

13 November 2017
COP 24, Agenda item 5 (transparency)
17:00-18:00, Bangkok
Jennifer Huang, C2ES

Summary: Opportunity for parties to react to the draft of the co-facilitators' informal note. Most parties not happy with how the text reflects their views, either textually or structurally. But they are willing to use the informal note as a means for capturing their progress and basis for future work, on the understanding that it is neither comprehensive nor exhaustive. Discussions of note:

- CFs will add Indonesia's proposal on the basis that it was submitted timely, but due to a technical issue the attachment with the proposal hadn't been received.
- No one likes the notation key as set up. Interventions generally trended to suggest a larger font size, removing notation key and indicating the parties to whom the provision applies in superscript next to the text in the informal note.

Next steps: Co-facilitators to make suggested changes; issue revised informal note Tuesday morning.
APA contact group Tuesday, 16:00-18:00 in Chamber Hall.

My shorthand/acronyms:

GROUP/Country intervening on behalf of group: (other group/party statements supported by group/country) CF = co-facilitator HOD = Head of delegation Art = article Re = regarding L&D = loss and damage ... = missed intervention (sorry)

Informal note:

http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/bonn_nov_2017/in-session/application/pdf/apa_5_informal_note.pdf

CF Andrew: Common template among APA agenda items. 1,041 written comments in total, plus interventions from floor: have tried to incorporate comments but make document manageable. Priority was to ensure substance and concepts include, so might have used our wording. We have not removed proposals. Inserted bullets for alternative approaches to heading/sub-heading. Where proposals should apply to different parties, updated notation to reflect. Re notation key, purely for informational purposes; not contained in final MPGs. Useful comments on streamlining but they conflicted with one another.

Emphasize paras in sec 2. Content of informal note not exhaustive.

Next steps: APA co-chairs not seeking agreed input re individual agenda items. Encourage you to work bilaterally to discuss next steps for agenda item; work through HODs or talk to us and we'll pass along to APA co-chairs.

Indonesia: We'd like to add one new bullet under 8.4 on interlinkages. "Interlinkage with all relevant elements of (list of articles)."

- CF Andrew: clarifying – attachment not added to email, that's why we're adding.

G77/Singapore: Notation key language transposed to each element accordingly. Perhaps in italics; same font. Caveat captured in box of notation key to remain in document.

LMDCs/Ecuador: (G77) Approach on how to move forward – we understand you might not want to create new version of text, but we note at this stage, issuing informal notes doesn't mean that we're negotiating, just that we're consulting with one another. There are still elements missing: differentiation in support provided and mobilized, having different headings, lists, and information. In current section, E.4 and E.5, they're still together. Need bullet where developed countries presenting info on expected impact of results; we provided wording.

AILAC/Costa Rica: (G77) Notation keys confusing; explicitly reference in the text itself. Keep a caveat in text.

LDCs/Bhutan: (G77) Not particularly happy with document itself but provides good basis for constructive negotiations in forthcoming sessions.

US: Contains a lot we don't like, but it's a good way to capture progress that we've made here so willing to continue work on the basis of this note. Uncomfortable with notation key; we don't see references relevant except in two instances. Recognize potential constructive way forward in proposal by G77, but think whole phrases incorporated into text would be difficult. Include as superscript. Still room to streamline document. Redundancies in text; valuable exercise to clean those up. In a few places perhaps either copied into wrong section or wrong notation keys applied; can be cleaned up later.

AFRICAN GROUP/South Africa: (G77) Willing to consider US proposals but superscript would be quite strange. Two things overlooked. We were keen on having separate sub-heading under item E.4 (reference to info in 9.5); very important for our group. First preference would be a heading. Possible alternative: placeholder for discussions under item 8 on future of that process around 9.5. Bullet reflecting that parties believe that due to importance of item it should have a heading.

Reference specifically to support provided in reference to Art 13.14 and 13.15. In favor of having separate sub-heading because of importance attached; flexible on having specific reference to that. Not currently captured in document.

AOSIS/Maldives: (G77) Recognize concerns raised not captured, e.g. standalone section on L&D. Recognize that this isn't intended to be exhaustive. Let's not reopen document or any substantive discussions at this stage; capture work and progress made in this session and to move ahead. Informal note could serve as useful reference document for other APA agenda items.

EIG/Switzerland: Understanding that we're not reopening text. Notation keys : unhappy; paper less readable. Proposal made by US on superscript could be a way forward. Streamlining: redundancies, so some purely mechanical streamlining could be useful but not lose any substance.

UG/Australia: Notation key – understand concerns about readability; increase font size? If superscript, use abbreviations.

EU: Basis for future discussion, but uncomfortable with how evident the document shows the number of difficult issues we still have to take on. Re art 9.5 discussion, placeholder is a difficult question because we don't have same understanding/agreement; shouldn't rise to level of heading, but we can discuss/clarify further in later discussions. Re proposal to have clear reference to parties in text: difficult to check whether notation in the right place so inclusion in text would be useful, but possibly hard to read. Leave it to CF's discretion; let's not create longer and unreadable text. Merits in clarification.

ARGENTINA, BRAZIL, URUGUAY/Brazil: (G77) Document is the reality of capturing the many views, opinions, proposals; we can go along with it recognizing that we'll have to negotiate all of it and then decided together what will be part of the MPGs and how they will be captured. Not so scared of document because some of the work, like the placeholders, are work for others. Hope that document will be read by non-transparency experts so they recognize they have work to do too. Don't see need to discuss/negotiate font size, superscripts, etc. We just want to see what you have presented; notation key provides readable way to do this. How to read is a matter of taste.

LMDCs/China (G77, LMDCs): G77 had clear statement and rationale; agree with Brazil to give discretion to CFs to handle issue. Maybe use larger font, though, for readability. Superscript with this size font would be too small to read.

ARAB GROUP/KSA: (G77) Good way to capture progress.

CF ANDREW: We'd like to include Indonesia's proposal on the understanding that this was a technical issue. On notation key/box, we'd like to remove it and move the applicable notations to the end of each provision. We'll put them in superscript. We'll keep caveat language but amend; "in order to accurately capture and streamline...[will include] shaded and italicized language following each provisions indicating to which parties the provision applies..." Text on first page of informal note. Take note of concerns re content and addition of headings/sub-headings. Emphasize nothing agreed in text; prepared purely under CF's responsibility.

Intention to make amendments ASAP and post something no later than tomorrow morning. Forward to APA co-chairs for their consideration with HODs.

South Africa: (asking for confirmation that their proposal captured in note) E.4(7), given broad nature of art 4.5, we'll have to live with that. Add art 7.13 to address concern.

CF ANDREW: Given oversight on our part, we'll add reference to 7.13.
(applause!)