

COP/CMA 7: Informal consultations by the Presidency on the WIM governance

November 14, 2022

Notes by Shira Lyss-Loren, Washington University in St. Louis

- G77+China
 - WIM is under COP and CMA
 - WIM and bodies under WIM are therefore subject to authorities of COP and CMA
- Bangladesh on behalf AOSIS
 - We need to act urgently to address LD
 - Need to structure facilities to act rapidly
 - Article 8.2 of CMA expanded governance—didn't exclude COP – understands that article 8.2 does not exclude COP from being governing body
 - There is no reason why COP and CMA should not share governance of WIM
 - We cannot lose this moment to codify governance of WIM
 - Unless we agree on WIM governance being COP and CMA AOSIS will not agree to single decisions about LD
- Colombia on behalf of AILAC
 - Aligns with G77+China
 - Dual governance of WIM by COP and CMA
 - Article 8 put WIM subject to CMA but not exclusively
 - Authority over WIM lies with COP and CMA
 - Acknowledges that there are unknowns about specific tasks overlapping with CMA and COP
 - Maybe make a mirror decision COP and CMA about WIM accountability
 - Must define responsibilities
- Brazil for ALBA
 - Position same as G77 and AILAC
 - Dual governance belief
 - Perspective that article 8 doesn't mention exclusivity and therefore all decisions made about LD at this COP should be mirrored in CMA and COP
- Kuwait on behalf of Arab Group
 - Agrees w G77
- Guinea on Africa Group
 - Echoes G77
 - WIM established to address impact of LD, this requires both CMA and COP
 - Keeping purpose of CMA requires cooperation with COP CMA
 - WIM operates under guidance of COPCMA governance to achieve goal of Paris
 - Equity and CBDR
- USA
 - View remains what it has been

- o Article 8 says WIM is subject to authority of CMA
 - Diff than other countries
- o For every other agreement under CMA and COP it is explicitly said it is both – this doesn't
 - “the bodies shall serve” in others CMA uses different language which means different intention
- o Paragraph 51 of 1CP21 mention
- o 2 options
 - Continue using approach of Glasgow and Madrid
 - Willing to have conversation to reflect that work under both CMA and COP would be the same but not co governance
- o No other option
- Nepal
 - o Aligns w G77 and LDC
 - o Loss and Damage progress at this conference cannot be hindered by separating the issues under CMA COP
 - o Article 8 gives governing to CMA but does not remove governing from COP which means it is both
 - o As a country that is extremely sensitive to climate impacts it is critical for us that LD decisions have power and that means CMA and COP governance of WIM
 - o Even at current levels of warming LD is disastrous – UNFCCC process is being too slow – we cannot afford to lose more time – any decisions passed under WIM must be mirrored in COP and CMA
- Jamaica on behalf of AOSIS
 - o 3CP18 in 2012 we as parties decided that the convention has role in addressing LD
 - Paragraph 5 – COP built on this to establish WIM in 2013
 - o CMA said WIM is subject to authority of CMA
 - o It is their understanding that in making decision of WIM and then WIM under CMA the COP didn't do away with their responsibility
 - o 1CP21 does not mean WIM only under CMA
 - o When functions of WIM were decided it was in relation to role under COP of “promoting implementation of approaches to address LD”
 - In this regard CMA expanded on role of WIM, not claim sole authority
- South Africa
 - o Aligns w G77
 - o It's been nearly a decade since WIM was established and we still have no governance
 - o CMA Article 8 didn't change mandate of COP and definitely didn't exclude COP from guidance
- EU
 - o Loss and Damage is already here, and urgent action is needed to avert minimize and finance

- o WIM plays key role of doing this
 - Santiago Network – hope to find agreement
 - o Willing to engage in conversations to compromise with all parties
 - o If we cannot compromise, there are procedural ways to work through it as long as it doesn't lead to duplication or complication of work
- Switzerland
 - o WIM serves exclusively the CMA “WIM subject to authority and guidance”
 - Clearly stated that WIM can be enhanced by COP
 - o Willing to explore possibility that would include dual authority of COP/CMA under single agenda item
 - As long as its under article 8 of CMA framework
 - o Or use Madrid Glasgow addressing solution
- Canada
 - o Legal understanding of article 8.2 means CMA
 - Reference of liability under 8.2 is important
 - o I think aligns with USA perspective
- Japan
 - o Aligns with US Swiss and Canada
 - o Governance of WIM should be only CMA
- UK
 - o Strongly welcomes work of ExComm WIM about Santiago and funding arrangements
 - o Believes WIM is only under CMA
 - o We can do what we did in Glasgow and continue as usual without resolving this
- Georgia
 - o Developing countries are being hit hardest
 - o Most pressing priorities are LD
 - These fights over governance is stopping real LD progress
 - o Pledge implicit in CMA that we leave no one behind is critical – WIM and ExComm do not live up to that pledge – WIM ExComm represents everyone but developing parties of Europe – for Georgia and these nations to participate at all they had to agree to rotating seat with developed countries which costs their nations continuity and representation
 - We are betraying our commitment – we must ensure adequate equitable representation on ExComm
 - o We must rectify this representation issue in the governance decision
- Proposes that parties agree to forward issue to Egyptian presidency to resolve and if that fails make it SBSTA/SBI June 2023 issue