

8/11/17 APA Agenda Item #3 Notes
Jacob Herbers, University of Minnesota

- Report from the roundtable discussion (presumably held earlier in the conference) by the co-facilitator:
 - Accounting should be practical/simple
 - Avoid double-counting of emission credits / mitigation credits, etc.
 - Some desire less demanding requirements for developing countries
- Comments on the roundtable discussion:
 - China:
 - Mix of optimism and pessimism
 - Good to have lots of ideas on the table
 - Have to be pragmatic, need to be clear on key divergences from everyone
 - How many details do we want in our guidance? Some parties want very specific, which would give a clear signal to domestic actors, or some don't think we should have difficult detailed regulations that would impose a burden on parties.
 - Paradox/dilemma facing us: if it's a "shopping list" why waste time elaborating? "We are not a housekeeper."
 - Enforcement concerns: all parties are at different starting points
 - Have to accommodate different viewpoints
 - Need to place options on table in a clear manner
 - Switzerland:
 - Paris Agreement not about humiliating parties involved.
 - Marshall Islands:
 - They don't like the proposal, not much time left.
 - Agree with China that guidance must not be too burdensome on countries with least capacity.
 - Developing countries not expected to get it right the first time around, they can improve, and the text needs to capture that.
 - No-text option not acceptable
 - Do need further guidance
 - European Union:
 - Roundtable discussion was quite intense, and not as interactive as they would have hoped.
 - It didn't solve issues, but had some salient points.
 - Discussion revisions post CMA-1 not a high priority.
 - Norway:
 - Prescriptive vs. non-prescriptive details, and timing are important.

- Need to have clear and easily-tracked progress.
 - Need to assist parties, not add burden, and don't set countries up for failure.
 - Emphasis on capacity-building.
 - Solution for addressing capacity-gap can't be centralized bifurcating.
- Brazil:
 - Roundtable hasn't brought much innovation forward.
 - Newly issued revision only complicates the discussions.
 - Want to leave COP23 with text (so does Uruguay)
 - Haven't had structure discussion yet, whether it's 1 decision, or 2, or 3?
 - Need different guidance approach for each subitem.
- China:
 - China is speaking on behalf of the LMDC
 - Thinks bifurcation approach isn't actually happening (their observation, not necessarily their opinion on what should be happening).
 - Differentiation issue deserves discussion.
 - Tracking target discussion may need coordinated discussion with transparency group, i.e. a joint consultation.
 - No specific reference to target in NDC.
 - Can't accept bullet points in paragraphs 27 and 31. No naming & shaming of developing countries.
 - Disagreement on new additional guidelines but deserves further discussions.
 - Cannot further elaborate on paragraphs 27 and 31, because it would lead to more regulatory burden on developing countries.
 - Opt in / opt out manner a possibility.
 - Want a common version by COP24 in 2018.
- Admin info from Co-Facilitator:
 - Discussion on substantive points of divergence.
 - Expected to finalize by 14/11/17 at 13:00.
 - APA closing plenary on 15/11/17.
 - Have 6 hour-long time slots for agenda item #3, and have just now used up the first one.
 - Many bilateral meetings yesterday, heard some diverging views.
 - Disagreements on how to spend time here.
 - Need informal notes from all parties.
- Discussion of issues:
 - Mexico:
 - Liked the spirit of collaboration here.

- Want useful guidances that helps inter-country communications.
- Many preparing NDC submissions, and need help.
- Suggest to move to more detailed discussions now.
- Substantive guidance for more clear understandable NDCs.
- India:
 - Working on guidance, not prescriptions, need to respect countries' different capacities.
 - No megastructure.
 - China has given cogent view of what LMDCs want.
 - Next step on LMDC proposal: list out all options, further distill them to concrete options.
 - Can't impose list on parties.
 - Let them have flexibility in NDCs design.
 - India made commendable strides in their own energy markets.
 - No explicit targets, need more actions on fulfillment.
 - The growth would send a positive signal to industries.
- Colombia:
 - Most really willing to get into texts discussion.
 - Really need to engage in gritty work that must be done in in-person session like now, i.e. save less intensive work for later.
- Papua New Guinea:
 - Unproductive to reiterate views already discussed at the roundtable discussion.
 - Agrees with Brazil/China/Colombia.
- Canada:
 - Paragraph 27 is a non-exhaustive and non-excludable list.
 - New regulations shouldn't impose new burdens beyond Article 4.8.
 - Doesn't think guidance should steer towards certain NDCs, shouldn't make organizations/hierarchies of NDCs, should just use a bottom-up approach.
 - Guidance doesn't need to be detailed, only need 1-2 pages of accompanied info.
 - No retroactive guidance, don't need to protect existing NDCs.
 - What lessons were learned from preparing NDCs to help make future ones?
- Japan:
 - —
- Iran:
 - LMDC member in roundtable.

- Will be difficult to reach agreement.
 - Agrees with China.
- Australia:
 - Would like a middle ground between loose and strict guidelines.
 - Mutual peer pressure acceptable in APA, but not humiliation.
 - There are probably some underlying genuine concerns behind delegates bringing up the word “humiliation” by not meeting the guidelines.
 - Should use everyone’s collective skills in the room.
 - Shouldn’t constrain policy choices.
 - Why do others think that the element(s) are too prescriptive and detailed? Asking for clarification, not confrontation.
 - No worries about discussing a topic biasing the text.
- European Union:
 - Can structure & process be separate or together?
 - What is / should be the structure for capturing discussions?
 - EU not in favor of 1-size-fits-all guidance.
 - Concerned about discussions going backwards.
 - EU prefers 3 decisions.
 - Separate annexes on CTU, accounting, and maybe features.
 - 2018 guidance will contain things EU doesn’t like.
 - Bifurcation against spirit of Paris Agreement.
- Brazil:
 - Not in position to agree on any structure.
- Switzerland:
 - Different capacities referenced in NDCs.
 - Bifurcation does not reflect different capacities of different countries.
 - Doesn’t think paragraphs 27 and 31 are designed to humiliate, because if they were, we wouldn’t have ratified them.
 - Structure of 2018 decision & guidance vs. structure of capturing our discussion here today are 2 different things.
- Co-Facilitator:
 - Immediate issue is the structure for the nonpaper so everyone feels included.
- Ethiopia:
 - Worried about running out of time.
- Saudi Arabia:
 - Saudi Arabia is speaking on behalf of a group of countries here.
 - Echoes China’s proposal of 2 sets of guidelines, for developed and developing countries.

- Disagrees with starting with accounting as EU said.
- Co-Facilitator:
 - Some parties want to start with substantive issues, or headings, or structure.
 - At a loss to see way forward, need help, we'll have used half our time by 16:00 today, need to see light at the end of the tunnel for informal paper capturing our discussions.
- Bangladesh
 - All elements should be fairly captured in nonpaper, then put them in a structure.
 - Non-prescriptive structure / guidance.
 - In developed structure, see different elements addressing different notions.
 - Shouldn't mix up different notions.
 - 2 fundamental principles: nat. Determined factors in NDC, and CTU in the process.
- Marshall Islands
 - MI speaking on behalf of other island nations?
 - More optimistic than Co-Facilitator.
 - Impossible to operationalize differentiation.
 - Developed countries need time to get it right.
 - Disagree with Switzerland, MI thinks that capacity building still is needed for NDCs.
 - Haven't gotten far in 1/3 of our time.
- Afternoon session:
 - Indonesia:
 - Proposed setting up visual structure. Needs to be concise, just the essentials. Would make the decision easier.
 - USA:
 - Middle-aged white male with suit, red tie, glasses speaking for USA.
 - Use Co-Facilitator's nonpaper.
 - Noticed no parties wanted to prejudice their own position.
 - Posed a "middle option" with some aspects that make the US uncomfortable, and other aspects that make other parties uncomfortable, as a compromise.
 - Co-Facilitators:
 - Asked if Brazil's proposal is acceptable to everyone?
 - Brazil:
 - Proposal is to layout options for structure, format (# of decisions) (annexes or not), approaches already outlined.

- We're not prejudicing structure or approach.
- Try to distill bullet points.
- "Feel free to amend it."
- China:
 - *10+ minute monologue with mostly loud tone of voice*
 - LMDC group feels a bit humiliated but agrees to proceed for the sake of cooperation.
 - "Sometimes that's the life in this multilateral process."
 - Don't want to be named as blocker to progress here. We need to get this done.
 - "For the common good of all humankind."
 - Spirit of compromise, we can take it, but enough is enough.
 - These specific elements are beyond our capacity: (GDP target and target year) and (Projection of GHG emissions and target year.)
 - Info irrelevant to content of NDC.
 - Territorial disputes affect geographic coverage aspects of this.
 - We can't exhaust all types of NDCs on table.
 - "I can share this story all day but I will not for the sake of time."
 - "We respect your proposal and we hope you can respect LMDC's proposal."
 - Agrees with Brazil on overarching chapter in text to identify key issues.
 - Sensitive language, debate on how to craft guidance language to inform mitigation section without going further than the Paris Agreement.
 - Simply listing the bullet points can't work.
- Russia:
 - Not comfortable with proposal to have 2 sets of guidelines because that would be inconsistent with the Paris Agreement.
 - Could address some differences in the same set of guidelines.
 - Brazil's proposal is a good starting point. (nonpaper?)
 - "This is our position and we will not change it"
- Marshall Islands:
 - Clearly some fundamental disagreements here.
 - Any issues in proposals that prejudice the fundamental issues will be problematic.
 - Need to build on Brazil's proposal, and start getting into the structure and details.
- India:
 - Other parties said that the different NDCs encapsulates the different situations of developing countries.

- India doesn't exactly agree with the above statement.
 - Scope of how to approach NDCs.
 - Question is "how" not "if" we should require differentiation.
- Proposed path of action from Co-Facilitators:
 - Observed significant debates and differences here.
 - Co-Facilitators have provided something for everyone to react to: a paper displayed on the screen:
 - All parties should fill this out and react to it before noon tomorrow (9/11/17).
- Sections of paper from Co-Facilitators:
 - Caveats
 - Wide range of strong views
 - Not prejudicing placement
 - General aspects
 - Purpose of guidance
 - Recognition of different starting points and capacities.
 - Capacity building to increase capacities
 - Etc.
 - Procedural Aspects
 - Timing of application
 - Vehicle to communicate
 - Etc.
 - Preliminary materials for developing substantive elements:
 - Clusters reflect what's been submitted by parties & doesn't prejudice the weight for support of them.
 - Cluster X
 - Cluster Y
 - Cluster Z
- Reaction to proposed path of action:
 - New Zealand:
 - Last 3 hours have been incredibly disappointing, we are moving backwards here.
 - Concerns of feasibility of proposal within given timeline.
 - "We are embarking on creating the Geneva negotiation text, then _____, then _____, all in a few days, we don't have time to fill all this out overnight.
 - Low chance of getting together to streamline agreement in a few days.
 - Wants alternate option.
 - European Union
 - Co-Facilitator accidentally said "UK" instead of "EU", laughter ensued.

- EU wants to minimize the number of clusters.
 - Should use bullet points only.
 - Can expand their granularity later.
- Marshall Islands.
 - Notes that although this doesn't happen often, he agrees with the delegate from New Zealand, in that we should note that we are clearly focusing on a paper or nonpaper, as opposed to an actually binding decision this year.
 - Skeptical of Co-Facilitators' process, expecting different inputs and language which will need much time to synthesize all the different views given.
 - Combine that with Brazil's approach to move forward.
- China
 - Speaking on behalf of LMDCs.
 - Knows informal note will have impact? How to elevate it and move forwards after that?
 - Already enough on the table, don't need more bullet points.
 - Co-Facilitators could cluster it themselves (instead of requiring every party to make a submission) in a clear and concise manner.
- Co-Facilitators:
 - Interrupted China because we are out of time for this session.
 - "There is no support for the Co-Facilitators to do it ourselves."
 - Optional meeting to be held tonight from 18:00-20:00 for discussions.
 - Egypt and Zimbabwe not that the African bloc can't make it due to a conflicting meeting. Concerned about attendance disparities and outcomes, seeking inclusiveness.
 - Does 7 pm work then?
 - China/LMDC: "We reserve the right to reject proposals that are "across our red line" and "we don't want turbulence."
 - Meeting is adjourned.