

Group SUR submission on experience and lessons learned in relation to conducting the first Global Stocktake (GST 1)

As mandated under paragraph 192 of decision -/CMA.5 (“Outcome of the first global stocktake”) which in turn recalled paragraph 15 of decision 19/CMA.1, and as invited under paragraph 193 of decision -/CMA.5 (“Outcome of the first global stocktake”), Group SUR is pleased to submit its views on experience and lessons learned from the GST 1. Group SUR comprises Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay.

What should be kept

Scope: The scope of the GST includes all thematic areas referred to in paragraph 6b of decision 19/CMA.1 to be considered together with equity and science as cross-cutting issues – and this is not a matter of refinement. Equity and science must continue to serve as foundation pillars of the GST, in accordance with treaty law under the Paris Agreement. Group SUR is of the view that the refinement referred to in paragraph 192 of decision -/CMA.5 (“Outcome of the first global stocktake”) is related to “procedural and logistical elements of the overall global stocktake process”. However, issues like Unilateral Trade Measures, Multilateralism, and Just Transitions were very relevant under GST 1 and should be considered under the next GSTs, in the context of the scope referred to in paragraph 6b of decision 19/CMA.1.

Sources of inputs: Group SUR is of the view that the sources of inputs agreed in paragraph 37 of decision 19/CMA.1 should be the same for the next GSTs. They are comprehensive enough to the purposes of the GST. Sources of inputs from developing countries continue to be largely underrepresented in relation to inputs from developed countries. This inequality must be corrected, both for the sake of equity, in terms of inclusiveness of perspectives, and for the sake of science, in terms of effectively channeling collective intelligence and avoiding the risk of group bias.

Structure for GST decision: The headlines of the GST 1 should be retained for the next GSTs {Preamble; Context and cross-cutting considerations; Collective progress towards achieving the purpose and long term goals of the Paris Agreement, including under Article 2, paragraph 1(a–c), in the light of equity and the best available science, and informing Parties in updating and enhancing, in a nationally determined manner, action and support (Mitigation; Adaptation; Means of implementation and support (Finance; Technology development and transfer; Capacity-building); Loss and damage; Response measures); International cooperation; Guidance and way forward}. The negotiation of them came late in GST 1 and keeping them under the next GSTs could be useful to refrain from renegotiations.

Looking for balance between progress and gaps of implementation; between “backward-looking” and “forward-looking” elements; among thematic areas of GST: GST 1 consolidated a scope of stocktaking that considers where we were, where we are, and where we want to be. However, there was no balance between past, present, and future considerations,

focusing excessively in future actions while neglecting a thorough analysis of past actions. The consideration of past efforts in future GST is key for avoiding perverse incentives of grandfathering, while incentivizing early-action, in line with both equity and science. Although these balances couldn't be fully assured during GST 1, all efforts are fundamental to continue looking for promoting them when drafting the future GST decisions, based in lessons learned from GST 1.

Mandate and connection to the Convention: Under Article 14 of the Paris Agreement, the CMA “*shall periodically take stock of the implementation of this Agreement to assess the collective progress towards achieving the purpose of this Agreement and its long-term goals.*”

The purpose of the Paris Agreement is stated in its Article 2.1:

*“1. This Agreement, **in enhancing the implementation of the Convention**, including its objective, aims to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change, in the context of sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty, including by:”*

The mandates from articles 2.1, 2.2, 14.1 and 14.3 of Paris Agreement and their inextricable connection to the Convention must be respected from the beginning of the next GSTs and throughout the process to their conclusion.

The GST shall periodically take stock of the implementation of the Paris Agreement to assess the collective progress towards achieving the purpose of the Agreement and its long-term goals, which is vital to **enhancing the implementation of the Convention**. There is no place to oppose the fact that the Paris Agreement goals go beyond Article 2.1 of Paris Agreement, encompassing also Articles 4, 7, 9,10, 11, 13, etc.

Party-driven process conducted with the participation of non-Party stakeholders: Parties decided through paragraph 10 of decision 19/CMA.1 that the GST will be a Party-driven process conducted in a transparent manner and with the participation of non-Party stakeholders. Lessons learned from GST 1 and its innovations should be considered by the next GSTs, guided by a learning-by-doing process.

What should be refined

Technical Dialogue (TD) and political consideration of outputs (PCO): Shortening the gap between technical and political phases is vital to provide more time for the political consideration of outputs. The time provided to the TDs could remain the same. However, the PCO could start before the cycle of TDs is fully completed, assuring flexibility to come back to the outputs considered in previous phases of TDs depending on the conclusions to be emerged from the subsequent phases. The decision of GST 1 started to be drafted very late, resulting in time constraints regarding the negotiations in the Joint Contact Group.

GST decision is not a “cover decision”: In COP28 during the final days of the negotiations, the process stopped being guided by the mandates emerged from Articles 14.1 and 14.3 of Paris Agreement, and the approach adopted was like the one followed by the so-called “cover decisions”. To a certain degree, the outputs from the TDs were superseded by political negotiations according to specific Parties priorities. The next GSTs should avoid this kind of approach, using technical outputs more extensively in the PCO of next GSTs. Not negotiating the technical outputs may have its benefits, but it resulted in a bigger challenge to achieving a smooth transition between technical and political phases. Such lessons and experiences should be considered to refine procedural and logistical elements of the overall GST process.

Technical Dialogue (TD) activities: The flexible and learning-by-doing approach referred to in paragraph 16 of decision 19/CMA.1 was useful to implement the TD through a range of activities format. However, paragraph 6a of decision 19/CMA.1 is too broad when Parties decided that the TD will undertake its work through a focused exchange of views, information and ideas in in-session round tables, workshops or other activities. Group SUR is of the view that other activities should be agreed more precisely before the next GSTs learning from those that have been taken during GST 1. In this sense, we should strive to have a reasonable number of events so as to avoid overburdening developing countries delegations which usually face constraints.

High-level events and inclusiveness/transparency: Although the high-level committee is defined according to paragraph 33 of decision 19/CMA.1, the high-level events could enhance a more inclusive and transparent participation of Parties to support those events.

Events at the local, national, regional and international levels: During the negotiations of GST 1 in the Joint Contact Group, the SBSTA and the SBI encouraged Parties and non-Party stakeholders to hold events, at the local, national, regional and international level, as appropriate, in support of GST 1. As provided in Article 14, paragraph 3, of the Paris Agreement, the outcome of the GST shall inform Parties when updating and enhancing, in a nationally determined manner, their actions and support, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Agreement, as well as in enhancing international cooperation for climate action. In this sense, for Group SUR these local, national, regional and international events should be encouraged in a more systematic approach in supporting the GST.

Taking into account the results of relevant work conducted under the Convention and its instruments (Paris Agreement and Kyoto Protocol): In line with the efforts made to align the process with paragraph 9 of decision 19/CMA.1 to avoid duplication of work and taking into account the results of relevant work conducted under the Paris Agreement, the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, efforts should be made to promote a better and concrete coordination between GST and other work streams.

SBSTA-IPCC Joint Working Group: In addition to having the latest reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) among the sources of inputs, the dialogue between the Convention and its instruments and the IPCC should be enhanced. Since the IPCC

AR7 will be due in the second GST cycle, the mandate contained in paragraph 29 of decision 19/CMA.1 could be fulfilled in a more concrete way using the SBSTA-IPCC Joint Working Group to enhance communication and coordination between SBSTA and IPCC in the context of the GST. In GST 1 the SBSTA-IPCC Joint Working Group was not used at all.

Relevance of Reports and Communications from Parties as well as Reports of the SBs: Despite the importance of all sources of inputs listed in paragraph 37 of decision 19/CMA.1, special attention should be given to national reports, including National Communications, BURs, BRs, BTRs and related Reports of the SBs, as appropriate. These Reports need a more meaningful and robust consideration under the GST as vital tools of MRV and ETF systems.

Streamlining the volume of written inputs: As stated previously, Group SUR is of the view that the sources of inputs agreed in paragraph 37 of decision 19/CMA.1 should be the same for the next GSTs. They are comprehensive enough to the purposes of the GST. However, while keeping inclusiveness and transparency of the written inputs, we should consider ways to streamline the volume of written inputs. The TD of GST 1 encompassed thousands of documents (over 170,000 pages of written inputs).