

**Live Blogging from the 18<sup>th</sup> Session of the Working Group on the Green Climate Fund's Allocation Protocol**

---

The Secretariat opens the floor for negotiations on Clause 4.6 of the Preliminary Action Charter, where Parties must come to an agreement on the portion of \$80 billion/year of the Green Climate Fund to be spent on adaptation. Here we provide a blow by blow account of what went down in the negotiations.

**EU:** promoting coordination, together face huge threat, enviro disasters, urgent!, according to numbers from the institute for policy studies, mitigation expensive, mitigation and adaptation costs linked, end result is the best possible outcome, 65% on mitigation, 35% on adaptation, these two costs very much linked

**G77:** 132 countries, 50% of the world population, we are the most vulnerable, adaptation is the most important part of the fund, adaptation measures necessary to protect these countries, developing countries can start mitigating but the effects won't be seen for a while, 75% adaptation

**AOSIS:** we are extremely vulnerable, 37 states, everyone else caused this, we did not (blame game!), 80% for adaptation purposes, mitigation is great but no guarantee that it will work, we see this money as an incentive for people to stay here, 15% of this 80% for emergency events for easily accessible funds in the case of natural disasters, migration guarantee if our islands become uninhabitable

**USA:** adaptation and mitigation important but no one should be excluded, with the GCF we are open to and hope for very fruitful negotiations

**China:** concerns with the \$80 billion, we think that people have come to this meeting with a broken promise and we need a road map for action, we need promises from everyone: where the money is coming from, not just words on a paper  
We don't even know if we want to negotiate with you because we can't trust you

USA steps in, followed by AOSIS

**AOSIS:** why don't you pay for what you have emitted? **China:** when we are rich enough then we will pay

**USA:** how much China is emitting now should be taken into consideration

China addresses G77 and AOSIS to press US and EU to hold promises

**EU:** promise to the children of all nations of the world! Actions speak louder than words and promises so let's just take the money and do it!

**AOSIS:** thank you for kind words. We have very little time. Our survival depends on this. This is why we emphasize 80% please. Focus on the matter at hand.

**China:** we need promises to see that the goals that we set today are a long term plan to make this adaptation safe so that you can stay on your islands and not become climate

refugees and this is why we need to have this promise before we set up these goals we need to reach. The roadmap that we want is for all countries' needs to be secured. We wanted \$100 billion not \$80b so they went back on their promises.

**AOSIS:** no promise has been broken yet. It is not yet 2020. We need to focus on the adaptation today!

**EU:** If we do \$80 billion per year now and continue to do this until 2020 why is this a problem?

Took a brief recess to decide if we need to take a vote about the focus of the meeting

**USA:** 62% mitigation, 38% adaptation we need to make sure that these talks proceed in a positive and fruitful manner

**China:** we are still a developing country, and therefore we would like to propose 90% adaptation needs

**AOSIS:** thank you China, we emphasize also the risk of food insecurity, adaptation needs to happen now! So we can start developing sustainably

**EU:** we would like to remind all the parties here that CC is still happening, the more we spend on mitigation today the less we have to spend on adaptation in the future, we should try to prevent more today

**China:** comparing emissions btwn China and US per capita, if EU and USA want China to take responsibility they need to put a lot of adaptation

**AOSIS:** no guarantee that mitigation will work, adaptation is the only security we can offer our citizens today

**China:** we agree with AOSIS and G77 to adapt, we would like to remind that we already have the tools in developing countries to mitigate so we don't need another tool for mitigation

**AOSIS:** USA and EU numbers are too low, adaptation needs to be higher in percentage! Stress that CC is happening NOW, not a future problem

**USA:** apocalyptic scenario propaganda of AOSIS

**EU:** we would like to request a break

**AOSIS:** not propaganda!

**China:** shocking that the other parties do not want AOSIS to exist anymore

Recess

**AOSIS:** we understand the need for mitigation, so we will lower the need for adaptation to 77%

**EU:** along with the US many adaptation processes can be put into effect at a lower cost than mitigation projects, we could consider spending a larger part on adaptation provided there is strong transparency steps taken so that we can be sure where the money is going

USA seconds this

**China:** 77% this is what we believe is a relevant level

**AOSIS:** want to point out that EU has claimed to take the leadership in climate negotiations, and with the deal you made with the US this is not the leadership that is needed in these negotiations, leadership needed

**China:** EU was talking about transparency this is good

**USA:** 47% for adaptation, an increase up from 38%, we would like you to consider this amount, concerned about China's transparency

**EU:** stress that mitigation and adaptation are connected, they work together, China needs much help in mitigation, we thought you would be more appreciative of this, we are

appreciative of being seen as leaders and we would like to facilitate the transformation of the world to a green future

**China:** if you want to help with mitigation help with the US, this is why we need adaptation, countries like the US can afford their own mitigation so we need an adaptation fund!

**AOSIS:** we want to stress what China is saying, there is no world fund for adaptation!!! Lots of funds for mitigation, Climate justice in terms of mitigating is not fair, mitigation is a concern for the emitters only, can we vote please?

EU fighting with AOSIS

**AOSIS:** mitigate for YOUR sake

**China:** irresponsible parties. Tsk tsk. Every country needs to take responsibility, the reason we are talking about mitigation is because we have behaved irresponsibly

**USA:** we have to start from this point, we didn't know what we were doing in the past, China should stop referring to the past, funding must come from the developed world

**China:** we are investing the most money in renewable energy and have a goal to reduce emissions by 45%, we are already doing things, we already have CDM so why do we need other tools for mitigation this would just be confusing.

**EU:** the fund should have a balance, therefore our proposal is a better balance

**USA:** China needs to take a position, certain positions don't apply to do, you have a different starting point than other developing countries so you need to take responsibility

**China:** we don't understand why USA has a position that means that many countries will not exist in the future; we have greater goals than you, we all have the same the rights to the atmospheric space

**USA:** we are trying to meet you half way

**AOSIS:** recess

**CAN:** 60% adaptation, 40% mitigation, because we need to build a more resilient world  
AOSIS makes last point

**EU:** why/where does CAN get their numbers

**G77:** we agree with AOSIS and China, we are willing to do more but we need funding and we need money for adaptation so we can develop

The secretariat called a halt to the negotiations after it became clear that the Parties present would not reach consensus. AOSIS, China, and the G77 even brought down their proposed level of adaptation funds to 62% after CAN made their statement in a vain attempt at meeting the EU and USA in the middle. The vote took place but the negotiations ended without a conclusion. CAN awarded the notorious Fossil of the Day award to the USA and China. While CAN felt that China showed great character in their support of AOSIS and G77 countries, their obstinacy at the start of the negotiations and the subsequent delay of focus on the issue at hand led CAN to their conclusion. The USA showed a huge lack of ambition that was detrimental to the negotiations.