

Sharm el-Sheikh mitigation ambition and implementation work programme - Informal consultation: SBSTA 7/SBI 7 (Negotiating Session)

Prepared by: Nina Giraldo, Kenzie Mounir - Washington University in St. Louis

Meeting: COP29, Baku Azerbaijan

NOVEMBER 15, 2024

Time	Session/Agenda/Event Title	Location
19:30 - 20:30 AZT/UTC +4	Sharm el-Sheikh mitigation ambition and implementation work programme - Informal consultation: SBSTA 7/SBI 7	Meeting Room 4

Relevant links or Attachments:

14 Nov - Informal Note - [SBSTA61 agenda item7 SBI 61 agenda item 7 Sharm el-Sheikh mitigation ambition and implementation work programme](#)

15 Nov - [Informal Note](#)

Notes:

Speaker	Notes
CoF	• Informal note was posted today around 5pm, recognizes the lack of time given for parties to view it • “This informal note has been prepared by the co-facilitators under their own responsibility, it has not been agreed upon, is not exhaustive, and has no formal status.” • Does not prevent parties from voicing other views • For each elements, various views have been expressed by parties, have done best to capture views of document • No text options if want to delete • Create a draft decision text, closing plenary scheduled tomorrow, to forward negotiations for next rk
China obo LMDC	• We do not think this is the starting point of our negotiation • Our topic here is Sharm el-Sheikh Mitigation work programme, not GST implementation • Beyond understanding of mandate • Firmly reject this informal note

	• Integration of GST outcome and any high level political messages are not the issues to be discussed here • We hope to hear the basic answer from other parties on whether this is starting point, instead of hearing discussion on how to change language on current document • We have to learn views of different parties if they all agree this is the starting point
coF	• Structure has also included in separate parts the option of no text and various views have been expressed by parties
Colombia obo AILAC	• AILAC's philosophy: Not possible to speak ambition without placing means in context of means of implementation, must contextualize this in action ◦ Recognizing divergent views request that everyone to listen ◦ In event there is no agreement, idea can be used to help seek consensus or alternative • This is the cop of finance and we understand that we are dependent on discussions on other rooms such as NCQG and how to scale up mitigation and implementation ◦ Concerned about state of negotiations on NCQG, bc issues are interconnected and one affects the other • See proposal is reflected as those of others, exercise of including views of last iteration • Identify proposal in constructive spirit para. 5, embody and go towards action implementation which is solid basis • In para 5, references public finance and importance of improving access to finance as challenges of high level effect countries in coastal and more ◦ Calls to action of themes of global dialogue • Para 5 is complemented by para 6, nationally determined nature of NDCs ◦ Strengthened by call to action ◦ CBDR-RC • Thanks that CoF has considered their considerations • Iterates that success of this discussion also depends on conversations in other rooms
USA	• Note was "clear, positive" iteration in collecting views and capturing a number of elements that parties highlighted last night • We must make progress and find common ground • Concerns with text ◦ Para 8: desire to put forward element to decide that the MWP would react to Dubai progress under GST, where there were really clear, forward-looking ways to progress ■ Cannot be taken away in these discussions ■ Muzzling the discussion

	■ Expect that a dialogue would evolve with the decisions we take every year ■ Third option under para 8 that say that future global dialogue topics will rise from 8, 33, 39 and 40 ○ Number of proposals with no text options bc we haven't had time, so won't comment on that yet
Norway	● MAJOR ISSUES with text (the issues are major) ○ Recognizes this is what we have, captures breadth of parties views even though not precise ○ Note does not please anyone here, but it is a starting point ● Structure is good ● Some parties have differing use of mandate, challenging to work with ● Some sections easier to work with, should focus on these instead
Switzerland	● Quite recent work programme, so we see this as a tool to listen/debate with one another ● Good starting point, you listened to messages in the room, including that we reflected on messages that COP should deliver in placement; China had discomfort but we think this could be discussed ● Falls short of providing really credible decision that we would want to come to UN system ● Want more clarity and concrete messages that speak to what actors in UN could do to support emissions reductions in cities/urban systems ○ Add more specificity, especially since it might act as reference doc for outside actors ● More clarity with regards to means of implementation and support ● Logistical improvement on follow up from one dialogue to the next ○ Experts from sectors to engage with one another ○ Co chairs should facilitate possibility of virtual workshop ● Para 8: helpful to not restrict future topics
Samoa obo AOSIS	● Good starting points, most views have been captures, 4 to 10 pages ● Contains elements that are represented ● Need more time, but notice repetition in text ● Preamble: welcome references of 1.5 and how they help information enhanced mitigation ○ Welcome best available science ● Progress: supportive of textual elements that welcome progres of MWP ● Improvements: regional dialogue, favor option 32 ● Para 13 option 2 ● Happy to provide this in writing
Saudi Arabia obo Arab Group	● Align ourselves with LMDC intervention ● Understanding would not be compilation of all views ● We asked for simple structure, and current note is too detailed,

	complex, contentious to serve as starting point and viable basis for negotiations • Would not guide discussions, and would only hamper negs • Need to start with skeleton as basis (simplified so we can focus on foundational elements), starting with bullet points • Parties are free to express views, but CoF must ensure that final product adheres strictly to mandate, not content that violates mandate and scope • Discussions must remain within the agreed mandate to show trust and integrity in process • Note is the “opposite” of that trust, takes us “far beyond the mandate” and they should not be included in the first place • We reject this formal note as basis of negotiation, and hope for new note that can show common ground
Australia	• Relatively comprehensive, capturing all views, some missing elements (highlighted well by US) • Represents diverse views; Has no text options, shows where there are diverge views, two groups that can't engage on this basis ◦ How to engage together if not through a note that includes everyone's viewpoints? Sounds like they want only the views of a few ◦ How is this party-driven process if you are ignoring many views expressed in room • If we focus on what we agree on: process, we ignore other views that diverge on scope • Elements under HLM should be agreed within scope of MWP • No one says messages from science shouldn't be in MWP • Agree with US, some GST options that need to be shown in text especially in global dialogue • Improvements section: hard to see how this relates to improvements to dialogue • Subsection 0 is more high level and doesn't actually refer to dialogue or its modalities in any way, so should be moved to high level section
Korea	• Good starting point, good basis for further engagement ◦ Things that shouldn't be included in MWP and have little purpose to it, but inclusion of things we do not like in draft text is not legitimate basis to reject it altogether • Here to work out our differences, so rejecting informal note on basis is rejecting our mode of work itself • We are happy to work with this, and will we come back with more specific comments
Russia	• Don't see informal note as good basis for further discussions as not all parties views are on table • MWP is not meant to duplicate GST process

	• Out of MWP mandate to include GST all outcomes ◦ Some parties will go beyond scope of what was agreed on GST outcome • Yet another example of “selective approach” to GST outcomes • Tripling of renewable energy can be through building [missed word] capacities ◦ Should employ full range of capacities such as geographical circumstances • Critical mineral and sustainable supply chains • Certain new obligations are presented as matter of fact and other parties are simply expected to accept them, this is inappropriate • First need to discuss other sector such as solutions as carbon removals • Mandate says outcome should not lead to new targets or goals ◦ Respect nature and should not call for any top down approaches
Zimbabwe obo Africa Group	• Relook and take time to look at text, as we haven't had time to engage with it, however from face value the text has way too many elements that go beyond the mandate • GST elements that feel like relating GST mitigation outcome • Why duplicate GST outcomes since they are already doing this and implementing in NDCs • We need to stick to the mandate of the MWP • Call a point for establishment of MWP fund, that will be funded by developed countries, which will be used by developing countries to implement mitigation in practical manner → we want to see this reflected
EU	• text has significantly changed and many elements have been taken up by parties that have not provided written statements • Parties need simple skeleton structure, high number of parties already proposed and do not trigger engagement • Why some parties reluctant to discuss in consultations? • HLC, still need to really look at text • Overall structure is workable, logical reading and good basis for further deliberations • Appreciate reflections of science and UNFCCC report, key to guiding our work • Key Findings: destile messages serving for work • Look forward to work with other parties • Topics section needs further review • Elements that narrow GD events will not help scale up implementations • High level messages: Option 1 includes all HL messages and only one more option is shown as “no text”, not workable solutions with other parties

	○ If you can't agree on one doesn't mean that all 16 of them should be rejected ● Cannot separate mitigation from MWP ○ Mitigation outcomes from GST cannot be separated from MWP
India	● Kindly request more time to review docs ● Some delegations, especially small ones, balancing multiple agendas and didn't get time ○ Broader picture: heard discussions on incorporating forward-looking elements of GST ● "Little confused" considering the same voices have called for replacing Paris with just UN processes ○ Consistency? Approach? Misleading ● cursory review, aligns with others that note looks prescriptive in nature like GST 2.0 and has descriptive language outside of mandate ○ Deviate from mandate ● Descriptive language that invites parties to consider/adopt references GST outcomes or outside of MWP ○ Share frustration of Australia...what will it take to hear the Global South? ○ Agreed with Russia: that tripling renewable energy not even considered ● Address unilateral measures that disadvantages developing countries
Iran	● Want to echo support to what was said by LMDC, Saudi, India, Russia ● We have concerns to text, acknowledge that text submitted very late and have not had enough time to go through parts of it ● Initial reaction: text is imbalance, and a kind of deviation from mandate that we have been given by COP 28 ● Some efforts have been ignored, and unjust if we put some and underestimate others ● New actions has been suggested beyond what we agreed on last year ● Specific need for more consideration of text, and improvement to be able to consider it
Bangladesh obo LDCs	● Must capture all views in a party driven manner ● Some elements previously missing are now in place, however many elements still to be placed in different chapters ● Process: some elements are very sensitive to some parties, should put brackets that is not agreeable to other parties ○ Want to see all views ● Only WP dealing with mitigation ● Support Iran highlighting means of implementation ● Feel some elements that can guide us to scale up efforts on mitigation and implementation on ground ● Use guidelines from previous COPs: these guideline are agreed

	overall collective manner
Canada	• On the question of using informal note as a basis? We agree with most that while note is not perfect for everyone, it still captures views that I've expressed, and while elements are missing and we don't agree on, we want space to engage with proponents of these ideas & dive deeper • Didn't have a lot of time to read/digest • Ideas they are supportive of ○ Australia on science and urgency at bottom, those do belong higher in note ■ Mitigation cannot be distinguished from urgency and science ○ Agree with US on para 8, where we talk about GST in relation to MWP, we want forward-looking perspective and make decision really clear ○ AOSIS comment, supportive of seeing ... • Would like to see text take on proposed text from submission ○ Message that speaks to inclusive approaches, and we would also like in para 11 that we have bullet that speaks directly to enhancing implementation for women, girls, vulnerable ppl, which should be in MWP • I'll be submitting all this in writing
Japan	• Text is good basis for discussion • Don't have time to reject it • Likes structure, some paragraphs like 11 should be moved • Importance of link between MWP and GST • Need more time to digest, if needed we will submit our opinions
UK	• Welcome text of summary as views expressed • Key elements missing: ○ References to sciences ○ Parties must retain decision to include topics ○ Fuskjadlfkjas;ldfkja;lskdfj;laskdjf;laskjf • Already protection given in mandate of MWP, but cannot and should not stop global dialogue from smother something • We still need to review text fully and streamline in a way that adds value • Agree with EU on value of text/no text • Should be scope that reflect key interests • "Optimistic" that we can find way forward
Kuwait	• Align with LMDCs and Arab Group • Not right starting point, this goes beyond our mandate
Norway	• References to agreed mandate, parties have different views on that,

	text contains items that different parties think within mandate • “Skeleton text but there are different bones in this room”
Brazil OBO Group Sur	• Many inputs were reflected in new text • Many elements still lacking, we can work on this • Thanks for incorporation of source proposal for implementation platform • Contribute more towards actionary approach in MWP (feels lacking) ◦ Need more action and implementation • Huge gaps in implementation to help raise ambition • Identifies repetition in final paragraphs recalled under PA Desc 1 and 5 in Preamble • Need to further analysis the further elements as time was short • CoF captured a wider scope • Still have to clarify complementary of MWP and GST, matter of disagreement ◦ Do not consider MWP to follow up GST appropriate ◦ Could be used to help implementation of PA ◦ Do not want to see fragmented approach ◦ Developing countries can delete means of implementation ◦ Want countries to implementate GST outcomes, needs further analysis to look at note
Bolivia	• Aligns with statements by LMDC, ARab Group, Russia, Indian African Group • Has concerns • Role of CoF is to protect previous decisions, agreements, all of which have been carefully crafted • Trying to avoid different understandings → not to say you are avoiding mitigation in context of mitigation, but was highlighted/repeated program is punitive, trying to avoid bad interpretations • Should protect mandate and Paris, which it “challenges the spirit” of • Cherry-picking GST outcome • Shifting bottom-up approach, cannot move into the opposite • Need to protect Paris Agreement, and can’t accept that way forward • Parties that could not fulfill Kyoto are trying to impose obligations on developing countries ◦ Affects bottom up approach • Different national targets, and we hope that we don’t have any provision of finance, “really, it’s too much” • Bottom up of Party agreement, moving beyond what it is in convention, so Bolivia rejects this note, and it is the job of the CoFs to protect • Brazil has idea of implementation platform, and in my perspective, it cannot provide support that developing countries need • Already has platform for Article 6.8, don’t need additional one • Need to change the scope of the NDCs to this idea of national

	investment times, so will connect with platform with idea of achieving NDCs • We need to find a way to move forward, especially for developing countries; we don't need targets imposing ways we should enhance ambition beyond national sovereignty
--	---

[left session early - parties still making interventions]