Date and time	Saturday 8 June, 12:00 am – 13:30 pm
Agenda item	SBI 5(b): Modalities of the UAE dialogue on implementing the global stocktake outcomes, referred to in paragraph 97 of decision 1/CMA.5
Session	3rd information consultation
Location	Nairobi 1/2/3
Notes taken by:	Matti Goldberg, Woodwell Climate Research Center

EIG:

- note is unbalanced and focuses too much on focusing the GST on one issue only support;
- The groups very focused on MoI have been blocking the mitigation items, and we are very concerned that those groups have called the GST a menu of options;
- You have to reflect our views;
- We are here to discuss the modalities, not the substantive; we want to discuss how the GST is informing national NDCs, how countries are consider the mitigation and energy provisions of the GST and adaptation, and these are not reflected in the current note;
- Chapter 1: we don't support including paras relating to the origin story of the mandate of the UAE Dialogue; we have a different understanding of this, and it's not common practice to include this
- We not a reference to specific negotiating workstream; if we list one, then we need to list others too;
- GST outcomes are being through NDCs and NAPs, but not only those - so we should not restrict that - it also happens through the work on international organizations;
- Calling the GST a menu options on the basis of national determination is not OK;
- […]
- In many ways there are existing processes in place that we can use;
- A follow up on the NCQG would be fine for us; an agenda item on long-term finance is also happening up to 2027;
- The note as it stands is not a proper basis for us and we expect a further revision;

GRENADA (AOSIS):

- Clarification about the note: it seems to comprise of three independent options, and under each the objectives, modalities and other things; how should we read this structure; is it one package from top to the bottom, or three packages? Should we speak to one option or the other?

FACILITATOR:

- The note reflects the discussions so far; there's three visions or framings for the scope: let's not call those options yet; that's generally how this would be structures; submissions: we found that for many of you the modalities were closely tied to the visions for the scope, so we could not separate things out; for those focused on MOI and finance the inputs are coming from Art 9.5; too hard to differentiate;
- Up to you to decide how to engage with this document; but these three visions do reflect the views of specific groups or Parties; you can comment on the vision you prefer, or comment on the others too; but mostly we want to hear if your views are properly reflected and how we can best clarify the text; some Parties did request that the different elements of visions should not be blended together;

GHANA (AGN):

- The way you packaged the issues reflects the challenges of moving forward; all views should be reflected, and we're not yet fine-tuning the wording; but this would work for our colleagues; we need more clarity on the scope, and that can help clarify things;

EIG:

- Indeed these are not options and we don't see our views reflected; we don't see an option that focuses on action;

JPN:

- We understand there are three scopes from the package; we need to organize the text as options; UAE dialogue should implement the 1/CMA.5 outcomes, and thus should cover the entire scope;

BRAZIL (Grupo Sur):

- Similar as AGN: very difficult to go into the details of the modalities before agreeing on the scope; so we need to speed up things; we need time to discuss scope; three options would be good; it's so clear we have one group that see finance as the issues we're dealing with, while another sees all the outcomes; we don't see the vantage of having option 2 and 3 separately; so we need to hear a bit more about the scope;

USA:

- The note reflects a different understanding of 97 and 98; we see three very different sets of views and think you've captured those, not sure if well; we agree with the approach at this point; we would remove ca. 90% of this note; missing or misrepresented: need to recall the GST mandate; some of the headings are challenge (esp. the 2nd one) - the 2nd bucket focuses on all GST issues, so we don't need to single out finance; too early to cross-reference specific processes; we don't need paragraphs with narratives; focus on specific proposals; first group: reflects only financial support, and at the minimum we correct that to the notion that 2.1 is reflected; issues that don't have a home [?]; preamble should not cherry-pick PA articles; process should be focused on where Parties views are not captured in the note; perhaps there's ability to resolve things; we need to resolve scope before we discuss the modalities, and for that we need time outside this room; at the biergarten tonight;

PHILIPPINES:

- Para 97 is clear: the dialogue is focused on climate finance in relation to implementing the GST outcomes; climate finance has the most number of paragraphs in the GST 1 document; monitoring of finance items need to be enhanced;

LDCs:

- We don't have a strong view; this note helps us move the discussion forward; how do we move ahead? There are differences that we've heard, and that makes it complicated for you to put together the document; but there are common views across the document;

CHILE (AILAC):

- Parties have different views on the scope; the scope encompasses all the identified outcomes of the GST decision; it's also a space to identify opportunities to overcome those barriers to make collective progress; it's not productive to repeat positions; to move forward: work on the areas where we can identify similarities in the three options; on some we can do that; e.g. governance, timing, inputs, outputs, among others; on those areas we can work together to refine the informal note and come up with shared positions;

EU:

- There are different visions on the table, but it's our understanding that all Parties want the UAE dialogue to be a success and driven by the spirit of the agreement;
- Three potential visions in the note: all contain bullets; form should follow function, so discuss modalities separately from scope; first focus on scope;

- 1st vision: this duplicates current processes; the multiple issues are covered by existing workstreams; finance mobilized are based on the NCQG, and there's a long-term finance goal under the COP, and the SCF has a mandate to produce a report on achieving the LT finance goal; no need to focus implementation only on developed countries
- 6th bullet: only one version of the history of paragraph 97, but this is not an appropriate place to reflect the history of things;
- The sole focus in the first vision is out of the mandate, and we cannot agree with it;
- 2nd and 3rd better reflect our vision: focus on all elements of the GST;
- 2nd: this best reflects our understanding; the bullets enable the tracking of progress of issues in the GST decision, and represent our best chance that the GST is more than just word on paper; the 2nd vision should contain messages on a sense of urgency, especially in light of the fact that we are way behind; emissions still have not peaked; there's a huge gap in ambition for mitigation and adaptation; this is why we agreed on the global efforts;
- GST said the FF era should end; we must reduce by 43% by 2030, and 60% by X, and net-zero globally;
- 3rd: also too much focus on finance, preventing real value added; much more needed to follow up on the finance and MoI things; it's not the mandate of the GST outcomes to focus only on implementation in developing countries; need to focus on paras 19, 90 and 91 as well; the work on finance should focus on processes to unlock enabling environments for international investment for finance in developing countries;
- Reform of international financial architecture: ???
- Current version does not reflect our views and we cannot work with it; we'll send more comments in writing;
- We are troubled by the preambular paras; they are cherry-picked and should be deleted;

SAUDI ARABIA (LMDC):

- Reflections on the clustering/vision/options: lot of our elements are reflected somewhere, but there's a distinct vision in our submission; I'll outline this and then we'll submit;
- 4.5 of PA is critical to how we approach this dialogue; support to d-ing will allow higher ambition; 1/CMA.5, para. 4: welcome thisl; recall that outcome of GST will be implemented through NDCs, NAPs and other things;
- Focus: 1. focus on financial support from d-ed to d-ing to implemented efforts; 2. tracking of provision of finance for implementation. Keep these separate;
- Not just a space for developed countries, but also for developing countries to outline barriers in this regard;
- We don't support: 1. any references to assessing collective progress, tracking NDCs, tracking collective action is the role of the next GST, not this dialogue - this would restructure the PA obligations; anything that would duplicate or change this fundamental notion would have to be removed; 2. calls or mandates to the UNFCCC secretariat to keep track of progress; this would circumvent the flow through NDCs and BTRs; the CBs are invited to reflect things in light of their mandates; NWP: not sure how we started discussing this; if some Parties want to expand mandates, it requires consensus; better not to bring in references to progress in other rooms;

CHINA:

- Scope sets the basis for further discussion on modalities; first clarify scope; annual GST dialogue lasted for two days and concluded yesterday; Parties had in-depth discussions on how the GST outcomes influence different work areas; so we should not duplicate by creating and other general dialogue; this should focus on commitments that meet the needs of developing countries; option 1 is a reasonable basis, the other two options go against the mandate;

UK:

- […]

AUS:

- Same concerns as Switzerland; the dialogue needs to focus on all elements; this includes finance and MoI, it's not limited to that; we disagree that the dialogue focuses only on MoI would be a suitable basis; we understand this is a compilation, but it misrepresents things: 6th bullet point: this is not our understanding of what happened in Dubai; the US said we could simplify by removing narratives that are unnecessary; at least we need to remove content that precludes decisions to be made next year;
- Missing elements: specify purpose of the GST as it relates to assessing progress under the PA; this dialogue should determine how that work should be taken forward; the GST decision has 196 paragraphs, and we cannot cover all of those; sec could map operational paragraphs and who could take that work forward; some of the work has not been taken up or have an institutional home; so the UAE dialogue is a good place to consider those things; IEA or UNDP could present on related activities related to the implementation of the GST; so a clear holistic vision is needed to reflect things;
- Areas of commonality: we'd welcome a discussion on these;

NZL:

- We don't agree with most of the content; very disappointing to see countries shutting down discussions on reducing emissions, adaptation, loss and damage, etc.; that's what happening; more focus is needed on the ambition elements of 1/CMA.5; we don't need long narrative paragraphs (e.g. how we got here); we agreed to para. 97 itself, not its evolution;

GROUP SUR (BRAZIL):

- We won't repeat things; we support option 1; proposal: we could start the negotiations focusing on the purpose and objectives, and freeze the modalities; continue at the beginning of the next IC;

USA:

- Process question: do you want language in text or references, or a discussion of what this looks like?

FACILITATOR:

- We encourage everyone to be disciplined; the note has no status; be concrete and specific; longer is not always better in this process;

GRENADA (AOSIS):

- Big differences on scope; key question is how we move forward; LDCs and AILAC: who suggested that when we look at modalities there are many commonalities; we should look where the modalities are similar without prejudice about which vision we are looking at; we need to look at what the operational visions are among different Parties; that's based on the LDC and AILAC inputs;

GHANA:

- If you can simplify the document that would be excellent, but please reassure that no options would be removed;

SAUDI ARABIA:

- We have fundamental issues with full visions or asking for the vision to be removed; so we don't expect our vision to be removed; would be good to get your feedback in this regard;

QATAR (ARAB GROUP):

- Same concerns - hard to discuss modalities without agreement on scope; action is important, and financial support is critical; developed countries obligations must be meaningfully tracked;

EIG:

- Our vision is not captured here and we disagree with those who say that it adequately reflects the views;

CAN INTERNATIONAL:

- We need this dialogue to start this year because we need NDCs to be ready on time; this dialogue must be inclusive and participatory; we don't want this to be like the GST annual dialogue; we'd like the dialogue to be inclusive - so we'd like to add: "facilitate the inclusive participation of women, indigenous peoples, etc."

FACILITATOR:

- Difficult task; different directions; details, consolidation; but reassurances that in the next version the clear and well-articulated visions will be retained; we won't consolidate too much.

(I missed the last minutes…)