

ECO

THE TWELVE YEARS LEFT ISSUE

eco@climatenetwork.org • www.climatenetwork.org/eco-newsletter • December 3, 2018

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 Katowice, Poland during the COP 24 meeting.

Editorial: Andres Fuentes Production: Verity Martin

12 Years Left: What Have You Done to Respond to the SR1.5?

The IPCC Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C is a game-changer. Scientists have found that 2°C of warming is much more dangerous than they thought it was a few years ago as it brings us closer to a number of critical tipping points. 1.5°C of warming is far from safe, but the half degree significantly reduces the risks many will face. The speed and scale of the transformation necessary to achieve 1.5°C cannot be overstated: the world needs to halve CO2 emissions in little more than a decade and achieve net-zero emissions by mid-century. The report does offer hope: a 1.5°C emissions pathway is not only feasible, it will make eradicating poverty easier and development more sustainable overall.

The SR1.5 has changed the game in Katowice. This meeting cannot be, if it ever was, just about getting a solid rulebook for the Paris Agreement. Make no mistake: ECO thinks the rulebook is very important. But to focus on it alone would be like fixing a leaking tap in your bathroom, while the basement is flooding.

The Talanoa Dialogue was tasked with taking stock of the collective effort in progress towards the long-term goal and informing new or updated NDCs. The SR1.5 makes clear that the world is not on track to limit warming anywhere near 1.5°C. The only conclusion that can be drawn from this exercise is that the current level of ambition is woefully inadequate and that parties must revise and strengthen their NDCs accordingly.

ECO has heard rumblings about a non-negotiated Presidency Declaration as the main or only outcome of the Talanoa Dialogue. Has ECO come to the wrong place? Is this not the international climate negotiations? Of course, the modalities of new and stronger NDCs will be determined nationally, however the outcome of the Talanoa Dialogue must be to establish a process to shepherd parties through this national determining. The only way to do that is through a COP decision. ECO has assigned much homework

to Parties over the years and your track record is abysmal: international pressure and oversight is needed to ensure that you actually deliver this time. There are no second chances.

In this COP decision, Parties must commit to revising and strengthening their NDCs by 2020 and developing mid-century GHG emission phase out development strategies that are compatible with a 1.5°C emissions pathway. The decision also must lay out a calendar of follow-up events, including space at the June session for countries to report back on progress and initiate a process to agree on the post-2025 finance goal. After all, how are the poor and most vulnerable countries supposed to strengthen their 2030 NDCs by 2020 without knowing the level of support available or even when discussions of post-2025 finance commitments will start?

The majority of parties to the Paris Agreement have said loud and clear they want a COP decision on the Talanoa Dialogue and enhancing ambition of NDCs. Despite this, it is far from clear that the incoming Polish Presidency is prepared to give ambition the attention it deserves. The Polish Presidency needs to clarify how it plans to facilitate agreement on an outcome along the lines described above, and soon.

Last week, the most vulnerable reiterated their resolve to never surrender to an irreparably harmful fate, but rather to fight for their right to survive and thrive. ECO too is steadfast in its determination to secure emission cuts on the scale necessary for 1.5°C. To maintain the focus on increased ambition, ECO will ask the same question each and every day of this conference: How are you responding to the SR1.5? There are many ways to answer this question, as there are many pieces to a 1.5°C emissions pathway. Yet, as the outcome from this conference, there can be only one: the initiation of a process to achieve 1.5°C compatible NDCs by COP26.

A Just Transition Declaration by the Polish Government? Just Don't Fake It!

The fact that the Climate Summit is being held in Katowice, the capital of the Silesia region - literally one of the last remaining coal mining regions in Europe, provides not only a symbolic setting for this meeting, but also raises a question at the heart of these negotiations: how can we phase out fossil fuels in time to limit warming to 1.5°C without affecting the people and communities whose jobs depend on them? A just transition - if managed correctly - can give us a pathway to a 100% renewable system while creating better jobs, a fairer future for all and a more equal society.

Today, the Polish government is launching a "Solidarity and Just Transition Silesia Declaration".

It is hard not to read this declaration as a crowd pleaser without any intention to follow through with actions. Over the years, Polish governments have been systematically taking decisions that contradict their self-declared commitment to a greener energy future. Examples abound. In the Polish draft energy policy published just ahead of COP24, coal still counts for 60% of the national energy mix in 2030. Moreover, the government recently announced the construction of a new coal power plant in Ostrołęka by the state-owned energy company ENEA, despite the protest of ENEA's labour union which demanded skipping investing in coal and going for renewables instead. In the nearby town of Imielin, the local community has protested against a new hard coal mine, while the vast majority of Poles want a coal phase out and a transition to renewable energy. The Polish government is planning to proceed with the construction of new open-cast lignite mines, despite strong opposition by local communities and their mayors. The government has also failed to develop any concrete proposal to support the miners and the communities

affected by the energy transition.

The transition from fossil fuels to a greener economy is unavoidable. It is time the Polish government stopped being hypocritical and started delivering on a concrete path to a just economic transition that combines urgent climate ambition, a complete coal phase-out by 2030 and secures the interests of affected workers and their families.

In order not to remain just a bunch of empty words, the Just Transition Declaration must:

- Support 1,5C goal;
- consider all affected communities;
- cover every high carbon sector of the economy;
- be properly resourced e.g. via redirecting fossil fuel subsidies to enable JT strategies and social programs;
- be geographically targeted and connected to regional development planning because the new job opportunities, e.g. in the renewables sector, are not always created where the old heavy industries jobs are phased-out, and;
- be based on social programs; with new investments being made before closures happen.

A coal-free Silesia is as essential for decarbonising Poland as a coal-free Poland is essential for decarbonising Europe. Unless concrete measures are taken to support those who might be affected by change, fossil fuel companies and others with vested interests in the coal industry will use the argument of workers and communities to prevent action. That is why, if we are to achieve the goals outlined in the Just Transition declaration, all countries supporting it must commit to and implement measures to secure both social justice and rapid and ambitious climate action including ramping up NDCs.

We Need a Technology Framework That is Fit for Purpose

Dear delegates, Silesia remains one of the final refuges for an industry that needs to be consigned to the history books. The needed phase out from coal and transition to a 100% renewable energy future only serves to highlight the importance of environmentally and socially sound technology in ensuring that we effectively address climate change and limit warming to 1.5oC.

The Technology Mechanism is about more than just the limited technical assistance we see today. The new Technology Framework under the Paris Agreement must include support and finance for local technology innovation and not just support for new and emerging technologies from developed countries. Innovation and local design needs to be nurtured, and some failure needs to be accepted, if the right technologies are to be developed that deliver on 1.5oC and enable effective adaptation. Support must be based on need, however putting support

into Technology Needs Assessments alone is inadequate and piecemeal, and will not deliver the technology that is urgently needed by the vast majority of developing countries.

Finally, the process must involve the private sector, but it mustn't be designed only to meet their market needs. Everyone knows that the introduction of new technologies is initially expensive, and can require incremental adjustments to meet specific needs. We must focus support where liberal market mechanisms alone will not serve the needs of the most climate vulnerable populations. Under the Paris Agreement, it is vital that we do not miss the 1.5 oC target in the pursuit of private profits. Not all technologies will be financially viable, but may deliver enormous environmental and social benefits, so we mustn't overlook this social and ecological value in the pursuit of a short sighted Technology Framework that is currently being considered.

Real Money, Urgent Action

The latest IPCC Report made it unmistakably clear: far more and better financial support is needed to adopt and implement urgent, rapid and transformational policies to hold global temperature rise to 1.5oC. Climate finance takes a lot of space in this year's COP agenda and ECO hopes negotiators will make good and constructive use of the space they are given.

New assessments from the UNFCCC's Standing Committee on Finance and the OECD indicate an increase in the overall level of international climate finance from 2013 to 2017 based on developed countries' self-reporting. However, this increase continues to heavily favour the utilisation of loans and not grants, which, as we know, have to be paid back. According to the OECD data, the amount given as loans doubled, increasing from USD \$20 to \$40 billion between 2013 and 2017. In contrast, finance provided as grants only increased modestly from \$10b to \$13b. Reporting finance provided in nominal terms -- and including flows through developed countries' export credit agencies, as the OECD report does -- does not reflect the actual support provided. A key piece of information missing in this report is the grant equivalent of all loan instruments. ECO wonders why this information is missing. Note that reporting on a grant equivalent basis is already done by developed countries under the OECD DAC rules -- so there is no excuse not to do it here as well.

These reports tell us that adaptation finance - at around a quarter of developed countries' public finance - still falls short of what would be required to meet the needs of the most vulnerable as well as to achieve a balance between mitigation and adaptation support as mandated in the Paris Agreement. These reports also show that developed countries can and must do more to achieve the \$100b promised by 2020 and reassure developing countries that climate finance flows

will be adequate and predictable now and in the future. This is critical for encouraging developing countries to increase the ambition levels of their NDCs by 2020. We need more predictable sources of finance, which is why we encourage Parties to fully operationalize Article 9.5 of the Paris Agreement.

ECO is encouraged by Germany's announcement that it will double its previous contribution to the Green Climate Fund to EUR 1.5 billion. We hope other contributor countries will follow suit and pave the way for an ambitious replenishment of the fund.

ECO, however, finds that there is still a significant list of unfinished business that could negatively impact trust among countries. One is the Post-2025 financial goal discussions. ECO advises countries to agree, at the very least, to adopt a process where Parties can exchange views on how to ensure discussions on the post-2025 goal are inclusive, fair and balanced. Making progress also means acknowledging the need to provide new, additional and innovative sources of finance for loss and damage. We can't continue to ignore this need, it's not safe according to the science of IPCC 1.5, it's not just and it won't go away because some countries try to ignore or delay it.

There is no time for division, as finance will be at the centre of the negotiations at the Pre-2020 Ministerial Dialogue, at the Talanoa Dialogue and most importantly at the High-Level Ministerial on finance on Monday 10th December. As in the Council of Elrond, here in Katowice, we know what needs to be done, and contributor countries have the means to take the lead in a just, robust and equitable way. Let's use this COP to ensure more transparent, adequate and predictable climate finance flows in order to achieve the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement.

Will the Polish Presidency Heed the Call?



*Manuel Pulgar Vidal,
COP 20 President*



*Laurent Fabius,
COP 21 President*



*Salaheddine Mezouar,
COP 22 President*



*Frank Bainimarama,
COP 23 President*



ECO welcomes the call to enhanced action just issued by four former COP presidents (Laurent Fabius, President of COP21, Frank Bainimarama, President of COP23, Salaheddine Mezouar, President of COP22, and Manuel Pulgar Vidal, President of COP20).

They rightly note that "the world is at a crossroads and decisive action in the next two years will be crucial" and that "we require deep transformations of our economies and societies to build a better world for all." They call for all of us in Katowice to "send an unequivocal message...for enhanced ambition by 2020 that puts the world on a trajectory compatible with the objectives of the Paris Agreement."

ECO strongly hopes that delegates, ministers, heads of state -- as well as the current Polish presidency -- will heed this call over the next fourteen days, and give us the bold action the world so desperately needs.

Loss and Damage: The Missing Link or the Smoking Gun?

Loss and damage is the smoking gun of climate change. When super heated wildfires leave whole regions in California a smouldering ruin, super charged hurricanes and cyclones decimate countries in the Caribbean and the Pacific, and when cities in Africa are left counting the days of their remaining water supply, there can be no doubt that irreversible impacts of climate change are clear and present.

It is therefore little wonder that loss and damage was agreed to as an integral part of the Paris Agreement. It was, of course, a part of the political calculation of getting the Paris package. In fact, it was deemed important enough to include as a stand-alone article.

Fast forward to today where there are attempts to bracket it out of existence. Surrounding loss and damage with brackets isn't the way to make it go away. Getting in a time machine and taking enough mitigation action 10 or 20 years ago is the only way it could have been avoided (Yes, this is ECO saying: "I told you so!"). Sadly, a lack of mitigation action — and an equally sad lack of adaptation finance — means that loss and damage is here to stay.

An explicit reference to loss and damage in Article 9.5, 9.7 — and the modalities, procedures, and guidelines (MPGs) of the transparency framework — is essential. You agreed, in Article 8, to enhance finance for loss and damage on a cooperative and facilitative basis. So cooperate! Don't renegotiate!

ECO: HERE TO HELP YOU UNDERSTAND LOSS AND DAMAGE

ECO is confused about the confusion around loss and damage. To make the concept more tangible, ECO will feature vignettes throughout the next two weeks that illustrate what loss and damage is. We trust these stories from the front line will answer all questions. However, if they do not, ECO stands ready to answer any questions our dear readers would like to send in. Or if you have a story of loss and damage that you'd like to share, ECO also welcomes input.

In Loving Memory of John Lanchberry

Dr. John Lanchberry, CAN's outstanding and much loved go-to expert on all things LULUCF, AFOLU and related topics left us on October 18, 2018. John's quiet humour, warm heart, typically British unflappability and extraordinary patience with activists needing tutoring on these issues was legendary. John was a skilled negotiator, talented orator, knew everyone in the UN secretariat, the delegations, the NGOs - and had a special link to fellow smokers, meeting regularly in the conference smoking areas - where much 'business' got done.

In John's honour, ECO would like to share a poem composed by one of his colleagues. May he Rest In Peace.

*When I went along to my first major COP
When the list of new acronyms just didn't stop
When my brain was full to bursting, I was ready to drop
John was there*

*When I needed help developing a new NGO line
When I needed someone to tell me I was doing fine
When I needed a friend with whom to drink white wine
John was there*

*When I was very nervous talking to the press
When the negotiations seemed one big mess*

*When I was actually struggling with stress
John was there*

*When secretly pregnant with my first child
When NGO submissions still needed to be filed
When I needed reassurance, comforting and mild
John was there*

*Now I'm sitting near his empty desk, tears in my eyes
I think of all he taught me, my friend so wise
All those memories, that knowledge, I realise
John's still there*