

APA item 7 – Friday 10th November 2017, 1000-1100

Notes taken by Rhianna Rees, Uppsala University

General overview:

parties are concerned with the duplicative nature of current preliminary documentation.

Some parties believe that aspects of the document renegotiate considerations in the Paris agreement that parties have already agreed to.

There are issues at present with the steps and legally binding nature of policies and committee intervention, at what point should external organisations like the GST And CMA have input or be referred to?

Norway suggested that majority voting within the committee would be needed at some point and at present developing countries represent the majority.

Saint Kitts and Nevis - thank you for the useful document. Specific issues to address, point a-missing elements. Compliance issues, operating in its systemic function, compliance at the aggregate level, party follow up, placeholder for the addition of some elements, follow up should be facilitative. Discretion would be needed for the committee, further godliness with general steps and methods needed for the committee. So far not many. Elements have been inaccurately reflected, national capabilities and circumstances, would be case by case basis. Should not be applied to scope or function of

committee. SIDs and LDCs taken into account. Do not necessarily think that the task in developing guidelines would require discussion, unless it would help in understanding of the committee. How can we reflect on principles moving forward? Overarching guidance. Non duplication at present is not represented in the document. Confidentiality with regards to follow up, is key to the processes of the committee.

Saudi Arabia - speaking in behalf of Arab group. Aggregate and not individual level of implementation. Moderate and reference discussion, including non duplication. Article 15 should not modify Paris agreement. Interlinkages should be grouped together in the paper. Output and national circumstances, loss and damage and otherwise should be included. One facilitation function, the output should be all circumstances and then one binding output. How will the different elements be developed? Should not shy away from complexity, go further, see every element and have a more streamlined tool. Trigger issue and response measure - see more engagements in conversation moving forward. There are two measures in measures and outputs.

Argentina (Brazil, Uruguay) - good base document. Systemic issues should not be individual, but aggregate. Missing input in the issue of structure and composition, diverse expertise in all fields should be included to

handle issues properly within the committee. Procedural arrangements talk after better understanding of scope. Functions, committee for compliance should be only in legally binding provisions. National capabilities and circumstances operationalised. Follow up is important, but do not necessarily see it as independent of processes.

Israel - good work in paper. Good basis. Agree with several parties from yesterday. Should always relate to Paris agreement. Some points for discussion were already agreed of in Paris. Mechanism applied to all the parties.

Iran - should take steps to improve text. Agree with Arab group. Sources of information should be limited and validated. Information could be sourced through subsidiary bodies. Concur duplication should be avoided. Confidentiality should be avoided to concur with non punitive nature of the committee. Linkages with the GST, should be careful that no case should be referred to this process. Triggering should be based on differentiation.

EU - reiterate yesterday's proposal to discuss committee procedures. Concrete addition: include under section G2, we should add the option of a referral in the case of inconsistencies in reporting, especially with respect to modality. Consider and be informed by the

implementation. We support parties that would not like modalities and procedures on underlying principles, because these aspects are already defined in Paris agreement. General provision 'engagement with the parties' as header to avoid national capabilities and circumstances.

China - principles, should be included, operational function of the committee, can not agree that Paris agreement has already outlined, otherwise what's the use of the APA? Function issues, address Saudi Arabia, do not agree proposals on legally binding provisions are separate, they are the same. Facilitated implementation. Section J on measures and outputs, legal character on provisions, developed countries should be included. Access to technical experts, this measure is too narrow. Follow up section, not completely necessary to have a separate section because it's dependent on the legally binding provisions. Depends on consent of parties.

Egypt - divergent views into one document, thank you. Interlinkages, support systems, transparency, framework and GST. The committee plays a facilitative role. GST is a collective process, the committee is more focused on individual party obligations. Systemic issues with implementation. Manner to address systemic issues? Broader issue than it appears. Needs fine tuning.

Norway - the document has a lot of Repetition of the Paris agreement, not necessary to duplicate.

Inconsistencies in document.

Do not need to agree on everything necessarily, but important to work out mode of work.

The compromises we agreed to in Paris should be recognised.

Section C, can be left to the committee members.

Majority voting would be useful, not everything can be decided by consensus. Majority developing countries in the committee.

Scope - dependent on function of committee, compliance only captures individual legally binding obligations.

Need for additional need for steps before the initiation of the committee. When looking for legally binding aspects the committee needs additional support.

Process left to the committee to decide, bounded flexibility to the committee, with some guidance.

Measures and output depends on the function, issues of implementation or compliance function with regards to each party? Access to finance, committee should not facilitate, but provide information and provide guidance.

Systemic issues should not be only at the request of the CMA, doesn't make sense. Recommendations are OK.