to unlock additional emission reductions is through offering developing countries the support that they have indicated they need.

3. The Paris agreement itself will establish the framework for future commitment periods. It must set clear guidance for Parties to communicate their INDCs for future periods early enough to allow for the intended efforts to be assessed against the long-term goal, the remaining carbon budget and equity, and then scaled up before they are inscribed and implemented. There should also be a clear review within each five-year commitment period to reflect on the implementation of promised efforts. The results of the review have to then inform the next round of target setting.

Of course, this entire plan depends on a clear transparency system that would enable robust assessments based on science and equity. The final concert will play out in Paris. Without this three point plan, ECO cannot see how anyone would find that performance listenable.

Don't Fly or Sail Beyond the 1.5°C Safety Zone

ECO is heartened to see that language on emissions from ships and planes is back in the negotiating text. If these sectors are left out of the Paris agreement, they have emissions that are not only large enough but, also growing fast enough to undermine global efforts to stay below 1.5°C.

In the words of one developing country active on the issue, these emissions have the potential to create major loopholes in the global emissions limitations and environmental integrity. Under a 1.5°C scenario they could count for up to 42% of allowable emissions.

Left to their own devices, the UN bodies regulating these sectors, the IMO and ICAO, show little willingness to seriously tackle GHG emissions. The IMO refuses to even think of a cap and ICAO is happy with the idea of offsetting emission increases after 2020. Both industries show little concern for the climate needs of the developing world.

The Paris agreement needs to address this issue explicitly and send a clear message to IMO and ICAO: now is the time to start reducing your sectoral emissions.

Clearing up the Clouds on Transparency and MRV

Clearing up the Clouds on Transparency and MRV

Transparency is good, as it is clarity because it can help countries direct policy and allocate resources appropriately. The co-chairs' non-paper includes MRV and accounting-related provisions throughout, highlighting the cross-cutting nature of this issue and its overall relevance to the deal. This is vital for success. To increase ambition, the Paris agreement should set the status quo as an absolute minimum to ensure progression and prevent backsliding on rules and requirements. A common transparency framework must acknowledge different stages of development, capabilities and national circumstances and set the direction to improve over time. It is essential to create a balance between action and the need for adequate support, as well as support for capacity building and technology transfer.

ECO is always willing to help, and here are some proposed improvements:

- Highlighting and strengthening the concept of independent, international review or verification in the text.

- On the current information provision, the frequency and standard of reporting should not backslide.
 - The accounting rules need to be clearer, as they currently lack even basic principles such as a ban on double counting.
 - The text should be clearer on methodologies for estimating greenhouse gas emissions and removals, using data from the latest IPCC assessment report.
 - Environmental integrity principles should be enshrined now.
 - The transparency of the information provided by Parties to outline their INDCs should also be clearer and should enable them to report on how respect for human rights, integrity and resilience of natural ecosystems, and food security are being ensured in all climate actions.
- If we get it right, a robust MRV system can provide the confidence to attract low-carbon investment and promote further ambition that leads to both domestic and international benefits.

Don't Let Fossil Fuels Dirty Up LPAA's Soirée

ECO nearly had a heart attack when it saw that Total and other fossil fuel companies were allowed into the NAZCA platform and LPAA webpage. Maybe this is just a fever dream brought on by nights spent lying awake, thinking of polluters. ECO is hopeful that the LPAA partners will apply some fundamental rules to this party before it gets out of control.

Yes, ECO is aware that some vague participation "criteria" have been decided already, but the door is still wide open to gate crashers. Existing participation rules must be strengthened and strictly applied, so they can act as a bouncer at the door before everybody gets in.

Before we pop open the champagne, the basic rules and principles written on the invitation card must be significantly strengthened. They include: a transparent selection process; compliance with international human rights law; environmental and social integrity; safeguards on land and resources tenure; and the promotion of food sovereignty.

Then there's the guest list needed for the party that will continue until the sun rises. The LPAA must take a closer look at the RSVPs and invite independent party chaperons from civil society to help review and evaluate the process from which invitations were made.

Just as dress codes can create ambience, the LPAA must set clear, measurable, and quantifiable objectives as a prerequisite for attendance—and must make sure the process is delivering on ambition. Companies and initiatives that are not serious about the necessary global energy transition away from dirty fossil fuels toward 100% renewable energy for all by 2050 must be uninvited immediately. This will allow real solutions to really shine on the dance floor. ECO is always ready for a party, but not if it's out of fashion.

The EU and Silence of the Lambs

The EU seems to be resorting to silence worryingly often, ECO wonders if this is a new negotiations tactic.

ECO first noticed this practice on Tuesday, when the EU failed to offer support to the G77+China group's call for observers to be allowed in the spin-off groups.

Later in the week, the EU again fell silent over the Umbrella Group's proposal to remove loss and damage as a standalone article in the agreement, which would leave already vulnerable countries even more vulnerable.

In Latin, there's a saying: "Qui tacet consentit." And for those not fluent, that's: "silence gives consent". But it's not too late to find your voice, EU! Clearly state your support for loss and damage and engage with Option 1. And say loudly and clearly, for all to hear, that observers should be allowed into the negotiations.

And remember, when you vocally stand up for what's right, ECO won't be silent in our praise.

When You're in a Hole, Stop Digging

Pop quiz time. Question one: Do you remember when G20 leaders pledged to eliminate fossil fuel subsidies? That bold and necessary pledge took place in 2009 and was greeted with much rejoicing. Question two: Do you remember the date when those fossil fuel subsidies actually got eliminated?

ECO doesn't know, either—because it's never actually happened.

Six years on, it's time to stop sitting around and waiting. On November 14, citizens around the world will mobilise in the streets and online, calling for world leaders to #StopFundingFossils.

The momentum and pressure to stop funding fossil fuels has been growing globally in response to rising concerns about the damage carbon pollution is having on the people and places we love. Businesses, local governments, faith organisations, pension funds, and other public institutions are jumping on board as part of the wildly successful divestment movement. And yet, even with all this support, national governments have failed to act.

But it's not too late! Between now and Paris, whether through new, substantive commitments at the G20 or by ending export credits for coal through the OECD, there are opportunities to achieve real victories. Not the kind of wins that depend on vague promises for the future, but the kind that involve the actual removal of all fossil fuel subsidies.. If we stop funding the continued survival of the outdated fossil fuel industry by giving them handouts, we can keep polluting carbon in the ground and use our money to invest in clean, renewable energy.

Delegates, put November 14 in your diaries and join the global movement to #StopFundingFossils

Option 2 will Leave Paris Lost and Damaged

September saw a relatively positive environment on loss and damage. It left ECO optimistic coming into this session that Parties would continue to work together constructively. Alas, this meeting has seen Parties move further apart with two diametrically opposite options, in the one text. Is this an all or nothing approach?

Option 1 offers comprehensive assurance to vulnerable countries that the world is taking this pressing issue seriously.

Option 2, which deletes reference to L&D, is an absolutely unacceptable option to enter Paris with—and places the whole agreement at jeopardy. Parties should work today to remove option 2 and ensure the L&D is properly and adequately reflected in the agreement, so that it doesn't damage the approach to Paris.

ECO online

Remember you can read ECO online or on your iPhone, iPad or Android!

<http://bit.ly/GetECO>