

Informal Consultation by the Presidency on WIM governance

15-16:30, Nov. 14th, MR16

COP27 Sharm el-Sheikh

Notes:

G77+China stresses that COP did not give away its rights over WIM

Bangladesh – on behalf of LMDC: facing major L&D now and need to act urgently

- Want more time on the structures of agreement
- Governance of WIM is under COP, subject to the authority of COP and CMA under Art. 8
- Art. 8.2 of PA is not exclusionary of COP, so WIM is not just under CMA but COP as well
- Ie Fiji clearinghouse was authorized by COP and still remains under that jurisdiction I think
- We cannot afford to lose this chance and must clear up governance on WIM to move forward
- We will not accept any solo decision on L&D from the CMA, we must have decisions that agree from both CMA and COP

AILAC (I think Colombia was speaking): agrees w G77+China about dual governance of WIM under COP and CMA

- COP decision 2 CP19 has never relinquished control of WIM
- COP and CMA should produce mirror decisions on both Santiago and WIM
- Argentina is speaking on behalf of Uruguay, Brazil, _____, and they all agree w AILAC

Kuwait on behalf of Arab group:

- Echoes G77+China
- Says nothing gives exclusivity over WIM to the CMA, dual governance should remain (is dual governance the default? I thought nothing had been decided yet and they were in limbo; maybe I got the wording wrong)

Guinea: WIM was established to study L&D, should be dual gov.

US:

- Our view remains what it has been
- For all other bodies established in this way, the body serves the agreement
- We should either continuing using the Glasgow approach or the Madrid approach
- If work under both the CMA and COP are the same, then they're open to discussing a practical way forward

Nepal:

- Agrees with G77+China
- WIM being put under CMA doesn't mean that it's also not under COP

Jamaica on behalf of AOSIS:

- 3CP/18 in 2012 decided COP has a role to play in L&D, in 2013 WIM was established and in 2015 PA was established, but PA did not do away with jurisdiction
- 1CP/21 does not imply that ONLY PA would speak to WIM, so not only PA has guidance and authority over WIM
- The PA expands the role of the WIM

- We cannot share the view that PA nullifies COP's authority in WIM and will continue to negotiate on this to play a role in L&D talks

EU:

- It's clear that L&D is already here and WIM is important
- Ready to compromise, but if that's impossible, we believe we have procedural precedent to continue the work as it is, as long as it doesn't duplicate other work

S. Africa:

- Same as G77+China

Switzerland:

- WIM is exclusively under CMA, but WIM can be strengthened through COP
- We would agree to put this under one agenda item for both SBSTA/SBI to work on and agree to dual governance
- Or we would follow the procedure established in Glasgow/Madrid

Japan:

- WIM is only under CMA, and ExCom is also only under CMA

UK:

- Either WIM as Art. 8 describes it is only under CMA, or we can discuss it further and follow Glasgow/Madrid

Georgia

- WIM and ExCom treats some developing countries worse than others – it's difficult for developing European countries to participate because these countries are given a rotating seat, not a permanent one
- This is inadequate geographical representation

Co-fac:

- Going to refer this issue to the next COP president