



**STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE GROUP OF 77 AND CHINA AT THE CLOSING PLENARY OF THE 47TH SESSION OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE AND THE 47TH SESSION OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY OF IMPLEMENTATION (Bonn, Germany, 15 November 2017)**

Mr. Chair,

The Group recognizes the work undertaken by you and the facilitators under SBSTA and SBI during these almost three weeks, in which our Group has been engaging constructively to make progress in all agenda items under each of the bodies.

At the closing of the work under these bodies, we realize that unfortunately much work needs still to be done to achieve a balanced treatment of mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation throughout the different agenda items; ensuring that there will be no reinterpretation or renegotiation of the Convention and of the Paris Agreement; and the need to respect and operationalize the differentiation between developed and developing country Parties as clearly reflected in the Convention and in the Paris Agreement.

The Group would like to reemphasize the urgent need to enhance the pre-2020 action and support, as a solid foundation for post-2020 implementation. We believe that the provision of financial resources, including for technology development and transfer, as well as capacity building support need to be enhanced.

The Group thanks you for all your reports, and we reaffirm our full support to you, while reiterating our will to continue engaging constructively in the textual work that is needed for the operationalization of the Paris Agreement and the enhancement of the full implementation of the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol.

However, we regret to transmit our concern about certain procedural and substantial issues. On process, un-equal treatment of certain elements remained during the sessions within the agenda items, un-equal modalities and guidance followed by Parties in the discussions, and also different levels of engagement and preference in terms of how and when to capture the outcomes of the discussions.

Nevertheless, our Group wishes to acknowledge the progress achieved in some specific agenda items, including inter alia, in the negotiations related to Loss and Damage, where we were able to adopt an initial positive step towards the operationalization of the WIM. The mandate to the ExCom to strengthen its five years rolling workplan, together with the meeting of the task force on displacement in May 2018, and the request to the Secretariat, under the guidance of the ExCom and the Chair of SBI, to organize in conjunction with SBI48, the Suva Expert Dialogue, constitutes a step in the right direction towards a permanent agenda item under both SBs that will ensure discussions on the WIM inter-sessionally. We also hope that the dialogue will help the future establishment of an ExCom expert group on action and support, the establishment of the dates for activities related to the 2019 review of the WIM, and the call for mobilization of resources for averting, minimizing & addressing loss and damage. However, there is still a serious gap in the effective support that the WIM can provide to developing countries that have been impacted by climate change, and therefore we stress the need for the full implementation of article 8 of the Paris

Agreement.

On Agenda item 3, we recognize the progress under the Nairobi Work Programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change, and the reports prepared by the Secretariat, while noting that these collaborative activities have enhanced the role of the NWP as a knowledge hub for enhanced action on adaptation and a knowledge-for-action network for climate resilience.

We reaffirm our view that the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) is fundamental to identifying policies that accelerate the development and transfer of resilient technologies. Its joint work with the CTCN is vital to strengthen the Technology Mechanism, especially for the provision of support for action in developing countries in order to implement the Convention and the Paris Agreement. Both, the TEC and CTCN should strengthen the linkages between both the Technology and the Financial Mechanism on matters related to technology and collaborative research and development, particularly with regard to the technology needs assessment (TNA) to formulate and implement national climate action plans.

Likewise, as mentioned in our opening statement, our Group believes that the development of the Technology Framework should take into account the challenges presented by the Agreement's long-term goals, to accelerate innovation, development, transfer, diffusion and implementation of technologies, in order to operationalize the vision of technology described in paragraph 1 of Article 10 of the Agreement.

The Group recalls that adaptation continue to be the key priority for developing countries, including adaptation co-benefits, of agriculture and food production systems, in light of the particular vulnerabilities of the agriculture sector and its relationship with the livelihood of millions and the fundamental priority of ensuring food security and ending hunger. Therefore we stress the importance of having reached an outcome after several years, and we look forward to receive all the proposed elements on this issue, including modalities for the implementation of the outcomes of the five in-session workshops, the methods and approaches for assessing adaptation, adaptation co-benefits and resilience, etc, with a view to begin a more comprehensive understanding and treatment of this issue by both SBSTA and SBI, especially in relation to adaptation and agriculture.

On the Adaptation Committee report, our Group agreed on the draft decision that welcomes the recommendations made by the Committee on paragraph 42 of the Decision 1/CP.21, while recognizing that the AC-LEG provided a good technical input with the collaboration of the SCF. However, our Group has identified some gaps, since these mandates are an integral part of the implementation of the adaptation section of the Paris Agreement. The draft conclusions provide more time to deliberate on those gaps during the SBs48 and COP 24 and we are willing to engage constructively in that discussion with our partners.

On response measures, we need to identify and establish actions to meet the specific needs and concerns of developing country Parties arising from the impact of the implementation of response measures and the avoidance of its negative economic and social consequences, including with regard to equitable access to sustainable development and poverty eradication. We look forward for the strengthening of the institutional arrangements and the establishment of a cooperative mechanism to address the adverse impacts of the implementation of response measures on developing countries. The Group considers important the creation of an institutional arrangement post 2020 in the context of the Paris Agreement.

On the Adaptation Fund serving the Paris Agreement, we regret to see the continued lack of will to move forward with a decision that ensures that the Fund shall serve the Agreement, without

prejudice to the discussions on the strategic role of the Fund within the broader climate finance panorama, or on the detailed definition of the governance, arrangements and sources of the Fund, particularly when we know that these arrangements can be developed until 2020. We urge developed country Parties to demonstrate their political will for a decision at this COP, particularly taking into account the importance of this Fund to developing countries and SIDS in particular.

On adaptation, we reiterate the high priority that our countries assign to adaptation, particularly in the current context of the increasing occurrence and severity of extreme weather and slow onset events and the increasingly high costs involved. Therefore, our Group has worked hard in this session to continue having a common position on adaptation and especially with regard to adaptation communication. We have reached a document that attempts to advance aspects of the guidance of adaptation communication in the understanding that this is the time to generate substantive progress. One of the key points of this guidance is the support needed from developed to developing country Parties in order to implement article 7.13 of the Paris Agreement, considering the need for public and grant-based resources for adaptation under article 9.4. We hope that after this session we can begin a more substantive work on the basis of the skeleton, headings, subheadings and textual inputs submitted or proposed so far from different Parties.

On the Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform, the Group expresses its appreciation and thankfulness to both the Chair of the SBSTA and the Fijian Presidency for their clear support for the operationalization of the Platform and we are proud to have contributed decisively to adopt a decision that will allow us to ensure that objective. We consider this as one of the concrete achievements of this COP and we look forward for the establishment of the Facilitative Working Group, including the development of its workplan for the full implementation of the functions of the Platform. The G77+China encourages a balanced representation of local communities and indigenous peoples as well as Parties in the multi-stakeholder workshop, as the first activity of the Platform's workplan.

In relation to the agenda of the SBI, our Group notes the successful organization of the workshop of the facilitative sharing of views (FSV) under the international consultation and analysis (ICA) that took place on November 10th, and welcomes the progress report and technical reports of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (CGE) related to the implementation of its workplan for 2017. On this subject we need to reiterate the crucial role of these processes that serve to reinforce MRV under the Convention and should lead to identify the capacity building needs of developing countries in order to facilitate reporting of information in preparing future BURs.

On the provision on financial and technical support, the Group regrets to reiterate once again the increasing difficulties and conditionalities faced by several developing countries in accessing financial resources from the GEF, including through the establishment of program priorities and eligibility criteria that have not been agreed at the intergovernmental level.

Likewise, with regard to the GCF, the Group reiterates its deepest concern that some developed countries are unilaterally applying into the decision-making processes, eligibility criteria that are not agreed upon, and that limit the access of funding to developing countries under the GCF. Such criteria is not compatible with the guidance from the COP and a clear departure from the letter and spirit of the Convention and the Paris Agreement. We also feel that the process and procedures of these institutions are creating continuous additional barriers to access financial resources for climate action, which severely undermine the level of ambition of developing countries in the global effort against climate change, and therefore, we expect this issue to be clearly addressed in the guidance of the COP to the financial mechanism.

The groups looks forward on the discussions that will take place in May next year on development of modalities and procedures for the operation and use of a public registry referred to in Article 4.12 of the Paris Agreement. In this regard, we recall that NDCs communicated by parties shall be recorded in a public registry maintained by the Secretariat' and that art. 7.12 establishes the same provision for the adaptation communications. We reiterate that in our view, the registration needs to be made only by the focal point, and that the registry must be clear and transparent, ensure security and avoid any possible manipulation.

With regard to NAPs, the Group stress the important role of adaptation planning in reducing climate vulnerabilities of local communities and looks forward to address the interlinkages between national adaptation plans and means of implementation, with a view to enhance access to finance and technology support and capacity building for the formulation and implementation of NAPs.

On item 10, we think that the work must continue on the approach and modalities for the periodic assessment of the Technology Mechanism in relation to supporting developing country parties in the implementation of the Paris Agreement; the evaluation should be coherent, cross-functional, and participatory. Also, we believe that it should take into account sustainable development, gender, global action and the special needs and circumstances of the developing countries.

On Capacity Building, we welcome the progress reflected on the synthesis report prepared to facilitate the annual monitoring of progress in the implementation of the framework for capacity building in developing countries, and the summary report on the 6th Durban Forum on Capacity Building, however there are still gaps in terms of capacity building provided with regards to the obligation under the Convention and the Paris Agreement. On the adoption of the report of the first meeting of the Paris Committee on Capacity Building, in Paris we agreed the PCCB to collaborate and coordinate capacity building activities in developing countries. However the PCCB was not given the resources to carry out its mandate.

We reiterate our concern on the lack of funding for the Executive Committee of the Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts. Also we reaffirm the need to look into the issue of linkages and overall coherence among the mechanisms under the Convention, specially the relation between the Financial Mechanism and the Technology Mechanism, as well as in the light of the ongoing work on the transparency regime under the Paris Agreement. We stress the need for the SCF to stay engaged in these ongoing processes.

The Group expresses its support to the issue of Gender and Climate Change, including through the development of a Gender Action Plan, in order to support the implementation of gender-related decisions and mandates in the UNFCCC process and to complete the mandates of Decision 21/CP.22, under the Lima Work Program and Decision 21/CP22. Our Group highlights that gender-responsive climate policy still requires further strengthening in all activities concerning adaptation, mitigation and related means of implementation, finance, technology development and transfer and capacity-building, as well as decision-making on the implementation of climate policies. In this regard, we are also proud to have contributed to the decision on the adoption of the Gender Action Plan at this COP and we look forward to engaging with partners in all the activities of the priority areas of the Plan, the future annual in-session workshops, and the future review of its implementation, as well as short and long-term impacts.

Finally we express our concern about the negative implications resulting out of unilateral coercive economic measures for climate action in developing countries, and the need to avoid undermining developing countries capacities to fight climate change and the rights to live of our peoples.

In conclusion, the Group conveys its appreciation to both of you for your work and leadership and we look forward to engage further with all Parties during the next session in May 2018.

Thank you very much.

G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77

G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77

G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77

G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77

G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77

G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77

G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77

G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77 G-77