

Sixth Informal Consultation on APA Agenda Item 3 on further guidance in relation to the mitigation section of decision 1/CP.21

Saturday, 11 November 2017, 6-7pm, Genf, COP23, Bonn, Germany

Note taker: Melissa Low, Research Fellow, Energy Studies Institute, National University of Singapore (esimlyx@nus.edu.sg)

The meeting began at 6.35pm due to a huddle at the beginning, and discussions among Parties.

The Co-Facilitators noted that the meeting was intended to continue from the previous discussion at the fifth informal consultation.

The Co-Facilitators noted that upon request of Parties at the informal consultation on 9 November 2017, they had attempted to informally capture views expressed by Parties, including in their submissions and at the round table in a Preliminary material. They underscored that the document was prepared under the Co-facilitators' own responsibility and thus has no formal status. The content is not exhaustive and Parties may decide to add additional views to this note. It does not represent agreed views, ideas or text and nor does it attempt to draw any conclusions on possible areas of convergence or divergence. The order of the information contained in this note does not correspond to any hierarchy or sequencing of proposals according to convergence or importance. The Co-facilitators' also recognize that nothing is final until the guidance on NDCs is final. The Co-facilitators further recognize that there are varying views on the structure of the guidance, including differentiation and scope of NDCs. There is no intention to prejudge or prejudice any next steps relating to the preparation of a draft negotiating text or the position of Parties on further guidance and its contents.

- On the preliminary material, the Co-Facilitators noted the different views shared, with some Parties noting that some cannot go forward with it.
- Co-facilitators said that without clear guidance, they are unable to move forward
- Grouping, structuring of proposals - so called clusters - is preventing the work from moving forward
- Happy to see parties talking in the huddle now and over the course of the way
- Asked if any party would like to share guidance with the co-facilitators

Australia

- Tool good to illicit better understanding and in that it has served its purpose
- Problem: Too much content, not streamlined and that some views not represented in full, properly or not captured
- Not comfortable with way clusters were represented
- Idea: amendments to the preliminary note
- Ask Secretariat to put it out on the screen, but will describe it
- Only an idea, welcome feedback
- After huddle, will raise issues that have not been resolved as a result of the huddle
- Replication of the most highest level of headings, sub-headings of preliminary note

- Resistance to the clusters 1.2,1.3,2.2,2.3 - because there was some sense that those clusters represented the views of only some Parties
- suggestion that these be replaced with Party inputs; targeted inputs on views on substantive areas of accounting
- Attributed in some way to Parties
- 1.1,2.2 - lifted from the Non-paper
- Suggestion to be placed in main body of the preliminary material
- Needs to be resolved
- Have heard diversity of views on how much clusters of views should be placed under headings - like to make comment on accounting cluster: there was potentially a different level of comfort/discomfort
- Suggestion to streamline to take 2.2 and ask Secretariat to streamline - retain all unique concepts and not remove, but to streamline duplications or where words can be simplified
- For 1.1, heard difference of views whether should/should not be reflected so leave that to parties to address if they wish
- Suggestion heard on non-substantive elements e.g. Objectives, procedural elements, information... etc. - any duplication can also be streamlined so that document. More readable
- How much of cluster 1.1, 2.1 should be retained in the format indicated in Australia's input (on screen)?
- Suggest that Parties' targeting input placed in alphabetical order and attributed to Parties or groups simply placed, clearly attributed - but acknowledge views on attribution...whether or how
- Simple table of contents to help whoever is reading it navigate the document
- Welcome comments and clarifications from others

Co-Facilitators asked for views around the room if this proposal by Australia can be a basis to work on or under what conditions can you work on

Marshall Islands (AOSIS)

- Thanked Parties for the work done, can see that much effort gone into it
- Understood that front part of preliminary material (until page 10) would basically stay as it was, cluster underneath inputs from different Parties or at least the groupings
- Asked for clarification about the structure or the product of the recommended approach by Australia

Australia

- Did not mean this is it, preliminary note front half is retained in full or streamlined
- Only things change is appendix of clusters, removed first 1.1,2.1 moved to main body
- Then Parties inputs attached to rest of documents, untouched no synthesizing or anything

Marshall Islands said it helped to clarify, but like to hear from other Parties

China (LMDC)

- Thanked co-facilitators, appreciate effort by Australia to propose preliminary thought on the way forward
- This approach will give equal burden for both parties and co-facilitators to work in parallel in following weekend
- Co-facilitators work would be to streamline points in the tool from page 1-10, shorten but keep key concept on paper
- Parties work to provide focused points in bullet point manner, inject or insert after sub-title or specific elements after accounting
- After that, still work to be done by Co-Facilitators to cut & paste for accounting and specific elements of accounting
- Regardless of whether approach can fly, if it could, we should decide on the deadline of work for parties and co facilitators
- Two issues
 - Attribution.
 - Whether views should be attributed - party, party/groups, groups/party banana/Apple(nickname)
 - From our group, reluctant to accept attribution
 - Hope to find equal footing before coming back to Bonn, bones and flesh
 - Recognize some views that first we should have structure or clusters before moving forward but that attribution would be awkward
 - Subheading of specific elements
 - Cannot accept any appendices
 - Need to figure out placement after caveat
 - Avoid any appendix in new iteration
 - Shortened version of cluster 1.1,2.1
 - Question whether we need to engage in these clusters
 - If we replicate this cluster, in the next session we might reopen procedural issue
- At the next session we should begin directly with number or nickname of party/group focused points, that could cover key points in clusters
- Help us find equal footing in the work to be done next year

Papua New Guinea

- Support Marshall Islands
- Confused
- Concern is going to be a procedural one
- The most authentic document we have is the Informal note that has aggregated all parties views
- Yesterday you organized a room for us to work on the document, no one willing to work with us
- Uncomfortable with this product that is cooked from one party unless it came from a Roundtable

- Procedurally could close this document and ask Parties for views on how to move forward

Russian Federation

- Thank Australia for their tremendous efforts to streamline and make text user friendly
- In our view the proposal by Australia is a constructive one
- Furthermore, believe it is in line with the PA
- Prepared to work with this document further

Switzerland

- Don't want to comment fully now
- Have one question to China -
- Understood that 1.1,2.1 to disappear and replaced by Parties' submissions
- What would you expect as being then the first issue discussed next may in Bonn?

Saudi Arabia

- Thank hard work for producing paper
- Suggestions we are hearing are based on this paper
- Welcome opportunity to engage on this proposal
- Clear mandate needed to give to the co-facilitators on how to proceed
- In original proposal from Australia- proposed that 1.1, 2.1 remain as appendices or not, and if party inputs captured in main document?
- Respond to Switzerland since share views of china:
- We've helped parties in providing focused submission for this, have been in some shape or form or in some ways captured in 1.1,2.1. We have identified mistakes (but we may be mistaken) in both, in capturing language or idea, that also exist and delivered in other instances we have met
- Next Bonn, we would engage on these options and party views captured in a document and this document will take us forward
- If we can create this basket of options, as 1.1,2.1 does, we can do that in a formal setting

Co-Facilitator clarified her understanding of Australia proposal:

- Integrate into main text, into information and accounting
- Or
- Delete and replace
- Have heard that some parties are not happy with engaging in this document as they are seeing it for the first time
- It is short and one page and reflects the tool you saw yesterday
- Not trying to persuade Parties to accept this but in there is not much time to find creative ways forward

India

- Nice to be in a room where we are finding greater convergence, credit to be given to Australia who has done homework on this issue to try and find a way to take us to a convergence and way forward
- Associate with China
- Address two points in relation to Australia's proposal:
- Cluster 1.1,2.1 - synthesis made by co-facilitator, did not belong to any party as such, had some reservation on the way the cluster as structured and balance of elements and views of both sides, useful to leave the clusters aside and move on with document that reflects the views of all parties
- Part of main document or appendices, preference to have views as part of main document so as to be able to consider the document as a whole

Brazil (Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay)

- Appreciate Australia's proposal
- Ready to engage with this proposal, as we have been ready to engage in substance since beginning of this session
- To work, would be key to have clear understanding of who and how would shorten the streamline clusters
- Not best way to structure our discussion
- Appreciate a shortened version
- Flexible on their or not it would be included in body or annex
- With regards to attribution, we don't care
- Comfortable to give you mandate to streamline and cut pages 1-11, but flag from start that this groups submission is not reflected in the section
- On CTU how to get to shortened views for next discussion
- Understand what is in 2.1 is caveat on nothing is agreed etc., but there seems to be an understanding there is no discussion to be had on some of these items
- Will not put forward these views not but better to understand who and how will do the work... that's the key point here

Co-facilitators clarified that if Parties give the mandate to streamline, then they will do it, up to Parties' decision.

China (LMDC)

- Short answer to Switzerland, focusing on outcome of this session
- Purpose of this session is to find a proper way to make sure document or tool or draft negotiating text reflects views in a balance manner
- Purpose Australia's proposal is to reflect views in a balanced manner
- Make some a little tired to think about something that will happen in half a year
- Why we propose to drop cluster 1.1,2.1 is to drop procedural debate
- What we can do with draft negotiating text, first is to DDD
 - Digest in next half a year (guessing the nickname)
 - Discuss base on solid material, debate with each other on specific elements
 - Develop some bridging proposal, middle ground, way out

Marshall Island (AOSIS)

- Exchange is useful
- If we do go down this route, this group will submit its position from the original non-paper entirely as our input
- In that context, approach raises questions
- Do we streamline or not?
- If so, who would do it?
- Don't see the value added to the current Informal note
- Don't have the mandate of the group to change much, only to remove redundancies
- Not acceptable to us to move forward
- If anything went to the substance of the original non-paper, cannot accept and no mandate

Ethiopia (LDCs)

- Thank Australia
- Can work on not having annexes and not having 1.1,2.1
- Some things missing from our submission
- We would like to see those things in there, considering we did not mention this yesterday
- If we can either send you inputs now that you can include in the main body and not in the annexes
- Don't understand if we are adding value to this process but can take things forward
- Our priority now is to send views to be included
- Don't see the point of attribution because by now we know who owns which point
- Perhaps we can give you the elements we think are missing and you can address them

Zimbabwe (African Group)

- Appreciate proposal by Australia
- Potential in proposal
- Support that 1.2,2.1 as stated, party views added not as attachments but used to improve and reflect all Party views
- In next iteration, all party views to be included
- Reserve right to add

European Union

- Left room yesterday requesting an opportunity to review the preliminary material
- Now we have Australia's proposal which has the objective to improve
- Removes CTU, accounting but replaced by party's own views
- Attribution important
- Parties who do not wish to be named could submit as anonymous
- Clusters did indeed capture all views as noted in yesterday but in features - non-inclusion of features

- Do not think streamlining of certain clusters necessary but fine to engage with parties if they wish to

Colombia

- Thank colleagues for spirit of compromise in this room
- Think we are moving forward
- Parties are free to bring forward issues on the proposals
- Raised suggestion to add features raised yesterday
- Understand work remains to be done tomorrow or by Monday
- Find space for convergence or divergence
- Believe that to provide parties with assurance that must be clear in this tool on views of parties it will be clear headings or titles that these are Parties views

Iran

- Original Informal note was controversial, many difficulties to accept
- Preliminary material was a way out of that
- That text included many elements and could spur some discussion
- But resistance from some groups made it difficult to move yesterday
- Possible for Co-Facilitators to copy and paste but parties do reserve the right to ask for views to be further added

United States

- Thanked Australia
- Workable way forward
- Round of submissions workable
- Trust in you to include our submissions in next iteration
- Can see that happening as a valuable approach
- Ultimate thing is to give facilitators opportunity to take another crack at this
- Important to be able to come up with a workable form to move forward

Mexico

- Thanked Co-Facilitators and Secretariat, acknowledge work by Australia
- See text as going to be challenging but need to move so we can DDDD
- head some parties saying it was quick but discussion has been useful
- Can see usefulness of this tool
- Discussion has given us enough time to discuss and understand this proposal by Australia
- Happy to engage
- Have clarification for Co-Facilitators on remaining time we have for this session

Switzerland

- Thanked Australia for the proposal, good way to bring us forward

- Have four points:
 - Have to be able to comment on the black items on the screen
 - Submissions without country identification - we cannot work with this, important to know who is submitting what, invites making submissions we not stand behind, do not want the nickname system
 - Do not understand deletion of clusters 1.1, 2.1, what do we do if we attach all of party submissions? Do we attach them all together? Not sure if we will have something digestible
 - We are moving to something worse than the Geneva text, not a brilliant outcome of our work here
 - Need safeguards
 - Came to Bonn to work on substance, better understand the substance needed
 - Leaving Bonn - need a clear & common understanding to discuss substance

India

- Respond to Switzerland - serious reservations on the clusters, have explained
- Don't feel comfortable with the way it is structured and balance of views not there
- Would drop 1.1,2.1

Co-Facilitators emphasized that it would not be their decision to keep or drop, it is Parties' decision.

China (LMDC)

- Feel tired, upset
- Represent half of the world's populations
- Drop 1.1,2.1 - yesterday we recognized that these clusters cannot fly or work
- Willing to work with others to address but for the sake of closing this session decently and with a document we can move forward with, we can be flexible and work with the proposal put up on the screen
- Ok to compromise and find some bridging proposal
- That's logic also applies to our position since we have serious concerns on clusters
- Unwilling to engage in clusters, will not repeat reasons
- No consensus better to drop them

Co-Facilitators made observations at this point during the impasse:

- If there is an Informal note coming out of this session, not agreed by parties but something parties agree to work on if they choose to accept it
- We are at your disposal, can do whatever you tell us to do but don't see a consensus in the room on what we should do
- We need to resolve this as we are the most advanced group, it would be a shame to not have something to show for it

Australia

- Two suggestions
 - Attribution
 - If parties agree they could indicate if they would like to be attributed, otherwise numerically identified in table of contents
 - Some willingness to engage or ask facilitators to revise then note and reflect and adding input from Parties
 - The one issue I'm hearing divergence on is treatment in Cluster, could we ask the co facilitators to look into this

Saudi Arabia

- On attribution, have heard views
- We do not understand need for attributions
- Attribution by party or groups not constructive
- If views share some areas of convergence, may be more constructive
- Australia's proposal that attributions can be voluntary

China (LMDC)

- Two quick points:
- To show maximum, constructive, comprised to make it faster than others, to get A+, propose some middle ground issues:
 - Attribution
 - Hope ministers will not kill me
 - Opt in opt out approach by Australia
 - Appeal to all colleagues to be anonymous
 - Hope all of us can be anonymous in this paper
 - Whether we should have clusters 1.1,2.1 or not
 - Smart, short, concise as possible:
 - On 2.1, non-paper, page 14-17 under specific element title - could be useful in streamlining exercise in the spirit of leaving no one behind;
 - Page 10 could be used, bearing in mind some red line/Super red lines
- Make a suicide step to try and help co-facilitators to help us to get something we can move forward with

The Co-Facilitators thanked everyone for their willingness to engage and for frank discussions, would like to indicate some steps and asked for feedback:

- All Parties invited to submit proposals on information and accounting, and it is within their discretion whether they want to be named or not.
- With help of the Secretariat, will streamline appendices 1.1,2.1 & go over text again to see if we can streamline further

- If party thinks there is something missing, please send us your additions for integration
- Taking a risk here because asked by APA Co-Chairs to prepare first iteration of the informal note but we will show it to Parties if we were to label it as an informal note.
- Since it is only to copy and paste, then the proposed deadline for Parties' inputs by tomorrow, Sunday, 12 November 2017, 5pm.
- Co-facilitators said they expected to share proposal with no status by tomorrow 6pm or slightly after.
- Just an exercise, not pre-judging. Not end of discussions, will ask for additional slot to discuss.

Saudi Arabia

- Sought clarifications on party submissions on information and accounting inputs.
- Suggested two deadlines
 - Noon for comments on current preliminary material on clusters
 - That Co-Facilitators take note of all parties who opt in so that if parties wanted to have their input attributed, make it clear on the floor... prefer to see not attributed in the document but parties who want to be attributed make it clear on the floor
- Where would streamlined clusters be on the final paper?

Co-Facilitators said cannot say for sure where to place streamlined clusters for now. On attributions, quite relaxed about it if proposal by Saudi Arabia is accepted, happy to go along.

Marshall Islands content to go along with proposal. On suggestion by Saudi Arabia, we need at least until 5pm.

Switzerland

- On naming submissions, we want to hand in a submission attributed to us.
- Don't see complicated suggestion by Saudi Arabia as necessary.
- Will add Switzerland in several places so it would be impossible to not include it.

Saudi Arabia

- Will make difficulty for technical negotiators but respect views

China noted that footnotes could be used to identify attribution for Parties that wished to have them.

The Informal Consultation ended at 8.33pm.