

Glasgow Climate Change Conference: Friday, 5 November 2021

On the last full day of negotiations under the subsidiary bodies, negotiations focused on wrapping up as many issues as possible and creating clear options in the texts for stickier issues that will need to be further considered in the second week of the conference.

COP

Matters Relating to Finance: Compilation and synthesis of, and summary report on the in-session workshop on, biennial communications of information related to Article 9.5 of the Paris Agreement (ex ante finance transparency): In informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Carlos Fuller (Belize) invited parties to express views on elements of a draft decision. A party said it would submit a written proposal after the consultations. Several countries opposed, indicating that the COP decision should be short and “take note of” the CMA decision. Given the divergence, the Co-Facilitators will gather different opinions to prepare a draft text.

CMA

Matters Relating to Finance: New collective quantified goal on climate finance: Consultations convened in the morning and afternoon, co-facilitated by Zaheer Fakir (South Africa) and Outi Honkatukia (Finland). Parties presented and responded to initial submissions made by various groups.

Two developing country groups presented a proposal containing: options for an *ad hoc* committee or an *ad hoc* working group to set the goal and determine various parameters, including availability of resources, shares of public and mobilized finance, a definition of climate finance, and a burden-sharing arrangement; a timeline for this work, concluding in 2023 at the latest; and an indicative range of USD 750 billion to 1.3 trillion for the goal. One group indicated, also calling for a definition for mobilized private finance.

Another developing country group called for a clear pathway and deliberations to cover, *inter alia*, quantity, quality, access, features, and targets of the goal. The group expressed preference for an open-ended *ad hoc* working group, informed by high-level ministerial meetings and completing its work by 2023. A further developing country group called for: putting developing countries’ needs and priorities at the center of the goal; considering inputs from multiple stakeholders, including from the private sector and academia; and concluding by 2024.

Another developing country group presented a submission, stressing, among others: agreement on a roadmap at CMA 3 (2021) and on the sources of input at CMA 4 (2022) to finalize “quantitative and qualitative work” at CMA 5 (2023), and adopt the goal at CMA 6 (2024); and providing disaggregated

information on support for mitigation, adaptation, and loss and damage. Other developing country groups suggested guiding questions, including on ensuring the multilateral process supports moving from “the billions to the trillions,” directing finance to just transitions, supporting recoveries, operationalizing Paris Agreement Article 9.5, and aligning multilateral development banks’ investments with the Paris Agreement’s goals.

Many countries expressed concern regarding a committee or group, with some developed countries cautioning against “over-engineering” the structure and staging of the deliberations by already specifying issues for discussion.

Developed countries and one group highlighted, *inter alia*: drawing lessons from the USD 100 billion goal; reflecting the needs of developing countries; that the new goal should strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change; workshops, ministerial roundtables and summary reports; working under the CMA; capturing progress, for example through Presidency’s or Co-Chairs’ reflection notes; political stocktakes or nominating independent champions or ministerial co-facilitators; and concluding discussions in 2024.

Parties agreed to mandate the Co-Facilitators to develop draft text. Informal consultations will continue.

Compilation and synthesis of, and summary report on the in-session workshop on, biennial communications of information related to Article 9.5 of the Paris Agreement: In informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Georg Børsting (Norway) invited parties to express additional views that will input to a draft decision. A group, supported by several countries and groups, suggested that future biennial communications include more information on, *inter alia*: efforts to balance mitigation and adaptation finance; instruments and channels used to provide finance; and criteria to evaluate funding proposals. They also underscored that the draft decision should not “welcome” the summary report but note “lessons learned” from previous submissions, especially regarding funding needs for developing countries.

Several developed countries indicated that the draft decision should not suggest any new type of information for biennial communications. They also encouraged other parties providing climate finance to submit biennial communications. The Co-Facilitators will prepare a draft decision as a basis for further negotiation.

SBSTA

Methodological Issues Related to the Paris Agreement: Common tabular formats (CTFs) on support provided and mobilized, needed and received: Informal consultations were co-facilitated by Seyni Nafo (Mali). Some parties that had met informally reported on their discussions, suggesting, among others, for cells to actively link to the underlying assumptions, methodologies, and definitions of the reporting party.

Several developed countries called for focusing discussions on what is reflected in the modalities, procedures and guidelines (MPGs) when objecting to adding a column on loss and damage or inserting parameters such as alignment with the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement.

Several developing country groups emphasized the principle of no backsliding and called for providing a decadal perspective on progression, both in terms of support provided and reporting. One developing country group called for using notation keys to explain the rationale for blank space, noting these can provide insights on methodology gaps.

There was general convergence on adding footnotes indicating that reporting on grant equivalency is done on a voluntary basis. The Co-Facilitators will prepare a new iteration for inclusion in the SBSTA Chair's note.

Article 6: Heads of delegation met in the morning to reflect on the revised text. In the afternoon, informal consultations convened, co-facilitated by Mandy Rambharos (South Africa), Hugh Sealy (Barbados), Peer Stiansen (Norway) and Kim Solberg (the Netherlands). Parties reported back on informal informals, saying there was some progress on discussions under Article 6.8 (non-market approaches) on consolidating work programme activities and on the list of focus areas. They reported there was no consensus on how to merge the two options relating to baseline methodologies. A group and a party called for working together on a clear proposal to merge these.

The Co-Facilitators presented revised draft conclusions on all three sub-items, explaining the rationales behind key textual changes.

Four groups made many suggestions to bring back options that had been deleted from the previous iteration, bracket language that had been unbracketed, and unbracket other text. On Article 6.2 (ITMOs), these related to, *inter alia*: shares of proceeds; NDCs consisting of policies and measures; completing the review relating to a single method for corresponding adjustments in 2022, not 2030; references to the long-term goals of the Paris Agreement; and having the Secretariat make recommendations relating to infrastructure, rather than organizing a technical workshop with submissions from parties.

On Article 6.4 (mechanism), suggestions related to, *inter alia*: shares of proceeds; anthropogenic removal enhancements; making language on human rights and Indigenous Peoples' rights consistent with that in the preambular text of the Paris Agreement; defining "best available technologies"; more stringent baselines and shorter crediting periods; mandatory cancellation; and certified emission reduction transition.

On Article 6.8, one group suggested adding focus areas related to financial policies and measures, and research and development.

Informal consultations continued into the evening.

Matters Related to Science and Review: Research and systematic observation: In informal consultations co-facilitated by Ladislaus Chang'a (Tanzania), parties reported back from informal informals on text relating to the Earth Information Days 2020 and 2021. Parties agreed, after some discussion, to move through the text on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.

Two parties called to remove an expression of appreciation for the IPCC's continuing work on the Sixth Assessment Report (AR6), including Working Groups II and III. A compromise agreement was reached, whereby appreciation is expressed for the continued work of the IPCC on AR6, without mentioning the Working Groups.

Consensus was eventually reached on how, and to whom, to express appreciation for the research dialogue and Earth Information Days.

A group called to add the participation of youth to a paragraph noting the importance of broadening their representation at future mandated events. One party suggested adding labor unions, while another called to delete the entire paragraph. Parties agreed

to leave the paragraph as it was in the text, with no additions. Informal consultations continued.

Sources of Input for the Global Stocktake (GST): In informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Juliana Arciniegas (Colombia) introduced draft conclusions, which parties welcomed.

Discussions focused on the wording of an invitation to constituted bodies and forums and other institutional arrangements to the Paris Agreement and/or the Convention, to prepare synthesis reports ahead of the GST's technical assessment. This invitation had been made in decision 19/CMA.1 (Global Stocktake), but parties disagreed on how to extend the invitation to entities established after that decision was adopted. Agreement was reached on recognizing that such entities are included in the scope of decision 19/CMA.1, and referring in a footnote to the Katowice Committee of Experts on the Impacts of the implementation of response measures.

Parties also exchanged views on complementing the lists of inputs in paragraphs 36 and 37 of decision 19/CMA.1 (sources of input to the GST). Developing countries proposed that in addition to such inputs, further sources and types of information shall also serve as a basis for the GST. Parties agreed to this proposal, and agreed that the further inputs would be made with a view to informing the technical assessment, rather than to achieving the outcome of the GST.

The Co-Facilitators will prepare a new iteration of the text, consult with the SBSTA Chair, and notify parties about the next steps.

Nairobi Work Programme: In informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Alessandra Sgobbi (Italy) heard parties' comments on revised draft conclusions. Discussions included: whether to use "intergenerational equity," following Paris Agreement language, or "protecting the climate system for present and future generations," following Convention language; whether "actions" can replace "response measures"; which provisions should specify "developing countries, including the LDCs and SIDS"; and whether to specify "finance, technology and capacity building" in a guiding question for the Nairobi Work Programme stocktake.

As no agreement was reached on the draft conclusions, Sgobbi advised parties that the Co-Facilitators would circulate a revised draft but, given lack of time for further discussions, they would seek guidance from the SBSTA Chair on the way forward.

SBI

Development and Transfer of Technologies and Implementation of the Technology Mechanism: Linkages between the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism:

In informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Elfriede-Anna More (Austria) introduced a text prepared by the Co-Facilitators, which includes draft conclusions proposed by the SBI Chair and a draft COP decision.

Many developing countries and groups supported the text, with some suggesting minor changes. Several developed countries expressed their dissatisfaction, emphasizing that providing guidance to the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and Global Environment Facility (GEF) is beyond the mandate of this agenda item. Many developing countries disagreed, noting that the GEF and GCF sought guidance on their linkages with the Technology Mechanism and such guidance had been made in the past.

Co-Facilitator More suggested removing these paragraphs from the text, opposed by two developing countries who noted they had not yet been substantively discussed. A developed country noted that no text can be forwarded to the COP without the SBI's agreement. The Co-Facilitators will consult the SBI Chair.

Matters Relating to the Adaptation Fund: Fourth review of the Adaptation Fund: Informal consultations, co-facilitated by Ali Waqas Malik (Pakistan) and Claudia Keller (Germany), considered revised draft decision text containing an annex with the review's terms of reference, noting most adjustments were technical or minor.

A developing country group, supported by another developing country group, made a bridging proposal relating to references to the CMA, including referencing paragraph 33 of decision 1/CMP.3 (deciding to undertake a review of the Adaptation Fund), deleting references to new CMA decisions, and including a paragraph inviting the CMA to consider the outcome of the CMP review. In response to a party's inquiry about whether this would imply that the CMA could consider the review before the CMP review has finished, the group clarified the CMA could take action if it wishes after the review.

Many parties and groups welcomed the text in principle but requested time to review it and consult with negotiators working on Article 6, given linkages to this item.

One group requested reintroducing "governance" of the Adaptation Fund to the scope of the review. One party expressed disappointment that its proposals were not included in the text, but expressed readiness to engage.

Parties agreed the Co-Facilitators would incorporate the group's proposal into the text, and to meet informally to seek agreement.

National Adaptation Plans (NAPs): Jens Fugl (Denmark) co-facilitated informal consultations. On the section on "gaps and needs related to the process to formulate and implement NAPs," parties agreed to procedural conclusions to continue deliberations at the next SBI meeting, capturing progress to date in an annex.

On the section related to the "assessment of progress in the process to formulate and implement NAPs," parties debated the two invitations for submissions in the text on: progress towards achieving the objectives of the NAP process; and progress in the process to formulate and implement NAPs. They also debated the timeline for submissions.

The Co-Facilitators will prepare revised draft conclusions to capture the views heard.

Matters Relating to LDCs: In informal consultations, parties agreed on draft conclusions and a draft decision on the extension of the mandate of the LDC Expert Group (LEG).

Administrative, Financial and Institutional Matters: In the morning contact group, co-chaired by Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago), parties sought to agree on draft decision text on all sub-items. Kumarsingh drew attention to a new paragraph, proposed on Thursday, 4 November, in the COP draft decision on the programme budget for the biennium 2022-2023, *inter alia*, requesting the Secretariat to prioritize constituted bodies in the allocation of core resources.

Bangladesh, for the G-77/CHINA, Belize, for AOSIS, South Africa, for the AFRICAN GROUP, and Saudi Arabia, for the ARAB GROUP, supported the paragraph, with AOSIS saying it confirms a practice already implemented.

Switzerland, for the EIG, the EU, and the US opposed adding the paragraph, pointing to a common understanding on all sub-items reached in the June SBI session. The US proposed an edit to a paragraph "agreeing" to the preparation of annual budget performance reports, and stressed it was too late to introduce such substantive messages given the lack of time to assess their implications on other areas of the Secretariat's activities. The EU underlined that it is a "principle of this room not to prejudge decisions" that are taken at COPs.

Kumarsingh proposed compromise language from a previous COP decision. The G-77/CHINA and the AFRICAN GROUP proposed including the paragraph in brackets and forwarding the text to the SBI closing plenary, opposed by the EU and the US, who called for forwarding the draft texts as presented on 2 November. The contact group reconvened in the late evening to seek a solution.

SBSTA/SBI

Development and Transfer of Technologies and Implementation of the Technology Mechanism: Joint annual report of the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and the

Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN): Stella Gama (Malawi) co-facilitated. A party presented revised draft decisions for the COP and CMA produced in informal informals, which included several brackets.

Several countries indicated general support for the new text, but suggested minor changes. Parties then went through the draft text paragraph by paragraph, but were not able to conclude the discussion. The Co-Facilitators will consult the SB Chairs on how to proceed.

Reports of the Adaptation Committee and Work on the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA): Le-Anne Roper (Jamaica) and Paul Watkinson (France) co-facilitated informal consultations. Delegates debated whether to first address the reports or the GGA, with some developed countries noting agreement on the reports was in sight and developing countries urging making progress on the GGA.

They also debated how to address a developing country group's proposed text for a draft CMA decision on the GGA, with many parties calling for time to review the proposal. Several called for considering both the Co-Facilitators' informal note and this alternate text together. After a huddle, parties made textual suggestions on the timeline and the modalities of a work programme on the GGA. Discussions continued in informal informals.

Report of the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism: Informal consultations were co-facilitated by Kishan Kumarsingh (Trinidad and Tobago). Delegates briefly indicated that some parties had engaged in fruitful discussions on the functions of the Santiago Network. Discussions continued throughout the evening in informal informals.

Second Periodic Review of the Long-term Global Goal: In the informal consultations, Co-Facilitator Frank McGovern (Ireland) and Una May Gordon (Jamaica) explained they had received and considered two submissions in the revision but a third was inadvertently "filtered out." A group, asked that its views be reflected before any paragraph-by-paragraph discussion. Some parties proposed language, but no agreement was reached. The Co-Chairs closed the meeting, saying they would report the outcomes to the SB Chairs.

In the Corridors

"Remember, remember the fifth of November" – meeting on Guy Fawkes Day, a UK celebration to commemorate the "gunpowder plot" to assassinate a king, perhaps would always invite fireworks. The day began relatively calmly. The Heads of Delegation meeting on Article 6 showed that they were, on the whole, comfortable with the text. Each planted their flags on the issues and outcomes they would fight for next week. Many are known: providing a share of proceeds for adaptation, carrying over credits from the Kyoto era, governing non-market approaches, and protecting human rights, among others. It is a lengthy list. The text already looks ahead, and creates a work programme to finish the technical work on some issues like accounting for the buying and selling of carbon credits in countries' NDCs (or, for those in the Article 6 bubble, "corresponding adjustments").

By the time the fireworks outside could be heard in the venue, large protests had taken place in the center of Glasgow and sparks seemed to fly in various negotiating rooms. The SBSTA and SBI Chairs were seen throughout the venue, encouraging delegates working on adaptation, loss and damage, agriculture, technology, and other issues to find agreement. One delegate wondered if the fireworks were "a good omen or a bad omen," hoping they were a good one, "meaning we can move forward with the text." As if on cue, requests to re-insert paragraphs in Article 6 burst forth and negotiators for adaptation, loss and damage, and other key issues expected a slow burn and a late night.