Today, Parties will get to hear both the urgency of the crisis as well as the feasibility of achieving a 1.5°C pathway straight from the horse’s (or in this case scientist’s) mouth at the SBSTA-IPCC special event on the SR1.5. While ECO does not want to steal the IPCC’s thunder, ECO did want to highlight a few key points from the report.

The scale of the task is clear: the world needs to halve CO₂ emissions in little more than a decade and achieve net-zero emissions by mid-century. This will mean a rapid phasing out of fossil fuels and a transition to a 100% renewable energy future. If the world were to follow the P1 pathway it would mean close to an 80% reduction in coal use below 2010 levels by 2030, with significant cuts in oil and gas are well. Time is of the essence for Parties to strengthen their NDCs and mid-century emission reduction development strategies, accordingly!

In terms of ECO’s question on how to respond to the SR1.5, ECO hopes that the SBSTA chair listens closely to the present by the IPCC and delivers as thorough a summary report as the Chair developed for the last SBSTA-IPCC special event held in May 2016. This report should feed into the Talanoa Dialogue and its outcome.

On Monday, the World Bank released news of its post-2020 climate action, to cover 2021-2025. The announced USD$200 billion is good news. Quite a lot of zero-carbon resilient-infrastructure building good news, in fact, and the Bank has doubled its existing climate finance commitment. The World Bank (minus the IFC) has also committed to 50% for adaptation. Did other MDBs hear that?

Who could complain about the newly-pledged efforts to support 36GW of renewables and 1.5GW of energy efficiency savings? Or helping 100 cities decarbonize?

It’s just that the Bank has failed to actually state a climate target, or even how much carbon savings all that money will aim to achieve. It has not promised to end funding fossil fuel infrastructure completely, either directly or through intermediaries, although its prior announcement to stop funding upstream gas and oil remains a very positive step. This remains a gaping hole in the Bank’s stated climate ambition.

Perhaps the simplest way to set a climate-ambitious target would be to pledge, as civil society called on them to do at their October annual meeting, that the World Bank will make ALL of its portfolio lending compatible with 1.5°C.

And please remember in the midst of all the joy surrounding the new announcement, that most of the money from the banks are loans that must be paid back – by the world’s poorest countries.

Where There’s Smoke There’s Fire in Paradise

Oh crap – that’s smoke. We ventured outside and were choked back inside by the acrid burn smell of fresh fire. Where was it? Nearby? In our neighbourhood? Fear took hold as the sky closed in.

The news spread fast; early that morning a fire had started near a town called Paradise, California. The fire became a storm of flames, whipping through dead and dying brush, spreading 110 metres per minute. We heard of people fighting to survive in rivers and ponds as flames leaped over their heads. Tales of people running for their lives, clothes on fire as firefighters fought to save them. Of lives lost and lives upended as California’s most destructive and deadliest wildfire destroyed over 611 square kilometres; roughly the size of 5 Katowices.

In the Bay Area, the air was so hazardous, schools were closed and over 8 million people were advised to stay indoors — especially the very young and very old. Protective masks sold out. The Paradise fire killed at least 88 people and destroyed more than 13,000 homes. Over 200 people are still missing and 1000s of refugees are camped out in tents, housed in emergency shelters, and living in their cars. More than 50,000 people were evacuated in a twelve-hour stretch of terror, bravery, confusion and turmoil that overwhelmed the evacuation and safety plans. The Paradise Fire moved at speeds no one – not residents, firefighters nor public officials – could handle.

Why was no one ready for such devastation? Because this fire was driven by a climate induced drought. From 2012-2016, the western United States experienced exceptional drought conditions. The Paradise fire will not be the last. This is our future: fire, heat, smoke and devastation from climate induced change.

Sarah Diefendorf, resident of Oakland CA
Go For It Pedro!

As Spanish President Pedro Sánchez spoke in the High Level Segment, ECO heard in his words the difficulties facing several world leaders. He felt unable to offer new commitments, and played it safe; only mentioning a part of his government’s ambition programme. Uncertainties of all kinds (intensified in Spain by the alarming rise of the extreme right as a political force in the elections in Andalucía, traditionally a socialist stronghold) make the job of leading an ambitious climate transformation doubly difficult. His minority socialist government faces other headwinds — playing ‘catch-up’ after years of conservative inaction; difficulties over the 2019 budget; opposition from the influential car lobby to proposals on diesel taxation and on banning the sale of polluting vehicles by 2040; the difficult relationship with the left-green ‘Unidos Podemos’ alliance; and the shadow of the far right looming over May’s municipal, regional, and EU elections.

ECO sends strength, hope and courage to Sánchez and his team for their climate ambition, energy transition, just transition and ecological transition agendas. Greater dialogue and participation, and setting aside political differences on key issues, are three elements which ECO will watch with interest in the future, as we look forward here in Katowice to the arrival of his Minister and veteran COP negotiator, Teresa Ribera.

Take courage from public support and match your words with action, President Sánchez. Put the previous government’s record behind you and show the world a Spanish President who keeps his promises, and really cares about his country’s vulnerability to climate change. Your emerging strategy, abolishing the ‘sun tax’ and pushing forward on renewables, is good for the future of the Spanish economy and job market, for people’s health, for Spain’s image abroad, for the EU and for the planet and our climate. ECO would like you to go further, faster, but Spain is finally getting on the right track.

And Spanish citizens need proof that things can be done differently so they can face change without fear. Your proposed climate change law is a good opportunity; it will create new jobs in more sustainable sectors while maintaining current ones, helping to bury the myth that protecting our environment is bad for the economy. The reverse has never been more true, but prove it: step up with your decarbonization promise and push ahead with your proposed law.

So: join the Powering Past Coal Alliance. Plan for coal plant closure by 2025. Support maximum EU ambition by calling for 2030 emissions reductions (against the 1990 baseline) beyond the 55% that some Member States and the European Parliament are calling for, with net zero EU emissions by 2050 at the latest, and revision of the EU’s NDC. Show stronger climate commitment in negotiations on the 2021-2027 EU budget framework and agriculture policy reform. Propose an ambitious ecosystem conservation and restoration programme — a real ‘ecological transition’. And finally: present, debate and defend ambitious proposals for a national climate and energy transition law and associated strategic plan.

SBSTA is Just the First Step

ECO welcomes today’s SBSTA special event on the IPCC Special Report on 1.5°C as one of the key opportunities to introduce the results to UNFCCC. But ECO thinks this can only be the start.

ECO is disappointed that the Polish Presidency did not respect the usual procedure for the opening ceremony to invite the IPCC Chair to give a presentation on the latest science on climate change, specifically the IPCC SR 1.5.

The IPCC Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C is the most important contribution to the Talanoa Dialogue — it is a game-changer that clearly lays out “where we are”, “where we need to go” and “how we can get there”.

ECO hopes the SBSTA Chair agrees and prepares a comprehensive summary from this event, including its key messages, which inform the Talanoa Dialogue and the Convention.

Ludwig: Seeking Space for CSO

Ludwig never thought he’d look back fondly on the times of the Warsaw Polish Presidency, with visions of abundant WiFi and plenty of seats, tables and plug sockets in the donut-shaped COP19 venue. These dreams were shattered. Instead of finding ready spaces for civil society (and anyone else who does not have megabucks or the lobbying power required to obtain a delegation for spaces to rest his weary feet (and check his weary inbox), for meeting space, power source he can possibly scavenge, and above all an epic quest to find the vanishing spaces! The venue site doesn’t seem to be lacking in space; Ludwig has to walk 8 km a day to get from zone A to zone G. Ludwig is in awe of a venue that manages to both have too few meeting rooms and too much space between them.

Now, Ludwig wants to give the Polish Presidency the benefit of the doubt. Maybe they just got a bit too keen on the concept of gamification. Maybe they just want to inject some energy and fun into our COP experience. Or, maybe they got the wrong impression of what we meant when we pushed for capacity building for resilience… But Ludwig noticed that there is so much less space at this COP. And it’s not just for civil society expression (including spontaneous, peaceful demonstrations), but for the day-to-day COP work and constituency coordination that allow the civil society to be most effective in supporting the operationalization of the Paris Agreement.
The “Bluffers Guide” to LULUCF

Even in the acronym-rich environment of the UNFCCC, the mention of LULUCF, which stands for Land Use, Land Use Change, and Forestry, freaks people out. It might seem complex, but here’s what you need to know:

Q: How could LULUCF rules undermine ambition?
A: Carbon accounting under the Kyoto Protocol fails to capture the real emissions to atmosphere from land and forests.

Q: Do land and forests get special treatment compared to other sectors?
A: Unfortunately they do. Current LULUCF rules allow countries to predict future emissions and get credits if they emit less than expected. If countries emitted exactly as what was predicted, they don’t have to account for those emissions. Imagine if this was the coal sector, it would be like a country saying “We predicted we would build 8 coal fired power stations but we’ve only built 5 so we’re in positive territory.” These false positives can also be used to hide a lack of progress in other sectors.

Q: LULUCF sounds a bit technical!
A: The headlines are simple. Forest and land emissions accounting doesn’t fully reflect emissions that are released into the atmosphere. This should be fixed!

Q: But won’t we fix these old problems with the new guidance developed under the Paris Agreement?
A: We hope! But we’re running out of time. We risk continuing the old emissions loopholes.

Q: So what’s the solution?
A: Make it simple and easy. Under the Convention, Parties already have to report their emissions from land and forests. This data should be used to account future emissions against emissions in the past.

ECO congratulates all Parties who participated in the multilateral assessment and facilitative sharing of views workshops yesterday. ECO offers special congratulations to China and Jordan for participating in the process for the first time! ECO hopes that these experiences help with the transition to the review process, to be established under the Paris Agreement.

Since ECO wasn’t able to ask questions during the workshops today, we wanted to share a couple of the questions we would have asked:

For Canada, ECO has two questions: The first relates to the need for strong domestic accountability measures in addition to the multilateral assessment. Given Canada’s track record on missing targets, such accountability measures are crucial. Will Canada establish a domestic climate change committee with the mandate to track the government’s progress towards its target, and provide a mechanism for judicial review of its climate legislation? The federal carbon pricing that will apply across the country beginning in 2019 is a long-overdue start, but an incomplete one. ECO’s second question is: when can we expect a serious plan to tackle the oil and gas sector? ECO does not need to ask about mechanisms for increasing ambition, as that question was thankfully covered by Switzerland. However, ECO still wants to see the results, and expects a strengthened NDC in 2019 that is inline with the IPCC SR1.5 report.

For France: Given that France has missed its emissions reductions targets for two years, artificially set higher carbon budgets for the next five years, and postponed the reduction of nuclear power in the energy mix until 2035, which in turn will delay the deployment of renewable energies. ECO would have asked whether France considers these measures an adequate response to the IPCC 1.5°C report and as a sign of true leadership?

For China: China noted that the ICA process helped to improve transparency, and that you have learned lessons from hearing the experiences of Annex I Parties. How have these lessons specifically informed the development of China’s MRV system and how will these lessons support the continuous improvement of the system?

For Jordan: during your presentation, you noted the challenges with the availability, accuracy, and completeness of data. What role can civil society organizations, academia, research organizations, and other non-governmental actors play in supporting Jordan’s data efforts?

ECO hopes that in deciding on the modalities for the facilitative, multilateral consideration of progress, Parties will allow observers to actively participate in the process. ECO asks, because it cares about the climate and about ensuring Parties achieve their highest levels of ambition.
The Plaster of Paris: ECO’s Recipe for a Robust Rulebook

Plaster of Paris’ widespread use for molds, casts, and ornamental work is derived, in part, from the fact that it does not crack. According to the Internet (which is never wrong), this construction material derives its name from the fact that its source material, a fine white powder, has historically been found in abundance right outside of Paris. ECO thought bringing a fine white powder across the border into Katowice seemed unadvisable, so ECO has come up with another set of ingredients: ones that will create a robust rulebook that does not crack and ensures the highest ambition.

The key ingredients for this Rulebook include:

- Detailed guidance on how a Party can demonstrate that its NDC:
  - Is 1.5°C compatible; fits into a Party’s long-term low greenhouse gas emission development strategy, contributes to a phase-out of fossil fuels and the transition to 100% renewable energy, and represents its highest possible mitigation effort;
  - is fair and equitable and incorporates rights-related considerations, including a gender perspective; and
  - represents leadership in the case of developed countries and a progression towards economy-wide mitigation measures on the part of developing countries.

- A five-year common time frame for NDC implementation.

- Biennial transparency reporting that begins in 2022, in time for the first global stocktake, and has a common GHG inventory time series endpoint of year minus 2.

- Operationalize Article 9.5, whereby, all contributor countries agree to provide similar types of ex-ante information for every channel and source, including a common timeline and format for submissions.

- Robust accounting rules for climate finance, including providing grant equivalent amounts for loans and other non-grant instruments and separate reporting for loss & damage support.

- Adaptation communications that include a separate section on loss & damage.

- LULUCF accounting guidance based on the Convention inventory reporting regime (work may continue after COP24 rather than rush into a poor outcome).

- Ability of a technical expert review team to track and assess a Party’s progress in implementing its NDC.

- A facilitative, multilateral consideration of progress process that includes active observer participation, especially regarding the ability to ask questions of countries.

- A Compliance Committee that is capable of initiating considerations of individual Party and systemic matters, issue statements of concern and findings of non-compliance, limit participation in market mechanisms, and holds its meetings in public.

- A separate workstream on loss and damage in the global stocktake.

- Rules for the transfer of mitigation outcomes that ensure environmental integrity by requiring that emission reductions are real, additional, verifiable, permanent, are supplemental to 1.5°C compatible national mitigation and are not double counted towards multiple objectives, including voluntary objectives and carbon neutrality claims.

- International sustainable development criteria for market mechanisms, a grievance process governed by an independent body and clear guidance for local and global stakeholder consultation processes.

- A Technology Framework that ensures the focus of technology development transfer is on the most vulnerable populations and balances support for adaptation and mitigation related technology.

The Rulebook is just one part of the package that Katowice needs to deliver. It is essential to enhance climate action immediately and revise NDCs in line with the SR1.5, initiate discussions on the post-2025 long-term finance goal, provide high-level guidance for next year’s review of the Warsaw International Mechanism on Loss and Damage, finalize the operation of the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform, and ensure that the Koronivia joint work on agriculture remains relevant to climate goals and agricultural contexts on the ground.

If Parties follow these instructions, the result is sure to be a masterpiece!

Loss and Damage as a Separate Workstream of the GST

The renewed, upward march of global carbon emissions is worrying and a big step backwards in the fight against climate change. Here at the COP, ECO is all too aware that the more we exceed 1°C of warming above pre-industrial levels the greater the impacts on poor people and ecosystems. It’s not that long ago that the IPCC 1.5 report warned us of the consequences of exceeding the limits of adaptation.

In the last twelve months we have seen this warming manifest around the world – from deadly bushfires, to extreme floods and devastating hurricane seasons – it’s clear that loss and damage from climate change is the new reality for developed and developing countries alike. It’s also clear that vulnerable developing countries do not have the capacity to deal with these impacts, while having had no role in causing them. ECO is concerned that the negotiators in Katowice COP are forgetting about this crisis.

The GST aims to assess whether the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement are being met. According to Article 14, Para 1, the GST must take into consideration “the latest science”. The latest science, in the form of the conclusions from the IPCC, warns of the devastating losses and damages the world will experience at +1.5°C warming. By not properly addressing these losses and damages, we risk undermining the Paris Agreement and our own chances of meeting its long-term goals, and protecting people, biodiversity and nature.

ECO urges for a dedicated loss and damage workstream along with mitigation, adaptation and financial flows under the GST, for its preparatory phase, technical phase and political phase. This is the only way to comprehensively reflect on the progress of the Paris Agreement and not hide loss and damage — having a separate article of its own — as a cross cutting issue. Only by doing this will the true mandate of the GST — to take stock of the entire Paris Agreement and of whether its long-term goals are being met — be fulfilled.