

UNFCCC Meeting Report (Negotiating Session)

Prepared by: Abigail Hunt, Washington University in St. Louis

Date: 6 November 2022

Session/Agenda Item: SBI10/SBSTA7 - Third Informal Consultation on KJWA

Location: UNFCCC COP 27, Sharm el-Sheikh

Room Number: R17

Date and Time: 5:00 pm

Participants(name and organization): parties

Attachments : n/a

Notes/Summary :

Key

Yellow = party against G77 position

Orange = party semi-against G77 position

- I. Deadline for decision: Fri., 11 Nov.
- II. Submissions/Draft Decision
- III. Party Replies
 1. Kenya
 - a. Kenya talked first. Thought their submission was ignored and the result was prejudicial.
 - b. G77 is happy with progress made in June
 - c. Wants the informal session to pursue progress but smaller countries should be allowed to add and make changes (slightly nuanced view from other G77 statements)
 - d. [Second round convo] informal note has no formal status... but also agree that parties can make submissions at any time... informal note was prepared by co-facilitators based on submissions... So there is no point in going back. Parties themselves aren't going to come up with something themselves.
 - i. If they don't grab on to the text of the draft formal document, everyone will go home with nothing
 - e. [Third time] Interrupted the EU. Says that not everyone agreed to submissions. Upset and says no going back.

2. EU

- a. Wanting to clarify... The only reason for the informal text was to give other parties a forum to express their views
 - i. Different from G77 position
 - b. Very important that everyone reports back with concrete things
 - i. Put together a submission for how they see way forward
 - ii. Talking about the future is good but need substance
 - c. [Second round] think this is all a misunderstanding. Don't want to get rid of note but want to discuss how to integrate the views of parties. Came here to do work not slow things down. Want to discuss views and for co facilitators to incorporate views
 - i. Thinks that since everyone submitted info, a better note can be developed
 - ii. Aligned with India (?)
- 3. Tunisia
 - a. Want to make changes to their submission
- 4. Fiji
 - a. Use any available inputs to make something concrete (?)
- 5. South Sudan
 - a. Their understanding was that the draft would be used as a basis of a decision.
Submissions should be used to inform future talks.
- 6. Ghana
 - a. Supports G77 note that draft should be used as basis of discussion
- 7. Malawi
 - a. ^
- 8. South Africa
 - a. ^
- 9. US
 - a. US is worried about countries' submissions on draft
 - b. Opposite of G77. Doesn't want the draft to be the basis. Wants to use recent party submissions and hear more about them first.
- 10. Sri Lanka
 - a. Supports Kenya... Wants to start and continue working on informal note but also continue to include submissions as information
- 11. Sudan
 - a. Supports G77 note
- 12. Uganda
 - a. Main focus is on draft. Contains what they consider to be the basis of discussion so far.
 - b. Parties can freely add and amend things going forward ^
 - c. Supports Sri Lanka/Kenya mostly
- 13. Botswana

a. ^
14. Senegal

a. ^
15. Uruguay

- a. Draft is a good starting point but also want to include new submissions

16. Japan

- a. Unsure

17. Switzerland

- a. Thinks informal note reflects the views of some parties but not all...
- b. Here we have the opportunity/obligation to be inclusive so all material that has been included in submissions so far should be included in the draft

18. Australia

- a. Agrees with Switzerland, etc.
- b. Important to build a good foundation and include everyone's views in the draft.
- c. But need to work quickly

19. Norway

- a. Agreement on most aspects of the notes but it doesn't include everyone's submissions
- b. Have given it more thinking and want draft updated

20. Benin

- a. Supports Kenya (G77, AG)

21. Thailand

- a. ^

22. Mexico

- a. Thinks its important to start work right away but need to be inclusive of views
- b. Supports Switzerland
 - i. EIG worked hard to get submission in and it isn't properly included in draft

IV. Revisiting Discussion/Call for amendments

- A. Co-Facilitator asked to hear what the proposed amendments would be (US, etc.)
 - 1. [Kenya interrupted again to say they don't want to hear anyone]
 - 2. The EU replied to say that submissions were agreed on (in reliance that that it would be incorporated)
 - a) Thinks that Secretariat should simply verify
 - 3. Secretariat did and said submissions were always welcome but not required
 - 4. Facilitator: going to offer an informal informal tomorrow to continue building understanding... 10 am, meeting room 12 (but arrive at 8 am because of leader security)
 - a) ONLY FOR PARTIES

V. Observers

- A. Co-facilitator opened the floor to observer statements. BINGO and ENGO were seated at the negotiation table with flags.
- B. Comments from BINGO and ENGO. Both positive and reasonable. No parties seemed to be paying attention though

Follow-up : Informal informal tomorrow, informals the next two days

Take Away: Lots of tension between G77 position and yellow highlighted parties. The crux of these discussions was whether or not to proceed based on the draft or if the secretariat should revise based on more recent submissions from the yellow parties.