

The time for ambition is now

COP26 must increase ambition in mitigation and adaptation in line with the Paris Agreement's goal to stay within the 1.5 °C temperature limit

October 2021

COP 26 at Glasgow is about urgent, dramatic and consistent emission reductions in line with the Paris Agreement's goal to stay within the 1.5 °C temperature limit. It is also about supporting the Parties most impacted by climate heating. In other words, it is about increasing ambition in mitigation, adaptation and finance.

*At the most, the COP is the forum where world governments come together once a year to cooperate in solving the climate emergency. At the very least, the COP is a major moment of public and media judgement on climate progress. **COP26 is the biggest political moment for addressing the climate emergency since Paris in 2015.** The interpretation of the COP 26 outcome is likely to shape perceptions of climate action and international climate politics for years to come.*

COP 26 needs to be equitable, fair, and transparent. This means full and fair participation for all parties, civil society, and media - despite the additional barriers created by Covid-19 that have prevented attendance for many - the voices of those facing the worst impacts must guide all decision-making.

The success of Glasgow will depend on governments taking action before and during COP 26, at its broadest and most basic level, Greenpeace is calling for:

- 1. The improvement of national commitments (Nationally Determined Contributions, NDCs) with emission reductions in line with 1.5 °C, halving global emissions by 2030 and stopping new fossil fuel projects immediately*
- 2. The delivery of \$100 billion per year in climate finance by 2020 to 2025 promised to developing countries (currently at \$80 billion);¹ with additional support post-2025*
- 3. Additional financial support for adaptation and loss and damage and a permanent political space in the agenda for loss and damage; and,*
- 4. An equitable and holistic interpretation of Article 6 that excludes plans to open a global market in carbon offsets*

¹<https://www.oecd.org/newsroom/statement-from-oecd-secretary-general-mathias-cormann-on-climate-finance-in-2019.html>

Greenpeace Policy Positions

1. Ambition²

COP26 to deliver an ambition decision 1./CP.26 text that:

- Recalls Article 2 of the Paris Agreement which set out a shared objective to pursue efforts to limit global warming to 1.5 °C;
- Acknowledges with serious concern the 1.5 °C gap outlined by the NDC synthesis report, UNEP emissions gap report, and the IEA Net Zero report;
- Recognises with serious concern the urgent need to address the significant gap;
- Notes with concern the AR6 WG1 findings and recognizes it is a clear message on urgency and worsening climate impacts make current levels of warming unsafe;
- Exhorts Parties to commit to no new fossil fuels and develop a plan for a global fossil fuel phase-out by 2050, recognising this as a condition to limit global warming to 1.5°C.

Besides the final COP decision text, there are two other clear categories of ambition on which our position focuses: nationally determined contributions (NDCs) and long-term strategies (LTS).

1.1 Nationally determined contributions (NDC)

Countries must close the mitigation gap to 1.5 °C, halving global emissions by 2030. This decade is decisive, and COP26 has to agree on how that is going to be done. Parties must agree at COP26 to enhance their 2030 NDCs to be aligned with 1.5 °C before the first Global Stocktake in 2023. All countries - especially the G20 - must submit NDCs with stronger 2030 targets, aligned with 1.5 °C and fair shares by COP26. These must include the commitment to stop building new fossil fuel infrastructure and plans to phase-out fossil fuels by 2050, both while protecting biodiversity and ecosystem integrity. All climate ambition commitments need to be followed up with genuine climate action and accelerated implementation, with climate plans and policies at the domestic level, in consultation with, and with the engagement of civil society.

Economic recovery plans from the Covid-19 pandemic are a make-or-break opportunity, either to invest in transformative changes for the planet, or to lock in climate chaos through misguided fossil fuel investment.

1.2 Long-term strategies (LTS)

Greenpeace supports CAN International's call on negotiators to agree to extend the mandate under the UNFCCC which invites countries to submit LTS which expires at COP26. They should also request that parties submit revised LTS aligned with a 1.5 °C compatible trajectory ahead of the 2023 GST. Countries that have not yet done so should submit their long-term strategies (LTS) for achieving 'real zero' by 2050 at COP26 and commit to align their 2030 NDCs with these targets to ensure action in the 2020s can get us back on track to avoid breaching the 1.5 °C limit. False solutions, and offsets including any support for a continued fossil fuel industry such as blue hydrogen, should not be supported.

Greenpeace opposes the abuse of Net-Zero targets by governments and companies alike. We note the momentum created by the increasing number of net zero targets and the opportunity they may present to accelerate climate action (e.g., setting long term expectations for markets.) if they genuinely eliminate emissions at source, make strides in transitioning away from fossil fuels and do not allow offsets.

² [Source](#) for ambition.

2. Article 6 (flexible mechanisms)

Governments need to agree rules under Article 6 that further international cooperation to implement the core purpose of the Paris Agreement: to increase ambition in climate mitigation and adaptation, while fostering sustainable development, the protection of rights and environmental integrity. Carbon offset markets don't reduce emissions, they fundamentally conflict with the purpose of increasing ambition and therefore should not be supported within Article 6.

Governments should instead focus on fostering international cooperation, setting up rules under Article 6 that incentivise them to work with each other in the implementation of measures that enhance mitigation and adaptation equitably, for example with the provision of finance, technology transfer, knowledge sharing and capacity building. [[Public Briefing on Greenpeace's Position on Art. 6](#)]

Note: Greenpeace is not aligned with CAN's Art. 6 position as CAN's position still interpretes Art. 6 to be about carbon offset markets.

3. Net-Zero

Greenpeace opposes the abuse of net zero targets by governments and companies alike. We note the momentum created by the increasing number of net zero targets and the opportunity they may present to accelerate climate action (e.g., setting long term expectations for markets.) *if they genuinely eliminate emissions at source, transition away from fossil fuels and do not allow offsets.*

4. Finance³

The success of COP26 relies on the delivery of a comprehensive, ambitious finance outcome. Greenpeace supports CAN International's position that developed countries must come forward with new and additional climate finance, and work together on a robust and transparent delivery plan that shows how the \$100 billion annual climate finance commitment will be met in aggregate over the period 2020 to 2025, as enshrined at COP 21 in Paris.

Developed countries must provide a clear articulation of how the aggregate will be met by delivering well beyond \$100bn a year between 2022-2025 to make up for earlier gaps, and reach \$50bn per year in adaptation finance in aggregate.

Developed countries must also enhance accountability for the quality and quantity of climate finance mobilised and delivered, building on lessons learned from pre-2020 climate finance mobilisation. COP26 must advance:

- How they will scale up local level access to climate finance for adaptation
- New and additional finance to address loss and damage
- Timely disbursement of climate finance, particularly for Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDs)
- How financial instruments that provide highly concessional finance will be prioritised, namely grants instead of loans that add to a country's indebtedness

At COP26, countries must agree on and start the process to develop a new post-2025 long-term climate finance goal. We are calling for this to be set up to be truly responsive to the needs of developing countries, science-based, and, depending on the length of the time frame envisioned for reaching that goal, set clear milestones and intermediate targets for increasing the quantity of climate finance, well beyond \$100 billion per year, including a commitment to provide L&D finance and distinct subgoals for mitigation, adaptation, and L&D.

³ [Source](#) for finance.

All climate finance must be 'new and additional', i.e. on top of the global standard of at least 0.7%, GNI commitment to ODA established in the 1970s. The current practice of over-reporting climate finance by donors must end.

5. Common time frames⁴

Greenpeace joins CAN International in its call for COP26 to reach a decision in favour of a single 5-year common timeframe for nationally determined contributions (NDCs). This is because it will provide more regular opportunities to increase and readjust the ambition of targets, it will align with the global stocktake (GST), it will provide more frequent and regular accountability moments, and it will give negotiators more than two chances to solve the climate emergency and put the world on track to achieve climate neutrality, compared with two NDC implementation periods in the situation of a 10-year timeframe.

6. Carbon capture utilisation and storage (CCUS)⁵

Alongside CAN International, Greenpeace does not consider currently envisioned carbon capture and storage (CCS) applications as proven sustainable climate solutions - there is no evidence at present. All government support for the continued use of fossil fuels, including CCS, must be phased out as soon as possible, and CAN strictly opposes any such support. Governments must phase out all fossil fuel production and use, and phase in 100% renewable energy, as quickly as possible but no later than 2050. CAN cannot and will not support any effort to promote negative emissions or offsets as an alternative to stringent emission reductions. Additionally, CAN does not support bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS) at any scale if it results in food insecurity, resource and land use conflicts, and detrimental biodiversity impacts; carbon capture utilisation and storage (CCUS) is currently understood as a detour for decarbonisation and unlikely to deliver mitigation in the magnitude needed to address climate change.

7. Transparency⁶

Greenpeace supports CAN International's call for Parties to deliver common reporting tables, common tabular formats, various report outlines, and a training program by COP26 (CMA3). The existing tables for developed country Parties offer a good starting point but must be updated to reflect the modalities, procedures and guidelines (MPGs) as decided in Katowice.⁷ The enhanced transparency framework is the backbone of the Paris Agreement and the only instrument where your people, and we as civil society and parties know whether commitments are actually fulfilled in a regular and meaningful time frame.

The MPGs outline specific provisions where flexibility is provided to those developing country Parties that need it in light of their capacities, as a way of adhering to the MPGs while enabling them to highlight specific capacity-building needs. Operationalising flexibility in the tables is a key challenge facing Parties, which must therefore uphold the TACCC principles (transparency, accuracy, consistency, comparability, and completeness). It should be recognised that Parties have different starting points, thus, flexibility should not compromise efforts to compare reports.

CAN International reiterates the importance of paragraph 77(d), its role in upholding vital Paris Agreement principles, and applicability to Article 6 in its entirety.

⁴ [Source](#) for common time frames.

⁵ [Source](#) for CCS and CCU.

⁶ [Source](#) for transparency.

⁷ [Guiding Principles for MPGs](#)

8. Global stocktake (GST)⁸

Greenpeace joins CAN International in recognising that the world is currently far off track to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement. Starting the process for input under the Global Stocktake is critical to adjust ambition needs in order to ensure that we meet the Paris Agreement goals. With the first GST to kick-off following COP26, important decisions are being taken on the structure and process it will involve.

First, a wide range of stakeholders need to be meaningfully engaged and invited to contribute to the GST; for this purpose, technical and financial support must be organised and provided to developing country parties, as well as non-state actors such as civil society, youth organisations or Indigenous Peoples.

Secondly, it is vital that guiding questions are based on the following principles:

- Limiting global warming to 1.5°C
- Enabling and facilitating the input of Indigenous Peoples' knowledge and local communities' practices that are sometimes transmitted in informal ways
- Centering of human rights
- Including all pillars of the Paris Agreement, with a dedicated section on loss and damage, that is currently missing
- Assessing polluting practices which contribute to climate change, namely the use of fossil fuels

9. Adaptation and Loss and Damage⁹

Greenpeace joins CAN International's position, noting that most vulnerable people are already gravely impacted by the climate crisis and are at risk of being pushed into further uncertainty and poverty. This has been exacerbated by 'vaccine apartheid' and the lack of equitable access to Covid-19 vaccines.

COP26 must take urgent and needs-based action on Loss and Damage (L&D) to respond to the needs of the most vulnerable people, to protect ecosystems and to stop runaway climate change.

Greenpeace joins CAN in urging leaders to come prepared to address the urgent and outstanding issue of Loss and Damage finance, and agree on the following actions and decisions:

- A permanent SB agenda item to discuss Loss and Damage - to increase its political relevance and profile, assess ongoing progress to secure financial resources for Loss and Damage, and provide a political space beyond technical discussions to ensure momentum and action
- A COP decision on the operationalisation of the Santiago Network on Loss and Damage ensuring sufficient resourcing and effective governance
- Provision of new, additional and needs-based loss and damage finance and a system to deliver it to vulnerable developing countries
 - Inclusion of L&D in the discussion on the post-2025 finance goal and a COP26 decision to provide new and additional loss and damage finance until the post 2025 finance goal takes effect
 - A COP26 decision to establish a robust financing system for loss and damage within the UNFCCC, based on an assessment of options for a system which delivers loss and damage finance to vulnerable, developing countries and most vulnerable communities

⁸ [Source](#) for GST.

⁹ [Source](#) for adaptation + loss and damage.

10. Agriculture^{10,11}

The Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture (KJWA) negotiations at COP26 should work towards developing meaningful guidance or ‘no regret options’ to inform climate action in agriculture. These guidelines should be based on the IPCC’s AR6 WG1 report, and provide advice for NDCs, LTS and climate finance. The guidance should work to ensure that climate action in agriculture is structured to deliver on the principles of food security and nutrition, adaptation, absolute and equitable emission reductions, ecosystem integrity and gender responsiveness. The KJWA must take forward key lessons from the series of workshops held, including:

- A necessary shift towards **agroecological** methods and production, with direct support for smallholder farmers, by shifting subsidies away from synthetic nitrogen fertilisers, monoculture animal feed, and overproduction of unhealthy food.
- A recommendation for **absolute (not intensity-based) emission reductions in the livestock sector, particularly in large-scale factory farming systems** in surplus meat and dairy-producing countries.
- Encouraging **gender-responsive approaches** to address gaps in access to land, finance, extension services and markets.
- KJWA must not promote strategies that will lead to polluters purchasing soil carbon offsets as an excuse to avoid taking real action to cut emissions. Instead it must recognise the complexity of local adaptation needs, requiring holistic and systemic approaches to addressing agriculture in the climate context, rather than narrow technological fixes or on counting carbon.
- Ensuring that **Just Transition** principles are at the heart of food and agricultural system changes towards agroecology and “less and better” livestock.

That KJWA outcomes can play a role in recommending **increased finance flows**, and better application of the use of climate finance to strengthen climate action in agriculture.

The Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture (KJWA) must explore ways to facilitate a shift towards less and better meat production that benefits people, nature and the climate in an equitable manner.¹²

11. Ecosystems

At COP26, Greenpeace asserts that the vital role of nature in climate change mitigation and adaptation to achieve the objectives of the Paris Agreement needs to be recognised. This can be achieved by operationalising key ecosystem provisions of the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement, ensuring a rights-based approach is followed for embedding the role of ecosystems in climate action, embedding nature into NDCs, national adaptation plans, and LTS aligned with biodiversity policies, and requesting parties to maximise the potential of nature in terms of protecting ecosystem integrity in their national plans and policies. COP26 should also increase UNFCCC-CBD convergence, recognising the concept of ‘Ecosystem Based Approaches’, revise the ‘Forest’ definition and enhance current carbon accounting rules, and improve the integration of climate and biodiversity through increased IPCC Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) joint work in advance of the 2023 GST.

Furthermore, Greenpeace opposes the term Nature Based Solutions (NBS) to be used in NDCs, it is not a technical term sanctioned by the UNFCCC or the IPCC. It is dangerously vague. The correct, technical

¹⁰ [Source](#) for agriculture.

¹¹ [Source](#).

¹² This link includes the full submission to the Koronivia that was developed in 2020.

<https://climatenetwork.org/resource/can-submission-to-kjwa-improved-livestock-management-systems-including-agropastoral-production-systems-november-2020/>

term that is related to nature in the UNFCCC is Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) for which accounting and reporting methodologies exist. AFOLU targets and actions are and must continue to be addressed in NDCs, with accounting being kept fully separate from fossil fuel emission reductions accounting.

Loopholes in the current AFOLU accounting and methodology should be addressed, in order that AFOLU actions represented in the NDCs do no harm to biodiversity and estimate future sink capacity accurately. Loopholes which allow the overestimation of future sink capacity enable a convenient but false perception of a speedier pathway and timeline to Net Zero. AFOLU actions should also help overcome the main crises of our times: social injustice, food sovereignty and mass biodiversity loss.

The reason that NBS is rapidly emerging as a term in the public discourse is that extractive and polluting industries are able to take advantage of the ambiguities and use the appeal of nature with no concrete accounting methodology behind it - to greenwash, offset and boost PR at a time when their social licence and profits are dwindling.

12. Greenpeace joins CAN in its call for a new work program for Action for Climate Empowerment (ACE) must ensure better mainstreaming of ACE across relevant workstreams through:

- Human rights-based approaches
- A coherent and incremental 5-year action plan and an ambitious road map
- An expert group or Task Force that would gather Party and non-Party stakeholders already conducting work outside of the UNFCCC that is relevant to ACE
- The Green Climate Fund (GCF), Global Environmental Facility (GEF), and Adaptation Fund should be included in ACE workshops and meetings
- Integration of ACE in Nationally Determined Contributions and National Reports

GLOSSARY

Acronym	Meaning	Explanation
CCUS	Carbon capture, utilization and storage	CCUS encompasses a range of methods and technologies which remove CO ₂ from fuel combustion or industrial processes and from the atmosphere (capture) that is then transported to facilities where the CO ₂ is either recycled for use as a resource to create products or services (utilisation) or permanently stored, for example, deep underground (storage).
CMA	Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement.	The conference where the parties who have signed and ratified the Paris Agreement meet. Non-signatories can also participate as observers. The CMA oversees and takes decisions to promote the implementation of the Paris Agreement.
CTF	Common timeframes	Common timeframes for emission reduction commitments is one of the priorities for the COP26 negotiations and remains an unresolved part of the Paris rulebook. The discussion on common timeframes is all about aligning the timelines of Parties' climate pledges, with the biggest discrepancy being whether they should be 5 or 10 years in length, and to which extent Parties have flexibility over their timeframe.
GST	Global Stocktake	A component of the Paris Agreement that is used to assess the world's collective progress towards achieving the purpose of the agreement and its long-term goals, by monitoring and evaluating its implementation in order to inform countries on how they should update and enhance climate action. The first GST will take place from 2021-2023, and every 5 years after that.
L&D	Loss and damage	Loss and damage refers to the Loss and Damage mechanism (or Warsaw International Mechanism). This attempts to mitigate the loss and damage associated with climate change impacts, including both slow-onset and extreme events. This especially targets countries that are more vulnerable to the negative effects of climate change.
LTS	Long-term strategies	Under the Paris Agreement, parties should strive to communicate long-term low greenhouse gas emission development strategies, also commonly referred to as long-term strategies, by 2020. This is the list of parties who have done that so far.

NDCs	Nationally determined contributions	Each Party is required by the Paris Agreement to create, communicate, and maintain a series of NDCs that it plans to achieve, to be updated every 5 years (which means COP26 is the first time NDCs will be updated since Paris). Parties should pursue domestic mitigation, adaptation and finance measures in order to meet the contributions' objectives.
Santiago Network	-	A network established as part of the Warsaw International Mechanism with the aim of averting, minimising and addressing loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change. It works to connect vulnerable developing countries with providers of technical assistance, knowledge, and resources needed to comprehensively address climate risks.

For more information, contact:

Juan Pablo Osornio: +49 (0) 151 4456 8454
josornio@greenpeace.org

Greenpeace International
Ottho Heldringstraat 5
1066 AZ Amsterdam
The Netherlands