Dubai Climate Change Conference: Monday, 11 December 2023

Delegates were left hanging in a waiting game for most of the day, as discussions were largely conducted behind closed doors. The first part of the governing bodies’ closing plenary brought only little new decisions and little relief. The new text on the Global Stocktake (GST) was met with deep concern and considered “utterly insufficient.” Many felt the text does not live up to the 1.5°C target as the “North star” of the meeting, and even goes back on ambition.

COP Plenary

In the evening, COP 28 President Al Jaber opened the first part of the closing plenary of the 28th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and invited parties that “the time for decisions is now.” He recalled that the “Changemakers Majlis” he convened on Sunday, 10 December, had brought a new tone and spirit of cooperation, and encouraged parties to work collaboratively to keep 1.5°C in reach. He then invited the COP to adopt a number of decisions.


Rules of procedure: Al Jaber noted that agreement had not been reached on this item and the COP would continue to apply the draft rules of procedure (FCCC/CP/1996/2), with the exception of draft rule 42 (voting).

Dates and venues of future sessions: Parties adopted a decision (FCCC/CP/2023/L.4) accepting Azerbaijan’s offer to host COP 29 from Monday, 11 November, to Friday, 22 November 2024, and Brazil’s offer to host COP 30 from Monday, 10 November, to Friday, 21 November 2025.

Mukhtar Babayev, Minister of Ecology and Natural Resources, AZERBAIJAN, extended appreciation to the Eastern European region for endorsing their offer to host COP 29. Aivaz Gulyamov, Minister of Ecology and Natural Resources, BULGARIA, said COP 30 will be held in Belém, noting the symbolism of having the conference take place in the Amazon. She emphasized leaving COP 28 with tangible results that lead to a new energy matrix characterized by a sharp increase in renewable energy and concomitant reduction in the dependence on fossil fuels, noting the need to bring means of implementation in line with mitigation ambition.

Reports of the subsidiary bodies: The COP took note of the reports of SBSTA 58 (FCCC/SBSTA/2023/4/Add.1) and SBI 58 (FCCC/SBI/2023/10/Add.1) and adopted a decision on the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (FCCC/SBSTA/2023/4/Add.1) and a decision on linkages between the Technological Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism (FCCC/SBI/2023/4/Add.1).

Reporting from and review of Parties included in Annex I to the Convention: Al Jaber noted that the SBI could not complete its work on this matter, which will be included on the provisional agenda for SBI 60.

Reporting from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention: Al Jaber noted that the SBI could not complete its work on this matter, which will be included on the provisional agenda for SBI 60.

Report of the Adaptation Committee and review of the progress, effectiveness and performance of the Adaptation Committee: Al Jaber noted that the SBI could not complete its work on this matter, which will be included on the provisional agenda for SBI 60.

Joint annual report of the Technology Executive Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network: The COP adopted a decision (FCCC/SBI/2023/L.9).

Capacity building under the Convention: The COP adopted a decision forwarded by SBI 59 (FCCC/SBI/2023/L.18) and a decision forwarded by SBI 58 on the terms of reference for the second review of the Paris Committee on Capacity-building (FCCC/SBI/2023/10/Add.1).

Matters relating to the least developed countries: Al Jaber indicated that the SBI adopted conclusions (FCCC/SBI/2023/L.24).

Gender: The COP adopted a decision (FCCC/SBI/2023/L.17).

Administrative, financial, and institutional matters: Budgetary, financial, and institutional matters: The COP adopted two decisions forwarded by SBI 58 contained in FCCC/SBI/2023/10/Add.1: one on administrative, financial, and budgetary matters, and one on the budget for the international transaction log. The COP also adopted a decision forwarded by SBI 59 (FCCC/SBI/2023/L.14/)), as amended orally during the SBI’s closing plenary with regard to removing a reference to the report on the policy and criteria for engagement and collaboration with non-party stakeholders (FCCC/SBI/2023/INF.12/Rev.1).

Decision making in the UNFCCC process: Al Jaber noted no agreement was reached during Presidency consultations on this matter. The matter will therefore be included on the provisional agenda of COP 29.

CMP Plenary


Reports of the Subsidiary Bodies: The CMP took note of the report of the administrator of the international transaction log under the Kyoto Protocol (FCCC/KP/CMP/2023/4).

Matters relating to the clean development mechanism: The CMP adopted a decision (FCCC/KP/CMP/2023/2).

Capacity building under the Kyoto Protocol: The CMP took note of the SBI 58 conclusions (contained in FCCC/SBI/2023/10 and Corr.1).

Report on the high-level ministerial round table on increased ambition of Kyoto Protocol commitments: Al Jaber noted parties could not reach consensus and the matter will be put on the provisional agenda of CMP 19.
The CMA endorsed the decision adopted by the COP (FCCC/SBI/2023/L.13).

Joint annual report of the Technology Executive Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network: The CMA adopted a decision (FCCC/SBI/2023/L.10).

Capacity building under the Paris Agreement: The CMA adopted a decision on the annual technical progress report of the Paris Committee on capacity building (FCCC/SBI/2023/L.19) and the terms of reference for the second review of the Paris Committee on Capacity building (FCCC/SBI/2023/10/Add.1).

Administrative, financial, and institutional matters: The CMA endorsed the decision adopted by the COP (FCCC/SBI/2023/10/Add.1).

Mitigation

Rules, Modalities, and Procedures for Paris Agreement Article 6.4 (mechanism): In informal consultations, Co-Facilitators Kate Hancock (Australia) and Sonam Tashi (Bhutan) requested parties to focus on paragraphs in draft decision text where divergent views still remained, specifically: authorization of mitigation contribution units (MCUs); transition and registration of Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) afforestation and reforestation activities to the Article 6.4 mechanism; transfer of authorized Article 6.4 emission reductions (A6.4ERs) from the mechanism registry to party-specific sections of the international registry; and recommendations by the mechanism Supervisory Body relating to removals and methodology requirements. Parties reflected on discussions in informal informal consultations that had taken place the previous night, clarified their positions and concerns, and made bridging proposals.

On authorization of MCUs, two groups, opposed by many others, proposed deleting a paragraph deciding that host parties may provide authorization statements for MCUs already issued, citing concerns that this could provide perverse incentives relating to how corresponding adjustments in relation to shares of proceeds and overall mitigation in global emissions (OMGE) would be applied. One group requested for a technical paper from the Secretariat to avoid creating loopholes in this regard.

Those supporting the paragraph stated that: authorization is a sovereign prerogative; authorization could only take place before the first transfer while the MCU still sits in the mechanism registry, removing the possibility of creating loopholes; and similar flexibility is needed under Article 6.4 as under Article 6.2. One group proposed adding language to ensure safeguards are in place to ensure that when MCUs are converted into authorized 6.4ERs, they will be subject to all corresponding adjustment-related requirements.

On transition of CDM activities, a developing country group clarified the purpose of a related paragraph as allowing the transition of projects that have not been addressed in the transitional measures by allowing their transition and registration under certain circumstances.

On transfer of authorized 6.4ERs, parties debated connections between the international registry and the mechanism registry, one party, supported by many, called for a reference to independent or standalone registries. One group stressed the need for a decision that allows those parties that wish to use the international registry in lieu of a national registry to do so.

On removals and methodologies, parties agreed on the need for further work with an eye on adopting recommendations on these matters at CMA 6 (2024), but differed on how to mandate this. They debated various options, including whether to adopt, provisionally adopt, welcome, or acknowledge the work on these documents. Many cautioned against setting a precedent where “every recommendation coming out of the Supervisory Body is subject to a revision,” which they said would undermine the integrity of the mechanism’s governance, while others felt these two documents were “constitutional” therefore requiring adoption. Many expressed preference for providing targeted requests to the Subsidiary Body for revisions instead of a generic mandate to revise the documents, but indicated there was no agreement on a list of issues. Countries called for ensuring both the operationalization of the mechanism and environmental integrity. Parties also diverged on whether the two documents should be treated equally, with some groups saying they had greater concerns about the removals recommendations.

The Co-Facilitators informed parties they would issue a new iteration of text based on the inputs. Informal consultations continued in the evening.

In the Corridors

COP 28 has officially entered the “waiting game” stage, or as one delegate called it, the “waiting for the cows to come home” stage. As all but the discussions on Paris Agreement Article 6 went underground, many were left waiting for the release of new draft texts, with conjectures running high on possible landing zones. Many also expressed confusion regarding the various channels through which groups and parties were reportedly being consulted. Talks were not only conducted by the Presidency and the co-facilitating ministers it appointed earlier in the week, but also UNFCCC Executive Secretary Stiell and UN Secretary-General António Guterres, who had returned to Dubai. “A lot is bubbling underground,” summed up a seasoned delegate, “the question is when it will surface, and whether we will like it when it does.”

Reactions to the GST draft released late in the afternoon were fast and furious. Hopes that this text would include language calling for a phase out or down of fossil fuels were dashed. The text suggests instead a laundry list of actions parties “could” do, including:

- limitations on permitting new and unabated coal power generation;
- advancing abatement and removal technologies; and
- “reducing” consumption and production of fossil fuels to achieve net zero “by, before, or around 2050.”

Observers kept up the pressure. They formed a human chain to greet ministers walking towards late evening consultations of their responsibility and the lives and livelihoods at stake.

In their reactions to the text, many ministers stood equally firm. Several emphasized “We are beyond an à la carte restaurant.” Many developed and developing country ministers underscored the document falls “short, way short” of what they can accept. “We did not come here to sign our death warrant. We will not go silently to our watery graves” said ministers from small island developing states.

As tired delegates filed out of the heads of delegation consultation, they wondered how they could move on from the “meaningless list of options” – as one minister put it – in the short time that remains for COP 28.

The Earth Negotiations Bulletin summary and analysis of COP 28 will be available by Saturday, 16 December 2023 at bit.ly/enb_cop28.