

## CoP-28 Global Climate Conference: Government and Civil Society Opinion

### 1. Paris Agreement: A faulty consensus reaching man-made catastrophe by man-made climate change

Man-made climate change is a global problem, and consequently, its solution must be comprehensive and global. However, it is disheartening to acknowledge that the "Paris Agreement," [PA] a forged document by world leaders through eight years of negotiations under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change [UNFCCC] from 2007 to 2015, falls short of an effective and impactful document.

The responsible countries for climate change, along with others already have provided their NDCs [National Determined Contributions] under the agreement, lack a significant role in addressing climate change or support the affected populations. Even if all countries were to fully implement their NDCs, are particularly insufficient in reducing the GHGs [Green House Gases] emissions. The outcome would still lead to a temperature increase of at least 2.4 to 2.6 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels by the end of this century [Emission Gap Report 2022]. This trajectory would have disastrous effects, resembling as a man-made catastrophic scenario. In essence, the Paris Agreement appears to be little more than a consensus or somehow ineffective aimed at preemptively addressing a potential man-made disaster, resulting from climate change.

### 2. How we are hopeful with CoP 28 negotiation and its success?

We assumed that the statements from development activist above, reflecting a genuine inference and frustration regarding the challenges of addressing climate change. Considering this, the question of how optimistic we can be about the upcoming CoP-28 conference and its success becomes a significant concern. Nonetheless, fostering optimism is crucial for our collective survival in view of fighting climate change, economic improvement with sustainable

development. Because we are now interconnected globally not any scope to be isolated.

It is imperative for governments to strategically consider these matters and actively participate in broad discussions, even in the face of frustration, as they are responsible for advocating for their own rights. Civil society also plays a role in reinforcing the government's position on rights issues. Without such collective efforts, the one-sided dominance of developed countries could undermine the principles of equality and justice, posing increased risks for poor countries. Nevertheless, we want to step back to evaluate progress of implementation since the Paris Agreement signed.

The PA has been adopted from the lessons of shortfall outcome of the Kyoto Protocol in addressing climate change. The Paris Agreement was established with the primary goal of implementing three key actions: limiting the global temperature increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels by the end of the century, ensuring the necessary financial and technical assistance for adaptation and mitigation in vulnerable countries, and developed countries to lead these efforts. As the developed countries have financial resources, technologies, and technical expertise, their leadership in implementing these activities is paramount. The support provided to poorer and more vulnerable countries, both financially and technically, is integral strategies to the success of **these global initiatives**.

But the developed countries, particularly those who are contributing significantly to carbon emissions, are not effectively fulfilling their commitments to reduce the global temperature. The apparent discrepancy in their actions has left the international community disheartened. Rather than directly mitigating carbon emissions, wealthy countries are resorting to intricate strategies, shirking their responsibilities and, regrettably, burdening poor

countries with additional debt instead of providing financial assistance.

While poor and vulnerable countries can make collectively advances toward success, they struggle to secure persisting benefits due to the ongoing politics by developed countries with a business and profiteering mindset. Two examples illustrate this point clearly. The Green Climate Fund [GCF] established to combat climate change, aimed to secure sufficient funding [100 billion per year] with at least 50% allocated to the adaptation sector in poor and vulnerable countries. Unfortunately, this objective remains unmet, and there is a tendency to accumulate more debt under the guise of climate finance, rather than fulfilling the intended purpose.

At the last CoP-26 conference, developed countries agreed to establish a new fund to address L&D caused by climate change. However, it is found that there is an intention to divert this fund for making business. Developed countries are actively pushing the involvement of the World Bank and the private sector in managing these funds, disregarding the urgent pleas of those who are at risk and prioritizing commercial interests.

In this context, the 28<sup>th</sup> Global Climate Conference [CoP-28] is scheduled for November 30. During this discussion, we aim to explore the global expectations that were set during the 1992 Earth Conference, understand how these expectations have been evolving since the last CoP [CoP-27] conference and assess the trajectory of what will be happening at the next CoP-28 based on these transformations.

### **3. Agenda of CoP 28: A rocky road in context of politicize the nationalism.**

The global climate conference [CoP-28], is scheduled to take place in Dubai, United Arab Emirates, from November 30 to December 12, 2023. The primary focus of the conference will be to evaluate the progress [Global Stocktake on implementation of Paris Agreement] made in implementing the "Paris Agreement". In addition to this, several significant topics will be added and discussed, such as the guideline & framework for a New Collective and Quantified Goal [NCQG] on climate finance for post-

2025 period, funding arrangements for Loss and Damage [L&D] and strategies for financing arrangements etc.

It is crucial to note that, despite the approval of the Paris Agreement in 2015 and implementation procedures, poor and climate-vulnerable countries continue to encounter with several challenges. Climate justice and justice-based implementation strategies are facing continual negligence. That's why there is a growing concern that the increase the domination of developed and capitalistic countries may further exaggerate socio-economic pressures on poor and climate-vulnerable countries, as they are forced to adopt climate change strategies that may not align with their national needs and interests.

Therefore, the upcoming CoP-28 conference holds great importance for engaging in discussions and establishing the necessary roles that the global community can play in ensuring climate justice for the poor and most vulnerable countries affected by climate change. It is imperative to advocate for thorough participation from all stakeholders, including civil society, development workers, and the governments, to articulate logical demands to international leadership during the conference.

### **4. Achieving 1.5-degree temperature goal: We lose hopes by dual role of developed countries**

**We believe** that even developed countries, who are significant contributors to carbon and greenhouse gas emissions, acknowledge that achieving the goal of keeping global temperatures below a 1.5-degree Celsius increase requires a scientific imperative to reduce greenhouse gas emissions gradually. To meet this goal, developed countries must commit to achieving zero emissions by 2050 and undertake a comprehensive phase-out of all fossil fuel usage. However, it is disappointing to observe that despite making commitments, these developed countries' actions are pragmatic and inconsistent with their committed targets. Instead of working towards decreasing temperature and fossil fuel phase-outs, there seems to be a tendency to exploit poor countries under the guise of "Net Zero Emission" initiatives and carbon trading. We are experiencing a deliberate intention of choosing new words/phrases

and efforts to confuse or lengthen the ultimate purpose while developing action plans. Although developed countries have pledged to set global warming at 1.5 degrees, our concern is that the current strategy, marked by ongoing duplicity, may not yield the **desired outcome**.

It is noteworthy that in September of the previous year, the UNFCCC released an evaluation report based on the Nationally Determined Contributions [NDCs] submitted by all countries worldwide. The report indicates that even if all countries fully implement 100% of their committed NDCs, only a meager 3.6% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions will be achieved by 2030, falling far short of the targeted 45%.

In this context, developed countries should abstain from retaining this ingenious strategy to mitigate global temperatures. Meeting the 1.5-degree global warming target demands not only their commitment but also the presentation of real-time and measurable implementation strategies [Real-time & Measurable] in forthcoming assessments. We represent these demands, having observed government representative's express agreement and actively participate in these discussions. We anticipate a clear stance from the government in the CoP-28 discussion.

- a. Developed countries must establish carbon emission reduction targets based on scientific evidence. Consequently, they [NDCs] should reevaluate their self-determined carbon emission reduction programs, set new targets and submit them to UNFCCC. The upcoming conference will reveal the extent of determination among developed countries to actualize their commitments.
- b. Aiming for a 100% phase out of fossil fuel and uses are imperative to achieve true "Real Zero Emissions" by 2050.
- c. Developed countries should refrain from exploiting poorer countries and their resources under so called carbon trading. Instead, they must ensure necessary financial, technical, and capacity-building cooperation to assist poorer

and vulnerable countries in simultaneously achieving the goal of zero emissions by 2050.

#### **5. NCQG: Suspecting a New NDC on Finance for Most Vulnerable Countries**

Developed countries established a "New Collective & Quantified Goal on Finance-NCQG" and initiated an agenda to deliberate on securing additional funds [surpassing the initially pledged \$100 billion] for climate finance following the demands of developing countries. It is crucial to highlight that UNFCCC projections indicate a potential requirement of around \$2.5 trillion annually by 2030 for climate finance in impoverished, developing and vulnerable countries [UNCTAD estimates 2019]. At the COP-26 conference, an ad-hoc work program and committee [SCF-Standing Committee on Finance] were formed to advance the goals of NCQG. Within this committee, a comprehensive outline/framework has been drafted to actualize the goals of NCQG by 2024.

Given that the post-2025 financing strategy of developed countries is developed in response to the demands of developing countries and is heavily reliant on market mechanisms. So, in that sense, it will be becoming challenging to expect considerable benefits for poor and climate-vulnerable countries from this financing initiative.

Because the new NCQG introduces a lack of clarity at some points, particularly in the interpretation/clarification of the term "Collective". An essential aspect that requires a detailed explanation is whether countries deemed at risk should actively participate in mobilizing new financing [Collectivism] and provide financial contributions. This raises concerns, as developed countries may insist that all countries play a role in the new financing strategy and formulate the so-called NDC on Finance-NDCF, potentially leading to more discussions.

This uncertainty becomes more noticeable when examining the United States' position on the NCQG. According to their interpretation, "the need for climate finance should not only be viewed as a matter of funding by the donors." Instead, they suggest prioritizing national considerations before

exploring additional opportunities such as multilateral funding sources. This implies that, in future climate finance discussions, the U.S. and its allies might exert pressure on vulnerable countries in the disguise of collectivism, urging them to contribute financially under the guise of education. Such a prospect is indeed alarming.

So, we need to be careful in the upcoming CoP. Following the principle of CBDR-RC policy in the Paris Agreement to combat climate change and ensure all forms of assistance [financial and technical] is the only strategy that promises to ensure unconditional, on-demand and adequate assistance to poor and vulnerable countries. From that point of view, the future shape and structure of NCQG financing may be;

NCQG financing strategy should be formulated with careful consideration and coordination for the implementation of all measures [mitigation, adaptation, and Loss & Damage] aimed at maintaining global temperatures below 1.5 degrees Celsius.

- This strategy will delineate specific targets for the execution of mitigation, adaptation, and mitigation programs, outlining the financial requirements necessary for their successful implementation.
- It will also emphasize resource mobilization to fund both developed and developing carbon-emitting countries. It is essential to ensure that financial contributions are not imposed on poor and climate-vulnerable countries in the name of collectivism.
- The NCQG financing strategy and its execution should primarily rely on grants for poor [Fully Grant-based] and vulnerable countries while offering highly concessional or concessional terms for developing countries [Highly Concessional].

## **6. CoP-28 Conference: No alternatives to be united of MVCs**

Before delving into our expectations for the CoP-28 conference, it is essential to reflect on our past experiences in climate negotiations, particularly for

the poor, least developed, and climate-vulnerable countries. Unfortunately, history has not been favorable. In each climate negotiation, countries facing imminent danger have found themselves in a constant struggle against developed countries, especially those contributing significantly to carbon emissions, to assert their rights. Regrettably, the track record indicates that, often, the interests of the endangered countries have been overshadowed, and perceived achievements often stem from compromising their genuine needs.

Experience suggests that the forthcoming CoP-28 conference is unlikely to be a smooth ride for vulnerable countries like ours. The primary focus of CoP-28 is to assess the progress in implementing the Paris Agreement. The discussions will inevitably touch upon the shortcomings of developed countries and the impact of their political and economic duality, potentially leading to clash between the 2 sides.

Once again, the strategy of developed countries at the conference seems to involve shifting the responsibility for carbon emissions onto poorer countries, manipulating financial opportunities, and, above all, resisting the calls for financing the damages incurred by less privileged countries, prioritizing their business objectives. All these issues are contrary to the interests of all countries at stake, making coordination exceedingly challenging. Given that Least Developed Countries [LDCs] like ours face limitations in various aspects, such as information, finance, and technology, unity is not merely an option but a necessity to ensure favorable outcomes in the upcoming conference.

EquityBD

[www.equitybd.net](http://www.equitybd.net)