ECO is pleased too about the finance section. This must stay in (as ECO can already think of a few Parties with fingers on the ‘delete’ button!). The provision of climate finance is an integral part of the fair share for developed countries (and, post-2020, of countries with comparable levels of responsibility and capability in accordance with the equity framework/indicators). Information on the provision of finance must be included when tabling initial contributions. All countries should spell out how they plan to mobilise additional finance and shift investment patterns, such as through setting policy frameworks or deploying public finance.

Adaptation is a fundamental element of the 2015 Agreement. Many parties have expressed concern over the need to ensure equal importance, and ECO shares these concerns. Yet ECO is also concerned that some parties seem to think a contribution on adaptation alone is a sufficient contribution to the 2015 agreement. Clearly it’s not! Adaptation is best addressed as part of the broader discussions on the 2015 Agreement, rather than just through the contribution preparation process. In a similar vein, ECO would like to stress that there are a number of issues related to finance, technology and capacity building which need to be addressed in the 2015 agreement. This goes far beyond merely being part of the discussion about intended nationally determined contributions.

ECO has many friends around the world. These friends are very knowledgeable about cutting emissions and transitioning to renewable energy. ECO’s friends are eager to help countries. It should be a no-brainer that civil society should be consulted and included in the domestic preparation processes for developing proposed contributions. ECO heard Brazil mention in yesterday’s Ministerial that they are consulting broadly with stakeholders as part of their preparations. To further facilitate independent assessments, the Secretariat could also help out – they could be mandated to prepare a compilation and synthesis of the national contributions as well as establish an electronic bulletin board so that Parties and stakeholders can post comments and questions to others about their contributions. How’s that for one idea? Imagine how many more Parties could receive if it asks civil society.

Havening now covered all the substance, ECO would like to remind Parties of the firm deadline for when this homework is due – and that it’s no later than the first quarter of 2015. This is necessary so that ECO’s friends and others can conduct an ex-ante review for equity and adequacy. What would be the point of having all these nice discussions if our combined efforts do not solve the climate crisis?

On June 16, CAN is turning 25 - come along to hear about CAN’s new direction and help us celebrate with a party! Register here: http://bit.ly/RegisterCAN25Anniversary

ECO online
Remember you can read ECO online or on your iPhone, iPad or Android:

The Visionary Few in the ADP Ministerial
Something revolutionary happened in the ADP ministerial yesterday even though most Parties repeated worn out positions, there were a visionary few that outlined a vision for Paris in line with what science demands.

First, the Marshall Islands, supported by Grenada, noted the “need to fully decarbonise our economies by the middle of the century”. AILAC entertained the notion of “possibly [going] carbon neutral” by mid-century to stay below 2°C, while Norway said “we need to approach zero net emissions by the middle of the century”. The Netherlands, Germany and others made similar comments. Clearly, some governments have taken the findings of the IPCC’s AR5 to heart (or was it ECO’s opening article on Wednesday on the need to phase out all fossil fuels by 2050 and phase in 100% renewables?). Over the coming days - and those UN Climate Summit statements! - ECO looks forward to hearing more countries outlining their vision for a fossil-free world.

Challenge is to translate this vision into concrete action. Countries like Norway need to drop their double-standards on climate finance and get the state-owned company, Statoil, to leave fossil fuels in the ground. All countries need to increase their efforts pre- and post-2020. However, ECO was really excited to hear China say it would table its proposed post-2020 contribution by the March 2015 deadline. Others, like Brazil, who noted that it would only be ready sometime “before Paris” clearly need to pick up their pace. ECO wonders if countries like Brazil are concerned about having their contributions considered in a civil society review?

ECO is even more confused about the idea that some Parties want to “commit to submit” at the Climate Summit. Of course, ECO would prefer that Parties submit what they will commit.

WTF! TXT! INF NDCs
Tuesday saw a draft text was released on what information Parties will be required to include in the announcement of their initial post-2020 contributions, and the process to review these for adequacy and equity. Much detail is still needed, but ECO welcomes this draft as a good development. Way to go Parties! Please continue to work at this speed!

As Parties ruminate over this text, ECO should mention a few points.

On the information needed
The annex is a positive start regarding the information required. The overarching objective is that the proposed contributions are quantifiable, comprehensible, comparable and reproducible. For developed countries, everybody already knows how to start filling in the basic detail – like their base year; that the commitment will be an economy-wide absolute reduction one and he will. ECO think that results should have a long term end date of 2025. But what about the long-term you may ask (especially if you saw ECO’s Wednesday edition introducing its position on a phase out of all fossil fuel emissions)? And you would be quite right, Dear Reader. Paris must also send signals for the long-term, and therefore it will also be necessary for Parties to indicate where they are going in 2030, 2050 and other time points.

...continued on the back page...
Fresh air for fresh thinking

ECO hopes that a fresh breeze of air in Bonn will give the Chinese delegation a break from Beijing’s filthy air, and perhaps a fresh perspective on the negotiations.

Last year, 92% of China’s cities failed to meet national air quality standards. The government has since mandated provinces to curb coal consumption, the biggest source of air pollution, in particular PM2.5 (particles smaller than 2.5 mm in diameter). A number of provinces have put forward specific coal control measures and some have even pledged to reduce absolute consumption by 2017. The aggregate of these provincial measures will reduce the country’s coal consumption by 655 million tonnes from a business as usual scenario by 2020.

ECO knows that there are significant co-benefits between addressing air pollution and mitigating greenhouse gases emissions. Over the past decade, China’s coal burning has accounted for half of the world’s CO2 emission growth. Slaughtering coal power generation will not only be good for the Chinese people, but also for the global community.

Provincial cuts to coal-based power generation will translate to roughly 1,300 million tonnes of emissions reductions, equivalent to the combined total annual emissions of Australia and Canada. If China delivers on these plans with full implementation and by expanding its coal caps to broader regions, then its emissions pathway will almost be in line with the IEA’s 2°C scenario. Other countries must do their fair share too if China is to have confidence moving forward.

ECO thinks that the Minister’s further clarification on China’s proposed submission by March 2015 is a timely step in the right direction that needs to be built upon. China should also communicate its domestic successes here in Bonn to help build momentum in the international climate negotiations. More transparency will help build trust, enhance collective ambition, and might just allow everyone to breathe more easily.

Ludwig

Basking in the double glow of the copious lighting and the bright sunlight shining into the “computer centre greenhouse” today, Ludwig was cool as a cucumber, thanks to the temporary air conditioning system snaking its way in from the back garden. Merely three metres from this newly arrived AC-monster. Ministers (or rather their stand-ins) waxed lyrical (except for you Trig!) on the subject of stepping up climate action, burrowing into their extra layers against the arctic conditions. The Maritim has been home to the UNFCCC’s intersessions since the Punic Wars (says Ludwig). But its management has appeared as audacious to some recent developments in this world of ours. With a major renovation now on the cards, perhaps the most concrete thing that can come out of this session would be for the UNFCCC to call for a passive re-construction. Certainly passivity is an area in which Parties have shown themselves to excel.

Paljon onnea Suomi!

ECO congratulates Finland on its brand new Climate Change Act. The Act gives legislative power for an emissions reduction target by 2050 of at least 80%. ECO would have preferred at least 95%, but hey, this is a leap in the right direction for Finland, which hasn’t shown such strong climate leadership in the past. Moving forward, Finland’s climate policy will not depend on political fluctuations. We applaud the long-term thinking! Please open your vodka bottles, and join ECO in a toast. “Kippis!”

Now, who’s next? If a cold, isolated country with lots of energy intensive industry can do it, so can you!

SDGs? Whazit? And what’s climate got to do with it?

In a land far far away, a bunch of busy bees are currently negotiating the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This brainchild of the Rio+20 Summit should provide for a successor to the MDGs, and is supposed to end poverty and bring on sustainable development. Since March last year, the members of the Open Working Group on SDGs have been working on an inspirational, aspirational and otherwise brilliant ‘To Do List’ (the goals) for international development over the next 15 years. Their recommendations are due to be delivered to the UN General Assembly by September 2014. The next round of negotiations starts on 16 June.

What will end up on the goals list depends on a battle that is yet to come. There are already some things in place like gender, health, education, food and agriculture, energy and water. There’s also some new kids on the block too, like climate change, ecosystems, forests and cities. Amongst all of these, the climate change goal is having the hardest time staying alive. At the moment the working group’s report’s zero draft has it on life support but a number of powerful countries are trying hard to pull the plug. These murderous intentions are only being kept at bay by a handful of brave countries and groups, like the LDCs, some island states, Bangladesh and Guatemala. Far too many others are just watching the battle from the sidelines.

It’s time for some soul searching on why a climate goal is worth having.

Is it because addressing climate change is a pre-requisite to ending poverty and achieving sustainable development? Or because the IPCC has hammered it home, time and time again, that climate change disproportionately affects the poorest and that action cannot wait another minute? Or because some leaders agree that climate change is the greatest threat to development? Heads ofStates will find it hard to credibly justify the SDGs in September 2015 without climate change goals while academia, civil society and even the private sector (and of course, ECO too!) realise that this is the most pressing challenge of our generation. Now that we get that, what’s that got to do with the UNFCCC?

A set of climate-blind SDGs agreed in September 2015 wouldn’t set a nice stage for an ambitious climate agreement a few weeks later in Paris, would it? Since the SDGs cover areas like energy, agriculture, water, forests, oceans, cities and economic growth, they can, and will, massively contribute to both mitigation and adaptation action. If you strive for low-carbon and climate-resilient development, you might throw the occasional side glance at those development goals.

Both processes are currently looking at the same pots for money and they intersect during implementation where (hopefully!) the same national strategies will guide climate and development action.

For ECO, it seems pretty straightforward that climate change must be strongly and credibly reflected in the SDGs and we want to encourage the Bonn clique to connect with their mates in New York - go!