

Margaret Jackson
Georgetown University
November 8, 2017

APA Agenda Item 3 Informal Session (3-4 pm)

Continuation of speaker list from this morning

Indonesia

- Non-paper is a good starting point
- Propose to sketch a structure for elements of points that have already been captured in the non-paper, agree with proposals by China, Brazil, and Bangladesh

United States

- Convergence about taking politics out of the equation, converge over technical grounds, center around non-paper which includes submissions of all parties
- Certain parties did not want to prejudice their positions, going one way or the other is not helpful
- Brazil's proposal is a middle option
 - US uncomfortable with some parts, but it gives us a place to start
 - Some prejudicial ideas still present

Is Brazil's option acceptable to all parties?

- EU requests proposal repeated
- Brazil
 - Idea was to lay out the options for structure in terms of both format, whether one or more decisions with or without annexes, as well as approaches you have outlined already in non-paper
 - We are not prejudging structure or approach, working on substance
- China
 - Clarification, for this round of intervention, is this a response for new proposal or for next step? (Answer: Both)
 - Speaking on behalf of many developing countries
 - On point from roundtable, here is China's view on structure
 - Highlight - heard party mention para 27 further detailed guidance would be helpful to communicate NDC
 - Something helpful for one country may not be for another
 - Since we have para 27 and 21, why should we agree to something that's humiliating us?
 - Two perspectives,
 - Agree on PA
 - Feel somewhat humiliated, but agreed to commit
 - Don't want to hear questions like why are you so dumb or feel humiliated? Sometimes that is part of life.
 - We have to agree, otherwise someone will name us as a blocker

- That is life, we cannot deny it
- I don't want to always have to answer this question
- Para 27, 31
 - Not an outcome negotiated by parties word by word, just a package deal, take it or leave it
 - For human beings, for the common good of humankind, we can accept
 - We want to act in the spirit of compromise, but enough is enough
 - We cannot agree further elaboration on para 27
 - Why?
 - Info on projection of GDP for target year
 - Beyond our capacities
 - Cannot have accurate, precise projections for 2030, we cannot predict specific growth for China or other developing countries
 - Projection of GHG by target year
 - Cannot do this either or we would have already
 - Irrelevant to content of NDC
 - Coverage, geographic coverage, what does this mean? Does your NDC cover the whole territory of nation state? This is a sensitive issue.
 - Some countries identify territory in NDC, but there is debate over territory
 - What is the purpose? This will trigger sensitive political issues.
 - Specific info for different types of NDC
 - We cannot exhaust every type
 - Linkage between long term strategy and NDC
 - Issue of differentiation. Why we bring this up?
 - Comes from long history, long story, industrial revolution, colonialism, imperialism, WWI/II
 - Need concrete solution for draft negotiation text
 - Structure of decisions
 - If parties want to bring this up, we are willing to discuss

- Want new proposal with specific rational
- Proposal for how to proceed. Different from BRazil
 - Can agree that there should be an overarching chapter in draft text to id key issues
 - How structure final decision
 - Specific approach for guidance
 - Scope, differentiation and other cross-cutting issues such as cap building
 - Another heading, features
 - Existing features
 - New features
 - General reflection
 - Procedural Elements
 - Issues such as timing, vehicles
 - Substantial elements of information
 - Options, 1. Elaboration of Para. 27, flexible to this option, or 2. Two sides of guidance: General info, Info for Developed Countries, Info for Developing Countries
 - Accounting
 - General principles
 - Substantial elements
 - Structure guidance under Para. 31 or two sides of guidance: developed and developing, and general guidance for all
- This is how we can make progress, listing bullets will not work
- All these elements are flesh, but we do not have bone. Need bone to organize flesh into clear issues, clear points, this is fundamental to next step so we can negotiate.

Other country inputs

Russia

- Not comfortable with proposal to have two sets of guidelines because it's inconsistent with Paris Agreement
 - Confident that parties can figure out how to use one set of guidelines. Had this approach before, can use it again.
 - We will not change our position.
- We would like to move forward with Brazil's proposal
- Keep the proposal a non-paper

Marshall Islands

- Concerns from different parties on fundamental issues
- Any proposals on way forward cannot prejudice fundamental differences

- Best way is to build on Brazil and get into substance

India

- What China has proposed on behalf of LMDC, we agree with it.
- The two sets of guidelines are in agreement with PA.
- NDCs allows for flexibility
- Why national determined nature is not exactly differentiation
 - The way we approach the scope of NDCs
 - Article 2.2
 - Guidance should be in line with this article
 - Article 2 determines scope
 - Other articles have clear mandate to operationalize differentiation
 - Don't wish to get into a debate whether or not we include differentiation, the question is not if, but how?

Co-facilitator

- Not arguing over substance, but over structure and approach
- Strongly held views that we do not want parallel structures
- Or put in parallel structures as a placeholder (but this would give a false recognition that it's agree upon)
- We will give you something to react to, a piece of paper
 - See picture
 - Give inputs by 12 tomorrow
 - Will then invite interested groups of parties to streamline inputs into similar clusters for each subitem
 - Are parties willing to embark on this exercise?
 - New Zealand
 - These hours are disappointing, we are moving backwards
 - One thing we like, we are talking about how to structure informal note
 - Concerns about feasibility about what you are proposing, it seems like we are embarking on a long process to complete in one night?
 - Not sure of chances of success of parties getting together and streamline this info given the disappointing spirit shown today
 - Ask, can we confer as parties informally to see if we can come up with an alternative option?
 - EU
 - Clarification questions: How many notes? One for each subitem? Info, accounting, features?
 - Yes, there are three different notes, one for each item
- Will streamline overlapping ideas
- Expect bullet form
- Can expand on granularity when have more time, just trying to crystallize concepts in an organized form
 - Marshall Islands

- Agree with New Zealand
- We are talking about an informal note that captures discussion
- Reading reflection notes, para. 20, co-facilitators will capture informal notes
- Already have a non-paper to build on, why do this whole process again?
- China (LMDC)
 - Appreciate effort to find a way out
 - Know an informal note is facilitator responsibility, but also now importance of informal note. How do we take next step and move informal note into a party driven text?
 - To make your job easier and not do more work of developing bullet points, this work could be done by you. CLuster different structures options in a clear, concise manner.
 - Structure could be applied to info, accounting, but features is different
 - Appendix 1, we can use this and have a new subheading
 - Overarching chapter for cross-cutting issues
 - For info and accounting, to cluster views logically, we trust you to present them in a balanced manner
 - Some parties are not comfortable, do not want to duplicate work
- Have a room, Berlin, at 6 pm, can come together and discuss among yourselves, but must close discussion due to lack of time.
- African Group debates time, will not be able to attend at 6 pm
 - China agrees

[Apparently no resolution? Countries may meet tonight informally if available]

Paper provided by Co-facilitators

Caveats

A wide range of stronghold views

Note prejudicing placement

General Agenda

- Purpose of guidance
- Recognition of different starting points/capabilities
- Capacity building to increase capacities

Procedural Aspects

- Timing of applications
- Vehicle to communicate
- Etc

Preliminary Material for developing substantive elements

- The clusters reflect what has been submitted by the parties and does not prejudice the weight of support for them.