

APA Agenda Item 3 - November 10th, 2017 - 17:00, Ghenf
Kali Lamont - College of the Atlantic

Co Facilitator: Made tool posted for parties to view a preliminary informal note. No divergence or convergence listed, no attempt to address or prejudge just reflect middle ground.

- Each item separated into a section, existing feature and new ones. Information did not include substantive elements in order to not prejudge organization of different structures
- Made into two Appendixes (info and accounting) and each have three clusters based on non paper. So what is next? Input?

China (LMDC)

- Thank you! "Tool" in mandarin = throw up. Don't want to just throw up documents to somewhere else and not of use
- We have no choice to agree to something with this kind of spirit of compromise.

Comments on PIMN and tool:

- Good effort to not cross any super super red lines.
- Parts unreadable - no options in objective of accounting. One of the options not listed is "no revision."
- Structure: main text + appendix give, info and then main text
- Move elements up in appendix - for example substantial elements
- A lot of redundancies and overlap in text, a little too long.
 - Ex. 1.1 and 1.2 a lot of issues the same
- Merge understanding - at the beginning there should be caveat that two approaches were raised covering all elements with differentiation - or separate into substance. Information and accounting have caveats.

Marshall Islands (AIOSIS)

- Recap: guidance should be useful to membership
- Would have been fine to go ahead on non paper but some parties expressed that did not reflect their view
- There is more in this preliminary that we don't like but more important that substance is still there which makes it acceptable. We could go forward with this even though in our position it got worse.
- There is little "status" which is explicit in the title
- There is a blank piece of paper that we need to fill but this is not that paper.

Australia

- As a preliminary:
 - Info and accounting clarify: headings and elements intended to communicate potential guidance or just share ideas? Because not all parties think all need guidance.
 - Procedural issues seen as aspects of guidance.
 - Substance issues: element in accounting seen as core of substance discussed in this room but strong views on how to be organized
 - 1.1 and 1.2 appear to be taken from non paper

- Other clusters: 1.3 and 3.3 have very similar ideas from ONE group of papers
 - One group's views portrayed more
 - We have not had discussion on accounting or substance
- Don't see our views reflected in the same way as in non paper
- As a tool this has been helpful and useful step forward.
- Issues are reflected but our parties' are not and would like to mirror the format and content of non paper

Cofacilitator

- Clusters seen as collection of ideas and parties should do what they like with it

Papua New Guinea

- Procedure question: you wanted preliminary action from product in front of us?
- Are we all on the same page or is there need to share additions/subtractions from document?
- Understand the view of Australia that some parties views not reflected
- In info section: included exercises that captured initial views from parties but may not qualify as information (based on views expressed in first session)

New Zealand

- Issues in general section: page 8 principled - we don't accept heading
 - Page 9 unnecessary - reduce length by deleting.

Saudi Arabia (Arab Group)

- It is very very large document and difficult to navigate. Many many redundancies
- Agree with Marshall Islands that it has gotten worse.
- Comment on behalf of Arab Group: thank you for giving time to look over doc: two conclusions 1. We see that the views of the group have not been fully captured in paper
 - Proposal: include 1.4 - tried to be direct in approach. Include preemptive objective and as feature not text, it addresses information
 - Another bullet point reference to paragraph 27
 - 3rd bullet is optional information

Brazil

- Comprehensive work to help us move on. Certainly could be shortened to be more useful for our work in next session. If we are lazy negotiators we could raise this to APA.
- Difficult to work on but could be base to work upon
- Headings are too overworked: look already like heading for decision text - suggest make those as broad as possible in reference to headings in bold and capital letters
- Section G of cluster 1.2: don't see why isn't also reflected in cluster 1.1 then moved up
- Ready to engage with colleagues to simplify clusters to move forward.
- We see a lot of detail being put up front in terms of guidance which could make our life more difficult

US

- Too long and too duplicated. Reiterate request from last night. We are ok that this doc exists but not acceptable to use in negotiation in current form. What do think next?

Colombia

- We could foresee that not everyone would be completely happy with the doc. A lot of work to do before we could show this to our ministers which will be in here in a couple days.
- We should work to own text as parties to be able to work ahead on guidance.
- Start work - no items on information: 1.1 and 1.2
- Accounting is very important. Need to have mandate and need to work on that
- Work on adaptation and means of implementation but the max we could accept is a placeholder for this item.

China (LMDC)

- Response to parties: did not mean to say to focus on any specific cluster. Not proposing to start from any one spot. Apologize for misunderstanding
- Heard colleagues say that some parties views in special manner, I see it as all are done in special manner
 - Cluster 1.1 and 1.2 from you (co facilitators) not one party. One party view replicated twice in the paper, some treated in special manner, and some parties views not reflected in paper. All parties views now treated in equally special manner because some reflected twice and some not represented at all in doc.
- Trust you to maybe produce another reiteration by taking parties views that were omitted, removing redundancies, and respecting red lines.
- We should have substantial discuss on elements and then exercise

Chile

- Recall proposal by AG: benefit from including views along as with AILAC
- Proposal on feature: like decision text, NDC feature outlined.
- Allow to continue work on information and accounting which is matter of high relevance.

Co Facilitators: too fast/detailed - please email what you just said to us

Ethiopia

- there are overlapping ideas and redundancy. Produce another text that is shorter in order to benefit at the end of this session.

EU

- Submissions features are contained in Article 4 as alternative to listing feature.
- Accounting: don't like two ideas described in preliminary as procedures
- Summary: let capture content first before streamlining

Zimbabwe (African Group)

- Find this doc quite useful
- appreciate structure of general doc but would have liked a more streamlined document
- Views: some aspect in doc not commonly understood. Request more time to review in depth since it is a 45 page doc

- If room to move element of first cluster within the document then we are willing to engage and hope you will continue to allow parties to participate in moving forward
- Reflect on NDC's and how this doc will assist us.
- Happy to work with Chile to consider proposal

Switzerland

- May not have been able to capture all views but at least 9.74 views
- Many questions in doc: challenging to have full understand doc, need more time and then continue discussion before moving on new submissions
- Why is there is no appendix for features?
- Heading and structure on main text on information and accounting need further reflection
- 1.2 is missing 1.1 and closer look
- Some views may be missing so need to look closer
- Not acceptable that one group gets more attention than others when/if used at COP outcome
- Too many duplications
- This is only a tool to develop informal note to develop guidance
- Would like to continue to discuss with more time to process then develop tomorrow

Canada

- Agree with many of the criticisms. Heard some people need more time to consult but don't see point when some have said it is already unacceptable.
- Consult and share views with co facilitator. Before moving forward in room there would have to be a bit of a reset on doc.
- not that useful. informal non synthesis non paper more useful

Saudi Arabia

- Want to respond with a change of heart tomorrow

Marshall Island

- Need further work but when will that be done? Came into session with idea that we would use non paper to move forward and succeeded to create greater information but it complicated it for us.
- Feature: important for our delegation, it's not in the appendix.

Brazil

- Clarity on way forward: how much time is left to negotiate?

Japan: approve of shared views

Russia

- Concerns on issues of increasing length of document: already overloaded with factual material. Rather reduce than increase. Good to think how we can merge the clusters rather than add additional ones.
- Share views expressed already. We need to work hard to make a non paper by end of session.

Mexico

- Support Zimbabwe and Switzerland for consultation and fully understand text.
- This is tool to come out with an informal note. Encourage parties to think of it in this way

India

- Should be more management/readable but should not be at the expense of parties core views. Our attempt should be to consolidate technical part not larger party views.

China (LMDC)

- Support ideas of India and Saudi Arabia: not enough bones in non paper that's why we took this step
- Brazil at least we have something in the pocket for anytime we want to go back to. To make sure there is a negotiating text in this session.
- Need more work: analogy - like somebody want to be healthier, to lose weight, key is not to lose bones but to reduce flesh! Clusters are to reduce clusters. Reduce flesh and turn it into muscle. Reduce flesh not the clusters which reflect bones.

Switzerland

- Don't want to lose flesh but fat! Only bones is like skeleton which is good for halloween.

Saudi Arabia

- Whether it's fat or flesh we should get rid of things that are not important. There is an appetite to engage on the bones.

Co Facilitator: I see no more requests for the floor and you have given us a lot to chew on. Give me two minutes. There are clear views in different directions. Do we want clusters or not? Could parties talk among yourselves and give us a specific answer about clusters.

Colombia

- Didn't hear any parties sharing that they didn't like clusters.

China

- Of course we need clusters but need to reduce redundancy across the different clusters to make shorter and more readable. No removal 1.2 and 2.3 - that is our red line. Sorry I use the word flesh because english is not my mother language.

Saudi Arabia

- I understand because flesh and fat same word in arabic. Engage on bones which for us are clusters.

Brazil

- Agree with AILAC. You know from interventions the things that should not be touched. Remove redundancies across clusters. If we engage in it now we might not get anywhere. Actually 55 pg - longer than non paper.

Marshall Islands

- I definitely need to lose weight, but I understand that it is not good to lose weight too quickly.
- Came here to work on non paper and now we have this doc. Differentiation of features.

Switzerland

- This kind of cluster is not working. (x2)
- I think most of us want to work on substance when organized in manner than reflect differentiation. If structure is not perfect than not engaging in text is not productive.
- Propose we look at doc again in positive light and come back tomorrow to discuss

EU

- Adhere to parties request to have more time to go over doc rather than going over clusters.

New Zealand

- Let us engage in new metaphor that is less gruisssem
- Like ending on positive note - there are some clusters we can engage with and could be base to work together.
- Let's go home, sleep on it, read it perhaps, understand that there are some clusters that we can engage with. Accept call to consolidate within clusters. Without prejudice on each cluster rather within clusters.

China

- Not only reduce redundancy to reduce across rather than within but since there is resistance then we could work within clusters.
- Respect proposal made by some colleagues that we need more time to digest this document.
- 1.3 and 2.3 are very fundamental and we will reject with some turbulence if not included

US

- We agree with Switzerland come back tomorrow. We are ok with this doc existing but not working on it as is.

India

- Agree with New Zealand to reduce redundancy with cluster. Must try and maintain sense of proportionality

Co Facilitators: "need to do further mind yoga"

Saudi Arabia: Would like to have some sort of plan for next meeting

EU: Clarification on how much time is left and next sessions

China: Can leave those clusters on the table

US: Cluster are not something that is working here, not ready to work on it but okay to see it

New Zealand: Can we focus on cluster 1 first without taking the other off the table

China: Reluctant to engage in clusters 1.1 and 2.1

Co Facilitator: Santiago de Chile available 7-12 tonight for parties to work things out if so desired

China: Keep cluster 1.3 and 2.3 otherwise not engage at all.

New Zealand: how do we move forward with china's request?

Co Facilitators: go to room

Closed meeting

Marshall Islands: Parties should focus on own cluster not try ad remove others clusters.

Closed Meeting

Colombia: How much time left before we have to have final product?

Co Facilitators: have scheduled for tomorrow 18:00. If there is willingness we can try and get more time but only tomorrow at the moment

Final Close of Meeting 19:20