

Developed countries must lead for urgent action keeping global warming to 1.5°C Paris Rule Book will contain CBDRRC Issues addressing the MVCs interest

In October 2018, the IPCC published a Special Report “1.5°C” on Global Warming. There are many messages in this report, but its core is surely that the Paris temperature goal in keeping “the global average temperature to well below 2°C” while “pursuing efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C” be an aspirational one.

We also observing that the Paris Agreement has been charted a new course actions forward, but it is very much unfinished. The most obvious problem is that, even though all countries are now start their act, Paris Agreement will be failed to deliver the scaled-up action needed to meet its necessarily ambitious goals.

That’s why the IPCC report made it clear; the world must come together now to take serious action to stop global warming. Climate change have been affecting the countries over the world especially the MVCs are mostly affected. This impact deprives the most vulnerable groups from basic universal rights, particularly people living in coastal areas along with women and girls.

So we the Civil Society groups from different position calls upon climate negotiation leader and governments, in particular of developed countries and emerging economies, to accelerate their climate action to reduce emissions now, not in 10 years.

1. Pathways to 1.5°C: Developed countries must enhanced their NDCs

To keep to 1.5°C, CO₂ emissions would have to decline by about 45% between 2010 and 2030 and hit net zero in 2050. That’s significantly faster than what is needed for 2°C a reduction of around 20% by 2030. We urged to developed countries to revise and enhance their NDCs as urgent action in reducing GHGs based on the IPCC 1.5 degree strategy, Article 4.4 under Paris Agreement (Take lead to mitigation effort) and CBDRRC (Common But Differentiate Responsibility with Respective Capabilities) principle as because they are in fact responsible for warming the planet.

2. Developed countries must follow Equity & Fair share strategies in global stock taking process and enhancing their NDCs

In fact CBDRRC principal under Paris Agreement refers to the exercise of equity and fair share strategy in attributing the responsibilities. 1.5°C is only achievable if equity and fair share (in view of mitigation, adaptation, finance and capacity building support) is prioritized, because it means strongly pursuing a low carbon future, and success on this front will only be possible if we’re simultaneously prioritizing poverty eradication and the protection of the vulnerable. In fact, the IPCC’s 1.5°C report is notable for the detail in which it discusses the centrality of climate equity and justice. For example: SPM “D6.1. elaborated the Social justice and equity are core aspects of climate-resilient development pathways that aim to limit global warming to 1.5°C as they address challenges and inevitable trade-offs, widen opportunities, and ensure that options, visions, and values are deliberated, between and within countries and communities, without making the poor and disadvantaged worse off (high confidence).”

3. No False solution in mitigation process for achieving NDCs

We opposing the developed countries effort to establish the clause “Article 6.2” (Use of internationally transferred mitigation outcomes towards achieving NDCs either market approach or it’s so called

carbon capture/sinking etc.) of Paris Agreement which in fact create pressure to the developing and MVCs to adopt mitigation action rather their adaptation priorities. So that we call;

- Developed countries must be followed their domestic and home grown mitigation pledges in line with fair shares and a 1.5°C pathway.
- Adoption the NDCs by developed countries will be explicit their quantified commitments to support their mitigation and adaptation for MVCs and developing countries.
- Arrangements under Article 6.8 of the Paris Agreement that go beyond emissions trading to effective nonmarket approaches to facilitate scaled-up cooperation, which could involve support for projects, policies, and programs that result in concrete and quantified emissions reductions and enhanced climate resilience.

4. Finance: Must be predictable, Balanced and from innovative and public sources

The provision of scaled-up financial resources should aim to achieve a balance between adaptation and mitigation in taking into account, country-driven strategies and the priorities and needs of MVCs and developing country Parties, especially those that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change.

We call developed countries negotiation leaders to develop modalities for prediction based financial provision for MVCs along with developing countries under Article 9.5 of the PA and for setting up a process for a new collective goal on finance based on the needs and priorities before 2025.

We call for rich and developed countries to assess and identify the various innovative mechanisms those can generate revenue without increasing the burden on the poor people of MVCs and developing countries. Possibilities include aviation levies, financial transaction taxes, progressive carbon taxes, progressive consumption taxes more generally, special drawing rights, and so on.

Ensure long-term finance with unconditional and must be public sources of developed countries: In respect of long term financing that agreed in COP Cancun (2010) for per year \$ 100 billion still is not clear. So we urge developed countries must revise their commitment in climate financing for vulnerable that must be (i) obligatory, (ii) new and additional, (iii) public in nature, (iv) covering full cost, (v) should not be as loan, (vi) without conditions. The financing also cover full incremental cost. If adaptation cost has to bear by the people of vulnerable countries then it will be double burden on them.

5. Adaptation: We call for a “Country Goal on Adaptation” Instead of “Global Adaptation Goal”

We observed that the Paris Agreement has failed to develop a common or global goal on adaptation under the article 7.1. We also think that this is impossible to develop a common adaptation goal due to the different context and distinctive nature of adaptation requirements in vulnerable countries.

On the above scenario we call to global leaders to revise the issue to design the Rulebook adding new text on “Country Goal on Adaptation”. This goal will be define as locally-determined, context-specific nature of national action. Doing this, countries need a range of approaches to monitor and evaluate their adaptation progress. Methods and procedures for tracking adaptation may already be in place through a country’s efforts in producing National Communications or in implementing a National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process.

6. Climate induced Displacement: TFD have work to specify the developed countries responsibilities

We CSOs observing that TFD (Task Force on Displacement) have been bi-passing to draw recommendation for developed country parties responsibilities those are needed for MVCs for displacement management through national and international process. This is unexpected and we call to TFD to work on our following demand to include their recommendations, will be submitted in CoP 24.

- Initiate to develop a UN global charter on “Displacement Management” like GCMR (Global Compact on Refugee and Migration). Taking this initiative will pave the scope for countries to identify national and international responsibilities for displacement management. May be it will take time but discourse should initiate by TFD at least beyond their existing mandate so called.
- In addition, TFD to draw the responsibilities of international communities’ especially rich and developed countries on how they can help and ensure cooperation to the vulnerable countries in view of climate induce displacement and human mobility.
- TFD must draw a few recommendation for developed countries on what type of support mechanism they could develop for vulnerable countries on their capacity building issues especially institutional, finance and technology that reduce the risk of displacement.
- TFD recommended or proposed support mechanism must be commensurate with historical responsibility of developed countries and align with the needs of vulnerable countries those facing displacement challenge.
- TFD also call to develop a recommendation for parties to ensure all efforts for an effective, comprehensive, robust, and balanced Paris Agreement Work Programme (PAWP) with appropriate modalities, procedures and guidelines addressing the displacement.
- TFD is asked to developing a recommendation for developed countries to develop a dedicated funding mechanism for vulnerable countries to implement their program reducing displacement challenges.
- TFD can develop a mapping in assessing the capacities gap among the developing and vulnerable countries in view of their displacement management. Based on the assessment, TFD also asked for making recommendations on specific need-based support from developed countries

7. Loss and Damage: We demand separate financial and Technical Support

We reiterating that, MVCs and developing countries have been mostly suffering the devastated loss and damage issues due to both rapid and slow onset events. Inadequate mitigation ambition by developed countries and insufficient adaptation support for MVCs leads the situation aggravated in future that IPCC 1.5 degree report (Chapter 3) already elaborated.

So we call to the WIM-Excom (Executive Committee) to address loss and damage is a major priority for MVCs, and take necessary initiate to anchor the issue in the process of developing of Paris Rule book and its main communication process. We also demand a separate financial mechanism that must be public contribution by developed countries for MVCs and additional to adaptation and adaptation finance requirements.

Drafted by
Aminul Hoque
aminul.coast@gmail.com

