The Curious Case of the Long-Term Finance Workshop That Didn’t Discuss Long-Term Finance

The helpful elves of ECO were disappointed to report yesterday that the workshop on Long-Term Finance (LTF) failed to meet our expectations in that it didn’t actually discuss the key elements within the framework of LTF.

Here is a reminder to our friendly delegates what the aims of the LTF process are; hopefully this will get you back on track for today’s session:

To quote the Convention itself: “COP19 requested the secretariat to organise in-session workshops to facilitate continued deliberations of Parties on, inter alia, strategies and approaches for scaling up climate finance, cooperation on enhanced enabling environments and support for readiness activities, and on needs for support to developing countries from 2014 to 2020.”

Our ECO elves waited in anticipation for such issues and ideas to be broached yesterday, but eventually left the room deflated. The concrete strategies to scale up finance didn’t get mentioned, nor did the topic of support and enabling environments.

Needless to say, the US$100 billion elephant in the room lingered until we approached the end of the workshop, with little mention of how to reach the goal or speedily deploy funds to vulnerable countries.

But all is not lost, dear delegates! With another full session today, there is still enough time to re-capture the objectives of the LTF process and address the most crucial aspects. Time that should be used to discuss methods to scale up public finance, particularly for adaptation, and talk about the readiness of developing countries to speedily and effectively deploy funds.

Accounting Our Way Out Of Trouble?

With INDCs rolling in, it’s clear that many Parties intend to use international market-based mechanisms to achieve their mitigation commitments. ECO’s main message to delegates—put in place rules to avoid double-counting mitigation efforts. Without good accounting, market mechanisms could undermine mitigation targets. The climate cannot afford the risk of both host and purchasing countries counting the same reductions to meet INDCs.

We commend the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG) for proposing criteria for the Framework for Various Approaches and next steps for a work programme.

Parties should undertake the technical work needed to ensure that claimed reductions are real, additional, permanent and verified, and that any participating system ensures overall net atmospheric benefits.

There are important lessons to be learned from the CDM. An adequate process will require sufficient time for Parties and civil society to participate in this complex work and to develop common standards and transparency procedures for linked national and UNFCCC registries.

ECO also notes that market-based reductions should be supplemental to ambitious national actions. Reference levels for carbon sinks must ensure that real emissions and removals are comprehensively captured and accounted, and are backed by science to avoid catastrophic climate change.

Delegates, accounting is important and we are running out of time. Let’s see a path towards transparent accounting and the highest environmental integrity standards.
Three strikes and you’re out!

Fossil of the Day is presented daily by the Climate Action Network to the countries that perform the worst at the UN Climate Talks. And Japan must have tried their best to get this process so very wrong!

Strike One! First place in the Fossil awards goes to Japan for their extremely weak INDC, which included smoke and mirrors (shifting baselines) tactics to fake ambition. They had the audacity to claim that this is in line with the developed country target of 80% by 2050. Japanese Prime Minister Shinzō Abe will present this excuse of an INDC—which equates to 18% from 1990 levels—to G7 leaders this weekend. He will presumably try to pull the wool over their eyes as well with this un-ambitious INDC.

Strike Two!! The second Fossil goes to Japan for blocking a proposal from G7 countries that would help development aid and banks work. This intervention would be in line with efforts to prevent global temperatures rising beyond the 1.5°C threshold. Seriously, does Japan want to lead us towards a world with catastrophic levels of warming?

Strike Three!!! Japan wins the third Fossil for funding carbon intensive coal projects in developing countries. Despite growing criticisms from the international community—Japan was previously awarded a fossil in Lima for this dastardly behaviour—it continues to do so. As long as Japan keeps its dirty coal policy, the fossil awards will keep coming. Japan should be funding renewable energy solutions, not dirty fossil fuels.

You’re out! Japan gets THREE fossil awards.

Vulnerable Nations
Shine a Light on Ambition

ECO is humbled and thankful for the courageous leadership shown by the Climate Vulnerables Forum. This represents 20 of the most vulnerable countries in the world fighting for their only means of survival—a global goal of 1.5°C.

The Philippines, Costa Rica and Bangladesh (current and former chairs of the group) are known for their commitment through national actions. As climate change impacts their communities, these countries have bounced back into action to protect them. The Philippines is mainstreaming climate change knowledge into their development planning. Costa Rica is getting closer to 100% renewable energy day by day and Bangladesh invests millions of domestic funds to fight climate change and build resilience.

The 2013-15 Structured Expert Dialogue (SED) review is the most significant signal yet that we must limit the global temperature increase to 1.5°C. ECO has been dismayed by some vulnerable countries that are blocking this from being formally recognised in the Paris agreement.

ECO is proud to stand alongside the Climate Vulnerables Forum, and we are inspired by their leadership and commitment to limiting global warming to 1.5°C. We would like to bestow Ray of the Day on the Climate Vulnerables Forum.
Carbon Climate Resilience Is In This Season

2015 is an important year for our planet’s future. Countries are coming together to agree on outcomes in parallel, but interlinked, processes: the United Nations process on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

There are clear synergies. It is hard to achieve sustainable development without developing a climate-resilient and low-carbon process, and vice versa. Climate change already threatens to reverse sustainable development advances that have been made.

It’s ECO’s view that implementing the SDG and UNFCCC outcomes should be done in an integrated and strategic manner, and we have an idea of how that can be done.

In 2010, UNFCCC Parties agreed that countries should develop low carbon development strategies, but this hasn’t been universally implemented. Now is the time. The beauty of low and zero carbon development strategies is they overlap with sustainable development plans.

Of course, before these plans are developed, countries need to:

- Define an indicative emission reduction trajectory through 2030 and 2040 to achieve decarbonisation by 2050. Advanced economies should achieve this sooner.
- Define mitigation goals for 2020 and 2025, in line with a UNFCCC system of five-year commitment periods.
- Include existing policies and measures to address emissions from all relevant sectors.
- Include measures to avoid double counting of any offset credits that may be used in the short term; however, the emphasis must be on domestic action.

These plans should also mainstream adaptation and climate resilience throughout, taking into consideration the predicted impacts of climate change appropriate to the location.

Development and implementation of these plans will be at the national level, giving opportunities for integrated thinking and cooperation between ministries, and engagement by a wider number of political actors and stakeholders to achieve sustainable development.

ECO thinks Parties should call these plans “zero-carbon climate-resilient action plans.” The title may not be catchy, but you know exactly what the aim is. Importantly, such plans would allow countries to strategically integrate their planned SDGs and UNFCCC implementation, and to develop a sustainable and climate-friendly vision and the implementation pathway to achieve it.
Renewable energy—the darling of the mitigation community—came, saw and conquered at the Technical Expert Meeting (TEM) on Tuesday. And we are hungry for more. So, let’s roll out the red carpet for the under-appreciated ugly duckling of the emissions cutting measures—energy efficiency. It might get less attention, but let’s not forget it has turned into a swan. So, let’s refocus and zoom into the obvious low-hanging fruit that can help keep us within a warming of 1.5°C. It’s time to welcome the Technical Expert Meeting on Energy Efficiency in Urban Environments. Insert feet stamping and loud applause here!

The TEM will be held today and tomorrow and ECO is expecting a full house.

Through energy efficiency, cities from Buenos Aires to Brazzaville and Berlin could contribute significantly to bridging the global emissions gap. Different kinds of urban action, according to the Stockholm Environment Institute, could decrease global GHG emissions by 3.7 GtCO2e below what national actions are currently on track to achieve in 2030, and by 8.0 GtCO2e in 2050. And some cities genuinely are tapping into this potential. Can we give a standing ovation for the cities leading the way, please?

Now, this is all fine and dandy. But what is still missing? ECO understands that there is a need for a strong financial mechanism. The main hurdle continues to be a lack of access to innovative financing mechanisms that can encourage cities to switch from high-carbon urban infrastructures towards low-carbon, sustainable infrastructure.

The world’s quickly developing and smaller cities will require up-front investments for capacity building support to help formulate and implement long-term climate strategies. Cities would also need access to transformational technological solutions to ensure widespread access to zero-carbon energy services. Thus, any post-2020 international climate agreement (as well as the pre-2020 measures, we are looking at you mitigation Workstream 2) needs to provide incentives to rapidly reduce deployment costs of such technologies, while bolstering mechanisms for technology transfer towards the fast growing cities of the global south.

ECO asks all the cities who have gone at it alone and are harnessing the energy savings potential now to take a bow. Bravo!

---

**CAN and UN-Security Solidarity Party for Nepal**

**Sat. 6 June 2015, 8.30 pm**

**Bundesrechnungshof Cafeteria**

**DONATIONS** will go to the reconstruction and rehabilitation of an earthquake impacted village of a CAN Partner in Nepal

**FREE ENTRANCE** - bring your UNFCCC-Badge