

# Notes

## Methodology

1. Our starting point is to find a way of measuring the size of a city in its totality, its actual existence as a dynamic urban agglomeration of activities. Thus we are NOT concerned with just city government and its policies on climate or other matters. These are important but are only a small part of the activities that constitute a city. Nor are we concerned simply with the size of the city in terms of its population: it is what these urban dwellers are doing that is our concern.

dweller to build lives. We treat these two responses as equally important; this is what distinguishes an emergency situation from normal societal vigilance of danger. Thus we convert the percentage of GIE that features "climate change" to a shortfall by deducting 50%, the emergency expectation. This is the Climate Emergency Shortfall (CES) for each city, the measure that we use to rank a city's readiness in response to the global climate emergency. Thus, from the percentages given above, we find that the shortfall ranges from a massive (- 49.89%) to a not very impressive (- 37.70%).

## Interpretation

1. The obvious first point is that overall these results are very bad in terms of dealing with the climate emergency; being forced to use the lowest end of the Greek alphabet says this clearly. Rankings are always relative but here there is no evidence of 'success'; no city ranking, including being No. 1, is a matter to celebrate.
2. This is not a simple indictment of city governments. The construction of the metric deals with the city as a whole not just its political organs. It is all activities that constitute a city that is indicted. In many emergencies the aim is to 'bounce back' as soon as possible to return to previous 'normal'. In this case such a process would be self-defeating: the need is to 'bounce forward' to a different 'normal'. In other words the climate emergency demands reinvention of the city. Our current 'normal' is effectively a 'global Los Angeles' combining mega-consumption, car dependence, corporate real estate and gross inequalities – huge consumption sinkholes that are 'heat islands' in plain sight. Reinventing a 'new normal' needs to go beyond necessary mitigation and sustainability to embrace stewardship, cities in nature. This needs both myriad bottom up initiatives and top down organization for coherent implementation.
3. Is there a pattern to the results? Initial inspection suggests not because there are many cases of quite different cities with very similar climate emergency shortfall (CES) measures. This apparent randomness indicates reaction to the climate emergency is not currently leading to any noticeable

