

Improving UNFCCC Negotiations through Facilitation Approaches: A Toolkit



Christine Peringer JD



Katharine Rietig PhD

www.betterclimategovernance.com

The Negotiation Process Toolkit (Part 1)

1. **Interpretation of consensus** that distinguishes it from unanimity
2. **Reminders of the urgency and goal** of the negotiations
3. **Small-group processes** to build consensus on divisive issues
4. **“Straw votes”** to assist chairs and negotiators to understand quickly where they are on the path to consensus
5. **Chairing best practices:** questions, restating and summarizing

Consensus Fundamentals

- **Best decision to which all can agree, can “live with”**
 - Not necessarily the preferred option for all
 - Any objections to a proposal have been
 - Heard
 - Understood
 - Considered in coming to the decision
- **Does not mean unanimity**

Not a veto

- ◆ *“Consensus requires that everyone is given the right to be heard and have their views given due consideration, and Bolivia has been given this opportunity. Consensus does not mean that one country has the right of veto, and can prevent 193 others from moving forward after years of negotiations on something that our societies and future generations expect.”*

Patricia Espinosa,
COP16 President

Use “Standing Aside”

- *“We don’t see the need for this ...*
- *“I think this may be a mistake*
.... but we can live with it”

When parties “stand aside” consensus exists

High standard of formal objection

“We cannot support this or allow the rest of the Parties to make this decision.”

- High standard – not just (even strong) preference
- E.g. violates the goal or the ultimate values of the UNFCCC

The Negotiation Process Toolkit (Part 2)

6. **Content experts** to identify and develop options – even within a session or overnight
7. **Facilitation experts** to support parties in exploring issues and developing consensus
8. **Mutual learning** among negotiators and non-national actors
9. **Institutional memory** of negotiation and facilitation techniques
10. **Non-negotiation settings** to explore common ground

Mutual learning

- **Sharing experiences with NDC implementation to avoid ‘re-inventing the wheel’**
- **Mentoring schemes for junior negotiators**
- **Institutional memory**
 - Database/‘wiki’ detailing negotiation techniques
 - Training manuals/workshops for chairs and negotiators

Non-negotiation spaces

- **‘Green Zone’ filled with energy and enthusiasm as non-national actors & parties discuss and present solutions**
- **Space to explore innovative climate action and cooperation outside ‘negotiation script’**
- **Action on Climate Empowerment Dialogues**
 - Define objectives and desired outcomes
 - Attract participants that can help achieve objectives/outcomes
 - Design Dialogues tailored to achieving objectives/outcomes

Making better use of non-national actors

- **Danger of climate-washing through focus on PR announcements, casual exchanges and database presence**
- **Inclusive learning and capacity building partnerships**
Meaningful partnerships focused on lesson drawing, experience exchange and mutual learning regardless of origin

Conclusions

- **Re-interpret consensus**
- **Facilitate learning among negotiators and chairs**
- **Use non-negotiation spaces for advancing climate action**
- **Inclusive capacity building and learning partnerships including parties and non-state actors**

Thank you for your attention!

Please contact for questions:



Christine Peringer JD
christine@peringer.ca



Katharine Rietig PhD
katharine.rietig@ncl.ac.uk

Which question do you want to discuss?

1. How can we **improve formats** to support more effective negotiation and action?
2. How can we **improve learning between parties?**
3. How can we make better **use of non-national actors?**
4. What **other ideas** to improve negotiations could be further explored?