

UNFCCC Meeting Report on UAE Informal Dialogue on GST Outcomes on Para. 97

Prepared by: Jade Zhang & Kyle Schwerman - Washington University in St. Louis

Meeting: COP 29, Baku Azerbaijan - 11/19/24

Time	Session/Agenda/Event Title	Location
15:00-16:00 AZT/GMT +4	United Arab Emirates dialogue on implementing the outcomes of the global stocktake , referred to in paragraph 97 of decision 1/CMA.5 - Informal consultation: CMA 11 (j)	Meeting Room 26

Relevant links or Attachments:

- [Modalities of the United Arab Emirates dialogue on implementing the global stocktake](#)
- [outcomes, referred to in paragraph 97 of decision 1/CMA.5](#) - Date - 19 November 2024
- [Technical dialogue of the first global stocktake](#)
- [Paris Agreement text](#)
- [Decision/1 CMA.5 \(Outcome of first global stocktake\)](#)

Summary:

- Parties rushed to give final comments and suggestions on the draft decision text prepared by the Co-Chairs before it is sent to the Presidency for consideration leading the meeting to run 12 minutes over time despite the hard stop
- Contention surrounding the scope of the dialogue was prevalent throughout the meeting
 - Some developing countries, notably India and China, emphasized the importance of preserving the integrity of the UAE as a dialogue, reminding parties that it is a dialogue and *not* a stocktake or other prescriptive event
- Parties also differed on what references to the Paris Agreement and GST should be included in the draft decision text, with some arguing for more references to help clarify the focus of the dialogue while others believed that cherry-picking certain paragraphs over others is misleading

Co-Facilitators: Riccardo and Patrick

Notes:

Speaker	Notes
CoF Patrick	● Published draft text this morning that retains all options on the table and reflects all party views expressed previously ○ Would like to use this discussion to hear party feedback on draft text ● Emphasized time constraint, only 1 hour today with hard stop, no scheduled time tomorrow on the matter ○ Emphasized that this is the parties' last chance to engage on text in this setting, welcome parties to only put forward focused ideas, bridging proposals, or key concerns ● Good progress has been made in these discussions, Presidency would like to conclude technical work on UAE dialogue today and use remaining time to work on more pressing issues ● Parties should transfer remaining proposals by 5pm tomorrow to Presidency to consider
CoF Riccardo	● This is not the day to restate stances that have already been expressed and noted
EU	● Preamble ○ Feels as though there is cherry picking concerning Paris Agreement (PA) and 1/CMA.5 ○ Feels 19/CMA.1 could be looked to when referencing PA ● Scope ○ Prefers option 2 ○ Appreciate that list of paragraphs has been adjusted as they suggested ● P. 4 on energy transition ○ Support focus on energy transition, however, in order to be a space for addressing the issue collectively the related call for enhancing global efforts in p. G is challenging for all countries in its current version ■ UAE dialogue encompasses both developed and developing states, language should reflect that ● Option 3 ○ Outcome of GST should say in its entirety, text should say with a focus on finance rather than "provision of finance" ● Option 4 ○ Does not support, but doesn't think they are mutually exclusive so there is still space for discussion ● Wants further clarity on the option to extend the dialogue ● On input ○ Does not support option 1
Chile obo AILAC	● Scope ○ The different options presented lack balance ■ Option 1 is much longer and detailed than in Chile's preferred option 3 ■ Wants to separate the ideas in option 3 to provide more

	clarity on their position on the scope ○ Request that option 3 p.1 remove the language “comprehensive” ■ Comprehensive is misleading ■ Also, the use of “Outcome” is unclear, proposes to change it to “outcomes” of GST since there is more than one outcome ○ Request option 3 p. 2, wants to separate different ideas of the paragraph with paragraph stops ■ Proposes paragraph stop after discussion of small islands and least developed states ● Suggests to include text that references all the different synthesis reports in one paragraph, stating “all relevant synthesis reports on NAPs, NDCs, etc” ● P. 8 ○ Believes this is not a source of input, since don’t understand why there needs to be presentation from experts as an input ● P. 13 section i ○ More accurate to mention there that there are summary reports from UAE dialogues, “outputs” is too general of language ● P. 14 ○ Does not think it should include reference to “in all countries” , wants to strike that language ● P. 18 ○ Referring to language “Work programmes and constituted bodies should integrate...” ■ Recalling P. 186 of CMA.5, option 1 should keep the language that it is an invitation to programmes and subsidiary bodies ● P. 19 option 1 ○ *could not understand what he said*
United States	● Preamble - fine to recall paris agreement, not fine with cherry picked provisions ● Scope ○ interesting work going on, broader set of parties views ● Governance ○ *spoke too quickly, could not translate* ● P. 4 ○ Decides to extend UAE dialogue, inappropriate UAE dialogue not started yet ● Inputs ○ Option 1 only one scope, won’t work this one ○ Option 3 could work ● Outputs ○ Options 1 and 3 they could work with ■ However there needs to be more clarity ■ Factual summary of inputs, discussion, are not currently captured ○ Options 2 and 4 are non-starters ● In p. 15 option 1 new proposal, redline for US, prejudices the negotiation, must be struck or we won’t move forward with this text

Ghana obo African Group	● P. 4 option 2 ○ Wants to see brackets around “extends to dialogue ● P. 6 ○ Also surprised there are no brackets here, will indicate where they think brackets should be
Nepal obo LDCs	● Preamble ○ keep it simple, confusion understanding scope section of preamble, starts with governance, how will the scope be captured in this document...in preamble or in body. ● Scope ○ Most views are expressed in option 3 ■ However, agree w AILAC that the options are not balanced ■ Not balanced in term of scope ● On timing format p. 3 ○ if we want a synthesis report based on all these different option, may not be ready by june session, should be a two set of dialogue or at end of year of CMA ● P. 11a ○ Mitigation list...we feel loss and damage is missing there, strongly feels as though loss and damage still needs to be there ● P. 13 ○ Outcomes GST children and mountain in climate change and would be helpful in inputs?? ○ *unclear what he meant here* ● Overall, feels as though there should be light surgical changes made in text to help expand on existing options
Canada	● Scope ○ Merge options 2 and 3 in a way that all parties see priorities reflected, confident we can 5pm deadline to ○ Comprehensive, all the outcomes of the GST, still can ack the finance and tech transfer ● Timing format ○ P. 4 ■ 2nd option doesn’t sound clear, 1st and 2nd sentences contradict each other in terms of timeframes ● Inputs paragraph ○ Unclear options 1, 2, 3 ■ numbering system with regards to paragraphs should be clarified ○ Option 2 currently noted as p. 12 - decides additional sources of input can also include the same information of sources as global stock take. Don’t want to exclude those submissions ● P. 19 ○ Request bridging proposal, bracket in option 1 maybe, rather than prejudging the dialogue, with a view to recommending a decision there on, so they can consider the outcomes of the UAE dialogue,

Russia Federation	● Scope ○ See truly divergent views on the scope ○ Not acceptable to break consensus right now and prescribe way of achieving goals ● Annual in SB ● Outputs ○ Align with scope ○ Factual summary should be included, particularly concerning gaps and barriers to GST outcomes ● P. 19 ○ See cherrypicking here, don't welcome inclusion of specific paragraphs here related to GST over others ■ All paragraphs are important, if you include some you might as well include all ■ Don't want to open pandora's box here, would be better to not include any ■ Non prescriptive approach
Saudi Arabia obo LMDC	● Preamble - spell out the relevant articles we are referring to ○ Not sure why we're recalling 19/CMA.1 ○ Not sure why modalities are relevant to UAE dialogue regardless of scope we're talking about ● Scope is well reflected, which option? ○ *did not catch perspective on this* ● Governance and format ○ Discussion of gender , only wants to include this if it is typical procedure ■ Think through how we would characterize "balance", as the language currently states ● Maintain brackets within timing and format ● Don't need a list of non party stakeholders, not needed in this context ● P. 8 ○ favors option 2 ● Inputs p. 9 ○ who makes submission depends on scope ● Sources of information ○ Supports option 1 ● Not feasible logistically ● Outputs under option 2 ○ Under point 2 ■ Change to "clarifying accounting methodologies and practices" ● P. 15 option 1 ○ Important to retain this option ● Remove proposal on 16 and 17 option 1, not acceptable, redline ● Not in favor of option 1 and 2 in p. 18 ● Does not support of option 1 in p. 19 ○ Supports canada's suggestion on this ○ Can also bracket the rest of the sentence, "for consideration of parties in X session"

Republic of Korea obo EIG	• Supports option 2 • Recommend a landing ground to look at how GST is being implemented ◦ Add angle on investment • *could not understand the remainder of what was stated*
Maldives obo ???	• *spoke quickly, only offered one comment- did not catch before finished*
India	• Align with interventions Saudi Arabia made obo LMDCs • Draw attention to fact that notwithstanding differences on scope P. 97 does not call for stocktake, it calls for a dialogue ◦ The kind of options we have seen in inputs and outcomes does not meet criteria of dialogue ◦ Would find difficult at any level to reach meeting point, is not conducive for further work or trust • Reference to 19/CMA.1 is not fortuitous ◦ This is something that is infeasible • Even accepting party differences on scope, why do we want these kinds of modalities? ◦ Urges colleagues to modify modalities
China	• Appreciate retainment of Article 2.2, it is a cornerstone of implementation • Scope - support option 1 ◦ Option 2 - prescriptive and not acceptable, singling out GST section • P.5 ◦ recommend that we add flexibility for co-chairs, etc. • P.6. Cut sentence, don't need to list all the groups, can't id them all • P. 8 so many events, don't need so many high level events • On scope ◦ We are talking about a dialogue, not a modality or Stocktake ◦ Outputs should be quite simple, only a dialogue ◦ Emphasized importance of non-prescriptive approach, since it is a dialogue • Inputs ◦ prefer option 1 ◦ Option 2 and option 3, don't have anything to do with mandate on finance • Outputs ◦ no need for so many outputs • P.15 - prefer no text • 16-18 outside mandate of dialogue ◦ Propose to delete these paragraphs entirely
Iraq	• Supports interventions suggested by Saudi Arabia • Support option 1 • Strongly oppose option 2 beyond intended scope • Option 3 and 4 have good ideas but concerned about the stocktake elements within them • *did not catch the remainder of suggestions due to fast pace*