

Hannah Greenhouse
Washington University in St. Louis
November 10, 2017
17:00-19:20

APA Informal Meeting on Agenda Item 3

Co-Facilitators

- Note recently disseminated doesn't represent agreed ideas or conclusions. It's purely a draft with no legally binding language
- Features
 - Listed current features and new ones
- Information
 - Includes views on objectives, capacity, timing, revision, etc.
- Accounting
 - General principles like understanding, objective principles, capacity building, how to draw on existing approaches, procedural guidance
- Both for info and accounting: didn't include substantive elements in order to not prejudge how these should be determined
- Included clusters of ideas in appendix 1 for information and appendix 2 for accounting (for reference only)
 - Cluster 1 is based on non-paper and includes additional views from discussions and submissions
 - Cluster 2 refers to only mitigation issues that reference all types of targets relating to parties regardless of developed or developing
 - Cluster 3 differentiates between developed and developing parties
- What do parties think?

China (LMDC)

- Don't want to just put forth a bunch of documents
- Why adopt an agreement that will humiliate you? We don't want to be considered a blocker so seems like we have no choice but to agree on something
 - Should value compromise
- Comments:
 - Didn't cross anyone's red line so that's good
 - Need to populate elements and options
 - Placeholders used to identify certain areas, but other areas are unreadable
 - Objection of accounting: can be attributed to different options
 - Some can probably reflect party consensus
 - Others need further work to identify clear options to give flesh more bones
 - Still options like "no revision" – that's not captured in this preliminary tool
 - Structure of the paper
 - Recognize structure will prejudge final outcome
 - Main text + appendix give the impression that there will be 1 decision
 - Features, information, and accounting all have information in the main text, but specific guidance is reflected in 2 appendixes

- Should move parts in the appendix to the main text
 - Text is 45-pages long – that’s a little too long
 - Using tools on Microsoft word, there are areas that are repeated
 - Can delete duplication that’s exactly the same
 - Approach 1: Only mitigation with common elements
 - Approach 2: Elements with differentiated status
 - Necessary to recognize reality, this will prejudice groups/negotiations

Marshall Islands (AOSIS)

- Guidance we produce needs to be useful to furthering our purpose
- Liked the non-paper that you produced
 - Would have been happy to go on based on the non-paper
 - But not all parties felt that way
 - So we agreed to work
 - Now, there’s more that we don’t like—but our views are still there
 - Substance of the non-paper is still there which we appreciate
- We can go on with this even though we think it’s gotten worse
- Emphasized that this paper has as little status as any paper can have
 - Know we are moving towards an outcome in the end

Australia

- Are all headings and elements supposed to indicate potential guidance or just a series of ideas? Perhaps not all areas need guidance
 - We can accept its presence for now
- Strong views on how substance is organized
 - 1.1: Mostly elements from non-paper
 - Don’t agree with everything
 - 1.3 and 3.3: Very similar to submissions/ideas from one type of country
 - One group of ideas dictated in full
 - Haven’t had a chance to really discuss substance/structure
 - Don’t reject the idea that parties’ views can be put here, but we don’t see our views reflected here
- Don’t think our views/group of views have been particularly reflected in this submission
 - Highlights one groups’ view without highlighting others and don’t think that’s a good way to move forward

Co-facilitators

- Worked with clusters as being basis of ideas, but it’s whatever parties would like it to be

PNG

- Co-facilitators wanted preliminary reactions from parties re: first iteration, already seems extensive additions/structural proposals on what to do with document – if we’re not all on the same page, should we just give a general reaction to the document? Or include additions/suggestions on how to move forward
- We understand views by Australia that some views weren’t properly reflected

- Haven't discussed actual structure
- Information section
 - Captured some initial reactions from Monday's group that may not actually qualify to be in the information section

New Zealand

- Page 8: Don't accept heading under principles, should move bullets elsewhere
- Page 9: Timing of applicability on accounting: Think that section's unnecessary, the decision text is clear

Saudi Arabia (Arab Group)

- Agree with AOSIS that it's gotten cleverly worse
- Comments:
 - Views of the group haven't been fully captured and we propose to include cluster 1.4
 - Not as long as other clusters, tries to be direct in approach, communicates clear message, would include preliminary objective message
 - Says developed countries *shall* do...
 - Re mitigation: What developed countries *may* do
 - Action and information
 - 3 bullet points
 - Relevant information
 - What developed countries may provide
 - 3rd bullet point is a placeholder
 - Looks at finance, technology development, and capacity-building
 - Option of no text re: accounting
 - This captures group views, tries to look at matter in most direct way, streamlines discussion

Brazil

- Comprehensive work that captures everyone's views into clusters
- Could be shortened to make it more useful
- If lazy, could give it to APA contact group and say it reflects everyone's views and it could serve as the basis to formally continue discussions
- Simplifying things:
 - Headings in bold might be too overworked, look like headings for decision text
 - Suggest to make them as broad as possible
 - Didn't grasp cluster 2, section G
 - Why isn't that reflected in cluster 1.1?
- Ready to engage with colleagues and work to simplify clusters
- Move from broad guidance to specific elements once the broad guidance is there – right now we're already looking specific and that might make life more difficult

USA

- Due to duplication in the document and length, it's unworkable
- Reiterate request from yesterday to look at how other groups are moving forward
 - Ok that this document exists, but not ok with working with it moving forward
- What's next with this document? Will it be made workable?

Colombia (AILAC)

- Could foresee that not everyone would be happy with this
 - Can't present this to ministers
- Idea here from the text is that we should work to make guidance through finding guidance
 - Agree with China re: Information that there are places to start working
 - *But* also think accounting is important and that should be a focus
- Understand Paris looks at mitigation, adaptation, capacity-building...
 - But the most we could accept is these items as placeholders

China

- Didn't mean to imply that we should focus on a specific cluster
- Re: One groups views treated in a special manner
 - No, all parties' views have been captured in an equally special manner
 - Some parties' views are even duplicated
- We will trust the co-facilitators from this day until the last day
- Shorten text?
 - Respect other parties' concerns
 - Trust co-facilitators to take parties' concerns and taking constructive ideas to change next iteration
- In next year, we can have an exercise to work on bridging ideas for headings/subheadings further specify structure for agreed outcome
- Should protect each other's views moving forward
- Discussions starting from accounting isn't workable
 - Need to understand text prior to looking at specific areas

Chile

- Agree with proposal from African Group
 - Note would benefit from including discussions
- Agree with Columbia
- Don't think "no text" option in features is a good one
 - Here's a third option: Note that NDC features are relevantly outlined in other areas of the PA
 - Would let us streamline focus in accounting and information

Ethiopia (LDC)

- Way too many items
- Document could be shortened and we would benefit from that
 - Since timing isn't on our side, another, shorter text would help move things along

EU

- Similar to Chile, our submission on features comment and other comments weren't captured in this argument
 - Say features are captured in Article 4
 - Listing features isn't necessary
- Accounting:
 - Principles section is misleading
- Elements needed by all parties seems to be captured here
- Important to avoid duplication and inconsistency

- But that can be worked on prior to the final document
- Need more time to ensure this captures view of EU

Zimbabwe (African Group)

- Appreciate general structure of the argument – but would have liked a more streamlined document
- How some views are captured aren't commonly understood by us or other parties → need more engagement and time for coordination
- If there's room to move elements across different clusters within document to allow for a more balanced, fair structure we're willing engage
- Important to note comprehensive nature of guidance and how it will help us
- Request more time to examine guidance
- Happy to engage with Chile and consider their proposal

Switzerland

- Didn't use form 9.7 so we're happy
- Isn't an informal note, but is a tool to bring us closer to an informal note
- Agree with Zimbabwe: We need more time to look at document
- Why is there no appendix for features? That was an option before
- Some sections/views seem to be missing
- Think all views/group should be treated equally
 - Not acceptable that a document would give more weight/visibility to one group than another
- Duplications/triplications need to be fixed
- Need more time
 - Tomorrow, should continue discussion of the document

Canada

- At least one party says this document needs to be changed before it could be used, others said modified, or too long, or shouldn't be used
 - Agree with many of these criticisms
- Understand some parties need more time to concern → but now sure understand why/how you need more time to consult on a document you already say is unworkable
 - Maybe have parties work within themselves?
- Likely can't move forward till we reset on this document
 - Not that helpful
- Maybe use synthesis document from October?

Saudi Arabia

- Would like to give co-facilitators opportunity to issue new tool based on what co-facilitators heard today so that parties can continue moving forward

Marshall Islands

- Agree that document is a mess, but it's a mess that captures our views
- Need time, but we don't have time
- Came into this group using non-paper and continually allowed other groups to add in more text
 - That makes it messier

- Now we have a 47-page document and if you do more work on this we likely won't have time to react to further iterations on the non-paper text
- Re: Features
 - This is an important issue
 - Understand the options are a bit clearer
 - But not willing to give up time over discussing these

Brazil

- Way forward?
 - How much time do we have left?
- Comfortable with proposals to give co-facilitators mandate to try and simplify this
 - Maybe have a round of bilaterals
 - Wouldn't like to leave COP without anything
- Important to have understanding that if in the future we lose this document, we could come back to it

Japan

- Would appreciate additional party views

Russia

- Some parts of the text we can deliberate and agree on
- Concerns with issues of increasing length of the document
 - Already overloaded
 - Would like to merge clusters rather than add additional clusters
- Could try to work on technical parts and leave controversial areas for later

Mexico

- Support Zimbabwe and Switzerland asking for more time
- Understand this is a tool and will only help us move forward towards an informal note

India

- Agree with requests to make document more readable and understandable
- BUT manageability of the document shouldn't be at the expense of parties' core views
 - Attempt to consolidate technical aspects, but not larger issues

China (LMDC)

- Support India and Saudi Arabia
- Too much flesh and not enough bones in the paper
 - Don't know how to go back to technical aspect present in the non-paper
- Brazil raised constructive point
- Add in one group that says they're views aren't in the document and then we can ensure that there's a negotiating text
- Analogy: Key to losing weight isn't to reduce bones, it's to reduce flesh
 - Don't need to remove clusters because those are the bones
 - Need to reduce flesh and turn it into muscles
 - Want to help people keep fit

Switzerland

- Disagree with China's analogy: If you have too much weight you don't want to lose too much flesh because then you only have bones and that might be good for Halloween, but isn't a positive way forward

Saudi Arabia

- We should get rid of what's redundant
- In this bone session we should look at the bones

Co-Facilitators

- You've given us a lot to chew over
- Give us a few minutes
- [Break]
- Don't want to take sides, but there's a clear divergence over whether we want clusters or not. Without knowing that answer there's no way for us to move forward
- Do parties need time to confer? We have this room for a while longer

Colombia

- The flesh is here
- The idea is just to get the text a little shorter

China (LMDC)

- Of course we need to keep the clusters
 - Just reduce the redundancy across the different clusters
- Can't accept any removal of the clusters 1.3 and 2.3 and would support no text option for all other groups
 - That's our super red line
- Agree with Switzerland to lose fat, not flesh
 - Lose weight and keep fit with bones in the body

Saudi Arabia

- Flesh and fat are the same word in Arabic
- Maybe there is an appetite in the room to engage on the bones in the coming days
 - Would give parties that need some more time to consider flesh on the bones in order to get back to the co-facilitators

Brazil (+Uruguay)

- Agree with AILAC, not sure how helpful it would be to stay here on a Friday night
- You know from interventions what shouldn't be touched
- Remove redundancies within clusters, but if you remove redundancies across clusters then parties that aren't represented across clusters will lose their positions entirely
- Might not need to stay here all night

Marshall Islands (AOSIS)

- I need to lose weight, but I understand if you lose weight too quickly it can be dangerous
- Came prepared to engage in a long paper

- Where we are now would be very hard for us to continue with, since we came with the idea to engage with the non-paper
- Can't lose substance of what was in the non-paper that reflected our view
 - Other parties are welcome to add in their views to the non-paper

Switzerland

- This kind of cluster isn't working
- We came to Bonn to work constructively on substance
 - If you work on substance you can find structure through differentiation
- If you come here saying if your structure isn't represented than you won't move forward than we can't have meaningful discussions
- Let's all look at it tonight

EU

- Groups have asked for additional time to negotiate text
- Can't lose fat, flesh, bones too fast and losing any means something different for everyone

New Zealand

- Talk of fat, flesh, bones is getting grizzly – let's choose a new metaphor
- For everyone, there's some clusters that we think we can engage with
 - Could be the basis for us to begin discussions
- Let's go home, sleep on it, read it and move forward with the idea that there are some clusters that we can continue on with
 - Support consolidating within clusters, but *not* across clusters

China (LMDC)

- Proposal is to not only reduce redundancies within clusters, but also across
 - Since there's reluctance to doing so across clusters, maybe we can work within clusters to reduce hodge-podge, mumbo-jumbo in the clusters
- Need time to digest document
- Think that the clusters 1.3 and 2.3 are very fundamental *if* there are no such clusters than we will react with turbulence and some may call us a blocker

United States

- Agree with Switzerland to come back tomorrow
- Ok with document existing, but not moving forward with in
- Agree with AOSIS that we should look at methodological guidance

India

- Agree with New Zealand that we need to reduce redundancies within the cluster
- Must try to maintain proportionality when reducing the structure
 - Certain parties' views are already concise
- Agree with Switzerland that we should probably sleep on this issue

Co-Facilitators

- No objection towards the idea of sleeping over the issue
- Work towards finding a way forward

Saudi Arabia (Arab Group)

- Would like to have some sort of a plan for the next meeting

EU

- We would also like clarification towards total time remaining and when the next meeting is

China

- Agree with Saudi Arabia
- Agree with co-facilitators to do mind yoga tonight
- Reminder: Can't engage with clusters 1 and 2, but can leave them in for spirit of communication

US

- Co-facilitators said that no one's disagreed with the clusters, that's not entirely true
- Reminder: We're ok with this document existing, but not in moving forward with it

New Zealand

- Speculating, but likely some parties wouldn't be willing to engage on .3 clusters, who would that include?

China

- Not the sequencing of the engagement, but further work on the text to engage
- Reluctant to engage on 1.1 and 2.1

Co-Facilitators

- Booked a room in Santiago de Chile for anyone who wants to do mind yoga

China

- Not able to participate in this specific mind yoga
- But want to keep clusters 1.3 and 2.3 from this day to the last day

New Zealand

- If China has this belief how is that being willing to engage

Co-Facilitators

- We don't need to get into that now
- Go to Santiago de Chile and socialize, chat about whatever you want ... co-facilitators won't be there

Saudi Arabia

- Also can't make it
- Understand that some groups have raised concerns

Marshall Islands

- May engage in Santiago de Chile room
- Whatever happens in that room can't focus on purely one cluster and people trying to cut out other people's clusters

Colombia

- How much time do we have left?

Co-Facilitators

- Secretariat?

Secretariat

- Meeting tomorrow at 6...but depends on how much time is needed can try to get more time

Switzerland

- 6am?