It's no mystery: scale it up!

Workstream 2 is great: without it, no long term goal matters, however it's expressed. 2020 is simply too late unless parties take bold actions in the next 5 years. ECO was thrilled to see all of yesterday devoted to the 2015 technical examination process. It is high time to move beyond identifying promising options and admiring great examples to the question of how we can scale up, replicate and implement. We need an effective mechanism to harness opportunities for additional ambition in the 2015-20 period. Here are a few simple suggestions:

- Focus the next TEMs of the solutions that have garnered the most support so far and those offering the largest potential benefits (deployment of renewable energy and energy efficiency at scale as well as on those that cut fossil fuel subsidies);
- Move beyond identifying options and examples, instead focus on implementation: how can existing barriers be overcome and needs addressed?
- Get specific about how existing institutions such as the TEC, the CTCN and the GCF should support best practices identified in Workstream 2;
- Create new partnerships and recognise existing initiatives that bring together pioneers and deliver significant additional mitigation results.

There also need to be criteria to distinguish meaningful initiatives from the greenwash. To ensure initiatives really help close the emissions gap; quantify their contributions, and allow for regular follow-up. Thursday’s session on Workstream 2 gives delegates another opportunity to focus on such outcomes as well as opportunities for countries to increase their current targets.

Avoiding further action until the post-2020 period is not an option. Why so many parties seem convinced it might be remains a mystery.
Climate protection needs human rights

As negotiators discuss how and where to include human rights references in the negotiating text, Panama has set a real world example. ECO warmly welcomes the decision by Panama’s environmental authority to temporarily suspend the Barro Blanco hydroelectric dam over noncompliance with its environmental impact assessment, including consultation requirements.

For the past several years, the indigenous Ngöbe communities have stood in firm opposition to the Barro Blanco dam, which would flood the homes of many indigenous families living at the Tabusará River. Where does the UNFCCC come in? Well, despite strong community resistance, the project developer applied for registration under the Clean Development Mechanism. When alerted about the danger indigenous families were facing, the CDM Board decided that the CDM’s consultation standards had been met and approved the project. There’s no question we need to fight climate change. But there’s no justification for violating human rights in the process.

Panama’s suspension of the project following the CDM Board’s decision to approve the Barro Blanco project is a game changer. Credible international climate policy needs to be consistent with existing obligations, and those obligations must be recognised and operationalised in the 2015 agreement. Dear delegates: don’t let projects like Barro Blanco undermine the integrity of international climate policy – our future climate deal should respect, protect, promote and help realise human rights.

Reduce coal technology exports, MFN!

Parties in the Workstream 2 Technical Expert Process yesterday coined a new acronym: MFN, “More, Faster, Now.” ECO is not a fan of acronyms for acronyms sake but this one could prove useful, particularly for those parties with a dirty coal habit.

It emerged that a number of OECD parties—Japan, South Korea, and Germany among them—have spent nearly US$15 billion over the past 10 years on exports of coal technologies abroad. This has made these fossil fuel projects cheaper than clean and renewable energy solutions.

Renewable energy solutions have innumerable benefits: the MFN mantra is more action on climate change at a faster pace, starting now. Spending billions on technology exports to advance the use of the world’s dirtiest fossil fuel does exactly the opposite.

ECO hopes this misunderstanding can be cleared up, ASAP, starting at the OECD Export Credit Group deliberations later this year.