

2 May 2018

SB 48, APA Agenda item 3 (mitigation)

10:00-12:00 and 17:00-18:00, Genf

Jennifer Huang, C2ES

Next steps: Continuing with accounting tomorrow, 17:00-18:00 in Room Genf.

My shorthand/acronyms:

GROUP/Country intervening on behalf of group: (other group/party statements supported by group/country)

CF = co-facilitator

ID = identify

MPGs = modalities, procedures, and guidelines

PA = Paris Agreement

PAWP = Paris Agreement Work Program

§ = section

¶ = paragraph

Art = article

Re = regarding

LTG = long-term goal

L&D = loss and damage

MOI = means of implementation

CB = capacity building

ICTU = information for the comparability, transparency, and understanding

Bilat = bilateral

PaMs = policies and measures

BAU = business as usual

FTCB = finance, technology transfer, and capacity building

ABU = Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay

... = missed intervention (sorry)

10:00-12:00 session

CF:

- (Summarized APA co-chairs' remarks and instructions on working to streamline the text)
- We've conducted bilats with groups over past few days. Parties continue to hold strongly divergent views, which makes streamlining task very difficult. We need clear ground rules from parties; urge you to discuss outside these informal sessions to find consensus on how to streamline navigation tool. Aware that one group of parties have made submission in the interim; will be taken into account.
- Time allocation as follows:
 - 1 hour for comments on approach outlined and hearing views on cross-cutting issues related to agenda item (now)
 - 2 hours for proposals related to ICTU (today)
 - 2 hours for accounting for NDCs (tomorrow and Friday)
 - 1 hour for features of NDCs (Saturday)
- Questions on screen as starting point for interventions

- We won't be carrying over speaker list to next session; please submit any interventions not given to secretariat
- Please don't repeat general statements and views already given; concise inputs, reactions, and adding to views already given

General issues related to agenda item

China (LMDCS):

- Support informal note as good starting point. Lengthy because analysis of substantive elements, content of submissions, and repetition.
- Expectations for this session: maintain options and elements to respect all views of parties.
- Time of application: Parties should apply guidance to subsequent NDCs with NDC target year of 2031+. Parties *can* apply to existing NDCs, but up to individual party. Guidance is meant to support to parties for preparation and communication of NDCs; "may include" should not be changed with respect to guidance.
- Structure of guidance should reflect Art 4 and differentiation (between developed and developing countries).
- Scope: Understand Art 3 that NDCs include mitigation, adaptation, and MOI.

NZ

- Support informal note and see lots of commonalities and opportunities to condense things while respecting different options.
- Cross-cutting issues: accounting as it applies to subsequent NDCs (2030 onwards).
- Information could be updated as part of communication process; room for discussion.
- Bifurcated guidance in terms of structure and scope: general guidance applicable to all, but what's applicable will deal with differentiation question. Guidance related to mitigation section.

RMI (AOSIS)

- Support approach on the way forward
- Overarching priority in cross-cutting issues is guidance that is useful and completing mandate in all areas by COP 24.
- Agree with points made by China and NZ on importance of CB

Switzerland

- Application: Applies from 2026 because in the spirit of Paris; at some moment for everyone.
- Regular revision on mitigation contributions: countries at different starting points but we agreed to improve over time. Regular revisions over time important. CMA decision to decide first and subsequent revisions.
- Structure: We agreed to system applicable to all with common guidance while respecting nationally determined nature. Bifurcated guidance not acceptable; common to all guidance. Only bifurcated scenario we could envision as potentially acceptable to ministers would be guidance according to other parameters, e.g. GDP criteria or emission levels.
- Scope: Clearly defined.

Brazil (Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil):

- Informal note useful tool to start.
- Guidance should encompass all elements of Paris decision and Art 4.
- Differentiation: built into Art 4 and should be reflected in guidance to be developed.

- Linkages: two categories: 1) info coming into guidance that could be reflected through placeholders or short narrative (e.g. specific on adaptation communications, support to be provided by developed countries) and 2) info going out, e.g. info on accounting and CTU.
 - Not useful is replication of these discussions in different rooms. Common understanding of these issues would be useful.

Zimbabwe (AGN):

- Support for implementation of guidelines key component.
- Time of application of guidance from 2025 onwards.
- Differentiation as reference in Art 4; guidance should express.
- Scope: reflect full scope in guidelines, even if this is a mitigation discussion. Should not replicate other discussions on accounting here.

Ethiopia (LDCs?) (supporting AGN):

- Support approach given. Need tool to make document more easily navigable.
- Need for support expressed.

Korea:

- Support need for new tool. Current informal note not appropriate to serve basis for our work, even though we support. We need to better organize elements within different options. 17 options but substantively I see maybe four options. We need to talk amongst ourselves to more clearly identify those options. Urge parties to have informal consultations for clear direction to CFs.
- Differentiation: we all have strong positions. We support tech differentiation according to NDC type.

EU: Required outcome for COP 24 is establishing one set of guidance for all NDCs with flexibility. Important we all engage in discussion so we have outcome we can all live with. Navigation tool sounds like promising way forward.

KSA (Arab Group) (align with LDMCs):

- Current informal note good basis for moving forward. Want to see Arab Group proposal reflected.
- Scope: all components reflected (mitigation, adaptation, mitigation co-benefits, MOI)
- Differentiation: Two sets of guidance for developed and developing countries. Don't accept redefinition of differentiation.

Indonesia: ...

India (aligned w/ LMDCs):

- Informal note good starting point. Includes options, including one that doesn't have a basis in the PA – levels of emissions and GDP. We don't accept such categorization.
- Stress full scope of NDCs.
- India would like to revise submission and make an additional submission that will include historical contributions to GHG emissions as an option.

St. Lucia (CARICOM) (associated w/ AOSIS):

- Need more manageable document; appreciate way forward. Lots of overlapping views.
- Scope: relates to mitigation; our work is specifically under that heading.
- Guidance: three distinct areas, appreciate time allocations.

- Bifurcation: We don't see bifurcated guidance. Emphasize commonalities among all parties in guidance.

Egypt (associated w/ AGN):

- Informal note good starting point. Streamlining needed to reduce redundancies while reflecting/maintaining options, elements.
- Scope: Art 3 (mitigation, adaptation, MOI) and differentiation. Full scope fundamental to solving other issues.
- Guidance for info and accounting should be as simple as possible.
- CB is important for preparing, communicating NDCs.

Iran (associated w/ LMDCs):

- Informal note good basis for continuing discussions.
- NDC only tool for parties to inform others of implementation of their obligations and ambitions under PA.
- Scope comprehensive.

South Africa (associated w/ AGN):

- New document not a good use of our time; continue working on informal note; good starting point.
- Applicability: 2030 onwards; voluntary going forward.

Discussion on ICTU

CF Sin: Hope we can continue in same positive spirit.

On screen: Informal note, page 8: https://unfccc.int/files/meetings/bonn_nov_2017/in-session/application/pdf/apa_3_informal_note_final_version.pdf

Australia:

- Quantifiable info on the reference point
 - Parties should provide three particular elements:
 - Party's reference indicator – reference point/baseline against which party chosen to compare outcome
 - Value or source of reference indicator – provided for indicative purposes
 - Conditions under which party might update reference indicator
 - Not all aspects of NDC quantified; relevant to those parties who have one.
 - All other info other than actual target is info provided for CTU; space for parties to specify whatever headline target to provide narrative
- Assumptions and methodological approaches
 - Parties tell us what intended accounting approach is
 - Parties provide description how they structure baseline or reference level
 - IPCC methodologies/metrics chosen to use
- This info is really important; parties will need to track progress in transparency process. Refers to info parties have come up with while coming up with NDC; it just summarizes what they've done to come to their numbers. Guidance does not prescribe how to do, just asks how you've done it. High-level key description.

Chile (AILAC):

- Info fundamental for achievement of PA goals; integrity of NDCs depends on info provided.

China (LMDCs):

- ¶ 27 of Paris decision scope elements meant to humiliate LMDCs and we cannot support. Just adopted under pressure of parties in Lima and Paris. “Enough is enough.” We have shown max amount of flexibility and that’s the maximum we can accept and no further. Environmental integrity and equity doesn’t depend on info but on real action. What developing countries care about are the co-benefits of actions and poverty eradication and sustainable development. If we really believe in the PA and really want to implement, stop making this all about the numbers on paper. Any further elaboration of ¶ 27 will further humiliate us.
- Reference point values -- what if we have innovative types of NDCs next round? We cannot predict. Some NDCs are policies and projects.
- Parties don’t need to provide indicators for any adjustment of NDCs. Parties also need to protect classified information. Not feasible to put our officers in jail for revealing confidential information.
- Scope and coverage issues: beyond capacity for many developing countries.
 - No common definitions, e.g. sectors and categories. Our definitions often relate to classified data sources; we cannot provide information.
 - Geographical coverage and whether NDC covers 100% of GHG emissions in territory. Some countries have territorial debates. This crosses red lines and triggers sensitive issues.

RMI:

- We have good reasons for needing this information.
- Guidance for all membership recognizing range of experiences and NDCs. Guidance on info should lay out types of info to achieve CTU so we can figure out what atmosphere will see in terms of emissions. CTU critical for success of Paris Agreement and staying within 1.5C limit.
- Not all types of info relevant for all parties and NDCs; must recognize.
- Scope of discussion should not be limited to what we see here or in ¶ 27.
- CB critical, particularly for SIDS to comply with guidance we produce. Access in environmental info is a severe constraint for us.

Brazil (Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay):

- Onscreen list useful guide for discussion; build on ¶ 27 to include other elements, including those in Art 4.
- Fairness and ambition section starts to capture more detail on how parties considers how NDC fair and ambition. Progression, highest possible ambition, informed by outcome of GST, how developed countries takes lead, how developing countries move towards economy-wide targets (progression). Include how party views contribution in context of Convention and PA.
- Additional general info on NDC and its components; elaborated in submission.

EU:

- Support Australia’s proposal
- Planning processes: 1) elaboration, e.g. if it came from cabinet decision. 2) implementation – domestic policies intended to be pursued and any linked plans, e.g. long-term development strategy.
- Consideration of mitigation co-benefits could also be considered here.

KSA (Arab Group) (support LMDCs):

- Add bullet on info on mitigation co-benefits per Art 4.7

Zimbabwe (AGN):

- Clarify elements highlighted on screen.
- Comprehensive scope of gases and include all sectors for developed countries; developing countries encouraged to include according to capacity and improve over time
- Fairness and ambition: countries taking lead, express how they are doing so and how increasing ambition
- Additional info on adaptation: don't view info adaptation info as additional but key component.

Colombia:

- Important for developing countries to elaborate on guidance of ¶ 27; we don't see as intrusive into national determination and useful for more understanding
- Elements as tool for us to be clear from what we want to get out of NDC, PA, and LTGs of PA
- Important for our economies to know where are going to be in next 5-10 years

US:

- Maybe we can just tweak nomenclature to encompass all NDCs
- Importance of clarity of info for purposes of environmental integrity
- Re concern that list requiring action on part of country: this is about applicability; no one is going to require you to include sector if you have not already done so. This is not an onerous burden; if onerous, you can choose not to include or include different metrics or explain what you'd like to do if you could.

Mexico:

- Support Brazil's idea on fairness and ambition; share info on how countries see their NDCs as fair and ambitious and progression over time. Could include consider conditional and unconditional sections of NDCs.
- Some stakeholder consultations can be referenced

Norway:

- ICTU guidance should be simple and assist parties. Important concern raised by LMDCs. But also as RMI pointed out, needs to provide sufficient basis for clarity and ability to aggregate.
- On quantification and issue of methods and assumptions, support others; Australia and Brazil laid out important points
- Concerns raised by China, LMDCs: some PaMs might be impossible to quantify but this isn't a straitjacket; it can be encouraged, though.
- Scope and coverage: Concern on how deeply information should be provided; it's simple. Indicate which sectors party considers important, that's all. Useful for perspective and tracking progress.

India (aligned w/ LMDCs): What we don't understand is how guidance for a *nationally* determined contribution be prescriptive? ¶ 27 gives us mandate, so why are we trying to get into details of capacities and national circumstances of countries? Unnecessary to get into these details. Broad framework okay, but further details are not.

Honduras (associated with AILAC): Planning process: Honduras already revisiting NDC in light of new information. We'd like to provide info on those planning processes, etc. to achieve our NDC. Having guidance to estimate effect of our processes would be very useful.

Norway:

- We should create useful tool.
- Three priorities: 1) quantifiable info on references/indicators; 2) scope and coverage; and 3) assumptions and methodological approaches.
 - Scope and coverage: essential to have info on sectors and gases, done as defined by IPCC inventory guidelines. Useful on intended coverage of land sector. Explanation of why gases and sectors excluded. Info on whether party intends to use cooperative approaches. Info on how NDC has considered encouragement.

Japan:

- Elements under assumptions and methodological approaches: description of intention to use ITMOs important.

Costa Rica: ...

17:00-18:00 session

CF Sin: Information across the various item; encourage parties to continue to engage on points raised.

Canada:

- Responding to proposals about changing points on screen and references to “additional” particularly around adaptation and support: those views are widely known and haven't changed.
- Focus on three things:
 - Quantifiable info on reference point: agree with Australia's proposal and we elaborate in our submission about headline target. Distinctions between reference indicators and reference points. NDC document v submission: requirements in PA don't apply to every word that party puts in NDC submission:
 - 1) means we'll have conversations about elements of guidance not relevant to all parties, e.g. any party not currently using or not intending to use particular reference point in their NDC;
 - 2) means some issues or topics that some parties currently mention or wish to mention in their submissions for which we do not need to develop guidance here because they're not relevant to legal requirements.
 - China's point about changing quantifiable info: any party may adjust NDC at any time but what we're talking about in terms of changing reference indicators is a technical update rather than a change in ambition.
 - Agree with China that we're not here to create new requirements not agreed in Paris.
 - Planning processes - No points on guidance mandatory, but useful. Help public servants designing NDCs. Helps share best practices between parties on planning processes.
 - Scope/coverage of NDC, particularly with reference to sectors – Info; different defined IPCC sectors. Which sectors covered/excluded in context of what party intends to achieve?

Korea:

- Working under assumption that we're working on guidance that is something more than what we have. What we have is not enough and not specific enough, esp info concerning reference points. That's the key. Not enough for other reasons, for other parties. We need more guidance, not only in terms of CTU, or whether guidance is prescriptive enough since guiding word is "may." Current NDCs are not clear and transparent and that needs to be addressed.
- Brings up issue of comparability. Others have pointed out that NDCs nationally determined, but we also have features – once we determine what is absolutely necessary for CTU of NDCs, it should be provided. They should be mandatory items. Other pieces of info may not need to be voluntary, but still useful. Parties have determined NDCs according to national capacities and circumstances; they have full ownership but also responsibility to be transparent about their NDCs. Parties should be able to provide the info necessary for CTU. Info not a matter of capacity; in process of establishing NDC this info is generated. It's a matter of disclosure.
- Substantively, four options throughout info guidance:
 - 1 Mitigation-centric info not differentiated between developed and developing countries.
 - 2 Scope inclusive of other elements and bifurcated between developed and developing countries.
 - 3 Scope inclusive of other elements in Art 9.5 and partially bifurcated between developed and developing, with respect to 9.5
 - 4 List of ICTU options and not differentiated.

St. Lucia:

- Re ¶ 27, it's not the beginning or end; look at ¶ 28 and Art 4.8 also needs to guide. In light of requirement, ¶ 27 is necessary info, but not sufficient; we need more info. Goal is to help parties report; to that end, detailed guidance to help parties know what is expected so we can assess in aggregate where parties' efforts are going.
- Expectation that parties will provide description of their NDC with some specificity.
- Scope/coverage, to be helpful to parties it's useful if guidance is clear about gases we're looking for information on. IPCC gases and sectors. So when parties read guidance they understand what's expected. Clearly specify whether land sector in or not and how; problem with the first set of NDCs.
- Need for more specific info: important to get enough info with respect to different NDCs types to get some quantification.
 - For BAU, we need more info, e.g. methodologies, models, assumptions for key inputs, GDP, population growth, and whether BAU target fixed and timing up any updates. Index used, GDP or population? Timing of planned updates.
 - Carbon neutrality targets: how land sector counted.
 - Quantification of expected emission reductions from policies and measures.
- Helpful to understand ambition of NDC:
 - Information on past emissions trends useful.
 - Relevant national circumstances useful
 - Description of domestic mitigation targets useful

Kuwait (associated w/ LMDCs, Arab Group, India):

- Scope should include adaptation, MOI
- ...

Israel:

- NDCs must contain mitigation component and info must contain related info because part of how to assess progress towards Art 2
- Differentiation explicitly included via national determination of contributions

Indonesia: ... (can't hear)

Brazil (Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay): In reaction to what necessary info or mandatory or voluntary info is: let's not look at guidance to be agreed to at COP in that lens. Our exercise is that party *shall* provide the info necessary; it's mandatory, and we all signed up. That doesn't necessarily translate into specific types of information that is mandatory when we give guidance on how to implement. Facilitative guidance rather than prescriptive guidance and keep it in a manner that keeps it open to all types of NDCs.

China (LMDCs):

- We're hearing constructive proposals for identifying options; useful for moving forward.
- Divergence on whether mandatory. Mandatory nature of Art 4.8 is that we provide info, but what is provided is not mandatory. Nationally determined whether info necessary or not.
- We're not only talking about mitigation. Really need FTCTB in the communication of NDCs. Financial support and technical support and CB should have detailed plan in NDCs that ensure future preparation of NDCs. Encourage developing country parties to provide detailed info on their support needs and in what areas.

EU:

- Applicability allows us to address diversity of self-differentiation in NDCs. It's about assisting parties, rather than directing parties to take new action. Parties have already gathered most of this information in the creation of their NDCs.
- PA Art 4.6 already includes specific provisions for LDCs and SIDS to reflect their particular circumstances.
- Support interventions on fully understanding extent of mitigation contributions.
- Applicability to all types of targets; info on sectors, categories, removals and gases. Continued coverage on sectors, categories, removals and gases previously covered.
- Unlike accounting guidance that applies from NDC2 onwards, we see this guidance applying from 2020 onwards.

NZ:

- Don't see options on structure particularly useful way forward. Let's not operationalize structure; it hasn't helped us before. Work together to try to merge views rather than alienate them.
- Don't see how additional info on support or adaptation really advances our work in terms of the mandate.
- Interesting constructive exchange between LMDCs and ABU: Art 4.8 creates mandatory requirement to provide ICTU, and we're trying to provide guidance on what that info might look like. Willing to explore guidance not being mandatory, but useful if it helped guide parties by listing info that could be applicable for viable types of baselines or reference points set forward in NDCs, then also useful to include something on info where NDC that does not contain reference point.

Colombia (AILAC): "Prescriptive" is the word that we'd like to see in guidance, but we can work on applicability dependent on type of NDC. We'd need to work on this.

China (LMDCs):

- “Applicability” is an issue of differentiation. If you agree, we can engage in this discussion, and discuss whether each and every element is applicable to developed or developing countries only.
- Types of NDCs: different views on whether there can be tailored guidance for types of NDCs; if we give prescriptive, detailed guidance for NDCs, that gives parties space for freeriding. Parties can innovate types of NDCs to avoid giving certain information.

RMI:

- Probably better to have some of these conversations informally over coffee
- Prescriptiveness: it’s a mandatory requirement to be clear; it’s on the face of the PA. Question is what info needs to be provided to fulfill that requirement? Fundamental difference in philosophy in what CTU is for. For some parties, notion of CTU is different from NDC (CTU there to explain NDC). For other parties, CTU *is* the NDC. If you’re prescribing the info you require, fear that in that prescription you’re saying what needs to be in your NDC. We should talk about it, but we don’t have time here.
- From our perspective, we want guidance relevant to us.
- CB and support is an issue, but question arises when developing NDC. Once we produce NDC, and you’re of view that your NDC is CTU, then the two are linked.

India:

- Interesting to note that Art 4.8 only talks about who will provide info, and doesn’t talk about *what* info will be provided. “Guidance” tends to give us meanings like “advice.” Gives flexibility to party to whom advice is offered. We should not be confused between guidance and prescriptions.
- Points raised re MOI: guidance should be seen as new action undertaken by parties. That’s fine, but guidance should help parties reflect ambition and help developed parties to reflect their mandated leadership in these issues. MOI absolutely important aspect of NDCs for us. If we don’t incorporate it, we’ll see tremendous problems when developing countries create NDCs. It’s only just.
- No party in this room adverse to giving info. It’s a matter of capacity and national circumstances.

NZ:

- Agree:
 - Art 4.8 about who, not what
 - Guidance is there to guide.
 - Diversity of NDCs
- Info is about what info appropriate for clarifying understanding of baseline or target being put forward; NZ doesn’t like saying “type” of NDC.

China (LMDCs):

- On projection of population and GHGs: clear that is no-go for LMDCs. If purpose of different info for different NDCs, whether encouraged or prescribed, projections of GDP and population are a redline.

CF Sin:

- Good start to session; good spirit of openness and willingness to explore views with each other and clarify views. Tone of interventions sincere.
- We took careful notes and taking into account with revisions to informal note.
- Tomorrow we continue with **accounting 17:00-18:00 in Room Genf.**