Annual GST Dialogue: Parties, it is time to draft your NDCs, with Ambition of course!

The Annual Global Stocktake (GST) Dialogue starts today. The purpose of this process is to support the continuation of the GST, by implementing its recommendations. ECO is not a Party but did work on the NDCs we need to see presented next year. This is a matter of justice and survival of many ecosystems and human lives: we need to keep the 1.5°C scenario as a key priority before 2030.

First, NDCs in 2025 must go further than the GST, with economy-wide absolute emission reduction targets and sectoral objectives, and also transparency and tracking processes. Accountability is key for climate action both for Parties but also non-party stakeholders.

Secondly, the next NDCs must reflect equity between Parties. Fair shares include fair domestic emissions reductions and, for countries with higher capacity and responsibility, fair financial support.

Thirdly, it is vital that NDCs translate the global commitments made under the GST to the national level. The GST agreed measures to transition away from fossil fuels, triple renewable energy capacity and double energy efficiency improvements by 2030, and to halt and reverse forest degradation and deforestation this decade. NDCs can be a chance for Parties to show how they are integrating action domestically to contribute to these global goals while prioritizing a pathway of clean economic development, supported by international finance.

Fourthly, NDCs must be cross-cutting and embed all related social issues that intersect with climate change: they must show solidarity and respond to climate justice. This means to deal not only with mitigation, but also adaptation and loss and damage. NDCs must address Just Transition, development challenges and co-benefits, be based on the respect of human rights and adopt a gender transformative approach. NDCs must be prepared with the people: the process must be inclusive, transparent, and participative.

Finally, NDCs cannot be implemented without predictable, adequate finance. According to the CBDR-RC principles, developed country parties must take the lead not only in implementing faster emissions reduction pathways within their jurisdictions, but also in providing the needed financial resources. They must also demonstrate this leading role in their NDC submission.

ECO has a last point: we won't win our fight against the climate crisis if our ecosystems are not protected. Nature protection, for all possible types of ecosystems (forests, oceans…) is the key to a livable planet for everyone.

Now Parties, you know what to do.

Ground Control to Major Bonn

The Mitigation Work Programme (MWP) is still up in the UNFCCC-universe orbiting planet Earth. This raises the question: When will the MWP manage to touch ground and deliver on its mandate to urgently scale up mitigation ambition and implementation in this critical decade in a manner that complements the Global Stocktake? This was explicit in the decision that created the programme back in 2021 and parties still don’t seem to get it.

Urban residents have increasingly been shaken up by extreme weather in recent years. So, it was timely to have the MWP Global Dialogue last week on the topic of Cities: ‘Buildings and Urban Systems’. After all, this is a topic in which many sectors come together and many actors can pool their energies. However, the key stakeholders – subnational actors such as city governments – were hardly present.

Well, as we have been saying all along, the MWP should have some form of regional dialogues to increase its relevance for participating actors. ECO believes that regional dialogues, which rope in subnational representatives and other relevant stakeholders in urban areas, could strengthen the next dialogue, leading to effective partnerships for decarbonizing urban systems.

ECO wants to remind parties that the MWP is not only about the Dialogue and the related reports. The Joint Contact Group should focus on its mandate, especially on complementing the GST. With the first GST completed just last year, this is the time to consider the GST outcome and how the MWP can contribute to its implementation. As a highly relevant example, the MWP could organize Dialogues for parties to share how they plan to transition away from fossil fuels.

Rather than drifting around in space, ECO believes that the MWP Dialogues could be a good venue on the ground for developed countries to present and discuss how they will lead in the global transition, and for developing countries to get support for their leadership role. Some parties have already been trying to re-establish contact with the MWP. ECO is eagerly waiting for the MWP to unfold its potential and return to planet Earth.
Agriculture negotiations: Has the oven finally been turned back on?

You may have noticed with delight the recent increase in food-related language in ECO, through lengthy cooking metaphors and kitchen-based prose. ECO cannot help but hope that this might translate into good language on food and agriculture making its way forward into the UNFCCC itself.

After two years of twists and turns, the recent progress in the Sharm El Sheikh Joint Work on agriculture and food security is starting to look interesting. But ECO was horrified to find, rotting in a corner of the language cupboard, an old and mouldy footnote explaining the term ‘sustainable agriculture’. The footnote reflects a random jumble of passing corporate fads and dangerous ideas including climate-smart agriculture, biotechnologies and even AI, alongside more credible concepts such as agroecology. As it was produced a year ago at SB58, we assumed it was long past its expiry date. Alas, we forgot that Big Ag’s products are full of preservatives and cannot be composted so easily.

ECO urges negotiators to avoid indigestion or even food poisoning by reframing workshop topics around systemic and holistic approaches, those that prioritize rights-based and agroecological pathways for food systems transformation, address the need for shifts to healthy and sustainable diets accessible for all, and reduce food loss and waste. The secret to a successful recipe is also to ensure that inclusivity and observer participation are at the heart of the joint work.

Meanwhile, it seems the COP29 presidency has also been inspired by recent ECO food metaphors, as they launched their brand new initiative “Harmoniya”. We’re curious to see what avenues for harmonization might emerge, especially if this helps us to better understand the chaotic but flourishing field of initiatives on food and agriculture.

However, this should avoid simply adding to the pile of existing initiatives. Instead, it should aim to increase funding available to grassroots farming communities on the frontlines of climate change impacts. The task is daunting, however, as we know the tendency of those funds to be devoured by corporate interests. In this important finance year, some of the trillions that must be shifted urgently need to flow to agroecology and small-scale food producers.

Excluding loss and damage from the climate finance goal: WTF?

This year has been deadly for those most vulnerable to climate change. Record temperatures in South Asia, floods in Brazil and Kenya, and many other extreme weather events have cost lives and destroyed livelihoods. As the climate crisis continues to escalate, vulnerable communities on the front lines urgently need support, so they can rebuild and recover from climate disasters for which they have minimal responsibility.

At the last two COPs, developed countries raised hopes that they would lend a hand to help those affected, finally recognising that climate action means owning up to responsibility for damage caused, and supporting those affected. That momentum took us through to agreeing on the Loss and Damage Fund (LDF), a historic moment when the world stood in solidarity, and developed countries finally said: “We are in this together.”

But at SB60, the tone has changed.

Developed countries are now refusing to include loss and damage in the New Collective Quantified Goal (NCQG).

WTF, guys?

And this time, we don’t just mean “Where’s The Finance?”

Loss and damage must be an explicit sub-goal of NCQG financing, or the hard-won LDF will remain unfunded. Sadly, ECO hears some countries say that loss and damage cannot be part of the NCQG because it is not specified under Article 9.1 of the Paris Agreement. ECO sought legal advice and found that there is ample scope to include a sub-goal on loss and damage in the NCQG:

1. There is nothing in the COP/CMA decisions that indicates that loss and damage cannot be within the scope of the NCQG. As this is a Party-led process, Parties are free to agree to include this in the scope.

2. According to the COP21 decision, the NCQG would take into account the needs and priorities of developing countries, who clearly identify loss and damage as a need.

3. The LDF is an entity of the financial mechanism of the Convention, which also serves the Paris Agreement, pointing to the inclusion of loss and damage in climate finance.

While the setup of the Fund is well underway, its sustainable capitalisation is still out of reach. The contributions announced at COP28 are not enough to address the increasing loss and damage in any sustained manner, or at the scale required. For that to happen, the LDF needs to be well and sustainably funded.

Developed countries need to stop hiding behind legalistic excuses. ECO has heard some developed countries say they want ideas on how to build bridges with countries most affected by the climate crisis. Here is one: If you want to build bridges to the most vulnerable countries, build on three strong pillars. First, commit to including loss and damage in the NCQG. Second, commit to properly capitalising the LDF in a sustainable manner. Third, make the LDF a central element of the future climate finance architecture.
Don’t forget the Godfathers of climate chaos

ECO could not be more excited about the start of the annual GST dialogue, and in particular the first roundtable on “integrating GST Outcomes into the updating and preparation of NDCs”. In case the Dubai flaring fumes impacted delegates’ memory, ECO would like to kindly remind that COP28 agreed to a “transition away from fossil fuels in energy systems in a just, orderly and equitable manner”; an outcome called “historic” by many.

Today is a good day to remember that agreement, because yesterday the UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres called out “the Godfathers of climate chaos” in the oil and gas industry, and urged leaders to slash emissions, boost climate finance, and clamp down on the fossil fuel industry – including by banning fossil fuel advertising.

Against that background, ECO would also like to stress that unless the Dubai commitment to transition away from the fossil fuels that fire climate chaos is reflected in countries’ next NDCs, it will be as useless as sunscreen many of these past days in Bonn.

We can only imagine the anxiety of delegates facing the seemingly impossible task of explaining how their country will translate the UNFCCC word salad into 1.5°C-aligned NDCs. Fear not, dear delegates, ECO’s feeling generous today and will provide you with talking points that will make sure you’re safe from the Secretary General’s wrath.

The first thing to say is that you now recognize the errors of your ways and that your new NDC will contain an immediate end to new oil, gas and coal extraction projects. ECO hopes it doesn’t have to remind you about the abundant scientific literature showing that new fossil fuel projects are not compatible with the 1.5°C limit that you all swore to uphold. And yes, that also applies to COP presidencies, declining global hegemons and socio-democratic petrostates (and no, your oil is not cleaner).

The second thing, if you’re a Global North delegate, is to recognize you have both the responsibility and the means to phase out your production and consumption of fossil fuels fastest. ECO would like to remind that five Global North countries are on track to account for half of planned oil and gas expansion by 2050. ECO is quite certain this does not qualify as an “equitable” transition. And then to be thorough, you’ll also announce that your country will stop burning coal by 2030 and gas by 2035, and that you’ll of course refuse any false solutions such as so-called abatement technologies.

And now speaking about gas, ECO is worried about some of you, dear delegates. The GST decision mentions so-called “transitional fuels.” Is this “transitional fuel” in the room with us right now? No, it appears this means fossil gas, and that is not ok. A real transitional fuel would not be another fossil fuel whose extraction, transportation and emissions are devastating communities around the world.

#CEASEFIRENOW
Climate Action Network (CAN) Statement Calling for the Reinstatement of UNFCCC SB60 Badges

Climate Action Network calls for the immediate reinstatement of the badges of Tasneem Essop, Anabella Rosenberg, and Danni Taaffe and deeply regrets the UN Climate Change Secretariat’s disproportionate response to legitimate and peaceful protest.

We stand in solidarity with and salute the courage of Tasneem and Anabella who are valued leaders in the climate movement and members of the CAN Secretariat. They staged a peaceful protest on 3 June during the opening plenary of SB60, denouncing “business as usual” as a genocide unfolds in Gaza. This was conducted wholly in their personal capacity, and not discussed in any way with CAN-International in advance.

In addition, we demand immediate reinstatement of Danni Taaffe’s accreditation. She did not participate in the action but filmed it and the removal of Tasneem and Anabella from the SB venue. She was assaulted by a UN security officer, and this was recorded on video. Her debadging for merely exercising press freedom is unjustifiable.

There is profound incoherence in seeing Tasneem, Anabella, and Danni lose their accreditation to a UN conference for bringing the global community’s attention to the unfolding genocide in Gaza when UN experts have repeatedly raised the alarm on the issue.

The UNFCCC Code of Conduct states that “the UNFCCC is committed to upholding human rights, dignity and worth of the human person.” Through their action, Tasneem and Anabella firmly upheld this fundamental commitment and should not be punished for it. CAN reaffirms the network’s refusal to be silent in the face of an unfolding genocide, condemns the invasion by Israel and demands an immediate and permanent ceasefire.

We are concerned about shrinking civic space within the UNFCCC. As climate activists, we know firsthand the power of civil disobedience and peaceful protest as essential tools for social change.

There is no climate justice without human rights. Ceasefire now.

Will the EU deliver an NDC of enhanced ambition in time? Questions for delegations

Today, 6th June, marks the start of the elections for the European Parliament. Countries will go to the polls until Sunday. ECO hopes that all delegates have cast their ballots and do not miss out due to presence here in Bonn. Every vote against anti-democratic, authoritarian-leaning and often climate-denying groups is needed to accelerate the path started with the European Green Deal.

But as we approach a new EU policy cycle on the critical road to Baku and Belem, what actually is the state of play on the next EU NDC?

ECO hears that the veil will only begin to lift after the elections. According to EU processes, the agreement on an intermediate 2040 target on the way to the bloc’s 2050 climate neutrality goal will be a key step for an NDC. The European Commission put a proposal on the table for net reductions of 90% by 2040, compared to 1990 levels, in its Communication in early February with a strong reliance on carbon capture. Unfortunately, it made no indication to upgrade the 2030 target.

Since then, there have been technical exchanges and minister-level deliberations. However, ECO is concerned that a clear political pathway to deliver an ambitious NDC in time for the February 2025 deadline is not yet on the table! Obviously, bringing meaningful progress at the required level of ambition to the COP and G20 this year would be conducive to global progress.

ECO wants to be clear: the ambition of current EU targets is insufficient: Instead of 55% net reductions by 2030 the EU must go to at least 65% gross emission reductions taking into account a fair approach to 1.5°C. and the climate neutrality goal should be moved forward to 2040 at the latest. Consequently, there must be an ambitious 2035 target in the EU’s NDC. The EU, in response to the GST, should also develop clear fossil fuel phase-out pathways. ECO urges a coal phase-out by 2030, fossil gas by 2035 and oil by 2040.

So against the above background, ECO hopes to leave Bonn next week with more clarity, and encourages delegates from other countries to raise critical questions with the EU delegation:

• The GST outcome called for enhanced ambition. Will the EU increase its 2030 target when submitting the next NDC?
• Will the EU pull forward its climate neutrality target to 2040, and include a consequently ambitious 2035 target?
• What considerations does the EU undertake to incorporate fossil fuel phase out strategies, and a big ramping up of sustainable renewable energies in the next NDC?
• What is the plan for the EU to deliver the next NDC no later than February 2025?
• And will the EU ensure a participatory process in developing its NDC?
• Will the EU finally answer whether it considers its targets as a fair contribution to the effort to limit temperature rise to 1.5°C by indicating on what basis such an effort should be divided across countries?

Dear delegates, feel free to share responses you get with ECO, so we might compile those in a follow up article, with anonymity secured. Dear Europeans, get out and vote for enhanced climate action!