

APA agenda item 3: informal consultations on further guidance in relation to the mitigation section of decision 1/CP.21 - November 11th, 2017 - 18:00 - Ghenf

Kali Lamont - College of the Atlantic

Co Facilitators: "We are happy to see you talking amongst yourselves but we ask you take your chairs and start talking also to us." (34 minutes after scheduled start time)

- Yesterday we presented you a tool for consideration and different views were shared. Without clear guidance co facilitators were not able to move forward. "So in this situation the hands of the co facilitators are tied." There were requests for more time and opportunity for do "mind yoga" separate or together.
- We have seen you huddling now and through the day, so, is there any proposal of moving forward?

Australia

- 3 particular specifics that parties found difficult:
 - Too much content or at least not streamlined
 - Not all views captured right way
 - Not comfortable way some clusters were represented
- On basis of discussions with colleagues I put forward amendments to preliminary doc:
 - Note: initial idea - like suggestion on it
 - Also identify issues that may be unresolved
 - Cluster challenges suggestion: instead of cluster 1.2 and 1.3, and 2.2 and 2.3, replace with party targeted input and provide full views (substantive on information and accounting)
 - Attributed to parties because we're not necessarily inclusive of all views
 - 1.1 and 2.1 lifted from non paper and represent substantive elements for info and account: the can be placed in main body of prelim notes
 - This is issue that continued to need to be resolved
 - Comment on accounting cluster: differen levels of comfort in info cluster
 - 2nd issue: streamline doc: 2.2 streamed by secretariat while retaining content but simplifying
 - Suggestion: make into non substantiv elements
 - How much of clusters should be retained? How are parties influence attached to original note?
 - Organize in alphabetical order by party/groups
 - Highlight suggestions made by other colleague: attachment by info site after info section and accountign the same
 - Simple table of contents
- That is proposal in nutshell

Co Facilitators: I would like to hear from you in the room if you find this proposal as something you can work with - not accept as is but as something can engage on

Marshall Islands

- My understanding of yesterday's end: everything until page 10 was basically as is and then we would cluster underneath the input we have from different parties or groupings
- Under features existing list: is that just a title? Is this just a structure or what?

Australia

- Everything in prelim note in front half is retained in full but streamlined. Only change is appendix of clusters. Remove 1.1 and 2.1 moved into main body of note and potentially shortened. The party input attached to rest of doc as indicated and non touched - no synthesizing

China (LMDC)

- Appreciate Australia's thoughts on way forward
- My understanding: give equal burden to both parties and co facilitators to work in parallel. Shorten point from pages 1 to 10 while still keeping main point on paper
- Parties need to do some homework to find some focused points in bullet points and insert input after sub title substantial elements in info and specific elements in accounting.
- Still work from co facilitators: copying/past party views under caveat below above elements
- Regardless whether or not this approach will fly.. Task is to work together then come back next week to see if it will work.
- Second point: do we need or not retribution too. "Each and every one of us will have nickname in this process."
- Maybe we can find equal footing and then come back next year in Bonn to discuss flesh and bones.
- Better to have nickname rather than list parties name. Better to label or number re attribution
- Placement of views: after subheading substantial element or specific elements we cannot accept any appendixes. Avoid any appendix in new iteration.
- 3rd issue: shortened cluster of 1.1 and 2.1. This approach could help us find equal footing next year.

Co facilitators: Since there is so much talk about flesh and bones, we could use birds or cats as nicknames..

- Clarification: are there parties that are not ok shortening appendix 1.1 and 1.2?

Papua New Guinea

- Bit confused: procedural concern
- Support Marshall Islands
- Most authentic document is the informal note
- You diligently organized room for us and number parties willing to work on it. We had all day to receive product from colleague but now delegation uncomfortable with seeing document on screen without pre time.

- Want to hear from parties. Ok if made in informal or roundtable but not in one party suggestion.

Russia

- Thank you Australia for streamlining and offering better structure (clearer)
- Believe it is inline with PA and can accommodate all views of parties within this proposal

Switzerland

- Like Marshall Islands: question to China that 1.1 and 2.1 would be replaced by inputs:
 - What would be first issue/top of discussion for us in May in Bonn?

Saudi Arabia

- Appreciate proposal from Australia
- Clarification: in original doc by Australia will 1.1 and 2.1 remain as appendix? Also group input in doc?
- Response Switzerland: share same view as colleague from China on 1.1 and 2.1
 - Submissions have been captured in 1.1 and 2.1 but have identified mistakes in capturing language/idea. Believe most accurate way to capture views and core principles addressing info and account in submissions. Try to answer the question on what we will do in May in Bonn. Engage in these options and views. Parties views will be reflected and captured in doc.

Co facilitator: review of two proposals (remove cluster or not)

- Parties not wanting to engage on document because it wasn't seen for long in advance but ask people to engage because it is short and not too new. Not saying to accept doc just that it is Saturday night and we want to move forward.

India

- Nice to be in room where I think we are finding greater convergence and alliance and thanks to Australia. It looks feasible to reach a common point.
- Align with China
- Address two points: 1: future of cluster 1.1 and 2.1 - moving toward doc that captures party views
 - Those above were a sort of synthesis. Had reservation toward way cluster was structured and balance of view from both sides.
 - Since we have to journey toward direction of convergence I think it would be useful to leave these clusters aside and move on with a doc that reflects a view of all parties for submission.
- Point 2: views of parties in main doc or in appendices - Prefer in main doc

Brazil

- Ready to engage in proposal
- Have been ready to engage in substance from beginning of sessions..
- Delegation could not move forward with copy past of 1.1 and 2.1 appendices. Prejudge content below and not way to structure our discussion.
- Appreciate a shortened version not deleted. Flexible on whether or not included as body or annex
- Attribution: we don't care
- We would be comfortable giving mandate to secretariat to streamline but flag that this

group's option is not reflected in feature section.

- CTU: streamlining of sub items streamline ok, but how to shorten and structure in next section
- Accounting: need a better understanding of how and who would do streamlining - proposal of parallel work could be engaged

Co facilitators: Streamlining: if you give us permission then we will do it

China (LMDC)

- Quick answer to Switzerland: not focusing on outcome of this session - should be to find proper way for doc to reflect all parties views in balanced manner which is also my answer to purpose of this session
- Reason of dropping 1.1 and 2.1 avoid discuss on whether to focus on this or that art of text after we have draft text. DDD:
 - First: Digest by guessing the nickname
 - Second approach: then in Bonn Discuss on this solid material
 - Third: Develop bridging proposal made of ground and some kind of weight out

Marshall Islands (AIOSIS)

- If we go down this route our parties would submit these elements from non paper as is.
- Do we streamline 1.1 and 2.1? If yes, who would do it? Then how?
- In our case not sure what value added if not streamlined
 - Not acceptable to end up with bullets in response to streamlining one

Ethiopia (LDC)

- Complaint: we are usually moving either super fast or super slow.
- Work with appendixes as whatever
- Want to see missing parts of informal as parts not annex
- If we could send you missing part before next submissions but not referred as annexes.
- Priority: given point missing from submission not included in 1.1 and 2.1
- No need for party name because by now we know who wants what.

Zimbabwe

- Next iteration parties views should be reflected
- Reserve right to come back with any proposal to aust proposal

EU

- Thanks Australia proposal which makes a lot of changes but shows potential
- Removes annexes 2 and 3 in exchange w/ party's own attachment. Naming is necessary to attach but could submit as anonymous.
- Not reflected our submission of section 4
- Streamlining of 1.1 and 2.1 needed but ok with it

Colombia

- Parties should be allowed to rank some issues. I think we have opened doors to substance (most important part)
- Chile had proposed having third doc to have like decision
- We understand we will have to work today and tomorrow and then we will engage after

- Expect co facilitators will find space in convergences and divergences and duplications that could be deleted

Iran

- We think that original informal note was controversial but preliminary was a way out of that but included many elements but could be further discussion. But saw difficulties.
- Maybe Australia suggestion would be way out.

US

- Thanks co facilitator and Australia
- We do believe this is a workable way
- Have another round of input in the next few days and move forward
- Agree with the first pages of yesterday's notes.
- Hope we come out with a lot of ideas in a workable form that we can all look at together

Mexico

- Thanks co facilitators and Australia
- See this text as challenging but happy to engage with it to move forward in discussions in May
- Response to party explanations and comments: now will have better understanding and think about usefulness of proposal by Australia
- Happy to engage in this
- Question: how much time left on this issue?

Switzerland

- Four pts: 1. We need to be able to comment on those parts done in black on the screen. Thank Australia - it is something we could work on
- 2. Submissions without country identification are not appropriate. Important to know who made submissions.
- 3. Don't understand why should delete 1.1 and 1.2..
 - What happens if we get 20 submissions all the same? Similar? Can we combine or must we keep separate?
 - Seems we are moving toward Geneva text..
- We came to Bonn to work on substance but we will have spent two weeks not looking at substance. Want clear understanding that next time we will talk substance.

Co facilitators

- Substance issue is not confined to this group that should be taken up in contact group with co chairs
- Was intending to make proposal but instead to India...

India

- Respond to issue from Switzerland: we have serious reservations on 1.1 and 2.1 and I have already explained views on why.
 - Not comfortable with balance in structure
 - Stick to earlier request to consider dropping both

China (LMDC)

- I feel a little bit upset because we are going back to pushing and pulling. I think we have repeated concerns/redline..in order to move forward we can engage in proposal by Australia
- Ok to compromise to find bridging proposal: serious concern on cluster 1.1 and 1.2

Co facilitators

- If there is informal note coming out of APA 3 consultation is will not be accepted by parties but something they can work with.
- Secondly, don't see consensus on how to move forward.

Australia

- Suggestion on attribution: some want and others not and others for other
 - Indicate if want to be attributed note and co facilitator do so and others can be listed as "party"
- Suggestion re 1.1 and 2.1: trust co facilitator to navigate through that. But if rest of proposal given input from today

Saudi Arabia

- Elaborate on attributions: don't understand need for attributions but we need collective party info in this paper. Not constructive

China

- Referring to: 2.1 in non paper pages to pages could be good example for streamlining
- Cluster 1.1 need shortened version: non paper page 10 could be an example

Co facilitator

- Thanks for constructive spirit and frank discussions
- Would like to indicate some steps to be indicates
 - All parties to submit proposition and on accounting and indicate name or not
 - With help of secretariat, we will streamline the appendices 1.1 and 2.1 according to your sharings and go over text again to see if we can streamline further.
 - If any party thinks anything is missing.. Please submit additions.
- On monday we come back to you with another version that will have no status.
 - Co chairs say we need first informal note
 - We should show it to you before labelling as informal note
- A deadline for input: tomorrow (Sun) 5pm
- Will take input if you want to do so and put out informal nothing/elements/material by tomorrow and will integrate missing views. ASAP for missing views
- Stress: this is just an exercise we are doing together and on Monday you will have chance to share. Not prejudging anything. This is not the end of our discussion.
- Yes?

Saudi Arabia

- Clarification on deadline

- Two deadlines to give max time with secretariat: give comments/suggestions/missing info (by noontime)
- Attributions: take note of all parties who opt in and seek our views next time. Don't attribute until after publicly doing so on Monday.
- Where will streamlined 1.1 and 2.1 be in paper?

Co facilitators: can't answer location question now because we have to see overall paper. Maybe at end of two part notes by section on substance, but I can say, just see.

Need deadline of 5p not earlier

Switzerland: Need names, we will squeeze in.