

Notes By: Sarah Greenberg, Washington University in St. Louis

APA agenda item 3: informal consultations on further guidance in relation to the mitigation section of decision 1/CP.21 – November 13, 2017, 18:00 – De Brum Room

Facilitators Opening Comments

- In the last negotiations, states had diverging views on the structure for accounting and information
 - Debates prevented work from moving forward
 - Several groups have stated their positions are “red line”
- Co-Facilitators allowed parties to submit views on information and accounting with deadline of 5pm on Sunday (2 days ago)
 - Co-facilitators streamlined information
- The parties had asked facilitators to prepare a new version of the tool
 - Facilitators and Secretariat published it this morning at 11 am. It is about 180 pages.
 - Input from 20 groups of parties was received.
 - Co-facilitators streamlined non-substance parts by removing duplicating information
 - Mostly information on clusters
 - Used outline presented on Saturday as basis
- Decisions on clusters
 - Decided to attribute source unless a party or group of parties requests not to be identified
 - Used non-paper as basis for streamlining clusters 1.1 and 2.1 (summary of each from non-paper prepared in October)
 - Many state comments were on items in appendix that mostly disappeared in streamlining
- After publishing the note, co-facilitators received input that notes had omissions from certain parties
 - Corrected mistakes and issued new doc 1150, referred to as Ref 1
- Other parties stated input and views not reflected in Ref 1
 - At 4 pm issued new version, Ref. 2
- Ref 2
 - Includes changes compared to
 - Features
 - Section D: option 3 under section A
 - Information
 - Section D substantive elements
 - Removed caveat on section 7 to be more appropriately placed in bullets
 - Changed bullets 2, 5, 6 to be more concise

- Added footnote on differences in views on word “additional”
- Included new bullet saying that this is not an exclusive list of bullets
- Section G – changed caveat to be same as in information(?)
- Tried to include inputs from parties as best as possible
- It was impossible to follow instructions in exact matter
 - This version can’t address the structural comments. Asked for some flexibility from everyone to move forward.
 - Paper includes several caveats for sensitivity to placement, structure, and concrete proposal
 - May have missed some proposals due to complexity of exercise
 - Focused efforts not to eke out additional slight advantages for parties, but to have wording that reflects concerns so that in May we can start with document everyone is comfortable with to have substantive negotiations “in earnest and in good faith”
- APA co chairs have expressed concern w length of paper and w/ input from individual parties

Floor Open For Comments

Zimbabwe (on behalf of Africa Group)

- Streamlining that was done to document was not workable as a text.
- Since there may not be further meetings on this item, they requested that attributions be removed from the documents and that this should be taken up by Co Chairs for parties consideration at the next negotiation
 - Remove attribution for anyone because the moment we have name attachments, it becomes difficult to work with.
- Co chairs to further streamline text, remove duplications ,and identify clear options that we can then consider.

Switzerland

- Asking to clarify African Group: are we leaving the doc as it is but asking co chairs to make a new version for May that would streamline different proposals without attribution?
 - Zimbabwe in response: Correct – we want co-chairs (Jo and Sarah) to further streamline the doc without attribution.

Columbia

- Stress that the process has had a lot of pressure, it is important to have confidence that this is something we can handle in transparent matter
- Made an agreement that what we have on table now is going to be the last version in this setting

- Would like to have compromise from different parties, would like good faith
- Important to recognize to Zimbabwe that it is important to go ahead. This is something we can work with. When this draft text is finished, how long will we have to review it and what if the text we are asking co-chairs to provide is something that is impossible to work with?
- We have made a lot of steps; we need assurance that we can come back to the paper that we have already.

China (on behalf of LDCs)

- Clarification: pressured the explanation made on procedure to deliver doc, concrete materials as basis for future work
- Technical suggestion on footnote clarification on page 8: we should delete the last 3 or 4 words bc we need to place the “all” after the “additional”
 - Keep it “Additional or not additional”
- Further points on document
 - We cannot agree on bullet points from pg. 3-8 and pg. 73-79, but the caveat in italics at least at this stage protects our interests and the key part of this document is parties’ input. This is important for us to accept the work.
 - Can transfer doc from PMFII(?) into an informal note by co-chairs, but co-facilitators need to complete the mandate and homework assigned by co-chairs to change this preliminary toy into a informal note
 - We should identify elements to what we should ask co-chairs to do. Also should we mandate co-chairs to do similar work under APA 4-8? We need further discussion.
 - Who should streamline? Co-facilitators or co-chairs? They are too busy to release a reflection note.
 - Want to identify why this document is so long. Not from country inputs
 - It is not from party input, but is from inputs that replicate clusters 1.1 and 2.1 again and again. Also because input under “substantive elements” include elements such as capacity building, revision, general principle in accounting that make up about 50% of the length of this document. We can shrink document by removing replicating elements of objective, capacity building, revision, general principle, and procedure. Can we collapse this somewhere?

Facilitators:

- Document is so long because it follow mandate parties gave them
- Countries were very protective of the integrity of their inputs so they did not dare mess around with them.
- Still a lot of useless stuff, but good basis for discussions to take to next level
- Next step matters will be taken up by co-chairs and contact group
- Whether or not this should be replicated across APA segments is not a position they can take, but they encourage people who can facilitate that discussion to do so.

- Stress that document should be read as whole. Can't separate things out.
- Believe there are no further comments/no further suggestions to amend
- Regarding suggestion for footnote on page 8: the phrasing 'additional, not additional, or needed at all' at the end of the footnote doesn't change anything because it is captured already in D. If this is common understanding, what would it change if we took it out? If it is changing something we'd like to understand what it would change.
 - Drafting this was by his [Sin Lian Cheah?] own omission, and was not optimal. Tried to please everyone by explaining there is no agreement on word additional and we don't want to prejudge it.
 - Or needed at all: everything below is questionable whether it is needed or not.
 - Makes more sense to revise as 'parties have different views as to whether to use additional or not additional'
 - Will capture intent
 - Not trying to negotiate content here, just preserving space for all colleagues to engage in May
 - Didn't mean to create distress for any parties
- Facilitators did not understand China's comment against all bullets from pg. 3-8 and 73-

Switzerland

- Many elements that could have been better
- Footnote on page 8: If we take out "or needed at all", will it change something?
- If it doesn't change something, why do we do it?

Facilitators

- It would make it a lot more concise [to take out 'or needed at all'] because intent of footnote was to clarify point of additional or not additional. Concept of need is already covered by caveat, so it is unnecessary to cover in footnote.

EU

- Corroborate Switzerland, on additional, non-additional, or needed at all point. The distinction is meaningful.
- Several elements that draw on previous material discussed. Options and a no text option is a meaningful distinction.
- Other areas are missing from concepts that we highlighted over the weekend.
- If inclusion vs non-inclusion is worth mentioning, then there is a reason for it.

Facilitators

- Thank you U.K. I mean E.U. I'm sorry (everyone laughs) he starts talking in German

Zimbabwe

- Annotation on additional or non-additional or not needed was good to summarize views by parties.

- Addressing previous comment asking co-chairs to streamline and noting China's previous comment about co-chairs being very busy, Zimbabwe wants to give another day to co-facilitators to streamline.
 - Will accept a streamlined document by mid February or early march so we have time to look at it before next session

Facilitators

- Clarification: is Proposal is for co-facilitators to do work now?
 - → response: Yes.
- We note that, but APA co-chairs and contact group will decide further steps.
- Propose that the meeting should show some flexibility to take the document forward to become informal note w/ APA co-chairs with slight removal of the footnote words. In that platform, it would be good to have discussion of who, when, how to do work. Can co-facilitators do that work please?

US

- Lots of elements that prejudice all our positions
 - Caveats protect our prejudice so we can find a way forward
 - In the spirit of compromise, some things are not acceptable to move forward next year
- We assume that if there is a mandate for co facilitators to do further streamlining that it does not alter language already in it
 - Note that some streamlining today did change previous language from before
- Mandate would not be in our mind for co-facilitators to take another look at this
 - Happy to see you look at this and see if there is a need for further streamlining before May
- In this text, we see language that is the language of all parties. This includes positions from all different angles rather than individual country or party position. We look forward to working with others in a reconstructive way.

EU

- Co-chairs get to decide how the further work would be carried out
- See the purpose of further work as developing substance of discussions. With that in mind, we want to see addition of key technical aspects taken forward
- Comments:
 - Page 8 in substantive element section D: should be bullet referencing the description of target (?)
 - Accounting in section G: reference in bullet describing base years, base line etc. has a reference to appendix 3 (which does not exist in this paper in this form), should add "including where app forest reference levels"
 - Paragraph 30 B referring to methodological consistency
 - Add bullet referring to use of accounting balance to track progress toward NDCs

- Substantive elements of CTU missing

Facilitators

- Took note of points, but do not intent to open document at this stage. Will convey points to co-chairs.

Russian Federation:

- Express deep support
- We refrained from making comments on the draft text because we believe additional comments provided will not be productive since document is already overloaded
- 180 pages of the document is very far from guidelines for a negotiation text
- In favor of operationalizing the PA in the nearest future, the constructive approach is streamlining and shortening the text.

China

- In response to some parties views to add something:
 - Heavily request co facilitators to bring it back to co-chairs at this point
 - If we decide to discuss adding these, we open another round of discussions about these missing points. If we have this kind of exercise, it makes our group feel reluctant to request co-chairs or facilitators to do further work because it will make the work uncontrollable because we do [n't?] know if our inputs will be merged, collapsed, whether our special views will be reflected. China thinks if we would like to go into these details on which parts parties don't like, it will make our group reluctant to agree because they don't know criteria of streamlining this work
- China has comments on these elements (some parts missing, some parts not appropriate) but the parties have safe parts in this documents in the form of caveats

Facilitators

- Caveats protect everyone. Can always raise and come back with more/other points.
- Also reluctant to negotiate today and tomorrow on the document. Would urge colleagues to show flexibility to allow us to move the document forward.

New Zealand

- In terms of who will carry work forward, it is clear that any decisions would be made in the contact group or APA. In the co-facilitators' report back to the contact group, please express the amount of trust negotiators have in the contact group to move this information forward.

Zimbabwe

- Similar to NZ comment

- The moment we start discussing and editing new items and ideas, it will urge other parties to start bringing things forward. Urge confidence in co-facilitators to bring current information forward for streamlining while keeping caveat.

Australia

- With regard to future work, this is something dealt with under APA contact group.
- This process has developed increased confidence in facilitators understanding of [the parties] views. To the extent that there is any work to be taken, Aus wants facilitators to have a big role in new work because they trust the co-facilitators understand their views better than others.
- Informal note: strong views on the elements listed in substantive parts in both information and accounting. Have regard to our views lodged on the input section of the note as it is. Some of what we hold very dear is not in there. As others have expressed, there are also elements in there currently that they do not deal with.
 - With caveats, happy to go forward in whatever form
- Still an issue that hasn't been fully resolved on footnote on pg 8
 - Suggestion: 'Parties have different views on the need for the word "additional"'

Facilitators

- Nodding of heads around the room.

EU

- Reflected that there are things we don't like, but we understand this is the process so that's fine
- Reiterate confidence in you
- Taking forward material is a job for APA contact group, hope co-facilitators are involved in that process

Ethiopia

- They second Zimbabwe – want a more streamlined version.
- Version we have at hand can be used as a reference (?)

China

- Clarification regarding report to co-chairs:
 - If you report that some parties think there are bullet points missing in the substantive elements, we humbly request that you include that some parties are against this approach.

Facilitators

- We will not be reporting that. We will just be submitting a document to co-chairs.