

ECO

THE 'IT'S SCIENCE, STUPID' ISSUE

eco@climatenetwork.org • www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletter • June 19 2019

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 Bonn, Germany during the September SB 50 meetings.

Editorial: Andres Fuentes Production: Verity Martin

Facilitating the Sharing of Your Views

ECO is excited to see nine non-Annex I Parties participating in the facilitative sharing of views (FSV) for their biennial update reports (BURs) and offers our congratulations to Parties for the work in developing their BURs. ECO thinks the FSV can be a great place to share lessons learned and experiences with other Parties in a constructive and welcoming environment. We look forward to hearing your presentations and Q&A sessions throughout the day.

Since ECO and other observers can't ask questions during these workshops, we wanted to share our questions with you, to inform your discussions:

Armenia

Armenia's BUR notes that an MRV system will be established in 2019. Can you provide an update on the establishment of this system? What lessons has Armenia learned from its participation in the international consultation and analysis process that has informed the establishment of the MRV system?

Brazil

Brazil's BUR2 notes that the Modular System for Monitoring Actions and GHG Emissions Reductions (SMMARE) would be revised in 2017 to monitor mitigation and adaptation actions. Can you speak to your experience in building and evolving your MRV system and the process of revising the systems to ensure they are fit-for-purpose? How does Brazil envision the ongoing future evolution of its

MRV system?

Nigeria

In the BUR, it is noted that the report is submitted with "the intent that the information contained therein will prove useful towards achieving the set environmental goals and objectives of the country as well as the objectives of the Convention." How do you envision that the report and Nigeria's MRV system will serve domestic action?

Republic of Korea

In October, South Chungcheong Province announced they were joining the Power Past Coal Alliance. Knowing that there is still a heavy reliance on coal, how will this announcement inform future national planning and inventory projections? Is the Republic of Korea still planning to construct new coal plants and further coal plant retrofits?

South Africa

Congratulations to South Africa on the implementation of the new carbon tax at the beginning of this month. How and when is South Africa making efforts to update the plan, plateau, decline strategy? How does this strategy, together with the national development plan, address the multi-pronged just transition agenda?

Thailand

The BUR notes that two issues affecting inventory quality are

emissions factors and activity data. How has Thailand approached efforts to address these issues and what lessons has Thailand learned from other Parties as they've struggled with these same issues?

The Republic of North Macedonia

The BUR2 notes that "over 6,200 green jobs can be expected in 2035 by implementing energy efficiency measures in buildings and low-carbon energy supply." How is the Republic of North Macedonia incorporating the views and inputs of citizens working in these sectors into decision-making processes?

Uruguay

Uruguay is implementing its CBIT project, titled "Building Institutional and Technical Capacities to Enhance Transparency in the Framework of the Paris Agreement." The aim is to provide tools, training and assistance for meeting the provisions stipulated in Article 13 of the Agreement. How has this project supported efforts also related to the development of the next biennial update reports? Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country?

Viet Nam

Viet Nam's BUR2 describes several improvements to its GHG inventory from BUR1. What efforts and improvements has Viet Nam made or plans to make for its work on the BUR3?

If it Ain't Broke, Don't Fix It!

True to the motto "if it ain't broke, don't fix it," ECO calls on negotiators to prevent any disruption or interference with the Adaptation Fund's (AF) ability to effectively fulfil its mandate. Negotiators just need to play an enabling role to ensure that the AF can continue to effectively serve the Paris Agreement, as it has since January 2019.

ECO was delighted to hear so many negotiators yesterday being very happy about the AF now serving the Paris Agreement. And of course ECO agrees with negotiators that the AF is covering a key niche in the international climate finance architecture. Its focus on people and communities most vulnerable to climate change, the direct access modality which it has pioneered, and its innovative features are only a few of its many unique characteristics. However, something is not fixed yet. The Fund still depends on thin support to continue to fulfil its unique mandate. It's facing the same need for life-support year by year, and depends on financial contributions from Parties to stay alive.

While some might still feel encouraged by the fact that the Fund surpassed its resource mobilisation targets last year, others are worried about its ad-hoc funding. While ECO was also happy about the many developed country Parties' contributions to the AF, it also notes that the AF needs more than that. More resources! More sustainable and predictable resources!

Ensuring this would allow the Fund to lift its country cap. Developing countries which have gone through the difficult and tedious process of accreditation, learning, and gaining experiences from project implementation, would actually be able to apply those experiences in the future and be able to further benefit from the Fund.

To Negotiators of the Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture: We Need You to see the Light!

"Lights... Camera... Action!"--the second shoot of the agriculture discussions at the UNFCCC! Since 2009, Parties have struggled with what to do with agriculture. We are now in the midst of several workshops discussing adaptation, soils, nutrient use, manure management, and the critical issue of socio-economic and food security aspects of climate action in agriculture with a decision due in one and a half years, at COP26.

The Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) recently launched its Global Assessment that demonstrates rather dramatically that we're on our way to extinction, along with millions of other species, unless you see the light.

In short, biodiversity and climate change are inextricably linked and our future is tied to the survival of other species.

But do not despair! There is good news. Agroecology is a transformative approach that can help save agriculture and hence the planet from destruction and provide a massive opportunity for a Just Transition. We are not dreaming: FAO and IPBES have both recently highlighted the high potential of agroecology to achieve the SDGs, the Paris Agreement goals, and the goals of the Convention on Biological Diversity. As well as to maintain and restore biodiversity. Even better news: so much work is being done on agroecology with the help of many of your own governments and other intergovernmental organizations.

Indeed, agroecology has been gaining ground in many UN processes. A recent decision by the FAO Committee on Agriculture supports agroecology as a key approach to promoting sustainable agriculture and

food systems. FAO has also endorsed the 10 elements of agroecology that are based on seminal scientific literature and inputs over a three-year process of FAO regional and international multi-stakeholder symposiums (2015-2018). In addition, the UN Committee on World Food Security (the foremost inclusive intergovernmental and international mechanism on food security and nutrition) requested its High Level Panel of Experts in 2017 to elaborate on agroecological approaches and other innovations for building sustainable food systems that enhance food and nutrition security.

Don't reinvent the wheel, rather ride the wave! Here is a three-step program to help you save yourselves and us:

1. Draw on the work on agroecology that your own countries and governments support in other intergovernmental organizations and processes such as the FAO and the Committee on World Food Security.
2. Support and integrate this progress on agroecology in all the issues that the Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture is addressing.
3. Ensure that agroecology becomes a central component in enhancing adaptation and resilience (with mitigation co-benefits) within your own NDC.

There is no time left for inaction! ECO is thus truly happy to share with you our big open secret about agroecology that will enable you to calmly and bravely face the climate emergency. Let this agroecological light guide your 1.5°C path. Your colleagues and several international institutions and processes are seeing it. And you? Do you see it the light?



This morning's ECO brings exciting news for you!

But first, let's start with what happened a few months ago. This spring, European citizens, especially the youth, took to the streets and called out loud and clear that they wanted more action on climate from their governments. This you all know. All these people on the streets made the climate emergency THE European election topic in many countries. Across the political spectrum, politicians committed themselves to stronger climate action, and the success of climate champions on the ballots confirmed to decision makers that delay is no longer acceptable and that the time to act is now.

And we really mean now! Tomorrow, Thursday, June 20, European heads of state and government gather in Brussels for an EU Summit to discuss the outcomes and conclusions of these European elections. And the main issue on their agenda is the climate crisis and what the EU can bring to the UNSG Climate Action Summit in September. Instructions for the UNSG Summit are clear: no speeches, but new and ambitious climate action that cuts global emissions by half by 2030. UNSG Guterres also sent a letter to the EU and outlined that this means revising the EU NDC with a target of 55% below 1990 levels by 2030. ECO says it should be at least a reduction of 65%, so there is still room for

improvement.

Admittedly, the EU might not be able to agree on the new 2030 target tomorrow, but could agree on revising in the months to come. However, it's looking more and more likely that tomorrow the EU member states will agree on a net zero 2050 target – which ECO believes should be for 2040. At the time ECO goes to print the support for net zero among EU members stands at 22 countries. In the last 36 hours, four new member states joined the EU net zero 2050 group! No country has spoken against it. By the time you read this we might be close to a full count, but even if that doesn't happen, there are still 48 hours to go. Go EU go!

Asking the Tough Questions About the Long Term Global Goal

How much warming (and resulting climatic disruption) is too much? The 2013-2015 review of 1.5°C of warming concluded there would be serious and perhaps irreversible impacts from exceeding this threshold.

Since the Paris Agreement was adopted, we have had the IPCC Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C (SR1.5) and more science is coming every day with increasingly alarming news of the consequences of exceeding 1.5°C.

This is where the Second Periodic Review (SPR) comes in. It can help Parties come to grips with the emerging science and escalating impacts and guide them towards an appropriate application of the global goal. This will be an essential input to the Global Stocktake (GST) in 2023. As an extra bonus, it will also start the GST's work on assessing progress towards meeting that goal.

But today, during the first informal consultation on the SPR, in a jam packed room reflecting the growing interest in this important topic, ECO couldn't fail to notice that some delegates seem to be too busy working in this bubble to see what happens outside of it: heatwaves in Asia and cyclones like Idai in Mozambique or Fani in India — whether attributed to climate change or not – occur more often and are stronger, just like the IPCC scenarios suggest. New impacts of climate change, like rapid permafrost melting in the Arctic have been observed this very month. These observations should be enough motivation for a review with a thorough survey of the newest science on climate change coming in 2021. To be clear we must aim for limiting global warming to 1.5°C.

For those not intimately familiar with this issue: what we are referring to

here is theme 1 of the SPR. In that context, we also suggest asking: Do we know at what extent of overshoot 1.5°C warming is reversible?

Theme 2 is a review of the overall progress towards achieving the long-term goal. Here it gets more complicated and we therefore encourage Parties to focus on this one. Yes, there is some duplication of work with the Global Stocktake (GST). But with so much at stake, is that really too much to ask? The scope of the SPR should include an analysis of the GHG emission reduction targets of the new and enhanced NDCs compared to the long term goal of the Paris Agreement.

Lastly, some countries with high emissions are not Parties to the Paris Agreement. If the GST only looks at theme 2, the emissions of those Parties would not be covered. Do we really want to reward them for their inaction and broken promises?

Beware the Gentleman's Agreement

COP24 requested the SBSTA to consider the IPCC Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C (SR1.5°C) in order to strengthen scientific knowledge on the 1.5°C goal. With apologies to Shakespeare (and the planet), it appears that some Parties have come here to bury the SR1.5°C, not to praise it or to learn from it.

There is much in this report that Parties must grapple with and collectively and individually take on board. The report spells out the emissions pathways compatible with this goal, the financing and economic transformations necessary, and the implications for equity and justice.

Parties that are more concerned about climate change impacts than oil revenue want to have a substantive discussion and reach conclusions from that outcome that can help drive action to limit warming to 1.5°C.

But some would prefer to ignore the science, and thus also the impacts, and the suffering of those facing the impacts. After first arguing Parties should completely

ignore this request, Saudi Arabia then called for "procedural outcomes" from this consideration – which is UNFCCC-speak for a text that ends discussion of the topic and never looks back.

Now the SBSTA Chair has reported a "gentlemen's agreement" that dispenses with Rule 16, a rule which calls for an agenda item to be taken up at the next meeting if agreement on an outcome is not reached at this one.

This puts the Saudi negotiators in a potentially no-lose situation. They are free to do all they can to obstruct and prevent a substantive outcome at this session, with no risk of the issue resurfacing at the next session if no outcome is agreed.

This tips the scales heavily towards an empty procedural outcome, unless the Saudis (and others who put their oil, gas, or coal revenue ahead of people and planet) are isolated and parties actually interested in preventing a climate disaster stand up to them.



LET ECO BRING BONN TO YOUR SMARTPHONE



DOWNLOAD THE ECO NEWS APP TO READ ECO ON MOBILE

