Climate finance inches forward

Yesterday parties negotiated on the way forward of climate finance under as they reflected on reports from Global Environmental Facility (GEF), Adaptation Fund (AF) and the Green Climate Fund (GCF).

As parties reflected on the three reports, there were some concerns that came up. The first major concern was that except for the Adaptation Fund (AF), the balance between adaptation and mitigation is proving to be difficult, with mitigation taking the lion’s share of most of the climate funds. The chorus recommendation was that this should be raised in the final decision as a concern needing immediate correction.

Most parties also bemoaned the access modalities of the funds. On the Green Climate Fund (GCF), the main concern was that while the readiness programme has been announced it was hoped that the implementation would start soon so that countries, especially the poor and vulnerable, could be ready by the time disbursement of the fund starts in the first part of 2015.

Regarding the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) the discussion centred on the issue of fixing a co-financing arrangement for it. Most developing countries saw co-financing as a conditionality that should not come with the any climate finance money.

The other issue expressed by developing countries related to access modalities of the funds, and a number expressed hope for a review in the process in the establishment of national implementing entities. The view was that the use of regional implementing entities and multilateral banks is long and difficult.

It is important that next week COP20 makes progress on the issue of access modalities, and uses the lessons from the adaptation review to apply to the Global Climate Fund, which is currently the biggest climate finance facility.

Reaching consensus on INDCs?

In discussions on the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) there was a lot of talk on upfront information, in other words the information countries will have to submit with thier INDCs, such as target year or period, sector coverage and indicators related to fairness and ambition. In the discussion:

- the EU voiced that it doesn’t believe upfront information should be applicable to elements aside from mitigation
- the US stated that while upfront information is the foundation for ambition, a distinction is needed between the INDCs and upfront information.

For China the most important point on the INDCs was to differentiate between developed and developing countries, with the information requested for the two, therefore, totally different from one another. It set out a proposal on how this would work and what it would look like. But will China’s proposal make the final text? cont...
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I coordinate the development work of CASA in Rajasthan, one of the most drought prone states in India, and am involved in the climate change work of CASA at national level.

India is vulnerable to multiple climate change phenomenons, such as sea level rising due to glacier melting, extreme weather conditions, variations in temperature and shifting of seasons. As a result of climate change we witness increased intensity of cloud bursting in Himalaya, more floods, severe droughts and cyclones in the coastal regions.

CASA helps make communities more resilient through increasing awareness and implementing adaptation activities. It is also involved in advocacy on issues of equity and climate justice nationally through different networks, and globally through ACT Alliance. CASA has developed many grassroot models for community resilience, such as community weather monitoring in Himalaya. It has also recently published a Low Carbon Path Study with partners in India and Germany.

We are seeing this COP as an important event for getting a Paris agreement that ensures mitigation, adaptation, climate finance, technology transfer and more transparent clean mechanisms.

Near miss as Mexico curveball threatens climate gender consultations

In a dramatic session on the final decision text on climate change and gender, it seemed that all of the Parties had met the previous evening to discuss and reach a consensus before the text was due to be submitted on Friday… except perhaps Mexico?

Mexico nearly derailed the discussions by quibbling over language, albeit very important language: ‘gender equality’ versus ‘gender balance’. Mexico wanted to suppress the language on gender equality in favour of a reference to the decision on the issue taken in at the 2010 COP in Cancun, (known as decision1/CP.16). They argued this was an agreed text therefore should be used.

To restore equilibrium Liberia sought compromise by suggesting the use of ‘gender equality and gender balance’. The EU too stated that although gender equality was an important concept they were ready to compromise and accept ‘gender balance’. Finally, in the dying minutes of discussion, Mexico, the US and Saudi Arabia came to a consensus agreeing it would be acceptable for the text to refer to the Cancun decision, with no reference to ‘gender equality’.

Bolivia, on the other hand, voiced concern at attempts by Parties to introduce international market mechanisms. These are mechanisms such as International Emissions Trading (IET), Joint Implementation (JI) and the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). Bolivia strongly reiterated its already established line in the negotiations, that there is no place for them in the INDCs.

Invitation to ecumenical reception

actalliance invites ACT members attending the COP20 to a reception on behalf of the ecumenical family. The reception will be an informal meeting where we will refresh and share our experiences and work in the first week.

Sunday, 7 December 2014
18.30 – 21.30
NM Hotel (Av. Pardo y Aliaga 330 San Isidro Lima, Peru)

And the Fossil of the Day goes to...Australia again

For the second day in a row Climate Action Network’s Fossil of the Day award went to Australia, this time for not putting any money into the Green Climate Fund. In an announcement Australian Foreign Minister Julie Bishop said she would just use the regular aid budget for bilateral climate support to vulnerable pacific islands – a clear breach, with the principle of climate finance being new and additional.

A special award, the Sly Sludge Award, was given to Royal Dutch Shell for promoting continued fossil fuel use.

However, we end on a happier note with The Marshall Islands being given the Ray of the Day award for helping the negotiations by stepping forward to propose a 5-year timeframe for future mitigation. A short time frame prevents countries from locking in low ambition and incentivises early action.