

December 10, 2018

17:00-18:15

MR 2

Annkattrin Tritschoks, Uppsala University

[?] and [...] indicates points that I missed, could not follow, or could not hear

COP agenda item 8b: informal consultation on linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism of the Convention

- 3rd meeting
- Thank you for advancing the text in inf infs,
- we understand that good progress has been made
- Desire to continue in inf inf modality? – yes
- Proposal:
 - o Convert to inf inf
 - o Coming back at 17:50, reconvert to inf consultation
 - o Then report back
 - o We request that you come back with concrete textual proposals
- Suspending meeting until 17:50

17:50

- Report back on progress made

[report]

- Happy to report back from inf inf: para 1-7 discussed, not agreed on all but progress made
- Para 1 - agreed
 - o Spell out “operating entities of the Financial Mechanism” as GCF and GEF
- Para 2 – needs further discussion
 - o “increasing” replace with “ongoing”
 - o Add here GEF focal points
 - o Latter part could read “encourages enhanced coordination in this area” – though not completely agreed
- Para 3 - agreed
 - o ... and notes with appreciation the support provided by the Fund for readiness requests submitted by national designated authorities
 - o Delete number “six” as well as end of para
- Para 4 – needs further discussion
 - o Different options outlined, still under consideration
- Para 5 – needs further discussion
 - o General agreement that this para lacks reference to GEF

- Not yet concrete wording but ideas for components
 - general reference of appreciation of support by GEF to Technology Mechanism
 - Noting the three strategic objectives which were agreed in GEF 7, including the one on sustainable energy breakthroughs
 - Encouraging to continuing this engagement consistent with GEF mandate
- Para 6 - agreed
 - Include reference to GEF in first line
- Para 7 – discussed but not agreed yet
 - Some proposals for improvement on the table

Co-facilitators

- Clarification for those paras that have not been agreed where language has been proposed
 - Is it a matter of language or technical parts?
- **Reply:** Para 2: lack of agreement on wording, who do we encourage?
 - Explicit reference to three entities or generic encouragement to enhance collaboration as mentioned in first para
 - Making it consistent with first para
 - = matter of language
- Similar type challenges in other paras or conceptual differences?
- **Reply:** Para 4 rather conceptual differences

US

- Para 2: notion on further enhancing work
- Wording should be “continue” because progress already being made, this is important to us

Co-facilitators:

- Proposal going forward:
- We will include in a revised text the language that has been agreed
- I will not put the “unagreed language” in brackets because I don’t want to go into brackets at this stage

Uganda:

- Clarification: Para 2 - US proposed another word “ongoing” and we agreed on that – it was their own proposal and we accepted

Co-facilitators

- We will issue a new text with the agreed paras
- The others, where there are textual proposals, we will leave for now while you continue working
- We will resume tomorrow
 - Inf consultation: 11:00, MR2

- If you so desire, we continue with format: convene – suspend, convert to inf inf – convert back to inf consultation, etc etc
- Formal informal at 17:00 at which point we will have to conclude

Kenya

- There might be a clash in the time
- As we are concluding the technology framework

Reply: Confirmation from the secretariat that this will not be the case

- We will continue with this item tomorrow as originally scheduled

--- meeting concluded ---