

December 10, 2018

11:00-12:00

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

- 2nd meeting
- Reiteration made available online:
https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/COP24.DT_i8b.pdf
- Aim of the session to do complete work through text
 - o Finalize decision paragraph
- Only today and tomorrow to finish work

Uganda (LDCs)

- As LDCs we are very grateful for the compilation of these issues based on our initial discussion
- Key issues are there
 - o Regarding how to address them, we will come to later
 - o Ready to work on this text
- Purpose of the linkages between TM and FM, looking to see how we can scale up the support and strengthen the linkages between the various structures of the mechanisms
- Major concern
 - o In-country link between NDEs and NDAs

Co-facilitator: invite comments on specific sections of the text

EU

- Welcoming text
 - o Recognition of the already reported linkages of annual reports
- Specific reflections:
- Para 2
 - o We feel there is a missing element on GEF focal point
- Para 3
 - o Could include UNIDO[?] as other co-host of CTCN
- Para 7
 - o Ask for clarification on what text on technical assistance may refer to, can be further refined
 - o Implementation: financial mechanism to support implementation

- Para 4
 - o Clarify that CTCN takes action and GCF supports
- Para 8
 - o Reformulate that CTCN takes the action rather than GCF
- Para 9
 - o Info from GCF would not be the only input, thus reformulate to “help to inform”
- Para 11
 - o General text for concluding the agenda item at this COP as the linkages have been established, therefore item can be concluded

Kenya

- Only one para that mentions Global Environmental Facility
 - o Though this is part of the GEF and has been very useful
 - o NDEs should also be focal points for GEF for linkages to be complete
- There are no suggestion on how to work on this further, instead we hear suggestions to closing work
 - o When strengthen something, we want to see how we build on strengthened linkage between FM and TM to realize growth
- Too much dwelling on incubators and accelerators
 - o Just starters, need to move beyond these
 - o We would like to come out clearly from the text how we move beyond these
- Specific feedback:
- Para 2
 - o Suggested text that would bring out further enhanced work and include GEF focal point
- Para 7
 - o “proposals and projects” rather than just projects
 - o CTCN supposed to assist in that
- Para 7
 - o Clarity needed that there is a system and methodology for going about proposals and submissions
- Para 11
 - o Instead of “concluding considerations of this matter” we would rather like this para to show that this is ground to build on further
 - o Further guidance to be provided by TF

Grenada

- Agree to issue relating to FM is not only GCF, balance not well represented in this doc
 - o e.g. para 5, clarify whole concept of sustainable energy breakthroughs
- Review of the CTCN and linkage to issue of finance
- Any linkages need to outline clearly how relates to TM, GST, [...]
- Gaps and challenges already identified in annual reports

Canada

- Welcome, good starting point
- Support EUs intervention in terms of specifically para 4, 8 and 10
- Para 4 language suggestion
 - o “invites the CTCN to continue exploring a partnership with the GCF...”

China

- Thanking for text, good basis to work further
- Join comments made by Uganda, Kenya, Grenada
- Para 5
 - o GEF role on mitigation
 - o Also 3 strategic objectives for adaptation
 - e.g. reducing vulnerability, which is highly relevant here
 - o Include this in para 5
 - o Further enhance mutually beneficial linkage
- Para 11
 - o Similar views as by colleague from Kenya and Grenada
 - o Not good timing to say anything about concluding this matter on linkages
 - o Aim was ‘ensuring financial resources and scaling up efforts’
 - These objectives have not been reached
 - o Suggested language “Agrees to continue its consideration for this matter...”

US

- Thanking for first text
- Support EUs intervention for para 4, 7, 8 and 10
- Additional comments:
- Para 4
 - o Parties can reach out to GCF directly and work on readiness requests, doesn’t necessarily need to be through CTCN
 - not our place to force GCF to get involved
 - Either make CTCN the focus here or remove para
 - But not telling GCF what it should be doing or what parties should be doing
- Para 8
 - o NDEs [...]
 - o GCF cannot provide finance to NDEs directly
 - either deleted or better reflect
- Para 11
 - o Similar issues to inviting GCF to explore (see above)
- Linking to Technology Framework
 - o This here is a COP agenda item, I don’t see how we could link it to a PAWP item
- Where we are with the linkages
 - o We have done incredible work on the linkages
 - o Glad to see progress being made across the board

- Joint annual report, is reporting on linkages
- Is it really necessary to repeat conversation here if we are already doing so in the annual report that is a COP agenda item?
 - Rather discuss there and close agenda item here

Norway

- Agree with Uganda and Kenya that this text is very GCF heavy, lacking more references to GEF and SCF
 - Suggesting a 2bis or 3bis: “further welcomes the collaboration between the SCF and the Tech”
- Para 2
 - We can fix issues raised by changing wording slightly
 - GEF OFPs[?] added in first sentence “and encourages the further enhancement of the work in this area” – not limit to GCF, because they don’t have power over the parties, not limited to GCF
 - Shared concern with US regarding duplicate text in different decision
 - Seeking your guidance on how to ensure coherence
 - i.e. para 8 in GCF guidance mentioning readiness program
 - need to find a way to ensure we give the same guidance
 - going forward
 - ideally merging this agenda item with work on GCF, joint annual report

Bangladesh

- para 4
 - [...]
- Para 5
 - Need for mention of collaboration between GEF and CTCN
- Sharing concern with Kenya regarding incubator and accelerators
 - Need to think about this in more comprehensive way
 - Planning for the future, going beyond

Saudi Arabia

- Thanking for draft, accept as basis for negs
- 2 concerns:
- Para 3
 - Six readiness requests – how many have been received and how many answered?
Question for the secretariat
 - We would like to know the reality, achievement
- Para 5
 - ‘Sustainable energy breakthroughs’
 - Terminology limited, we are looking for sth wider, including mitigation and adaptation
 - “climate technology” instead of “sustainable energy”
- Para 11

- Sharing concern with China, Kenya

Uganda

- Different understanding of session, thought text by text work through in inf infs
- Thus coming back with specifics:
- Para 2
 - Acknowledge the need for increased coordination
- Para 3
 - [...]
- Para 4
 - Flexible on that one
- Para 5
 - Why is it appearing here? What is the value added?
 - Propose deletion, not relevant in this context
- Para 8
 - “their capacity and accelerating their activities” and “report on progress made”
 - Make sure that entities are assisted in their work
 - Not report on the consultation but on progress made
- In response to US:
 - CTCN advisory board: it took us long (about 2 years) for GCF board members to come to our meeting
 - Therefore it is a welcome initiative to see these linkages
 - That why it is here and not irrelevant
 - NDE’s and NDA’s working together

Malawi

- Thanking for good work
- Para 3
 - Agree to add GEF focal points
- Para 7
 - Agree to additions proposed by EU
- Para 8
 - Agree that CTCN is the one to take actions
- Para 11
 - First part to take stock of the progress, but we should not prejudge the outcomes of that stocktaking, we should continue to discuss this matter as China highlighted

India

- Aligned with observations by Kenya, Malawi, China
- Mechanisms future cannot be prejudged at this point in time
 - Must look at possibility of continuation
- Agree with views presented that this is a larger conversation
 - Not just incubators and accelerator, asking beyond that
- Don’t see much of recognition of scarcity of the resources that is present in reality

- Is there a possibility to reflect this?
- Suggested language: “invites the GCF to enhance its effort to build resources for promotion of tech development and transfer”
- Agree with Norway that its very GCF loaded and needs more balance with GEF

Chile

- Thanking for work
- Sharing sentiment regarding para 11
- New text proposal for para 12
 - “also encourages the TM and the FM to continue enhancing their linkages in a manner that takes note of the Technology Framework.”
- About relationship with entities
 - If changes to one entity this should be reflect here
 - Saying we cannot discuss this as a COP item gives appearance that there are two different Technology Mechanism, which is not the case.

Korea

- Thanks for text
- Para 4
 - Share view with EU, reformulating for CTCN action
 - Both CTCN and GCF engagement needed
 - Reformulating in a way that invites actions from both
- Para 10
 - Share sentiment with Kenya on incubators and accelerators program
- Para 11
 - Conclusion of agenda item
 - Major mandates of GCF under this item of linkage
 - Maintaining this agenda item until program is in practice seems appropriate

Sudan

- Appreciate work done, agree as basis for negs
- Para 2
 - Coordination with GEF, focal points
- Para 5
 - Miss sth related to adaptation and climate resilience
- Para 8
 - Progress report not only consultation but sth referring to implementation or progress made
- Para 11
 - Sth referring to upscaling support

[?]

- Para 11
 - Full stop after 2020 and delete language on concluding this matter

- Delete incubators and accelerators
- Para 12
 - FM and TM shall serve the PA
- Para 10
 - PA very clear, especially para 10.6 linking this to support and GST
 - Important to have a placeholder here
 - Support proposal by Chile as good start
 - And also India's point on support

Japan

- Support statement by EU and US
- Para 8
 - Also invites the CTCN to continue consulting with the GCF on ...
 - CTCN better place to welcome NDEs issues
- Para 11 and 12
 - Preference to keep 12 and delete 11
 - Support proposal by Chile
 - Everyone wants to avoid inconsistency of outcome of different agenda item
 - We should avoid keeping para 11

Philippines

- Regarding the question to secretariat on number of requests submitted, we would also be interested in that information
 - Could help us to evaluate significance of the linkages
- Support that 'projects and programs' should be supported
- Support continuation of consideration of this support and are therefore not for the conclusion

Viet Nam

- Happy to work with draft
- Para 5
 - Support views by Sudan, China, others
 - We need not only mitigation but also adaptation
- Para 8
 - Difficulties how we do approach with guidance from CTCN
 - Technical assistance but also guidance from CTCN for proposals

Canada

- Para 8
 - Problematic for Financial Mechanism to provide support to Technical Mechanism entity, NDE
 - Reword "CTCN to consult with GCF and GEF to identify ways to enhance information sharing opportunities among the NDEs, NDA,s and GEF focal points"

Kenya

- Para 7
 - “invites DC parties to seek support for ... proposals and projects ... further invites the operating entities of the FM to give consideration to the implementation of these proposals and projects”

Co-facilitators

- Now inf inf
- Next informal consultation today 17:00-18:00

--- meeting closed ---