

Efforts continue to break deadlock over adoption of agendas of Subsidiary Bodies

Bonn, 14 June, (Meena Raman) – The adoption of the provisional agendas of the UNFCCC's Subsidiary Bodies (SBs) over the Mitigation Work Programme (MWP) continues to be deadlocked, as divergences with the **European Union (EU)** and the **Like-minded Developing Countries (LMDC)** could not be resolved.

Discussions to bridge differences continued behind closed doors on 13 June between both Parties conducted by the Chair of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (SBI) **Nabeel Munir (Pakistan)** and the Chair of the Subsidiary Body for Science and Technical Advice (SBSTA) **Harry Vreuls (Netherlands)**, did not manage to break the deadlock.

According to sources the SB Chairs are to propose the way forward in a meeting with the heads of delegations to be held today, 14 June.

The SB Chairs had convened a plenary on 12 June to adopt the agendas of the respective bodies, but differences persisted over two items: (i) on the 'Sharm el-Sheikh mitigation ambition and implementation work programme' (MWP) proposed by the **EU** and (ii) a new proposal by the **LMDC**, titled, "Urgently scaling up financial support from developed country Parties in line with Article 4.5 to enable implementation for developing countries in this critical decade" which

was proposed to be added to the agendas but was not, due to a lack of consensus. (See related [update](#).)

(The SBs had launched work on 5 June, but the agendas were not adopted [see related [update](#)]. Throughout the first week, discussions on the provisional agendas of the SBs continued with the SB Chairs consulting with Parties behind closed doors, without resolution).

The plenary on 12 June opened with the LMDC seeking clarification on their proposal on mitigation finance. They explained that they had proposed the agenda item to have a dedicated space for Parties to discuss how the means of implementation and support from developed countries could be scaled up to meet developing country Parties' needs and lead to implementation on the ground.

However, developed countries led by the **EU**, the **Environment Integrity Group (EIG)**, the **United States (US)**, **Norway**, **New Zealand**, **Australia**, **Canada** and **Japan** rejected the LMDC's proposal to be included to the agenda. Their rationale was that finance was already part of the discussions in the Mitigation Work Programme (MWP) agenda and that finance was already under discussion under several agenda items and in roundtables and workshops.

Bolivia for the **LMDC** and **Cuba** (speaking in its national capacity) called out their bluff.

Bolivia said that developing countries were making serious efforts “beyond what is realistic and possible” to carry out ambitious climate mitigation. Introducing the new proposal on finance is very critical to demand of developed countries, taking into account “social justice and climate justice,” it said recalling the unfulfilled promises of the developed countries, and said, “we have memory”. “We are still waiting for USD 100 billion. They are saying they are talking about the issue of finance. I can say they are not. That is why having a dedicated space to discuss finance is important. Dialogues are spaces simply for exchange of ideas; we need dedicated space to move forward on what has already been agreed (on the provision of finance) from developed countries to developing countries,” said Bolivia further.

Referring to the USD 100 billion goal, **Cuba** said it was concerned listening to a “chorus by those who have not met their own commitments” and called it a “fraud”. “The Standing Committee on Finance report talks of the needs (of developing countries) ranging between USD 6-11 trillion. Are we willing to talk about that?” asked Cuba.

The developed countries, however, wanted to adopt the agenda as presented for adoption, which included the EU’s proposal on the Mitigation Work Programme. The **LMDC**, **Arab Group**, and **ALBA (Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America)** said they were not in a position to accept the EU’s proposal on mitigation without their proposal on mitigation finance, given that ambition in mitigation is dependent on ambition on the means of implementation support to developing countries to undertake mitigation as is provided for in the Convention and the Paris Agreement (PA).

The LMDC also presented its rationale that there was no mandate to have an agenda item on the MWP at this (ongoing) session of the SBs, given the decision adopted at CMA4 last year.

Long discussions ensued (see highlights of exchange below), with the SB Chairs proposing that they adopt the agenda with the exception of the MWP and that consultations continue on the

matter among Parties. Further, the SB Chairs warned that Parties would lose all the work that has happened across the other agenda items if the agendas of the SBI and SBSTA did not get adopted.

The LMDC accepted the Chairs’ proposal of adopting the agenda with the exception of the MWP and for consultations to continue on the MWP. The EU however rejected the SB Chairs’ proposal, leaving in limbo the fate of the agenda.

HIGHLIGHTS OF EXCHANGE

At the opening of the session, **Bolivia for the LMDC** requested an update and response from the SB Chairs on their request for the inclusion of a joint SBTA/SBI agenda item on scaling up mitigation finance.

“As a global community, we are all conscious of the need to scale-up ambition and the effective implementation of the PA. In this critical decade, this is no longer an option to consider, but rather an imperative that must be achieved in line with the foundational principles of equity and common-but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC),” said Bolivia, adding that it is also no secret that scaling up ambition and implementation is a challenge for developing countries, and in recognition of this reality, the global community outlined arrangements for means of implementation and support as conditions for ambition and implementation.

“We must remain committed to our differentiated obligations to restore trust in the process and achieve collective progress on our shared objectives. At the same time, we must honour our agreements and proceed with solutions that are feasible, practical and backed by sufficient means of implementation and support,” it said further.

Bolivia also said, “in our hunger for action, discussions have centered exclusively on scaling up ambition against the backdrop of broken promises, failed commitments and low delivery of means of implementation and support from developed countries. That is why a balance between ambition and means of implementation must be struck in our incoming discussions. To ensure that we do not discuss what we *want* to achieve, without understanding how it *can be* achieved,” said

Bolivia.

Bolivia stressed equity and CBDR-RC must be integrated back into the outcomes of the deliberations, “in recognition of the key role climate justice has to play in solving our key challenges”. “We must recognize, that when we discuss ambition, it must not only apply to implementation, it must equitably apply to support as well. Article 4(5) of the PA which embodies these outcomes, in line with Articles 9, 10, and 11, and it is overdue that we have a dedicated space as Parties to discuss how means of implementation and support from developed country Parties can be scaled up to meet developing country Parties’ needs and lead to implementation on the ground. Correcting the course of financial support from developed country Parties cannot wait any longer, it must be done urgently to enable developing countries to fulfil their nationally determined contributions. There will be no use to discuss scaling up ambition, without also discussing how to scale up means of implementation. That’s why, we requested inclusion of the agenda item,” it explained further.

The **Arab Group** and **ALBA** expressed similar remarks and supported the LMDC.

Samoa for the **Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)** stressed the importance of the MWP for the small island states and supported the inclusion of the MWP agenda item, as did **Costa Rica** for the **Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC)**, which also added that finance is reflected in the MWP agenda as was intended. **Senegal** for the **LDCs** also suggested finding a way to refer to finance within the mitigation discussions.

Zambia for the **African Group** said that both the agenda items on the MWP and urgently scaling up finance was important and called for a resolution of the matter.

China also supported LMDC and said that finance discussions had not been part of any SB session and more generally, finance was being discussed in roundtables and workshops rather than diving into serious negotiations process.

Cuba said the issue of finance is highly important and long overdue. It said that the more Parties

resist the issue of having finance on the agenda, the suspicions will further increase on the lack of means of implementation. Cuba further said that developing countries had not been getting finance and the mitigation they were undertaking was upon their “own shoulders”. Referring to the USD 100 billion goal of developed countries, Cuba said the promised finance has not been there since 2009 and expressed frustration that finance was way behind schedule not just for climate but also for the Sustainable Development Goals.

The **EU** said it disagrees with the inclusion of the additional agenda item by the LMDC on finance and that even after hearing the LMDC’s rationale, said it remains confused why there was a new proposal on the table after launching work. The EU further said that finance was being discussed in a lot of places such as Article 9(5) workshop, long-term finance, in high-level workshops and dialogues, in the Standing Committee on Finance and technical expert dialogues, ministerial roundtables and guidance for the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and Global Environment Facility (GEF). It stressed that it objects to the proposal as worded.

The **US** said finance is important and they had no objection to discussing finance issues, and how they relate to mitigation in mitigation discussions and said it does not support Bolivia’s proposal. It further said Parties should avoid proposing agenda items that do not derive from CMA mandates. It said Bolivia’s proposal was not consistent with the PA since Article 4 of the PA did not limit sources (of funding) to come from only developed countries, adding the need to look at the private sector and other sources as well.

Norway said climate finance is urgent and critical, however, they could not support it since finance was being discussed in many areas, including in the MWP. **New Zealand** and **Australia** had the same position as the EU, Norway and the US and objected to the LMDC proposal for an additional agenda item on finance.

Switzerland for the **EIG** said everyone wants to discuss finance and there is space in the MWP to discuss finance, and rejected the LMDC proposal.

Responding to the interventions, **Bolivia** for the **LMDC** said it was concerned and worried to hear

the interventions of Parties. Bolivia further explained that prior to the adoption of MWP in Sharm el-Sheikh (last year), they wanted the title to include means of implementation, but developed countries rejected the approach, and the “means” was eventually dropped and the agreement was called “work programme for urgently scaling up mitigation ambition and implementation”. Bolivia said with so much of resistance to means of implementation by the developed countries, it was necessary to have a dedicated space to discuss the issue of mitigation finance.

It also strongly expressed that the LMDC “does not accept the inclusion of the MWP agenda item, as there is no mandate for its inclusion; it does not belong to this SB session,” reminding Parties of the mandate from Egypt. It said Parties had the first “Global Dialogue prior to the opening of the SB 58 in Bonn. We will have to wait for the report of the first Global Dialogue, the convening of the second dialogue and the annual report to input into a decision. Let us wait for the appropriate time and space to have the discussion, and as per mandates and decisions that we have agreed collectively. We are not in a position to pre-judge the outcome of the dialogues,” said Bolivia.

Bolivia also said that it sees the value of the first Global Dialogue and looks forward to engaging in the next one. “We need to trust the Co-chairs of the MWP to improve the Global Dialogue through learning by doing. We also appreciate that the Co-chairs are also having conversations with groups and Parties and believe all reflections and expectations will be well considered. In addition to that, we believe the Co-chairs will consider the submissions and organize the following Global Dialogues according to the mandate. And the mandate is an exchange of views,” said Bolivia.

It reiterated that it recognizes the importance of effectively delivering the mandate Parties agreed to in Sharm El Sheikh and remains committed to deliver an outcome in line with the issued decision. It also said it looks forward to further discussions

within the dialogues and to the decision in Dubai, recognizing the importance of delivering mitigation action on the ground. “We are undertaking ambitious mitigation action, but also have to focus on adaptation and suffering losses and damages due to the historical emissions of developed countries. Our challenges are unprecedented, and we do not have the time to play to the gallery or make empty promises,” stressed Bolivia further.

It also said that developing countries had heard about budgetary cycles and approval processes being barriers in developed countries to deliver finance for decades, but without any attempt to systematically address those barriers. “Without a discussion on ways to urgently scale up finance from developed country Parties in this critical decade, we are not in a position to backtrack on our agreement in Sharm El Sheikh and discuss ambition for mitigation in these SB sessions. We are not interested in empty words, with no real progress. We do not accept the proposed agenda item on MWP. We are ready to accept the agenda but without the MWP on it. We urge our partners to rise to the occasion and not hold the process hostage,” said Bolivia.

INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS ON THE MWP

Meanwhile, since work was launched on the MWP agenda despite disagreement on the agenda item, informal consultations continued on 13 June, with Parties expressing divergent views, including on the mandate to have the item on the agendas of the SBs. The **LMDC**, the **Arab Group** and the **African Group** viewed the discussions as being premature, as the results of the first Global Dialogue held on 3 and 4 June as well as the investment focused event convened under the MWP by its Co-chairs were not ready as yet for reflections of Parties and in arriving at conclusions. Hence, no mandate was given to the Co-facilitators of the informal consultations to produce any informal note from the discussions.