

# 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 Doha, November-December 2012.*

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

## 1(b)(what??)

ECO is wondering how much more clarity this process needs. Amongst many others, the UNEP and the World Bank have pointed out that while there is still a chance to restrict temperature rise to two degrees centigrade, we are not on track to avoid dangerous climate change. ECO thinks that there is no disagreement about that.

So where are we on next steps to address this issue and agree on essential and urgent mitigation action? Well, the Umbrella group seems to be telling us that there is no need to worry because they are making pro-

gress – they have a proposal for a new process! Yes, the Umbrella Group is proposing to clarify the pledges under 1(b)(i) and have suggested a two year programme to do so.

ECO would like to get a couple of points in this proposal clarified. You're saying you need more time to talk? And that there will be no agreement of common accounting rules here?

Surely a bit of common accounting for 1(b)(i) pledges would allow the mist to clear and help Parties to check comparability of effort? Just

set out a carbon budget for 2020. If you think there is no need to compare apples and oranges, you could just check the number! And a little hint – we have a tried and tested way of comparing pledges – you know, under the KP... Now that would help everyone understand what's what. And if the Umbrella Group signed up then that would sort the eligibility issue too.

At this point a couple of lines from a song spring to mind: a little less conversation, a little more action please. Now that's a song we should all be singing...

## Today's Good Deed: Donate Your DSA To the Adaptation Fund

In his remarks to the Parties on Wednesday, the Adaptation Fund (AF) chair underscored the great achievement made by the Fund this year. He emphasised, among other things, that the AF has now accredited twelve National Implementing Entities, which allow for direct access of developing countries to the funds of the AF. Experience shows that this has also triggered the strengthening of institutional capacities to manage project funds. For ECO, this is evidence that direct access is no longer a pilot test programme perceived as highly risky, but rather a reality. In addition, two years after its first call for proposals, the AF has approved 25 concrete urgent adaptation projects covering all fields of adaptation, with several more in the pipeline. A key objective is to target the most vulnerable groups.

Because of these significant achievements of the AF and at the same time the scarce resources at its disposal, ECO is seriously worried about the dwindling resources and lack of predictability that poor countries are facing.

Due to the over-supply of permits, the lack of mitigation ambition and the global economic downturn, prices for CERs, which provide the main source of income for the AF, have gone down to record lows below US\$2.

While almost everybody is looking at the Green Climate Fund (GCF), which will hopefully lead to the long awaited transformational change needed to tackle the climate crisis, ECO would like to draw the attention of Parties to the Adaptation Fund. It is the only operating fund providing direct access under the Convention. ECO believes that the AF should play an important role until the GCF is operationalised, and beyond. So let us now secure the survival of the AF.

In order to increase funds for the AF, Parties are discussing the extension of the CER levy to other mechanisms. Furthermore, since yesterday, individuals can

*continued on page 2*



**Adaptation continued**

donate funds into the AF through a simple procedure on its website. Dear COP participants: Why not donate one DSA into the AF for your daily good? (The donation function is also open to individuals from non-Kyoto Parties, and, by the way, hosted in the US). The more people

contribute, the stronger the signal to incoming ministers that there is support for the AF. Looking into the books of the AF, ECO has found out that some not too poor countries, such as Japan, Norway, France and Canada, have not yet made contributions to fund projects. ECO wants to see additional contributions being

pledged in Doha. The system allows for amounts of up to 13 digits (that may be sufficient to solve all adaptation problems now!). So ministers, bring credit cards to Doha!

Get started early:

<http://www.unfoundation.org/how-to-help/donate/adaptation-fund.html>

## No Ambition Without Equity No Equity Without Ambition

In both ADP workstreams, Parties have begun taking positions on the future of CBDR. Some see a global spectrum approach as the way forward. Others advocate a system in which the annexes are nuanced and differentiated. Whatever happens, ECO sees the need for a dynamic system that differentiates on the basis of equity principles.

ECO believes that it is helpful to cluster the various equity principles into three groups:

- \* Precautionary or adequacy principles – because climate catastrophe would be the ultimate injustice
- \* CBDR+RC, which remains key, but must be interpreted and operationalised dynamically
- \* Equitable Access to Sustainable Development – because just and sustainable development are human

rights that must be both protected and promoted by the climate regime.

Why wouldn't Parties want to discuss these principles within a separate, one-year work programme, with the intention of operationalising them? Such a work programme must inform the ADP streams on near-term and post-2020 ambition. ECO calls for a COP decision on this equity work programme to be taken at Doha. The Shared Vision contact groups should prepare this decision.

One way or another, Parties have got to find the space to build greater understanding of one another's positions if they are to identify areas of convergence. As they do so, the renewed trust that will be fostered could trigger higher ambition from all sides, especially in the near-term ambition track of the ADP. There is no time to waste.

## En-gender-ing Progress

Is history repeating itself, or is a strong commitment to gender equality really on the table? During yesterday's open-ended consultations on SBI agenda 21 (Other matters), the EU introduced a draft decision promoting gender equality in the UN climate negotiation process. The draft text decision, Promoting gender equality by improving the participation of women in UNFCCC negotiations and in the representation of Parties in bodies established pursuant to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change or the Kyoto Protocol is in fact a re-affirmation and strengthening of a decision already taken more than a decade ago. During COP7 in Marrakech, the parties agreed to adopt Decision 36/CP.7, which recognized the importance of gender equality in climate decision making; urged the parties to nominate women to elected UNFCCC positions; and requested the Secretariat to keep information on the gender composition of UNFCCC bodies with elective

posts.

Despite this decision, participation of women in UNFCCC bodies and as Party delegates overall has remained disappointingly low. With that in mind, the EU delegation submitted this new decision to remind COP participants of the importance of gender equality. In many ways, the proposed decision is similar to the old one: it recognizes the importance of women's participation as part of effective and equitable climate policy; requests the Secretariat to keep information on women's participation in the conferences; and sets a goal of gender balance in all UNFCCC bodies.

So what purpose does this decision serve, besides reminding a plenary session of what they (hopefully) already know? First, it is important to take note that when this decision was brought to Parties, it was introduced under "Any Other Business". That means that the needs and concerns of half the world's population

were not given a place of their own in the central agenda of the COP. Adopting this decision would place gender and climate change issues on the official COP agenda so that the interests of women would no longer be considered auxiliary to UNFCCC goals. Secondly, the decision requests the Secretariat to convene a workshop at COP19 to discuss gender responsive policies and strategies to advance gender equality in climate decision-making. Finally, it requests Parties and observer organisations to submit, by 31 September 2013, their views on options and ways to advance the goal of the decision.

Parties (including Bangladesh, Ghana, Iceland, India, Malawi, Mexico, Nepal, Pakistan, UAE and the United States) voiced support and some text revisions during the open-ended consultations co-chaired by Kuni Shimada (Japan) and Ambassador Diseko (South Africa).

*continued on page 3*

## Have Gulf Countries Read the Script?

Yesterday ECO asked the question every journalist watching these talks wants answered: will countries in the Arab Gulf commit to change course to a greener future here in Doha? So far just one country has given an answer. Lebanon has said that they are striving to submit a supported NAMA. ECO strives with them.

To most people in the real world outside the climate change negotiations, the acid test for success in Doha is whether the outcome will include any further emissions cuts beyond those pledged three years ago in Copenhagen. That is, any action that will actually help us to tackle our ballooning global greenhouse gas emissions.

But when negotiations on this issue finally began on Friday, delegates talked more about what mitigation actions others must take, rather than what they must do.

At least Lebanon seems to have read the script for this COP. It's time for other countries, including those in the Arab region, to learn their lines. They should recognise their vulnerability to climate change impacts, an-

nounce a pledge and show they are ready to be major players in these talks.

That would be something these talks can be remembered for, even after the circus has left town. It would boost trust and put the spotlight back on the developed countries for their lowly pledges. The ball would be smashed back into the developed country court. With top-spin.

What Gulf countries including Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, the UAE, Oman and Bahrain should be doing right now is preparing their set of planned emissions reducing actions into formal submissions that would go into an INF doc, namely FC-CC/SB/2011/INF.1. We hope that Lebanon and other Arab countries do so too. All it would take is for them to bring their voluntary nationally planned actions into a formal document in the international process.

In case they need some hints, ECO has prepared a helpful crib sheet of national actions that can easily become NAMAs, including:

- \* Saudi Arabia's 7-10% renewable

energy (RE) target by 2020 (30% by 2030)

- \* the UAE's 7% and 5% targets for Abu Dhabi and Dubai respectively

- \* Qatar's 10% 2030 RE target

- \* Kuwait's and Oman's respective 10% RE by 2020 target

and

- \* Bahrain's 5% by 2030 RE target

That goes for other developing countries as well, especially those with greater capacities. All countries are vulnerable to the impacts of a 4C world - which is where we are heading unless and until new and higher emissions pledges are announced - and every country must do something in the fight against climate change.

Many have been sceptical as to why the highest emitter per capita on the planet wanted to host this COP. The scepticism is yet to fade, but there is still time to help stop this COP becoming a flop. The script for COP 18 can yet have a happier ending, if Arab Gulf ministers jointly announce and pledge some NAMAs.

### Gender continued

The UNFCCC Women and Gender Constituency proposed replacing "by" with "and" in the draft decision title. This seemingly innocuous amendment ensures that women's equitable participation is recognized as a procedural right, while gender equitable outcomes of UNFCCC decisions would be recognized as a goal in its own right. The Women and Gender Constituency also suggested strengthening the paragraph requesting an in-session workshop, by deleting a reference to this workshop as subject to "available resources".

The decision made in Marrakech came about when the

'gender and climate' debate was mainly about addressing the near complete absence of women from the process. This new decision will address the still existing gaps. We have come a long way since then in recognising that gender equality goes beyond participation in decision-making. The outcomes of COP16 and COP17, for example, included language on a variety of critical issues for women's and men's lives and livelihoods. Replacing the 'by' with an 'and', a decision could be adopted that closes the gap on women's procedural rights. But it also opens space for discussion on how to promote gender equitable outcomes, as COPs 16 and 17 have started to do.

## Norway: Big Spender, Big Polluter

While Norway spends millions of dollars on rainforest protection and renewable energy in developing countries, new data shows that Norway is falling short of reaching its domestic targets. The country has been applauded for using its oil tax income to fund REDD+ and CDM projects as well as ODA. However, this is in stark contrast with new numbers from the International Energy Agency (IEA) showing that at

home carbon emissions have increased dramatically.

Bård Vegar Solhjell, Norwegian minister of the environment, will arrive in Doha next week to present ambitious targets in the battle against climate change: a 20 percent reduction in domestic greenhouse gas emissions by 2020; a pledge for 500 million dollars annually towards rainforest protection; as well as funds for promoting renewable energy in

developing countries; as well as several million for adaptation.

However, the IEA data changes the Norwegian image as an environmental super hero. Norwegian CO2 emissions from fuel combustion have increased by 38 per cent since 1990, more than all other OECD countries except Australia. More worryingly, emission projections toward 2020

*continued on page 4*

## Norway continued

show the numbers will only continue to rise. The reason for this increase is that emissions from oil and gas extraction and consumption have risen dramatically. In the same

period, though, onshore industry has reduced its emissions of other climate gases.

This development will strike a blow to Norway's good environmental reputation. If Norway does not want

to be seen as merely making ambitious statements at international conferences about their global engagement while the situation at home shows a different reality, they need to take bold steps soon on domestic CO2 emissions reductions.

## Nix the Flex Mex, NZ

New Zealand is topping the Fossil leader board this year and seems determined to stretch its lead. Initially copping an onslaught of condemnation for not re-committing under Kyoto, they are adding insult to injury by continuing to advocate for access to flexible mechanisms for non-legally bound countries, while offering no carrot in return. Their self-centred approach to these negotiations reflects a distinct lack of willingness to participate responsibly.

Increased access to markets is probably a good thing - no one wants to see the CDM collapse entirely - however New Zealand must demonstrate in Doha that it is prepared to pull its weight pre-2020. New Zealand should announce a target of at least 25% below 1990 emissions levels and send a strong signal that they are prepared to make real progress. Yes, these are above the conditional

range of your present targets, Minister, but that's what ambition is. A pledge to significantly scale up finance next year would also serve to restore previously eroded trust, and advance crucial progress on scaling up desperately needed climate funds.

Four fossils in five days give New Zealand a pretty decent hit rate on the fossil ladder. So resigned to inadequacy, the New Zealand Climate Change Minister Tim Groser has started referring to "Fossil" awards as a certainty. Here's the thing, Mr. Groser - they needn't be. Come to the party with ambitious targets and offers of bold and broad finance, and you'll be surprised at how few Fossil awards you receive. Failure and disappointment needn't be so prevalent, and New Zealand can help to change that.

**NGO PARTY!!!**  
★ Outside Desert Party  
★ Saturday night 7:30pm-4am

Shuttles leave from DEC starting at 7pm  
Shuttles return to DEC until 4:30am  
Taxis will be available at DEC.

Snacks provided; Bring your jacket!

Conference badges are required to board shuttles to the party.

**The First Place Fossil goes to New Zealand and the USA** for not wanting to advance common accounting rules here in Doha. CAN was shocked in today's spin off group on 1b1 when New Zealand had the gall to declare that countries will not agree on common accounting in Doha and thus a pragmatic approach would be to continue talking. Oh New Zealand, if only that approach would work on climate change!! But we all know, as Hurricane Sandy dramatically reminded us, climate change waits for no government. So the pragmatic approach would, in fact, be to finally agree that a tonne is a tonne is a tonne and all must be reduced! The USA has long not moved on this issue and today's session was no dif-

ferent. But as South Africa helpfully reminded us, it is no longer acceptable to just refer to the system as "rigorous, robust and transparent" but you actually need to agree on the rules to make that happen. Time to get to work!

**Canada wins the Second Place Fossil of the Day award.** Oh Canada. When will you give fossil a break? You have failed on Kyoto and you are embarrassing on mitigation, but it seems you will not be content until you hit rock bottom on finance too. You won a first place fossil two days ago for holding finance in the green climate fund hostage, and now we have confirmed you are also breaking with agreed practice when it comes to NAMA support.

