

APA Item 3 - November 13, 2017 - De Brum
Kali Lamont - College of the Atlantic

Cofacilitator:

- Last meeting: discussed structure of non paper
- Redlines recognized, moved forward by parties submitting input by 5pm yesterday.
- Facilitators created new version with input published 11am today - voluminous
- Received 20 submissions and used outline (from Australia) as basis for compiling doc
- Streamlined non substantive option - deleted input by parties as indicated
- Some parties commented on previous appendices
- Revision made by 4pm based on parties missing info
- Changes in substantive section: features - section D included as option
 - Info (D) on substantive: removed caveat on pg 7 to above bullets
 - Changed bullets 2, 5, and 7 and add footnote re: additional, non additional, or needed at all.
 - New bullet: "other elements" leaving room for changes
 - Accounting: revised caveat pg 76 same as in info section
 - Tried to include all parties. Requests to change language/meaning = new bullet
 - May have missed specific inputs but these details don't change approach - welcome comments to improve
 - Urge focus efforts on capturing and having wording reflect concern so in May we can start will doc all comfortable with.
 - APA cochairs concerned with length and input from individual parties
 - Comments? Equally happy?

Zimbabwe (AG)

- Thank you for revised preliminary material
- Streamline not that helpful in getting to workable text: difficult to work with moving forward
- Request: attributions removed and cochairs produce draft negotiating text for next session - further streamline to remove duplication
- Submission and attribution should be in streamlined doc otherwise hard to work with

Switzerland

- Clarification on proposal: cochairs streamline and make new version with proposals and options?

Colombia

- Thank you for undated version.
- Need transparent manner in this process
- We made agreement that this would be last version - need compromise and good faith in process
- Proposal is reasonable, we can work with it. When will draft be finished? How much time will we have to review?

- Don't want to go back to paper we already have, need assurance that we can get to point where we all agree

China (LMDC)

- Clarification: appreciate explanation on procedures, done good work.
 - Footnote on pg 8: can you delete last few words? (Additional or not additional)
- Points:
 - Still bullets we cannot agree on - pag 3-8 and pg 73-79 but caveat protects our interest
 - Key part of doc is party inputs - fundamental for us to continue work in May, bridging material and substance
- We can go along with doc and transfer from PMIN to informal note by cofacilitators - change as is
- Not sure what to mandate co chairs do.. Same as on APA item 3-8? WHO should do work of shortening? Cofacilitators? Cochairs? They are busy..
 - Need to decide answers then what to do and how to go forward.
- A lot of input repeats cluster 1.1 and 2.1 which makes it long
- Submission on substantial elements: [detailed example given] 40 pages of information and 40 for accounting if eliminate non substantial elements it would decrease.
- Problem: some input just reiterating clusters 1.1 and 2.1 objectives, procedures, and general principles which makes it long.
- Need to figure out collectively why it is so long and need clarity on who, what and how?

Cofacilitator

- Doc is so long because followed mandate to compile everything - integrity of submissions. Has useful parts and good basis for discussion (not prejudging)
- Further work not in our mandate, matter will be taken up by cochairs at contact group. Streamlining is not our decision.
- We will convey message that doc should be read as whole

Switzerland

- My understanding is two proposals: 1. Footnote page 8, proposal and conclusion? Seek clarification on changing words/removing/not.
 - 2. Also clarify proposal on pages 3-8. All informal note or something else?

Cofacilitator

- Footnote draft not optimal. Purpose to highlight disagreement based on word "additional" and also included "or needed at all.." which had done better in drafting but created great distress so I think we should change to "additional or not additional" to capture intent.
- Want to be able to negotiate in good faith. Don't want distress for parties and hope for flexibility. "Less is more"

Switzerland

- Does this change anything by taking out "or needed to all" and if not

Cofacilitator: intent to clarify between additional and not additional and need is covered in caveat. Not necessary in footnote and better for it to be concise.

EU

- Meaningful distinction between options.
- Accounting: “no text” option which is also meaningful
- If inclusion or non inclusion mentioned then should be done in consistent manner

Switzerland: question on “We all..”

Co Facilitator: Some parties have expressed great distress over it so it should be more concise.

EU

- Additional, not additional, or nothing at all
- accounting has parts that draw on material we have had in other texts
- Missing items: inclusion or non inclusion is important

Co Facilitators: Thank you UK - nooooo (second time mistaken name of party)

Zimbabwe

- Annotation on additional or not add or not needed good at summarizing views of some of the parties
- Give mandate for co fac to further streamline, remove duplicate views
- Have new doc by mid Feb so we have time to look at it before next session

Cofacilitators: Taken note of the proposal but co chairs have that decision

Allow us to take forward doc with removal of words in footnote to APA co chairs and then have a discussion on who will do the work and by when.

US

- Thank you for taking another draft of this and other drafts
- There are lots of elements in here that prejudice our views
- Caveats protect our prejudice
- In the spirit of compromise: Streamlining should not change language from before for us to consider
 - Mandate to cofacilitators
 - Further streamlining by MAY

EU

- Couple points
 - Bullet description of the target
 - Accounting section G specific elements: reference includes reference to appendix 3 which doesn't exist in this doc (maybe non paper?). Reference to PA paragraph 35 B - methodological consistency including baselines

- Add bullet on use of accounting balance to track progress to NDC's

Cofacilitator: We have taken notes of point and will convey to co chairs.

Russian Federation

- Refrained from commenting on draft text because add comment on weekend would not be product because doc is already overloaded by comments by parties
- 180 pg are very far away from guidelines or negotiation text
- We are in your hands co facilitator and believe partners: in favor of operationalizing agreement so we can start implementing it
- Want to streamline and shortening text and approve of engaging further in text few days

China

- Appreciate effort by you
- Response to some parties views to add something that has been omitted: we still have some comment on these elements, some part missing/not appropriate but at least parties have safety net
- First by caveat: whether or not should have this/elaborate
- What is the criteria for this streamlining work?

Cofacilitators: The caveats protect everyone. We encourage colleagues to be flexible to move doc forward.

Australia

Zimbabwe

- Agree with co facilitators to wait to talk about this doc until it is more streamlined and good to have caveat that we can always add or remove from doc

Australia

- Thanks all.
- Future work: we have developed increased confidence on our views and that of all parties here.
- Take note on our views on information and accounting and that there are very important points are not included
- Happy for this to go forward in whatever form
- Footnote phrasing: my understanding it refers to elements whether additional or not: purpose is to address "additional" in that sentence and whether that is necessary or not. Replace with: parties have different views on what the word "additional" means.

EU

- Reflect comments by others that this has made things we don't like but since we all have that view so that's fine.
- Reiterate our confidence in you.
- Hope APA contact group will discuss how this is going to work

Ethiopia

- Second what Zimbabwe said and thank you
- Remind you: next session prefer more streamlined text
- Conclude: take note forward of what we have discussed: Australia proposal to footnote added.

China

- Clarification: our report will go to your co chairs?
- Note: Bullet point missing from substance and specific elements
- Request you understand some parties don't like this approach. Thank you.

Co facilitator: Will not be reporting anything in depth, just submit to co chairs.