

APA Agenda Item 3, informal consultations on further guidance in relation to the mitigation section of decision 1/CP.21 (paragraphs 26, 27, 28, 31)

**Notes by Naveeda Khan, JHU, May**

Co-facilitator:

We are tasked with enabling parties to build linkages between agenda items across the work streams. We have to streamline informal note but without removing anything from the table. Aim towards a Navigation Tool. Scope and differentiation “may already be resolved later this year” Have held bilaterals with all parties. Parties are eager to engage. We now want elements in the navigation tool without compromise. We need clear ground rules from Parties on the three sub items. Possible for parties to meet in informal exchange? Over coffee or dinner? This will allow streamline over the next two days. One party has made additional submission. If we get guidance from Parties we will have the navigation tool by Monday. Will request another hour. We have 6 hours total this week. The first hour is for crosscutting issues. The rest allocated this way: 2 hours today for ICTU, 2 hours for accounting for NC and 1 hour Saturday features of NDC. Strict time mgt. Email submissions if we don't get to you in this session. Please do not repeat general inputs.

China on behalf of LMDC:

We support informal notes. We see duplication in subheadings, bullet points, etc. that can be easily streamlined. Elements and options should reflect all views provided by parties. We are very willing to talk. Crosscutting elements, how to use the guidance, such as, shall/should; support for communication of NDCs; Item 4 should reflect differentiation, one set of guidance for developing countries and another for developed; scope of NDC should cover mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation, all the different elements should be incorporated. This should be the full scope of the NDCs; capacity building to developing countries to prepare and communicate NDCs.

New Zealand on behalf of...?

Thank you for constructive input from China. We too like the note. We see duplication. Crosscutting issues: subsequent NDCs is 1 Jan 3031, we need accounting focus. We don't see the need for bifurcated guidance. General guidelines will be applicable to each baseline, this brings in differentiation. Our scope is absolutely mitigation.

Marshall Islands (hard to hear on whose behalf they are speaking)

I support general guidance. Priority...?. China and NZ support this.

Switzerland (on behalf of..?):

Request for regular revisions of early contributions. NDCs will serve as learning curve. Common guidance for all. A division between developing and developed countries not acceptable... Agree with China that informal notes has a lot of.. Scope...

Brazil (on behalf of?):

Note rich and useful. Good basis for discussion to get to formal note. Article 4, isn't it just restricted to paragraph 27 of decision 1 of CP21? Differentiation embedded.

Crosscutting issues: placeholders/short narrative on adaptation commitment (APA 4, Article 9.5); support from developed countries; information on accounting and ICTU; common understanding in linking, no duplication across bodies.

Zimbabwe on behalf of Arica Group

Welcome the proposal. Crosscutting: comparability of capacity building in input; need to support the implementation of guidelines; time of application of guidelines for NDCs post 2025; differentiation is a crosscutting issue; full scope of NDCs should be in guidelines, not just mitigation discussion; accounting in here and in transparency, duplication?

Ethiopia

Zimbabwe well represented our position; much duplication; can co-facilitators provide guidelines, capacity building important; timing has to be suitable for NDCs (common time frames?)

Korea

We see 17 options in informal note that can be reduced to 4 substantial ones. Informal consultation needing among parties. Technology is where differentiation is most relevant.

Bulgaria on behalf of EU

We need to be able to live with the outcome. The idea of navigation tool seems promising.

Saudi Arabia on behalf of Arab Groups

We align ourselves with the LMDC position

Scope, all components should be reflected; differentiation, two sets of guidelines; we don't accept a redefinition of differentiation.

Indonesia on behalf of?

Guidelines should not apply to the first NDC but to the next one. Flexibility for developing countries.

India

Align myself with LMDC

The Informal note is a good starting point. Full scope of NDCs, transparency, compliance should all be considered in their entirety. In decision 1 CP21, NDCs have been emphasized, there is no speaking of mitigation component alone. The devil is in the details. India and China made a submission earlier. India revises it and says that the historical consideration of GHG from before industrial revolution is one of our options (?)

St Lucia

Aligns with Marshall Islands; streamline; comfort for all parties; cross cutting issues are: scope of our guidelines be on mitigation. We don't see need for bifurcation. General guidelines is better to allow us to see NDCs in their aggregate.

Egypt

Associates with Zimbabwe. Note good starting point. Operationalize the full scope of NDCs; differentiation; guidelines for accounting should be simple, not prescriptive nor mandated. Developed countries should provide support for implementation. Countries need help in preparing NDCs.

Iran

Aligned with LMDC. Full scope: NDC is the only tool that has been accelerated and circulated so far since the PA. PA was considered a package deal so NDC has to be considered accordingly...

South Africa

Associates with Zimbabwe on behalf of Africa Group

Navigation tool...applicability of 2030 mandate, voluntary going forward...(?)

The session moves into second hour in which second co-facilitator notes that previous discussion was conducted in constructive note, pleased about that, and now move on to substantial discussion on elements. I leave after this.