

Rich exchange of views on the mitigation work programme

Bonn, 9 June (Meena Raman) — Parties to the UNFCCC exchanged views on the work programme for urgently scaling up mitigation ambition and implementation in informal consultations held from 7-8 June at the ongoing Bonn Climate Change Conference under the Subsidiary Bodies (SBs). The informal consultations were co-facilitated by **Carlos Fuller (Belize)** and **Kay Harrison (New Zealand)**.

(In Glasgow last year, Parties had agreed “to establish a work programme to urgently scale up mitigation ambition and implementation” in this critical decade, and requested the SBs to recommend a draft decision on this matter for consideration and adoption by CMA 4 (in November 2022) “in a manner that complements the global stocktake”. (The CMA refers to the Conference of Parties to the Paris Agreement).

In the informal consultations, Parties’ provided their views on the scope, institutional arrangements, modalities, inputs and outcomes of the mitigation work programme (MWP).

Bolivia spoke for the **Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDC)** and said that the MWP should be guided by the principles of equity, common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR), science and climate justice. It said that the push for net zero targets for all by 2050 is a fallacy in keeping 1.5°C within reach and that this is against equity and CBDR.

“This implies a heavy burden on developing countries and gives a lot of flexibility to the developed countries. For the developed countries, such pledges mean doing too little too late,” said Bolivia further.

On the scope, Bolivia said that the MWP is crosscutting and it should adopt a holistic approach and address adaptation, loss and damage and means of implementation; the need to close the gaps in these areas; as well as address the issue of pre-2020 gaps. It also referred to Article 4.4 of the Paris Agreement (PA) and said that developed countries must take the lead in relation to emission reductions.

(Article 4.4 of the PA states: “Developed country Parties should continue taking the lead by undertaking economy-wide absolute emission reduction targets. Developing country Parties should continue enhancing their mitigation efforts, and are encouraged to move over time towards economy-wide emission reduction or limitation targets in the light of different national circumstances”.)

It said further that the MWP should not consider processes outside of the PA, nor agree to any new arrangements and the focus should be on the idea that mitigation ambition should go hand in hand with the provision of finance and the means of implementation.

Bolivia also said that the MWP should be a platform for sharing information and knowledge on implementation aspects and added that the first step must be to exchange views for consensus on what is mitigation ambition. It suggested the MWP be used to share national experiences and best practices and address the implementation aspect. It also suggested discussion in the MWP on key thematic areas such as barriers for low carbon transition; just transition, including finance, technology and capacity building needs; economic diversification and opportunities for developing countries in diversifying their economies; technology development and transfer; and equitable access to carbon space.

Speaking for the **Arab Group**, **Saudi Arabia** said the MWP should be structured in a manner that supports countries in the implementation of their NDCs. It emphasized on maintaining the balance in the PA, its bottom up nature, and for the MWP not to create new mandates outside the PA. Saudi Arabia also suggested ensuring complete alignment with the PA, and avoiding duplication with existing processes mandated to assess and support the enhancement of ambition, “which is done through the global stocktake (GST)”. “Any mitigation gap of any sort should be addressed through the GST,” said Saudi Arabia. It also said that the PA as stated in Article 2 is the basis of any mitigation discussions, taking into account equity and CBDR.

Further, it said that the MWP should provide a platform for Parties to share experiences and exchange best practices on their progress towards implementing their nationally determined contributions (NDCs). “This could support the first GST by collectively working together and collaborating on the different fronts helping each other out to achieve our own NDCs,” it added.

It also proposed thematic topics to be discussed such as just transitions; economic diversification and its mitigation co-benefits; mitigation co-benefits from adaptation; technology; circularity approaches; equitable access to the remaining carbon budget in line with the principle of equity and CBDR, and the impact of implementation of response measures.

It was also of the view that it was too early in the process to decide on intersessional work and reiterated the importance of balanced progress in both mitigation and adaptation at the ongoing SB56 session.

Zimbabwe, speaking for the **Africa Group** expected developed countries to implement their NDCs and long-term greenhouse gas strategies (LTS) in a credible manner under the MWP. It referred to the pre-2020 gap in commitments of developed countries and called on them to demonstrate leadership by enhancing their mitigation ambition. It also said that enhanced support should be provided for developing countries to implement their ambitious NDCs in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication.

It also said that the MWP should discuss just transition, sustainable pathways and related finance for such pathways, and referred to means of implementation as central to the discussions. The principles and provisions of the Convention, equity, CBDR and historical responsibility should be clearly articulated and demonstrated within the MWP. It also said that the MWP should be guided by science and it should also not duplicate other processes and complement ongoing processes such as GST. The scope of the MWP must be broad and have synergies with finance, technology and capacity building support for developing countries. Zimbabwe also said that the MWP should operationalize Article 4.4 of the PA in concrete terms.

Bangladesh for the **Least Developed Countries (LDCs)**, said the objective of the MWP is clear in that it is to scale-up mitigation ambition in this critical decade. It said that the fundamental premise of the MWP is the Glasgow Climate Pact and emphasized on sectoral dialogues, adding that the MWP should be duly considered in the annual high-level ministerial roundtable. It said the MWP should begin in 2023, last for seven years, with a mid-term review around 2026. Bangladesh also said that the MWP should facilitate mobilization of resources on the ground.

Marshall Islands for the **Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)** said MWP must discuss how to scale-up mitigation ambition and implementation at scale and focus on a sectoral approach. It suggested that the MWP must operationalize Article 4.11 of the PA and saw the timeline of the MWP lasting until 2030. (Article 4.11 of the PA reads: “A Party may at any time adjust its existing NDC with a view to enhancing its level of ambition, in accordance with guidance adopted by the CMA.”)

AOSIS called for intersessional technical work on the MWP prior to COP 27. It also said that the G-20 countries need to do their part and submit more ambitious NDCs and LTS. On the modalities, the AOSIS suggested technical level discussions, workshops, summaries from workshops to feed into the annual ministerial roundtables and called for discussions on phasing out fossil fuel subsidies and coal. It also called for submissions from Parties on the MWP.

Speaking for the **Independent Alliance of the Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC)**, **Chile** said the objective of the MWP is already defined in paragraph 27 of the Glasgow Climate Pact. It also said that the world faces an ambition gap in limiting global warming to 1.5°C and called for all sectors to be included in discussions on the scope of the MWP. Chile said that non-CO2 greenhouse gases should also be discussed.

On modalities, Chile proposed that the informal consultations should reach annual decisions and called for intersessional work on the matter. It proposed submissions, meetings and in-person workshops under the MWP and called for inputs by non-Party stakeholders in the process. It also requested the co-facilitators to produce “text” as soon as possible.

Argentina spoke for **Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay (ABU)** and stressed that ambition in mitigation goes hand in hand with ambition in means of implementation and that developed countries should provide support to developing countries to fulfill their commitments. The group said the MWP should consider pre-2020 gaps in its scope and outcomes and be a platform for sharing of knowledge and experiences.

The group also said there should be a call for submission by Parties to work efficiently at COP 27.

China said the MWP should not create new mandates, must not change the targets set in the PA and must follow the principles and provisions of the Convention. The MWP should address the pre-2020 gaps and developed countries must show leadership, it said further. China said that the purpose of the MWP is to support Parties to enhance their implementation in line with equity and CBDR. China suggested the MWP discuss topics such as how to achieve NDC targets; what technologies do Parties have to achieve the targets; how can the technology transfer happen in developing countries for them to achieve their targets; and how additional support can be provided to developing countries. China also said that the MWP must try to find solutions and for it to be completed within one year so that the solutions are available by then.

On the modality, China said the MWP should be structured in a manner where Parties are able to share stories of their successes and failures and suggested that the MWP be completed within one year, by COP 28. China also cautioned that Parties’ obligations must not be shifted to non-State actors. China said the MWP also needs to discuss the issue of finance and any potential intrusion to the nationally determined nature of NDCs must be avoided.

India said the guiding principles of the MWP would be the foundational principles and provisions of the Convention. In relation to inputs for the MWP, it said the IPCC working group reports form the scientific basis for the MWP, such as the remaining carbon budget; the NDC synthesis report on the gaps in ambition; and the national communications and biennial update reports and the biennial transparency reports in the future, to track progress on implementation. “The work programme should be developed in keeping with the foundational principles of equity, CBDR-RC and national circumstances. What this means is that work programme should respect that the climate targets of Parties are already embodied in their NDCs,” it said.

It cautioned that the MWP should not become an “NDC-plus programme, demanding sectoral, gas specific, policy specific targets from all Parties and then tracking their implementation”. India said it recognizes the climate crisis; crisis of poverty; energy access and security to power industrial, agricultural and service-sector growth, and the urgent need for meeting all other sustainable development goals by 2030. “For this reason, we do not support any sector or gas specific work programmes that are prescriptive in nature and infringe on sovereign rights for determining national climate policies,” it said.

India further added that it did not see the scope for developing sectoral benchmarks under any work programme, nor for creating additional reporting requirements beyond what has been agreed at COP26 under the Enhanced Transparency Framework. “We cannot support singling out specific fuels or specific policies for discussion in the work programme. We need to distinguish between subsistence related emissions in developing countries with low per capita emissions, from emissions in industrialized and post-industrial economies arising from energy intensive, unsustainable lifestyles,” it added and also cautioned against bringing in agendas of other mitigation-centric plurilateral coalitions such as those related to methane into the ambit of the MWP.

It also suggested including a range of elements for inclusion in the MWP such as: a global carbon budget tracker to be developed; for the MWP to be a programme for delivery of critical enablers for strong climate actions to developing countries, as envisaged in the Convention and PA; for the MWP to provide a platform for exchange of experiences and best practices amongst Parties, with regard to policies and programmes, and encourage practical cooperation in mitigation, including for sector and gas specific reduction targets amongst Parties that choose to do so; to identify the barriers for low carbon transition in developing economies, which could include how finance and technology transfer obligations of developed countries would be accelerated. India said that without these elements, the MWP would not be of relevance to developing countries.

It also suggested the MWP discuss how to bring down the green premium associated with low carbon technologies and facilitate their rapid deployment worldwide and address how the world can move towards sustainable lifestyles, globally, as a response to combating climate change. It said further that the MWP must address how the pre-2020 ambition gaps would be fulfilled by developed countries within this decade.

Switzerland for the **Environmental Integrity Group (EIG)** said that the concrete outcome of the MWP would be to put a plan for 1.5°C. The EIG sees the MWP running till 2030 or until the 1.5°C gap is closed. The MWP should discuss the findings of the IPCC’s Working Group 3 report on mitigation, findings of the NDC and LTS synthesis reports, it added. The MWP could look at how to enhance support for NDCs, besides addressing scaling up and deployment of clean energy measures and efforts to reduce methane, it said. On the modalities, Switzerland said that the MWP should include the right stakeholders and there should be workshops and submissions by Parties. It also spoke about the importance of sharing of experiences and best practices. It also called for a draft decision emerging out of the MWP providing guidance on how Parties intend to respond to the call to revisit their NDCs.

The **European Union (EU)** said the MWP objective is well defined which is to urgently scale-up mitigation ambition in this decade with a view to keeping 1.5°C within reach. It said the scope should contain all the elements captured in the Glasgow Climate Pact and that the MWP should be informed by science. The EU said it sees the time horizon of the MWP to be till 2030, while noting the urgency of taking action in the near future and a review at a certain point between 2024 and 2026 to adjust the modalities of the MWP. The EU also said it is important to link the MWP with the political process where the MWP informs and guides the annual ministerial roundtables. The EU also called for the inclusion of non-Party stakeholders in the process. It also suggested that it would be important to start an activity under the MWP in 2022.

The **United States (US)** said the mandate is clear in the Glasgow Climate Pact, which is to scale-up mitigation ambition in this critical decade, where the idea is to implement existing goals and commitments and increase ambition. The US said that under the MWP, Parties can exchange their understanding, practices and experiences and that the MWP could look at sectoral opportunities, mitigation opportunities in non-CO2 GHGs such as methane, as well as at planning processes and on how to align NDCs with LTS. The US also called for the participation of non-State actors in the process. On the modalities, the US said the MWP could be led by appointed co-chairs or the Chairs of the Subsidiary Bodies (SBs), and involve dialogues, both in-session and virtual dialogues for which the chairs would prepare reports and submit to the SBs for their consideration. On the timeline, it said that it sees the MWP run through 2030 but there is value in a short-term set of activities for the next few years.

Canada said that the MWP should discuss policies, measures, technical approaches and that it should be a facilitative space for sharing knowledge, adding that the MWP needs to have a clear link to the CMA and that it sees links of MWP with the pre-2030 roundtables. The focus of the MWP should be to make it operational and figure out how and where it will fit within the institutions of the PA. Canada suggested regional workshops, technical dialogues building on the mitigation elements of the Glasgow Climate Pact under the MWP, with the presiding officers of the MWP setting the agenda from year to year. It suggested the output of the MWP be summary reports to the CMA which would inform the pre-2030 ministerial roundtables and that the timeline of the MWP is till 2030.

Australia said the scope of the MWP is ambition and implementation and that it sees the discussions as facilitative in nature. The inputs would come from the IPCC's working group 3 report as well as the NDC synthesis report and the modalities would involve the CMA to reflect on the MWP and make decisions. It also spoke to the political importance of the MWP and called for the recognition of non-State actors' in-

volvement in the process. Australia said the timeline of the MWP is until 2030 and that it would welcome the opportunity for submissions. It suggested having an event at COP 27 on updated NDCs and synthesis report.

Reflecting on some of the interventions, **China** said it had heard that the mandate had two parts viz. ambition and implementation. It clarified that ambition includes implementation since implementation of targets would depend on whether there is ambitious means of implementation to achieve those targets. It sought clarification of what kind of ambition were Parties speaking about - new net zero targets, or new NDCs or comprehensive ambition?

China said that in the context of the MWP, the discussion on ambition must be in the context of enhancing ambition comprehensively. It also said that it had heard many Parties speak to the outputs of the MWP in terms of reports and recommendations and sought clarity on who would formulate these reports, what would be the process towards formulating such reports and whether these reports would be subject to negotiations in the SBs. China also said that it had heard Parties' wish to launch the MWP end of this year and wanted to understand where was the mandate for such a launch. "In Glasgow, we decided to convene an annual high-level ministerial round table. Are we now going to establish a new mechanism under the WP?" China asked. China also reiterated that a discussion on why some Parties did not achieve their pre-2020 commitments would be important to not repeat mistakes of the past.

Following the interventions, the co-facilitators sought Parties' views on whether they could prepare bullet points to capture the discussions of the informal consultations on the matter. **China** clarified the approach and suggested adding guiding principles as a bullet.

Further discussions are expected to take place after the co-facilitators issue the bullet points capturing the discussions in the informal consultations.