

APA meeting on Agenda item 3: Monday 13-11-2017 18:00 to 19:00 De Brum room Cop23 Bonn.

Co-facilitator:

Welcomes delegates etc.:

- 7th meeting, how to structure the non-paper,
Debates have prevented the work from moving forward,
Several groups have said that their position is a red-line,
After some discussion, parties could give their view before Sunday 5pm. The goal of us is
how the input from parties could be incorporated in the note.

We have provided a new version of the tool at 11am, it's about 188 pages long.

We hope you had more joy reading it than that we had preparing it. Input from 20 parties where received, some commented on the streamlining most provided comments on the clusters.

We streamlined it by:

- Deleting duplications
- And sources were attributed unless the group of parties requested not to be identified.

Regarding the streamlining of appendices 1,1, and 2,1:

- the non-paper was used as a guideline (the non-paper of 23 October).
 - Revision 1 was published this morning,
- We received further input that it had omitted sections, that raised concern with parties that submitted them, we corrected this
- Over lunch we revised it again after parties felt that their views where not presented.

We would like to apologize for any stress or unhappiness that was caused by us.

On Revision 2:

include the following changes compared to revision 1 and initial notes.

- Features inserted as option 3,
- It fits within an option of new features that are not identified or incorporated
- remove the caption, and place it above the bullets
- we changed bullet number 2, 5, 6 to be more concise,
- Footnote added, to reflect differences in views of the different countries.

Parties have different views as to whether the element is additional/non-additional or not needed at all.

The concerns of the word additional where reflected by this footnote. To clarify the word additional, we did not aim to pre-charge the item.

We felt we did our best to include all inputs of parties, although it was not always possible to follow instructions in an exact manner.

It might not please everyone, we particularly expect some structural comments.

The paper includes several caveats to accommodate the comments on structure, wording etc.

What I would urge is to focus our effort not to try to get advantages over the others, but to reflect the views of the countries so that in May we can start with a document that everyone is comfortable with so that we can start real negotiations within good faith.

We promised to explore how and whether the length of the paper could be addressed.

Wave the flags in a nice and orderly measure, as it's hard to see in this room who raised its flag otherwise.

Zimbabwe on behalf of the African group:

Thank you very much for the device,

- We have had our input and we are still in the process of trying to see that in the revision one and revision 2 of the document.
- The streamlining was not that applicable as it was not applicable text, as there will be no further meetings at the COP.
- Could the attribution be removed, and further streamline the document, delete duplicated views, etc.

Chair:

- Remove the attribution what did you mean with that?
- Remove the attribution of Zimbabwe or the African group?

Zimbabwe:

- The attribution of the countries should be streamlined in the document and not be an attachment. As it currently is to have one comprehensive document.

Switzerland:

To have a good understanding of the comment of Zimbabwe:

- To leave the document as it is, and make a new document which is streamlined from the original 188 pages document?

Zimbabwe:

Work of co-chairs as it is, and streamlining work from countries into this new document.

Columbia:

We like to stress again that since this is a process with a lot of pressure it's important to all of us that we hand this in together, the issues that you have from countries that felt that some statements were missing... (rest not captured)

We have an agreement that the version now on the table was the last version, streamlined
I think we should keep the good faith of the process.

The proposal by colleague of Zimbabwe is something we could actually work with,
What are the dates that we have, when this draft text will be finished, how long will we have to review it and would like to get also the opinion of the different bodies, and the text that will be provided by the co-chairs it's impossible to work with the text just drafted by the co-chairs.
(rest not captured)

China:

On behalf of many developing countries:

Seek clarification, we appreciate the explanation on the procedure, and we fully understand the secretariat and that you and they have done excellent work as a basis for further work.

The footnote, I heard we should delete the last 3 or 4 words It's additional or not additional, it's just a technical clarification.

Chair

To just keep it to additional or not additional.

China;

Thanks for clarification.

- Although there are some bullet points from page 3 to page 8 and also from page 73 to 79 we can't agree on.
- Though the caveat in italic words at least at this stage protects all of our interests.
- The key of this document is country input and we think that that is very important and also debate on this.
- I think we can go ahead with this document to complete the mandate and the homework to complete this homework in a successful matter. And get this into an informal note.

(on the further role of the co-facilitators)

The concrete proposal to do something I think, I'm not quite sure what the co-facilitators will do, and I think it's better for parties to develop some kind of terminology for the work of co-facilitators.

We don't have very clear roadmap on what we should request the co-facilitators to do.

Do we want the co-facilitators of the other APA groups to also do this?

Who should do this work of streamlining? The co-facilitators, they are already so busy with the informal work, whether they have time, and how they should do it is something that should be answered before we move forward.

(on the length of the document)

A lot of input is just to replicate the cluster 1,1 and 2,1 that makes the document a little long. Since you have been inviting parties to submit specific elements or substantial elements, even though there are some initial elements in the beginning on accounting etc. this is still a major part of the document. I think for each party the average page is 2-3, The bullet points are streamlined in a very concise and excellent matters.

The problem is not party inputs some inputs is just replicating the clusters 1,1 and 2,1.

There is another issue why it's long as it relates to procedural elements on information and accounting and why not collapse this in a cross-country chapter. At least the timing of revision should be maybe in this part.... (rest not captured)

- We have to figure out the reason why it's so long not because of the input but because the reasons I named before. Identify from a technical level why this document is so long.

Co-facilitator:

- The reasons why, is that we followed the mandate given by the APA working group item 3.
- You were very protective of your input on this item, and as colleagues also mentioned there is a lot of not useful stuff. Further work is also of our mandate also when this relates to give the co-facilitator more work. It's really the matter to be taken up by the co-facilitators and the working group. Also weather this same exercise should be taken by the other APA sessions, but we will do this at a APA co-chairs meeting.

We will certainly ask co-facilitator with the message to.... (comment lost)

Switzerland:

- I have no further comments, and there are no further comments on the document.
- Is my understanding correct that there were two proposals?
 - One that was just a question on footnote on page 8.

- What does it change if you take this footnote,
- if this does change something we should know what it changes, and if not, why do we have it in.

Co-facilitators:

The inclusion of the footnote that states that parties have different views is if this element is additional or not additional or needed at all. The drafting of the footnote was by my own omission not optimal, because we know that there is a disagreement on the naming of additional. We wanted to displease/please everybody to put it in a footnote, not prejudging the item in our haste to do so, we also added whether it's needed or not. If we were to revise the footnote we should make it different, make it smaller. Whether it's additional or not additional.

The goal is to end on a good note to work further with it in May, as it's necessary. Less is more sometimes.

Switzerland

Does it change something or not, if "or needed at all." If that is added or not?

Co-facilitator:

It was to clarify additional, and or needed at all should be deleted in our view.

I would see party indulgence to allow us to incorporate that so that nobody gets to upset or loses their jobs.

EU:

comment missed.

Co-facilitator:

This are words submitted by parties.

Zimbabwe:

- The annotation on additional, not additional, and not needed was good to summarize the views by different parties.
- Give the mandate to the co-facilitators to further streamline the document,
- And accept the streamlined document by February. Or march. In order to further work on this in April.

CO-Facilitator:

- Is the understanding right that you suggest that we do the work, as you know that the APA connect group co-chair will take the further steps so not the current co-chairs?
- I would propose that if the meeting is able to show some flexibility to allow us to take forward the document with the slight removal of those words I mentioned and take it forward with the APA co-chairs and have the discussion of who should do the work when and how be discussed in that forum.

US:

- Thank you to take another draft on this, also thanks for the October non-paper,
- The way that we need to move forward is that there are caveats in here, that protect all our national interests
- WE see that some really unacceptable things that are in there are kept in there, we will be flexible and not oppose it as there are the caveats.

The mandate would not be in our mind for the co-facilitator, but we see that you as the co-facilitator, would be able to further do this as you have been our chairs the whole week.

With one thing that we see in this now very large text we do see language that is in a way, that includes all different position from all different parties. What we see in the first pages is what we would like to see working further on in May.

EU:

Thank you, we like to raise a couple of points

- it's within the mandate of the APA connect group and not the APA on item 3 how the modalities for further work is carried out.
- We see the purpose of further work to develop the substance on the items on the discussion.
- We would like to see some technical terms should be added, referring to description of the target
- In accounting: in section G on specific elements we believe there should be a reference: (this is a reference to appendix 3 which does not exist anymore).
- There should be a reference to some other thing concerning methodological consistencies
- We believe an additional bullet is necessary for accounting measures. Accounting on CTU, is missing from collective

If the Co-facilitators are mandated to further streamline this document, this is a matter of substance that should be contributed in the streamlined document.

Co-facilitator:

we don't want to open document at this point, but will take the points to the APA co-chairs

Russia:

I wanted to express our full support, we believe that additional comments provided in the weekend would not be productive as it already is overflowing by the parties' comments. The document is way too long. We believe that the parties that already have agreed to the PA, are very much for fast implementations, and we think that streamlining is therefore important.

China:

- Appreciate the effort. To make sure for a balanced outcome.
- To response to the comments raised on some stuff that is missing: all groups have some kind of comments maybe some part is missing some part might be inappropriate, but the parties have two save walls the Caveats, if we open up again we get back to the missing points.
- China seems to be against adding extra points, or further mandate on streamlining as the criteria of this streamlining work is unclear.

(So, China is not in favor of extra streamlining.)

Co-facilitator:

Caveats protect everyone,

I would urge to show extreme flexibility to move the document further.

India

withdraws comments;

Just in terms of who is going to carry the work forward it seems clear

That we as negotiators put a lot of trust in you as co-facilitators.

Zimbabwe:

- We take confidence in you, the moment we start discussing new ideas and other stuff on what is missing or what is that.
- We would like to give you the confidence to work on the streamlined document, but also to keep the caveats in place

Australia:

- Thank you for working very hard, and also the parties for providing the input.
- With regard to future work, as you have raised that that is mostly done by the connect group we leave it to that.
- We have developed increased confidence of your understanding of our views and the views of the parties here and we would like to see that you have a strong role in further work in this. We trust that your understanding of our views is better than others.
- We have strong views on the elements that are in the long document, Some elements that we hold very dear are not in there, but we trust in your streamlining
- An issue that hasn't fully been resolved yet is the footnote.
 - We have a suggestion it could be phrased, as it refers to elements and whether the elements is additional or not, in the context of the sentence and whether the element is additional or not.... (resto of comment not captured)

Suggesting: Parties have different views on the word and for the need of the word additional.

Co-Facilitator:

Thanks we can always count on your help Australia.

Eu:

- Thank you for offering to convey our words or add them to the mix, it's late in the day.
- I reflect the comment that there are things in here that we don't like but everyone has them in this stage.
- We like to reiterate our confidence in you, you have an incredible delicate job to do, and the further work is decided by the APA contact group but
- also the EU would like to see the co-facilitators to help in further work progress.

Ethiopia;

We would prefer a more streamlined document but like the document as a basis as it is.

Co-facilitator:

Thank you for the extreme flexibility and like to take the note forward, towards the APA contact group.

China;

In the oral report to the co-chair will the co-facilitators be reporting that some parties think that there are missing specific elements we humbly request you that some parties are than against this approach.

Co-Facilitators:

We will just submit a document to the APA co-chairs, we won't express specific views of different parties on different contents.

Close the meeting:

And moving forward with the document.