

## Clash of views over scope of ‘UAE Dialogue’ on Finance-related GST outcomes

7 June, Bonn (Perna Bomzan)-- Parties clashed and expressed divergent views over the scope of the ‘United Arab Emirates (UAE) dialogue’ referred to in paras 97-98 of the global stocktake (GST) outcome adopted in Dubai last year, at the informal consultations held on June 5 and 6 in Bonn.

While all developed countries and some developing countries viewed the UAE dialogue as a space for the implementation of the entire outcomes of the GST, a majority of developing countries clearly viewed it as a finance focused dialogue, given its placement under the ‘Finance’ heading of the decision.

(In the GST [decision 1/CMA.5](#) paras 97-98 are placed under the ‘Finance’ heading of Section C on ‘Means of implementation and support’. Para 97 reads, “*Decides* to establish the xx dialogue on implementing the global stocktake outcomes”. (“xx dialogue’ being renamed as the “United Arab Emirates dialogue” in the edited version of the decision.

Para 98 reads, “*Also decides* that the dialogue referred to in paragraph 97 above will be operationalized starting from the sixth session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement and

conclude at its tenth session (2028) and *requests* the Subsidiary Body for Implementation to develop the modalities for the work programme at its sixtieth session (June 2024) for consideration by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement at its sixth session.”)

On 5 June, Co-facilitators of the informal consultations on the matter, **Patrick Spicer (Canada)** and **Ricardo Marshall (Barbados)** pointed out the mandated task was on developing the modalities of the dialogue work programme at the ongoing session of the 60<sup>th</sup> session of the Subsidiary Bodies (SB 60) and invited Parties to provide views on their “expectations” and “a clear outline on what to achieve at the session and beyond to provide meaningful inputs to the GST”.

**Brazil for Group SUR** (comprising **Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay**) clarified the “relationship” of the UAE dialogue with the annual GST dialogue mentioned in para 187 of the GST decision as two tracks; Para 187 being on how the GST outcomes will inform the nationally determined contributions (NDCs) considering also the importance of “international cooperation” to do so, and para 97 being under the “means of implementation

(MOI) and support” of the GST decision for which modalities needed to be developed, and that it is “guided by MOI” enabling the implementation of actions and support for different Parties. It said that the UAE dialogue needs to be considered in this context and the two tracks would converge at some point in time.

(Para 187 “Requests the Chairs of the subsidiary bodies to organize an annual global stocktake dialogue starting at their sixtieth sessions to facilitate the sharing of knowledge and good practices on how the outcomes of the global stocktake are informing the preparation of Parties’ next nationally determined contributions in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Paris Agreement and also requests the secretariat to prepare a report for consideration at its subsequent session)

**Ghana** for the **African Group** stated that there are important outcomes from Dubai and now there’s a need to “focus on the means of implementation”. It said that “developing countries are not short of ambition” given their NDCs and updated NDCs, both conditional and unconditional, and that the “focus must be on availability, predictability and adequacy of finance” to support current NDCs, national adaptation plans (NAPs) and targets from the GST decision. It also referred to the annual GST dialogue (in para 187) and para 186, saying that the relevant processes have started hence, there is need to “avoid duplication” and “instead incentivise ambition and restore trust” in the process.

**Saudi Arabia** for the **Like-Minded Developing Countries (LMDC)** stated that the GST outcome was a result of “difficult negotiations” and the “location” of the dialogue can “validate” what was the intention of the pen-holder of the text. It said that implementation of the entire GST outcomes in one dialogue is a “strange notion” and further explained that countries would be producing enhanced NDCs which would require MOI, particularly finance. It explained that in terms of the timeline, the new collective quantified goal on finance (NCQG) would be concluded in Baku, Azerbaijan this year (at COP 29), and this UAE dialogue will commence following COP 29. Hence, it’s a “perfect space for implementation of developed countries’ obligations and pledges within the NCQG and it will be a core space to operationalise Article 4.5 of PA (on support for

NDCs) and track the delivery of the NCQG within the dialogue on implementing the GST”.

On modalities, Saudi Arabia said that any call to the secretariat for mapping of actions is not the scope or mandate of this dialogue under ‘Finance’. On inputs, it said developed countries are to provide updates and announcements on their contributions to mobilise finance while developing countries are to outline the gaps and needs, highlighting reports from the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF). On outputs, there could be annual reports from the technical track and biennial reports of the ministerial dialogues, as well as synthesis reports for consideration at the next GST and NCQG decisions. Topical areas for reflections could include information in biennial communications under Article 9.5 in 2025 (for the ex- ante reporting by developed countries of public resources available); biennial transparency reports made available in 2028 and review of year one and year two of NCQG by early delivery of data in 2028 and report to the technical dialogues of GST 2. It underscored that the core element to understand is that the UAE dialogue is “not in solo or vacuum” – that there is space for everything related to the PA but no space to implement the financial obligations and financial support after concluding the NCQG.

**South Africa** expressed “concerns” on the approach taken by developed countries and stressed that the text of the UAE dialogue needs to be read “contextually” which is clearly about finance. It recalled that there was a long discussion (in Dubai) on the follow-up and a “broad follow-up was debated” and appealed for a constructive approach refraining from cherry-picking para 28 of the decision (on the global efforts on mitigation including on transitioning away from fossil fuels). It underlined that it was important to have a focused dialogue on MOI particularly on finance, being a year working towards a ‘Finance COP’ in Baku. It said that para 186 is clearly about the GST follow-up, while paragraphs 97-98 are about finance.

**China** stressed that the UAE dialogue should focus on finance, given the context of the mandate as an essential element which comes from the ‘Finance’ part of the GST outcome and therefore, it certainly “focuses on finance and how to implement the finance-related outcomes of COP 28”, focusing on how to fill the “gaps and challenges”. It stressed on

“avoiding redundancy” with other workstreams and dialogues.

**Malawi for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs)** said the first GST gave an opportunity to look at the gaps to achieve 1.5°C in mitigation, adaptation, loss and damage and MOI so the dialogue would help to have a deep discussion on how to address these gaps, including the link between the NCQG on climate finance and how to inform the NCQG. It stated the scope of the UAE dialogue is on the “whole landscape of the GST outcomes”.

**Maldives for the Alliance of Small Island Developing States (AOSIS)** stated that the GST outcomes will be in vain “if we don’t ensure that all actions are followed through and maintained”. It saw the UAE dialogue as a “robust follow-up mechanism” so that “all” GST outcomes are effectively implemented as opposed to only one (on finance). It acknowledged that finance underpins all actions and hence believed that the dialogue is to maintain an “overarching focus on covering all components” of the GST including MOI.

**Switzerland for the Environmental and Integrity Group (EIG)** stated that the success of Dubai hinges on implementation and that the UAE dialogue was ensured as a place to reflect on the implementation of the GST in its “entirety”. It said it was important to track progress at the global level which included of actions at the global level and resources available; on sharing of country experiences and common challenges with possible inputs from international organisations; and on institutional set-up to support the implementation of the GST as well as clarity on which constituted bodies and processes will support recommendations or calls from the GST. It also wanted a mandate for the secretariat to produce a report latest by 2025, to keep track of the overall progress made and a mapping of which bodies are working on each call or recommendation of the GST ahead of COP 29 to inform further deliberations. On modalities, it said there was no need to “renegotiate” the objective of the dialogue with its frequency being one dialogue each year possibly at the SBs and the output as a yearly “negotiated decision”.

The **European Union (EU)** said that the UAE dialogue should “add value and show complementarity both within and outside of the UNFCCC process” and that it should contribute to the successful implementation of the GST outcomes ensuring collective progress towards achieving the “objectives of Article 2 of the PA in its entirety”, adding that the dialogue is a “tool” to take stock of progress of aligning with the PA goals and that the aim is to look at both updating and enhancing “action” and support. On modalities, it said the dialogue should be a bridge between two GSTs and referred to para 186 of the GST decision (which “*Invites* the relevant work programmes and constituted bodies under or serving the Paris Agreement to integrate relevant outcomes of the first global stocktake in planning their future work, in line with their mandates”). It said SB 60 and CMA 6 should “operationalise” this invitation including for the mitigation work programme, just transition work programme, global goal on adaptation work programme on indicators, Lima work programme on gender, to “regularly report” to the UAE dialogue.

**Norway** said it looked at the UAE dialogue as a “comprehensive follow up” on the GST outcomes across work under the PA and that it is an “ambition and action mechanism that sends signal to everyone within and outside our work to ramp up our actions and support”. Further, it saw the annual dialogue to be informed by a “report” that summarises and gives an overview of what is happening to the GST mandate across tracks within and outside the process, and hence, is an “unique opportunity” to reflect on progress made towards “building the bridge” between the outcomes of Dubai and the next GST already starting in 2026. It underscored in ensuring a space where results of one GST will inform the next GST which was the “intention” of the GST process.

The **United States (US)** said it fully agrees that MOI should be part of the UAE dialogue but that para 97 says “GST outcomes” which is “across the board”. It said that para 187 is in the context of NDCs but had a “narrow focus” and therefore, the UAE dialogue then has the opportunity to focus on “all forward-looking” elements of the GST. It also said that the workstreams and constituted bodies should report on progress to date at each dialogue with “updated data” related to the calls from the GST outcomes. It

stated that SB 60 should capture points made to operationalise the dialogue at CMA 6.

**Japan** said that the “proper scope” of the UAE dialogue is to implement “entire” GST outcomes and proposed to adopt the modalities at CMA 6 and convene the first dialogue at SB 62. The **United Kingdom (UK)** also said that the mandate from para 97 means consideration of “all outcomes” of the first GST.

With the list of speakers still pending on 5 June, the second informal consultations on the following day on 6 June saw them provide their views with interventions from additional Parties.

## HIGHLIGHTS OF INTERVENTIONS ON 6 JUNE

**Colombia** for the **Independent Alliance of Latin America and the Caribbean (AILAC)** said that the purpose of the UAE dialogue is to follow up on the implementation of “all” GST outcomes in a “comprehensive” manner and not exclusively limited to how MOI is supporting actions with sufficiency and adequacy, as currently there’s no mechanism to track the implementation; so the dialogue is crucial to do so. It said that discussing all outcomes is crucial and that “cherry-picking will undermine consensus”. It did recognise the utmost importance of MOI but not the exclusive focus on it, recalling that the dialogue encompasses “all actionable paragraphs with reference to any calls and commitments”. **Chile** echoed **AILAC** stating that the added value of the dialogue is to provide Parties and non-Party stakeholders to track collective progress of GST outcomes.

**Egypt** clarified and elaborated further that the GST outcome was “clearly structured in the format with clear headings and sub-headings”, on what is needed by the international community at the global level. It underlined that para 97 was clearly placed under the ‘MOI and support’ and ‘Finance’ sections of the decision and that it was “intentionally” not placed under the last section on ‘Guidance and way forward’.

It explained further the differences in the two dialogues: one on finance (para 97) and the other on moving forward (paras 186-187). Further, it said that “there’s a huge gap for developing countries to implement their current NDCs. So, the

logical and established reading of decisions clearly points to the fact that the dialogue is a finance-related dialogue, while there is the wider implementation of the GST outcomes under paras 186-187”.

It also cautioned against “renegotiating our approaches on how to structure the GST decision as it would open a Pandora’s box”. Egypt further clarified that discussions under the UAE dialogue would focus on “enhancing the implementation of GST elements by developing countries and empowering them” by focusing on the “gaps on scale of finance; the instruments used to provide support in terms of grants, loans and highly concessional loans; and also, on the issue of transparency on how much finance is being delivered as per the PA provisions and decisions particularly on Article 9 of the PA on climate finance”. It emphasised that throughout the GST decision and other decisions, it is very clear that there are huge gaps in terms of finance but no space to catalyse its delivery in supporting developing countries and therefore, reiterated that paras 97-98 are a finance focused dialogue while paras 186-187 are pertaining to the wider GST outcomes.

**India** pointed out that Article 14 of the PA [on GST] brings out the PA’s “five-year ambition cycle” and it clearly tells how to implement the outcomes of the first and subsequent GSTs. It stated that para 97 falls under the section on ‘MOI’ and sub-section on ‘Finance’ and the “placing of para 97 within the overall structure of the GST decision is good enough to suggest the scope of the UAE dialogue,” which when read with “provisions of Article 14” is to track the progress of finance which represents a critical enabling factor for the low carbon transitions, well cited in the IPCC AR6 report on mitigation. It called upon Parties to have “focused discussions on the structure and elements of the draft decision text” and emphasised that as “mandated” in the GST decision, “the dialogue’s modalities must look at the adequacy of finance required for incorporating the outcomes of the first GST into our climate action”.

**Philippines** for the **Group of 77 and China** said that the “nationally determined implementation of the GST outcomes through countries’ NDCs, NAPs and other action is crucial. The dialogue under paras 97-98 should allow for discussions on

implementation with provision of finance at the center of implementation of such outcomes, recognising that other means of implementation are also crucial". It also made a caveat that these views are "without prejudice to other statements or views that the Group or the various constituency groups within the Group may raise".

**Bolivia** recalled that in Dubai, none of the Parties had any "reservation" on the UAE Consensus which adopted the GST decision and hence, "we cannot question the results that we do not want and undermine the UAE Consensus". It said given this context, "we did not agree to put in place a mechanism or platform to track progress on the implementation of the GST outcomes and that what we agreed clearly highlights that this is a finance-related dialogue". Further, highlighting the central role of finance for the implementation of the NDCs, it said that the PA will be "undermined" if the dialogue does not track finance which is the "success or failure of PA" and cautioned that there should be "no additional scope or reopening of decisions". It also cited para 32 of the GST decision on "non-market approaches" and urged to move forward finance in a "balanced" manner.

**Venezuela** emphasised that "developed countries must take the lead in mitigation actions and in providing financing and means of implementation to developing countries". It said that "we should not reopen or reinterpret the elements" and that the UAE dialogue "is a Finance-related dialogue". **Iran** also said that the dialogue is a good space for achievement of the PA goals and did not agree on reopening or renegotiating para 97.

**Iraq for Arab Group** said that as mentioned by many developing countries, the scope is very clear that this is a finance dialogue given its contextual placement and its objectives and that the group sees the mandate of the dialogue as a "space to operationalise Article 4.5 of the PA". It did not accept any calls to mapping various mandates and activities outside of the scope, stating "we have clear processes through the NDCs and the enhanced transparency framework on Parties' progress and we do not support a continuation of the GST process and causing confusion and duplication, inconsistent with the mandate.

The **LMDC, LDCs, Group SUR**, and the **African**

**Group** all came back with their second interventions restating and elaborating their positions.

**Kenya for the African Group** in particular stressed that given major gaps in finance clearly identified in the GST outcome and all other decisions from Glasgow onwards, "the ministers facilitating the finance section of the GST [outcome] and further the teams working on the final text under the UAE leadership, proposed the paragraphs that create the space for focusing discussions on financing the implementation of the GST elements, with a clear intention through placement and content on the goal and focus of this dialogue. The African Group highlights that any change or redefining the goal and the focus of this paragraph is clear deviation of the intention, the agreement, and the established rules and procedures, and opens the door for interpretations of future and previous decisions".

**Saudi Arabia for the LMDC** in response to calls for tracking the implementation of the GST outcomes, clarified that this will take place at the next GST (which is about an assessment of the collective progress of Parties in meeting the goals of the PA). It explained further that Parties will report their progress on their NDCs and NAPs implementation through the enhanced transparency framework (ETF), adding that the "(tracking of) progress mechanism is very clear" and there is no need for a new space.

**Egypt** also came back to rebut the developed countries' persistent positioning on broadening the scope of the UAE dialogue beyond finance, as well as on the "reinterpretation" of Article 14 of the PA on the GST, which is a "legally binding" document.

In closing, Co-facilitator **Spicer** said that "as noticed in the debates, there are very different visions on what this dialogue will cover", adding that "let the past be in the past" and Parties need to "move forward to more of a shared vision".

On the way forward, he invited Parties to submit their views in writing by 9pm in order to capture them in an informal note under the authority of the Co-facilitators to help organise the next discussion at the third informal consultations.

## **ANNUAL DIALOGUE UNDER PARA 187**

Meanwhile, the annual GST dialogue under para 187 was convened for the first time on June 6 in the

afternoon and will continue on June 7. It saw presentations by some Parties on how they are integrating GST-1 outcomes into the updating and preparation of NDCs.