

# eco



*ECO has been published by Non-Governmental Environmental Groups at major international conferences since the Stockholm Environment Conference in 1972. ECO is produced co-operatively by the Climate Action Network at the UNFCCC meetings in Marrakech, Morocco during the November COP 22 meeting. ECO email: [administration@climatenetwork.org](mailto:administration@climatenetwork.org) • ECO website: [www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters](http://www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletters) • Editorial/Production: Linh Do*

## Come One, Come All

**Any individual with a conference badge, from observer to Party delegate is welcome to come the renowned NGO Party.**

**Address:** So | Night Lounge, Rue Haroun Errachid (next to the Sofitel Hotel)

**Time:** Tonight from 2100 until sunrise!

## Germany's Got a Long-Term View

Maybe being awarded the Fossil last Wednesday helped because Germany has pulled itself together and ended the fight between the ministries of environment, economy, agriculture and transport. It also finally published its 2050 climate action plan yesterday.

Let's give them a big hug! We know, it's been painful. Germany is now the first country to present a detailed long-term low greenhouse gas emissions development strategy outlining how it intends to decarbonise its economy. What ECO likes about the plan is that it includes interim targets for 2030, broken down by individual sectors: power, industry, transport, build-ings and agriculture. This gives citizens, companies and investors the clarity they need. Ger-many also recognises its international responsibility, placing the plan (which includes an ex-plicit reference to international climate finance and support for developing countries to im-plement their NDCs) in the context of the Sustainable Development Goals.

This has to be a short hug, though: Germany has to get back to work. Fossil lobbyists were successful in stripping many good elements from the plan. There are quite a few gaps in the document that need to be strengthened:

The headline targets—a range between 80 and 95% reduction by 2050—are still not enough to deliver Germany's share of the global effort urgently needed to limit warming to 1.5°C. These need increasing.

The plan's targets can only be achieved if Germany phases out coal. But the govern-ment lacked the courage to explicitly say so. This only creates uncertainty and makes a just transition for workers and communities more difficult to organise.

The call for the establishment of a commission with representatives from civil society to develop new opportunities for coal producing regions is a real necessity! ECO hopes that this commission is not going to be a meeting of fossil lobbyists. And given the urgency of the transition, why would you wait until 2018 for the first meeting? Minster Gabriel, we suggest inviting the commission, civil society and climate scien-tists for a Christmas brunch this year! The earlier, the better—and you might find a so-lution before next year's elections?

ECO could not agree more that the EU emissions trading scheme needs to be reformed and strengthened so it can become an effective policy tool. What happened to the con-crete idea of a floor price in the ETS being included in the plan?

ECO is a friend of the learning process and ratchet mechanisms and hopes that Germany will revise its 2050 plan and work to increase the EU's NDC, bringing it in line with the Paris ob-ligations in time for the first review of ambition in 2018! Only then can Germany again be a role model—especially for other G20 states, as Germany will hold the Presidency in 2017.

## “Loss and Damage” from Concept to Action

ECO was thrilled to be able to participate in the informal session of the loss and damage discussion beyond the first contact group. But this excitement was watered down when a Party proposed to de-lete the paragraph that allowed relevant organisations to express their views and provide input on the possible activities in the work stream of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage (WIM), before the first meeting of the Executive Committee in 2017.

Input from observers helps to enrich the discussion, provide experiences and lessons learned from around the world and identify the possible activities that the WIM should take into account to fulfil its objectives.

Additionally, the concept of a “placeholder” on loss and damage finance, instead of more defined work activities, is disturbing. It almost seems like developed countries are procrastinating on the subject. ECO is confident you've got it in you to agree to write a submission on enhancing mobili-sation of financial support before March.

## Timing Scientific Reporting to Increase Ambition

The period through 2020 is critical to increase ambition. The 2018 Facilitative Dialogue will play a key role. The IPCC Special Report on 1.5°C (expected September 2018) will provide important input. Before Paris, the scientific input of the First Periodical Review (FPR) and its Structured Expert Dialogue (SED) was critical.

The FPR concluded that the 2°C limit as a line of defence should be pushed lower. Additionally, the world is not on track to achieve this goal. In other words: meaningful mitigation measures must urgently be scaled up. In Paris, Parties used this input and took the important decision to strengthen the global goal to pursue efforts to limit warming to 1.5°C compared to preindustrial levels.

Periodic reviews and expert dialogues need to be repeated regularly under the Paris Agreement. We need to start with the Second Periodical Review (SPR) and its dialogue in 2017, or in May 2018 at the latest. A further session should be organised in October 2018 to summarise the content of IPCC Special Report on 1.5°C to inform the Facilitative Dialogue in 2018. Key questions here will be: What path do current NDCs put us on; and how far is that from achieving the Paris goals?

The SPR has to examine the adequacy of the long-term goal of the Convention and how far we are from achieving it. This should be in sync with the IPCC process for AR6. The SPR should finish its work in 2022 or 2023 so that it can inform the Global Stocktake in 2023 with the latest science.

---

## Next Steps to Get to \$100 Billion

Finally, the juicy discussion on long-term finance under COP agenda item 10a is getting off the ground. It's not surprising that virtually every developed country that spoke yesterday celebrated their roadmap towards the \$100-billion-a-year promise. And of course they highlighted their projection that public adaptation finance may double by 2020. Maybe developed countries even think they are off the hook when looking at those projections. Yet, with a closer look, a few additional things come to mind that may require COP action.

Let's start with a key fact. Doubling adaptation finance by 2020 would mean only a fifth of the \$100bn would be public finance for adaptation. While a welcome increase, a gross imbalance is still projected between mitigation and adaptation, and Parties may wish to address this in any COP22 decision on long-term finance. They could do so by urging developed countries to increase adaptation finance way beyond the roadmap's projections. Quadrupling instead of doubling would be a fair start, in ECO's view. After all, adaptation needs are set to soar dramatically in the near future, especially given the lack of ambition in countries' NDCs.

ECO was delighted to hear Bangladesh questioning the inclusion of market-rate loans as climate finance. Right on! Commercial loans do not constitute assistance to cover the 'incremental cost' of action as referred to in Article 4.3 of the UNFCCC. That's where grants and the grant equivalents of concessional loans come in. Logically, the grant equivalents of such loans, not their face-value, are a better measure for progress towards the UNFCCC obligations that developed countries have committed to under the Paris Agreement's Article 9.

And here's another one—we've noticed that not all developed countries have made pledges or announcements on how they intend to increase their individual levels of climate finance by 2020. In some cases, the 2020 announcements do not constitute an increase over current levels. ECO suggests developed countries may want to clarify that when they next take the floor on this agenda item, and a COP decision may be needed to urge them to do so.

---

## Good News Day, Sort Of

Yesterday was a good day in that there was no official Fossil of the Day winner; though some would say Venezuela deserves at least an honourable mention for attempting to throw the baby out with the bathwater.

ECO completely gets that fossil fuel companies shouldn't be influencing negotiations. Organisations making a business out of polling have no place here. That doesn't mean that they should be lumped and grouped in with everyone else in civil society though!

We live in a world where the voice of the people counts—civil society can help governments truly understand the needs of the communities and support the development of effective, relevant climate solutions. Flush that dirty water down the drain but keep the baby safe, Venezuela.

---

## Coconutty Congratulations Fiji!

The question on everyone's lips has been: where will the next COP be? Ladies and gentlemen, ECO is glad to inform you that Fiji will have the Presidency of COP23 in 2017. Before you get too excited and start packing your scuba gear though, you should read the fine print: the official bidding proposal requested that COP23 be hosted in Bonn, Germany. All that remains are procedural matters to officially adopt Fiji's nomination at the COP plenary session. Worry not delegates, even though the COP itself will be in Bonn (think about German night markets!), the pre-COP may be in Fiji.

## ECO online

Remember you can read ECO online, through Poken or on your iPhone, iPad or Android!

<http://bit.ly/GetECO>

