

9/11/17 APA Agenda Item #3 Notes
Jacob Herbers, University of Minnesota

- Co-Facilitators:
 - Meeting started at 17:20 due to earlier meeting running late.
 - Spent 3 hours talking yesterday, many proposals, no agreements.
 - Received submissions today from yesterday's request for parties to fill them out.
 - APU(?), Brazil, and Marshall Islands proposed today to use the appendices of the nonpaper as the basis of the informal note.
 - Co-Facilitator asked if there were any objections to that?
 - Yes... India and a few others objected.
 - Any other proposals would be nice to have...
- Zimbabwe:
 - Speaking on behalf of African Nations
 - Wants to improve upon the proposal, but doesn't outright object to the proposal.
 - Structure should look at whole nonpaper, not just appendices.
 - How different ideas/views from parties can be incorporated and reflected.
 - Structure should have critical headings and subheadings.
 - How IPCC guidelines will be incorporated.
 - Timeframes, scopes, planning process, reporting plans?
 - Paragraph 4.4 will have guidance for limitation target.
- Ethiopia:
 - Speaking on behalf of African Nations
 - Nonpaper is a good base.
- Marshall Islands
 - Speaking on behalf of AOSIS
 - Agrees with Zimbabwe.
 - Co-Facilitators have our support to take the proposal forward.
 - They should work on it tonight while the rest of us sleep.
 - Proposal has captured the substance of everyone's views well.
- Papua New Guinea
 - Speaking on behalf of AOSIS
 - Agrees with Zimbabwe
 - Repackage it in certain areas without stalling progress.
- Co-Facilitators
 - Everyone wants us to spend the night here.
- China
 - Hand conditional mandate to the Co-Facilitators to produce something for us.

- Preliminary materials for preparation (not sure what the acronym is but it's the same format as was discussed in a different session today.)
 - 1st iteration of informal note should be uploaded to the APA website for us to digest.
 - "Although I'm just an apprentice I think I know how the game is played."
 - Of course technology mechanics are fundamental, but still valuable points should be reflected in the tool without prejudicing the final decision.
 - Scope differentiation funding issues.
 - Can't have guidance without purpose.
 - Needs dictionary for some english words that are being used in this discussion.
 - Agrees with Brazil's proposal that there should be general narrative consisting of 2 main structural approaches: a common guidance based on paragraph 27, and
-
- Need to avoid prejudice.
 - Need "flesh and bones" together
 - Needs structure subheadings to support flesh, shouldn't be a hodgepodge.
 - We trust Co-Facilitators to capture all our different ideas and construct the bones and flesh together.
 - Promise by Co-Facilitators in stocktaking meeting earlier today to protect integrity of parties' proposals.
 - "Family with children in home, jail, school..." etc. "Don't want family to be scattered everywhere."
 - Can use formal note to capture progress.
 - Need to elevate Co-Facilitator's tools into formal outcome that reflects parties' views.
 - Parties reserve the right to reject/approve later on.
 - Our group (agenda item #3 parties as a whole) deserves a gold medal and an A+ for working well compared to the other APA groups.
- Brazil:
 - Scary thought that we're more advanced in progress towards an agreement than the other APA groups.
 - How do we bring this forward?
 - USA:
 - We could work with something like that what China said, but not sure about what the conditions are that they were talking about.
 - Tool doesn't prejudice the "who"
 - Work on the "what" leave open the "who"
 - Tools being presented have different elements.
 - Figure out which relates to what parties.

- Might support that direction.
- Switzerland:
 - Agree with the proposal but strongly opposed to using form 9.7 as a basis for that.
- Marshall Islands:
 - Speaking on their own behalf as a country
 - Already given Co-Facilitators our trust.
 - Could sit all night for consensus, or have Co-Facilitators just do it.
 - Need to find agreement by all parties.
- Egypt:
 - Full confidence in Co-Facilitators to work on appendices and text.
 - We need to see differentiation clearly reflected in guidance, 1 for developed countries, and 1 for developing countries.
 - That is a red line.
 - Need to seek flexibility in Paris Agreement through differentiation.
- Co-Facilitators:
 - We're well aware of the divergence of views, we will take care to account for them all.
 - But can't guarantee everyone will be happy with it tomorrow.
- Saudi Arabia:
 - Speaking on behalf of the Arab nations.
 - Supporting tool that everyone's mentioning to go further.
 - About "what" "who" "when" "where" "how frequently" "how many" etc.
- USA:
 - Doing same thing in transparency room.
 - We couldn't have 2 bifurcation lists, but happy to look at language.
 - Doesn't support starting point of bifurcation.
 - Nonpaper good way to go.
- China
 - Speaking on behalf of LMDC
 - Can't proceed on tool.
 - We trust Co-Facilitators.
- Colombia:
 - Support Zimbabwe's proposal.
 - Thinking of 1st iteration, not final product, could be missing things.
 - Important just to get the 1st draft out now.
 - Still space in the next year to add new drafts.
- Co-Facilitators:
 - Not negotiating guidances, but capturing views in informal note.
- India:

- Trusts Co-Facilitators.
 - Comforted by assurance from Co-Facilitators that they'll capture entire range of views from all parties.
 - Some parties have red lines, and the Co-Facilitators to bear those in mind.
- Mexico:
 - Agrees with Zimbabwe, that's a good way to move forward.
 - Agrees with India on importance of trust.
- New Zealand:
 - Agrees with India and Mexico.
 - Pleased to ask Co-Facilitators to do work, as opposed to the opposite of that usually occurring.
 - Should maintain balance of red lines in constructive manner for a way forward on this.
- Co-Facilitators:
 - Meeting adjourned at 18:05.