Report of the Green Climate Fund to the Conference of the Parties and guidance to the Green Climate Fund - Contact group COP 8 ©
10:20 - 10:45
Room 12:
Prepared by Clara Park with support from Theodore Keeping

African Group:

Switzerland on behalf of Environmental Integrity Group (EIG):
EIG is very keen on moving forward based on the draft element of the GCF guidance. We welcome the progress made on policies and simplifications of procedures. On project approvals. However, we believe that there's much room for streamlining. Several elements of guidance. But needs to be shortened and simplified.
Other elements remain much operational. We need to stay as strategic as possible and avoid entering. Key issues that we would like to see and promote
Increasing complementarity and coherence between GCF and other actors, such as MDBs and climate funds. Putting special focus on vulnerable groups and fragility and conflict
Scaling up private capital mobilization , notably with regard to adaptation and most vulnerable countries. After the session, we are ready to submit our edit.

Arab Group:
Reform must increase access to developing countries.
Country ownership. Fully consider and prioritize developing countries.
Urge effectively distinguishes mitigation and adaptation.
To maintain 50-50- balance in mitigation and adaptation.
More to be done on the technical side.
Least developed countries.
Highlight our concerns of lack of geographic diversity in the GCF staff
Will send the remarks by email

European Union:
Adaptation fund has been significantly increased.
Strategic long-term development of GCF rather than providing detailed description.
Areas for several improvements for GCF would like to see it to be included
Access and ? procedure
MDBs
Project pipelines. Prioritize adapting high-impact proposals.
More support for developing countries to greening financial system and access green finance.
NCQG: Full negotiation at the moment. do not know the result.

US:
Guidance is 136 paras long
Need to be actionable.

Difficult to use lengthy guidance.
Streamlined document.
Will not speak on specific issues
What the guidance should look like
Between COP and GCF. eligibility criteria
Should be based in Fact
Should not misrepresent work
Guidance should be guidance. Should not micromanage the work of GCF or the board
Should not be directed at parties.

China:
Want to highlight areas for improvement
Much room for enhancing developing countries' access to funding
Continue providing greater amount of resources for developing countires
Depend on developed countries' commitments to meet pledges and make new ones
Partnership with national, regional,and private actors respecting country ownership
MCFs can work better together on following joint work on complementarity

Co-Chair:
Hearing the desire for a streamlined text. What do you want co-chairs to do for the next section?

Gambia (on behalf of the LDCs):
LDC group welcomes GCF reports
Enhance access GCF resources remains a priority for the LDC group
Concerned about the low number of funded projects
Request swift action to deliver usb2
Significantly strengthen the programming.
Give priority to subproposals
LDCs want to request consider how to further facilitate expertise on approvals of adaptation projects based on countries' adaptation plans. Adaptation remains the LDC priority
Para 39 , needs to be expedited
Increase multi-country projects, noted at the previous baord meeting
Importance of monitoring
Integrated resource management
Welcome the revision of direct access entities
Country-driven processes.
For the LDC group, we view that DAEs are pillars, stronger support needed
Enhance in-country coordination.
LDC group welcomes this report. Have a streamlined text

Australia:
Four key areas
1. Most vulnerable to climate change, LDCs, and pacific-island countries
2. Strategic plan, more direct engagement with LDCs. Streamlining access

3. MCF action plan. Review additional recommendations. How private sector financing can be jointly leveraged.
4. August 22 decision. Local indigenous knowledge. Do not micromanage decision text.

Canada:
More streamlined text. Avoiding duplication.
Working toward more concise outcome. Guidance on CMA 5. Guidance does not micromanage the board and is not over-prescriptive.
Strong language on the work of GCF to implement gender policies. Second replenishment period. Lessons from the first period. Gender responsiveness of GCF project.
Enhancement of consideration of indigenous people. Improved channels of engagement. Ensuring that they are included in GCF activities that respect their rights.
Coherence and complementarity with other MCFs high priority. Build on progress to date. Achieve a cohesive climate finance architecture.
Risk creating barriers to access – this should not be the intent.
Importance of board consideration of key items - regional presence, simplify access to its resources
Echo US. it's about the GCF, not about the parties
Re: NCQG, echo the EU. careful not to overstep and infringe on negotiation, which is still ongoing.

India:
Not adequate. Not representative of developing countries
60 bil. Small amount
Difficult to get co-financing for adaptation projects
Longer time to get approval for projects – should be simplified and streamlined
Access modalities: 70% are accessed by international entities.

Send remarks in writing to co-chairs

Report of the Global Environment Facility to the Conference of the Parties and guidance to the Global Environment Facility - Contact group COP 8 (d):
10:45-11:05
Room 12:
Prepared by Clara Park with support from Theodore Keeping

AILAC: doubling climate financing for developing countries
Recognising that developed countries increased their commitment from the first period
Regional head for LA and Caribbeans
Some paras of the report are not aligned with COP languages in the previous guidance.
Streamline to make it more appropriate without cutting priorities in the text.

Grupo Sur: Brazil, Ecuador Paraguay Uruguay
Must reflect clear priorities

Simplifying accreditation projects, approval of projects
Need to reduce developing countries' burden in assessing their resources
Limited access due to distance to GCF
Provide support in a geographically balanced manner,
So that partners can implement projects locally
Principle of country ownership in investment and development plans
Accreditation of regional direct access entities, increase participation
Adaptations are supported so that developing countries can take actions.
Development and tech transfer. Enhancing engagement of financing mechanisms

Co-chair: streamlining of draft. Acceptance of STS draft as a basis for going forward. Need submissions. By 3 PM today. Email: climatefinance@unfccc.int

African Group.
We don't agree to this process. We have 116 paras. You want submissions. You are ballooning the process. We can't stop any party from making submissions. We don't have time to balloon text. You saw what happened with the NCQG text. If ppl want to go to 200 pages. We are not going to make submissions. We don't agree to this practice.

Co-Chair:
We have heard call for streamlining the text, we have also heard calls for streamlining. I will just leave the floor to the Arab Group.

Arab Group:
Update information with the latest GCF board meetings. As a group of 22 sovereign nation-states, we reserve the right to update our text. We will make submission in writing. To reflect the latest board decisions of the GCF. We favor streamlining. It should be only on the basis of merging similar paras, and nothing else. The ideas should be preserved.

UK:
Agree with call to offer submissions. We have submissions to send, after the recently concluded board meeting.

Co-chair:
I sense agreement on submissions/re-submissions and then for the co-chairs to submit a streamlined approach. *No dissent.*

Egypt:
Beyond this deadline, nothing should be considered. What is the deadline?

Co-Chair: 3 PM today. Streamlining will take some work. Deadline is 3 PM TODAY. We now close the contact group for GCF items.

Turning to our mandated task:

COP decided that operating entities, CMA shall provide guidance on financing mechanisms related to the Paris Ag. for transmission by COP. We will use remaining time to invite parties views. Seeing no flag up, we would like to produce co-chairs' draft for the next meeting. We invite all parties to make submissions on this item.

Arab Group:
Re: CMA item. We would like to see NCQG and recognise the new pledges by developed countries and call up on developed countries to increase resources agreed. We request more integration with GGA and to scale up effort to support GGA. We request different language on 21c. There is no common interpretation for this work. Fully reject the effort to pre-judge . Pending matter required to be deliberated at the next COP.

Egypt:
Highlight parts of draft guidance by the standing committees. About NDCs: in preparing your streamlined guidance, need to differentiate CMA guidance (which includes NDCs), and cop guidance (that do not include NDCs).

Co-Chair:
Would like to produce co-chairs' draft for consideration for the next meeting. Submit by 3 PM today. We will also circulate submissions. Close contact group for the GCF CMA item.

Report of the Global Environment Facility to the Conference of the Parties and guidance to the Global Environment Facility - Contact group CMA 11 (d):
11:05-11:37
Room 12:
Prepared by Clara Park with support from Theodore Keeping

Co-chair:
Turning now to GEF. Agenda item 8d. Would like to remind parties and observers that contact groups are open to observers. Decision text for this agenda sub-item.

Switzerland (on behalf of EIG):
As for the GEF. EIG is ready to go ahead based on the draft elements for GEF guidance. We welcome the report and recognize the important role of the GEF in UNFCCC and CMA reporting. Also support the GEF-integrated approach. Would like to see more streamlining and simplification and less micromanaging. Strengthening complementarity between GEFs and other MCF is dear to our heart.
In our view, following items must be promoted more: respect for country ownerships; focus on LDCs and SIDS; sustainability of projects; engagement with private sector; diversification in implementing agencies.

In my national capacity, would like to stress CHF does not support GEF 9 replenishment. We are ready to submit our edits later on.

African Group:
See comments in previous session, we will not repeat them. There is heavy micromanagement of the GEF. To echo Egypt, there is confusion on the NDC difference between the CMA and COP. This needs to be streamlined and cleaned-up. The members of the G20 are signatories to the convention, but the G20 itself is not so we do not welcome that language.

Swiss representative needs to read paragraph 11d of the convention. This gives us a very specific mandate to give guidance to operating entities with regard to resources and to replenishment processes. We cannot accept backtracking that it's not part of our work. It is fundamentally part of our work. Our group would not be party to any backtracking on any obligations under COP and CMA. It is a treaty obligation to give instructions to the operating entities on the replenishment level.

US:
Will not repeat full intervention under GCF, but the message is the same.
To consolidate the SCF compilation (*missed this, unclear*)
We will work with a scoped, clear, and to-the-point document to submit at a later moment.

Nepal (speaking on behalf of the LDC group):
We align ourselves with ASEAN. We appreciate GEFs 34 climate projects, and the current programme is commendable. Additional resources are needed for current adaptation needs. More contributions are therefore needed. At COP 28, 174 million USD was committed to LDCF SSCF. Only 6 countries pledged to LDCF and 3 to SSCF. We appreciate this, but more countries should step forward and make pledges to these funds.

The access cap for LDCs should be raised to 20 million USD in grant financing to LDCF. Aligning with double the adaptation financing. We need further work on streamlining LDCs' access. Loss and Damage, early warning system, reduction are appreciated. GEF programming is necessary for loss and damage. We acknowledge USD 240 million to the ? GCF and adaptation fund. In line with GEFs adaptation strategy; we must continue streamlining access process for LDCs, loss and damage and technology.

Arab Group (Saudi Arabia):
The shift to ETF does not mean there will be no more reporting under the convention. Also national communications will continue. GEFs must ensure all DCs are avialable to access resources. Like to see reflection GEF-9 replenishment must be commensurate with developing countries' needs. We will make submissions via email and request similar mode of work under the GCF.

Egypt:
Full support of what AGN proposed.

1. In dec, start of GEF time discussion. Would like to see the language at least doubling input into the GEF in line with developing country needs.

2. Similar to what African group said. GEF itself would be developing, infringing GEF council, cross-cutting, not specific to climate change, cross-cutting on all GEF areas. We should not be bringing elements under the GEF council consideration.

EU:
Speaking on both COP & CMA. On process; it is unfortunate that the standing committee wasn't able to already streamline the work already. We are ready to start working from it. We give you mandate to streamline it, under COP and CMA as you see fit. On contact; we consider guidance to GEF crucial to the funds impact. It's true value on strategic and overall priority is key, so propose a shift from annual to biennial guidance. Moving to biennial give COP and CMA more room for strategic guidance. However, we know that replenishment is starting, so good to give substantive guidance. We believe that GEF strength lies in coherent approach in focal areas: climate change, environmental degradation, biological diversity, and conservation. Access remains a key priority for GEF, with priority to LDCs nad SIDs remaining crucial. EU supports GEF for other funding mechanisms. We wish to see further work in this regard, harmonize and enhance adding money. We encourage implementation of gender policy

UK:
69% of resources have been programmed. Congratulate GEF for integrative programming deliver across priority areas. Raising capital medium size to $5M. Celebrate progress on access and streamlining, and would like to see these achievements recognised.

Canada
Acknowledge the important work of GEF, LDCF, SSCF. All parties should be able to participate, even if they could not submit previously. We support giving the co-chairs a mandate for streamlining. Every should be encouraged to consider the value of working towards an outcome that is concise, given the busy agenda. A concise outcome is in line with the Canadian government's view and others - allowing for flexibility in implementation. We welcome effort from GEF to implement previous guidance.

Core priorities for guidance
1. Delivery of co-benefits as the EU mentioned (climate change, biodiversity) as well encourage coherence and complementarity with other MCFs.
2. Further advocate GEF to integrate gender considerations, gender equality programming guidelines. Promoting gender balance across the governance structure of the facility.
3. Enhance GEF to incorporate indigenous perspectives into its decision-making.

New Zealand:
Welcomes the GEF report for COP and CMA. Recognize that compilation is long and support mandate of co-chairs to streamline it. Board is best served by streamlined guidance, which sends clear signals, leaving flexibility for implementation. Mid-point in the 8th period.
GEF should become even more accessible to LDCs and SIDS, especially pacific island countries. Welcome joint action plan on complementarity with other funds, and emphasise importance of GEF plan to be implemented in full. Funds must work together as a system to

significantly enhance access to climate finance. Action plan is a welcome step and in the right direction.

China:
Welcome efforts to streamline the project cycle and simplify the process. Look forward to the outcome of the working group. Coherence and synergies among focal areas to give. Mandate you streamlining the text.

Kuwait:
Fully support GEF and many projects. Guidance to be provided and acknowledged – would be highly appreciated. We echo that there should be no restrictions on all developing countries on their accessibility to the fund.

Australia:
Note the disappointment that the draft process is long. Happy to support co-chairs in simplifying to avoid micromanaging
5 key points

1. Streamline and harmonize the process, project cycles to meet countries
2. GEF remains agile
3. Note the scale of environmental challenges. The large financing gap. Innovative and transformative approaches, including private and philanthropic actors.
4. Complementarity and coherence
5. Gender is to be incorporated.
6. Indigenous people are to be incorporated.

AILAC (Colombia):
Give mandate to streamline the text. Right now, it is unmanageable. We should be discussing and receiving guidance on GEF priorities for the next replenishment cycle. We welcome work towards more coherence with GCF and other projects, and streamlining processes for project cycles (e.g. in GBF fund). Important to have more coherence in accreditation process and complementarity with other funds. There should be more coherence in the premeditation period Echo comments about synergies and coherence and transformational global envir impact. Important to AILAC: Linkage between technology mechanism and financing mechanism, by having more complementarity between different bodies. We have to see how GEF can evaluate sufficient support for providing transparency. These are our priorities for now.
Through co-benefits there are more adaptation benefits. How can we start having these co-benefits for adaptation, as this is a key priority for developing countries.

Maldives (on behalf of AOSIS):
Current draft contradicts the initial guidelines. SIDS only received 34.97 million USD. Less than 1 million USD for each small island country. On access: implementing agency expansion.

Focusing on national and regional entities, specifically SIDs, including through LDCF and SSCF. We will submit our other inputs if you open a submission window.

Co-chair:
We are out of time. The next group is waiting, we encourage parties to make submissions and encourage next speakers to give their remarks at the next session. We will work on streamlining the text.

Bangladesh (on behalf of LDCs)
The per country cap is very limited, it is important to increase money. Country allocation should increase.
Regarding LDCs, increase the amount to LDCs. so that we can meet the mandate of doubling adaptation financing. Financing and co-financing is the long-term challenge for us. Co-financing modalities should be made more easy for LDCs.

Co-Chair:
We expect submissions by 3PM. We will streamline the text

Arab Group:
We sent our request via email and would like the record to reflect it.

African Group:
On the CMA part of the guidance, we would like to see something in line with last year's same guidance in terms of full support for the BTRs (**Biennial Transparency Report**). In relation to NCQG, there must be at least a doubling of the next replenishment of GEFs. The GEF resources should not only be allocated for reporting, we must secure substantial % of the allocation for the implementation.

India:
We will send written submissions.

Kenya:
We are finalizing the first round of BTRs . We are facilitating a sustainable implementation of the ETF. Per paragraph 11 of CMA-5. As we go into next year, replenishment of the next cycle begins, we must develop reporting capacities especially by developing countries.

AILAC:
We support having the link between the guidance and NCQG, this is fundamental for us. Paramount importance having financing for BTRs. adequate and timely. CTCN and tech and the GEF. and increase support for technology.

Co-chair:
Meeting is closed.

Arrangements between the Conference of the Parties, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement and the Board of the Fund for responding to Loss and Damage - Contact group: COP 8 (f):
11:52-12:09
Room 12:
Prepared by Clara Park with support from Theodore Keeping

Co-chair:
In line with UNFCCC, we must maintain a respectful and constructive atmosphere to all participants inside and outside of negotiation rooms. COP28 and CMA-5 designated FRLD designated as serving the CMA, accountable to both COP and CMA. Arrangements with the fund consistent with its governing instrument, fund is accountable to both COP and CMA. In this context, we are developing these arrangements for approval by the board, by COP and by CMA. The drafts can be found in FCCC/CP/2024/Add.8 and FCCC/PA/CMA/2024/8/Add.8. Also FCC/CP/2024/9/.

There is a heavy climate finance agenda, with a constructive high-level dialogue yesterday, the COP president has asked us to prepare a decision text ASAP. Guidance should be provided as consistent with governing institutions of the fund, accountable to both COP and CMA. Important signal to the crucial matter of loss and damage. Open the floor o the approval of the draft arrangements

New Zealand
Standing committee on finance, AFDR board produced report on this guidance. Approve of collaborative spirit, we should be proud of there hard work and we should implement their guidance. We look forward to a short decision approving these arrangements as they are.

Kenya (on behalf of Africa Group):
The Africa group would like to approve of the guidance at this point. Thank you to all the board members and the ACF as well.

Co-chair:
Apologizes for misidentifying Kenyan negotiator.

Honduras (on behalf of AILAC):
Thank the ACF for drafting the arrangements and sending it to the board. We ask the board to approve this draft. Do we expect two different decisions on the arrangement with the board and COP or CMA?

Saudi Arabia (on behalf of Arab Group):
Happy to approve the arrangements. In terms of reflection on the report for the loss and damage and the guidance: we also expect to have identical decisions under the COP and the CMA as has been the case for the fund’s different issues. Can we make a reflection on the report?

Co-Chair:
This session is about the COP agenda on the arrangements only. You can speak on that in the next session.

Timor Leste (on behalf of LDCs):
We appreciate the work done by the standing committee on finance. The group is happy to welcome this draft and we are ready to approve this as a part of the arrangement to be adopted at this time. We also note that this will be a part of the accountability of the fund to both COP and CMA.

Canada:
I don't know if it ever happened before, but I would like to support AGN, AILAC, Arab group, the LDCs and New Zealand in adopting the arrangement and thank the board for their work.

UK:
There is unanimous consensus in the room to adopt this arrangement unchanged.

Australia:
As one of the co-facilitators it would be strange if I did not approve. We would like to thank both the SCF and the board, we are willing to adopt this unchanged.

EU:
We also support the adoption of the arrangement. We thank the SCF and the board to agree on the arrangements.

Co-chair:
We are pleased the parties are ready to approve the arrangement. We will prepare a straightforward draft decision text to be circulated before the next meeting. Thanks also to the board of loss and damage for their work on this.

Maldives (AOSIS):
Not an objection. We would like to note that our understanding is that the fund responding to loss and damage would be subject to periodic review of the finance mechanism. We would like this to be reflected in the report to COP and CMA.

Co-chair:
I need to consult with my co-facilitator. To Maldives: We would like to proceed with what we presented given the enormous support. We will deal with this question separately, in the constructive spirit we will move forwards and are ready to engage with you bilaterally.

Arrangements between the Conference of the Parties, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement and the Board of the Fund for responding to Loss and Damage - Contact group: CMA 11 (f):

12:09-12:10
Room 12:
Prepared by Clara Park with support from Theodore Keeping

Co-chair:
Given no objection, we will prepare a draft decision to be circulated before the next meeting. This session is now closed. Moving on to **Agenda Item 8e**

Arrangements between the Conference of the Parties, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement and the Board of the Fund for responding to Loss and Damage - Contact group: CMA 8 (e):
12:10-12:56
Room 12:
Prepared by Clara Park with support from Theodore Keeping

Co-Chair:
The board has made significant progress. *(They read from the report provided in the agenda - titled FCCC/CP/2024/6/Add.8-FCCC/PA/CMA/2024/8/Add.8)*
https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/cp2024_06_cma2024_08_adv.pdf

FCCC/CP/2024/CMA/2024/13/
FCCC/CMA/2024/30/Add.1

Agenda items: to welcome the report and the progress made, the dull operationalization of the fund, *the s*election of host countries and the executive director of the fund.

Switzerland (on behalf of EIG):
Very encouraged by the progress made. Executive director to be appointed. The fund has received several additional pledges including from Republic of Korea. The bulk of the work is ahead, we look forward to getting the fund up and running. Board has been entrusted with the responsibility, we should provide necessary space and time for them to proceed. Environmental Integrity Group does not see the need to intervene in the board's ongoing work and welcome the work submitted by the board.

Timor-Leste (on behalf of LDCs):
One of the funds has already done excellent work and we appreciate these efforts. The host country of the board has been selected so we congratulate the Philippines for its readiness to host this board for providing legal capacity for the board. We also consider and congratulate the executive director of the secretariat of the fund from Senegal. We also note that drafting and hosting the agreement during this COP which was yesterday, and high-level dialogue on funding, and also for next year. We look forward to fully operationalizing next year as LDCs and SIDS are looking for fully operationalizing the fund next year.

Kenya (on behalf of Africa Group):

We welcome the report and the signing of pledges, the responsible organization strategy and we appreciate the dialogue that happened yesterday. Note the importance of signing of pledges that have been made that would be transitioned to commitments. We welcome the action by Philippines.

Saudi Arabia (on behalf of Arab Group):
I missed our member UAE in my last remark. Shout out to our Arab colleagues who are representing us on the board.

We would like to also have identical decisions also under the COP and the CMA.
We would like to mention our concern of the constitution of board while noting the concern of delayed nominations. We want nominations in current times. We thank governments that submitted to host the board, host countries, and the Philippines. We appreciate the UAE, South Korea, Azerbaijan and thank the Philippines.

We welcome the selection of the first executive director. We welcome the launch of the high-level dialogues. We request the board to fully implement the work plan without delay, with regard to the long-term resource mobilization strategy. For developing country parties to provide support . All developing countries should be adequately supported in that regard. We encourage developed countries to encourage others to provide support. Safeguarding against loss and damage.

Propose a smooth transition of the secretariat. Consider minimizing costs in hosting this secretariat. We call for a fair and ambitious travel policy. Fair and equitable travel policy to prioritize developing countries for the high-level dialogues. We will submit in writing.

Honduras (on behalf of AILAC):
Agree with elements you are proposing. Welcomes the report to the board, COP, and CMA. Congratulate Philippines as host country of the board and other govts that offered to host the board. Thank the World Bank for accepting the invitation and thank the current interim secretariat UNFCCC, GCF and UNDP for their work this year. Looking forward to an easy and smooth transition to the secretariat into the World Bank. Echo the Arab group for their thanks of the countries that have hosted the board.

Taking note of the work plan: highlight the importance of the board’s work in long-term resource mobilization strategy, operationalization of the fund, ensuring all developing countries remain eligible and can participate in all aspects of loss and damage. Now pledges have been signed with the world bank, we hope that pledges made throughout last year and this year can be converted into contributions ASAP and call for more pledges to the fund. We thank governments that made those pledges and contributions affected. Conclude rules and procedures ASAP. Thanks the board for their hard work this year.

US:

Many around the room who worked on the board have been impressed by the swift work the board has undertaken. The GI has been a guiding operating principle. There is no reason for an additional steer from this body or acceleration. The board is working very quickly and we need to welcome that. This body should instead provide to the board a welcome of the decision of the board, the selection of the exec director, the Philippines as the host organization, the World Bank, the high-level dialogues, and welcomes the progress of the board in operationalizing. Does not seek to provide additional guidance that might imply the board needs micromanaging - although we all have ideas. Let's give them time to try and continue to work at this pace.

EU:
Last year's decision on fund for loss and damage has given direction to the board for it to proceed with major milestones already to be met in 2024. EU and 27 member states welcomes the report for loss and damage and its addendums. Board has met many milestones already this year. Thank world bank, thank philippines, congratulate Mr Ibrahima Cheikh Diong, and commend launch of the high-level dialogues. Operational model of the fund, start disbursing the fund by the end of 2025. We echo the US, we do not believe that COP and CMA should be giving guidance to this fund. The fund is at quite an early stage, being quite new. Has its needed direction, the board has been following it. Working tirelessly that it delivers on its milestones. Let's continue this dynamic. Once they finish the board, we can give guidance for next year.

UK:
Also like to welcome the report. Collaboration with many board colleagues around the world. Same as above (EU, US). UK's preference is to stick with the outline proposed by the co-chairs but will follow suggestions from the room. The board is very busy this December and next year, there will be substantive discussions on resource allocation and mobilization strategies. COP CMA has already detailed complex governing mechanism. We should not have further guidance this year, there will be an opportunity next year. It is pretty phenomenal how far we have come from 24 months ago. This is a victory for multilateralism.

New Zealand:
We agree with others on the incredible progress it made in its first year. Appointment of Philippines, executive director, and world bank has occurred at basically lightspeed. Because of emerging convergence now is not the time for detailed guidance. Board's future work: given progress so far we don't need to lean more on the future work given its work so far.Leave the board to continue its work. Proper guidance to be given at COP-30 and beyond. For now, simple decision as I just described.

India:
Appreciates the progress made so far, the contributions from all parties and the Philippines. Going forward, we hope to have a decision on access modalit, finance instruments. It is important to materialize pledges made to the fund. We need based replenishment cycles from developed countries parties to ensure long-term sustainability of the fund as well as periodic review of the outcome, impact, minimizing loss and damage, building local capacity in developing countries

Maldives (AOSIS):
Congratulate Philippines. We recognize the many AOSIS that expressed interest in hosting the fund. We congratulate the executive director. Thank interim secretariat for hard work this year. We align with the LDCs, to expedite operationalization of the fund. Current pledges are insufficient to continue additional financing. Operational **modalities?** that fit the purpose and evolving needs of loss and damage. We should fully deliver cop28 decisions.

Canada:
The board has made quick progress. Executive director, host country, high-level dialogue, and acknowledge the contributions made thus far. Simple decision to welcome the board would be the easiest way to go. Let's not interfere with a good thing.

Egypt:
Echo African Group. Some elements need further guidance from us, welcoming doesn't really help and is not our responsibility as members.
Resource mobilization comes on top, this is very important and is not intervening in the discussion but is adding to it. UN SG and WB have said this very clearly. Resource mobilization should respond to loss and damage, which is the mandate of the fund. Encourage others to make pledges ASAP. so that the board can put policies into place. Procedures and substantive feedback that gives guidance to the board.

Norway:
Congratulate the board. We echo two of the points made by colleagues: we welcome the report of the board. We also commend the swift progress on operalization. Thanking parties and non-party stakeholders, it has been a pleasure to work with you past year. Would like to see guidance to the FLRD, the board should be trusted to follow the details of its mandate.

Australia:
We reaffirm points made by Canada, UK, EU. We agree in full and would like to see a clear and clean text. We give you mandate to develop one for the next session. Willing to see an acknowledge pledges made to date.

Saudi Arabia (on behalf of Arab Group):
Base the draft in compilation based on inputs from parties (that will also be sent). Will make submissions. In large part we welcome the efforts of the board. We also will provide recs on guidance and issues. One procedural point: the Arab group meets and coordinates everyday at 1pm. Could you announce what will happen with the Sharm-El-Sheikh dialogue? We need this 1pm meeting to discuss NCQG.

US:
Come back on this question about how we are proceeding. Many would like a decision that simply welcomes the action and accomplishments of the board of the past year and welcomes the report and a variety of other things. There is this idea about substantive guidance, which

could waste a lot of time. We can discuss generally whether we want substantive guidance before we go off and spend entire evenings drafting the guidance that many in the room do not want. Could we come to a way forward on whether we as a group want substantive guidance before calling for submissions?

Co-chair:
We have heard your views. We will come back with a draft decision text in our next meeting. We see no need for submission at this stage because I am hearing that we are almost reaching consensus. We would like to put forward that we will work on the first iteration of our draft decision text and come back to you for consideration in the next meeting.

Egypt (on behalf of Africa Group)
We fully agree with you, I hope what you say is not on the basis of how many took the floor. I don't think we are working on counting numbers on who is speaking for or against. AGN (and its 54 members) supports us also.

Arab Group:
The term consensus was used. The Africa Group is 54 states, the Arab Group is 22 states. Any party can make a proposal. We already sent our proposal. We ask it to be reflected in the draft text. The majority of the room would like to provide recommendations on guidance.

AILAC
We echo Egypt and the Arab Group: we think that we need to capture the views reflected in the room. Elements that were sent for recommendation to the board has to be considered as a process of guidance. We ask you to reflect that.

Co-Chair:
Duly noted, I would like to move onto the CMA.

Report of the Fund for responding to loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change and guidance to the Fund - Contact group: CMA 11(e)
12:56-????
Room 12:
Prepared by Clara Park with support from Theodore Keeping

Co-chair:
The floor is open.

There is nobody wishing to take the floor and I thank you for the views already expressed earlier. Moving forward we will proceed along the same lines as the COP. Our next meeting will be an informal consultation. This session is now closed.

Paris Agreement Article 2. 1(c) rescheduled to the afternoon.