

Prepared by: Emma Waltman & Noah Adelstein, Washington University in St. Louis

Date: 12/7/18

Session/Agenda Item: APA agenda item 3: informal consultations on further guidance in relation to the mitigation section of decision 1/CP.21

Location: UNFCCC COP 24, Katowice Poland

Room Number: Meeting Room 20

Date and Time: 12/6/18 @ 12:00-13:00

Participants(name and organization): Larger session

Attachments:

[Joint reflections note, published 17 October 2018](#)

[Draft text on APA 1.7 agenda item 3, version 05/12/2018](#)

[Draft text on APA 1.7 agenda item 3, version 07/12/2018 08:43](#)

Jumping into speakers list

Marshall Islands

- We like reference to 4.5 in preamble
- Disappointed in features - our grouping made it clear - no consensus to remove option b and it still doesn't appear
 - Also supported by other groupings
- Re. para 3 - we support the basic notion, but the language doesn't reflect our position
 - We want 2020
 - SBI should come back with a view to adopt further guidance in that session
- Want to recall there's been lots of features conversation - discussion was to elaborate further guidance so we want that language updated
- On ICTU
 - Support para 5
 - And 6
 - Recalling cp21
 - But to be clear, this isn't adequate as a landing zone - otherwise no further than Paris
 - In 7
 - Want to be clear guidance applies to all parties
 - C.4 -> support as drafted and see it's legally consistent
 - H1
 - We like the way it's handled here strongly support 11, 12, 13 on capacity building

- 14 re. Timing support notion of second and subsequent NDCs
- On issue of revision -
 - If necessary
- 2024 date too late
- Guidance - want to see brought forward - latest revised 2023
- didn't think text achieved re. Land use?
- On paragraph - all parties must account (consistent w Paris)
- 18 f.1 -> want it to be treated as CTU - should only apply to parties with NDC
- 21 seems to be replicating capacity buildings revisions in the text on accounting so not sure why it's repeated
- Date in 27 - revise if necessary but 2024 too late, 2023 at the latest we'd say

Japan

- Thanks
- Disappointed on some matters
- Don't need to include article 3 and 4 - pp1 - understand solved outside this room
- Re. capacity building
 - 4.5 is good for us
 - Pp4 is good w/ caveat of legally describing language - largely we can support
- Features/substantive elements
 - Revisit might have to be somewhere - flexible on timing
 - Support Marshall Islands revision - no consensus yet
 - Para 4 - recalling 4.4
 - We don't support idea to operationalize differentiation **not our mandate in this room (not APA-3s job to deal with diff)
 - Re. para 7 - we strongly support increase - guidelines should apply to all party's NDCs as applicable
- ICTU Re. pg 2
 - Deep concern that different types of NDC info has gone without consensus and 'discussions'
 - H2m - still there - assume there's manner to handle these - disappointing
 - Most of info in these guidelines I think is there, but some clarification needed
 - 2a is fine for us and b is fine, c we need ___ like we said
 - Re. assumptions
 - E4 - IPCC guidelines (should be guidance)
 - *Sector-, category- or activity-specific assumptions, methodologies and approaches consistent with IPCC Guidelines as appropriate, including, as applicable:*
- Paragraphs 8-15
 - Generally support ideas in these paragraphs para 11 - combines 4.5 and 11 creating a new provision as such - so we have to be careful w language to be in line with 4.5
 - Whether CMA should invite parties to do something?
 - Timing application - by 2020

- No consensus to delay in Paris, therefore, paragraph 22 cp21 for accounting guidance
- Accounting
 - Most elements look in good shape, so appreciate your guys work
 - E2 on pg 7 - a little far from language we need to have to avoid double counting
 - Adjustment or corresponding adjustment of emission is needed, which should be consistent with article 6 guidance
 - E on page 7- we already have para 25 (related to Art6)
 - Should use 'article 6' instead of '6.2 or 6.4'
 - Timing of application - no disagreement
 - Para 25 has different issue on application because of Article 6
 - Haven't looked at everything in detail, but we support capacity building language and need crystal clear language so no misinterpretation

Korea

- ICTU
 - Quantifiable info on ref point
 - Measurable improvements from previous ones
 - Greater clarity esp 3rd element
 - Key; was missing
 - Work with other parties to hammer out a clearer interpretation
- Of new text - seems no structural change except
 - Target-specific information is completely dropped
 - We need this - want restored - so equally applicable to all ndcs
- Info on the structured summary of [] something in APA-6
 - Need to wait for final outcome on transparency framework

SAudi Arabia

- Consensus
 - Yes, we're here talking about consensus
 - Consensus not agreeing on some parts, agreeing on some parts
 - Urge that co-facilitator don't put back things that have or don't have consensus
 - Still want to need that mechanism for getting consensus. How??? Tet, email, w/e
- Features
 - Third point
 - Will not revisit features, accounting, or ICTU
 - If going to revisit anything, going to revisit everything
- ICTU
 - Quantifiable
 - Some points have been added that we didn't have consensus; but I see it anchored here
 - Point 5
 - Under accounting not ICTU
 - Point 3 under scope

- Also should be under accounting
 - Planning processes point gst
 - Manner to be discussed by gst not us here.
 - This area is only about how to apply the accounting guidance and how to define assumptions as applicable to NDCs, not to have a very detailed list as here
 - Ref to article 6 should be deleted not a place here
- Agree with brazil on chance of ABU
 - Now the whole text has been bracketed
 - Micromanaging of brackets- why??/
 - Page 4
 - Info on ____ been bracketed in support on finance, technology, so one
- Pg. 5 15
 - Bracketed
 - If going to bracket one provision, want to bracket all of them not just one
- Prefer to see 2nd and subsequent ndcs to be implementing information and accounting
- Accounting
 - Not accept “... on the parties outside the mandage”
 - Things added out of paragraph 31 on page 4
 - Not looking for prescriptive/detailed list ot be there; need to be nationally determined
 - Not in this way
 - By giving details, a lot of things to do
- Anything added without consensus needs to be re-visited

Brazil for ABU

- Take capacity building as a package
 - Think that countries engaged contributed good and constructive spirit and agreeable by group
 - Don't think we need to work on it further
 - Open to discussing more, but strongly prefer the language we have is the landing ground
- Features
 - Par 2 We say the additional paragraph - think it's redundant and not needed
 - No need for paragraph 3
Outlined in Paris
- ICTU
 - Para 4
 - Good paragraph
 - Para 7
 - Our proposal for “to provide” should be included not “shall provide”
 - Very simple, 2 little letters
 - On para 7a - acknowledge good work
 - A iv

- ‘Explanation’ translates not that well - gives ideas you have to present justification in readings and we’d rather use ‘information’ - more precise and accurate word here
- A iii and v
 - important what they’re providing and extent of what they’re providing
 - Would work to try and find language that accommodates all - heard concerns from others
 - Av if a good one
- C iii
 - Needs ‘if applicable’ - big IF
- Di
 - Note of implementation plans go too deep in national policy - already would be moving from what we thought of initially to have notion of implementation if available (can capture)
 - ‘If available on it’s implementation plan
 - Including ‘as appropriate’ colon
- D i b
 - Improvement from what we had
 - Some of the concepts were lost - ideal to have them reflected in preamble to decision - noting that it’s inclusive - highlight important stakeholders
- Reference to domestic mitigation efforts deleted - issue to too many parties, and we’re defending it in other rooms
- D second i (typo from co-facilitators)
 - Have heard concerns from LMDC - I understand it’s weird/strange - propose phrase it ‘as the party has been informed by the outcome in GST in preparing its NDC’
 - Still in parties prerogative to speak to that - close to language as possible
- D iii [?] Heard explanation to like minded in 3
 - Still think can capture info for gaps and barriers
 - ‘Best practices and experiences including info on gaps and barriers’
- E
 - Also improvement from what we had - like what we see in 1-4
- E. v. a
 - list after constructed could list to 200 page ndc if most diligent party (definitely not ours *laughs*) - so keep it simple
 - Let it up to party’s prerogative and don’t need ‘for example’
 - Will get what we want from what we have in a
- E v. b and c
 - Should look at c with b in mind
 - ‘As appropriate’ - maybe: everything is “if applicable” or “as a party decides”
- E vi
 - Know it’s linked to broader issue

- In assumptions/methodological approaches - this language we could work on but recognizing what we do there has to be consistent with whatever comes with article 6 - so anything that comes from that - needs to be consistent and not in conflict what's happening in that room
- F & G
 - We're happy with
- H, I, J
 - Think placeholder approach still applies since other rooms still developing guidance
- Para 11
 - Strongly urge colleagues to keep "decides" and "urges" - idea preparing communicating and accounting as something that's useful
- 14
 - *14. Decides that the information to facilitate clarity, transparency and understanding of nationally determined contributions [contained in annex X][in paragraph X above] shall be communicated by Parties [when communicating or updating their nationally determined contribution by 2020][with their second and subsequent nationally determined contributions, and that Parties may elect to apply this guidance in relation to their first nationally determined contribution, including when communicating or updating it by 2020];*
 - When communicating/updating by 2020
 - When we have 'by 2020 it creates confusion since some parties have already submitted by 2020'
 - So we want to be more encompassing and say 'with their second and subsequent'
 - Second option what we favor still
- 18
 - A
 - also acknowledge didn't make as much progress on smaller metrics in other rooms
 - APA 5 didn't go into this detail, so noting here to do that and bring in DTP and DWP
 - 1
 - A4-6
 - Useful for specific areas of land use and accounting
 - B-d
 - Okay
 - E
 - *e. Avoidance of double counting i. Each Party that pursues voluntary cooperation as referred to in Article 6 of the Paris Agreement shall promote environmental integrity and ensure that double counting is avoided on the basis of corresponding adjustments to the level of emissions by sources and removals by sinks corresponding to their NDC in the structured summary consistent with decisions adopted by the CMA on Article 6; ii. For the avoidance of double counting, where a mitigation outcome is used or transferred for a purpose other than the achievement of a nationally determined contribution, that mitigation outcome shall not be used to demonstrate the achievement of a Party's nationally determined contribution;*

- For Brazil (not Abu) - issue is not issue we have mandate to express and we were surprised to have it here and to have it without brackets especially - not conducive to moving us forward
 - If it stays in next iteration has to have clear bracket - very delegate area for our delegation
 - As I had said before, ideas we're trying to capture here captured in our guidance and they will be from 6.2
 - So when we're talking about e2 - mitigation outcome used for transfer achievement of NDC - not sure what it is, doesn't exist under Paris
 - Takes us back to 2014, so double brackets around little 2
- 19
 - Have to be clear what comes in from Art6. room
 - Keep consistency
 - 'Each participating party shall account for transfer'
 - Has to be same language as other
 - 'Consistent with guidance from 6.2'
 - Also reflected in the text - or at the least in brackets
- ABU hat back on 21-23 are good
- Wait
- Brazil again; abu hat back on 25 "sorry guys"
 - 25 something about brackets
 - 26 - missed a bracket - including structured summary
 - Not allergic to it but

Egypt

- Still going through document and consulting may come back with more details and comments
- Full scope of nds - important for our delegation
 - Want this adequately reflected in the document
- Article 4.4 is crucial to understand the article 4 in general
 - May explain where we're coming from
 - Don't see it adequately reflected
 - Says importantly that we're not going to do the same thing - developed countries will be doing abs mitigation reduction vs. developing will not be doing
 - Developing are encouraged to enhance mit issues and move towards overtime
- Feeling tht from the guidance people are trying to go around that
 - Let's give paris some time; still gresh
 - No time to challenge at this point -
 - A one size fits all type of guidance will not work
 - It is not our mandate
 - It will not work
- Repeat a lot over last days but Don't see reflected throughout document
- Para 2
 - In particular article 3 of the paris agreement
- Para 3

- Should be deleted
- For developing countries, we don't have same starting points, expertise of others, too early to call for a revision at this time
- Give it time to be implemented first
- Then give mandate to cma to decide
- Why need to pre-judge / prematurely do
- Features
 - Text in paragraph 7
 - Diff should be clear and captured
 - Developed countries "should" developing "may" -- if this is not captured to accommodate all NDCs - THEN we'll have to put "if appropriate" or "applicable" everywhere in the document
 - So need to decide now what we want to do.
 - Let's decide now.
 - Easier to be faithful to paris mandate and reflect diversity - operationalized in document - or address issue of applicability
 - A - Quantifiable info
 - I and ii - about reference years - this doesn't accommodate diff types of ndcs (Policy and measures based ones)
 - iii
 - Add "if applicable" if stays as it is
 - Language of what developing and developed should have to submit, recognize timing, but we want to see this in the text.
 - Iv
 - Go to accounting part
 - Add that the reference may not apply
 - Developing countries would not be required to communicate reference points
 - C - Scope and coverage
 - I
 - New insertion here - headline numbers - delegate does not understand what this is
 - Preferred previous form of the paragraph to accommodate diff types of ndcs
 - Ii-v - this should only be under accounting, not features
 - Iv → mainly mitigation; main idea that should be reflected is to accommodate reflected views. For some, mitigation vehicle. Others it is comprehensive and includes all measures of the paris agreement
 - D - Planning processes
 - Operationalize differentiation
 - I a
 - Say developed countries demonstrate leadership as in the PA
 - I sub para b

- Delete
 - I sub para c
 - Not relevant. All parties have prepared - although it is not a requirement under the PA
 - I d
 - National prerogative
 - 9-12 months before CMA
- E - Assumptions and methodological approaches
 - Add to heading 'if applicable'
 - Esp 'those that will be based on policies and methodologies
 - Again this is very detailed
 - Developed "shall" identify approaches and
 - Consistency, fairness, others
 - Developing encouraged to identify... taking into account national circumstances, diff capacities
- F - [missed this; heard to hear]
- Para 14 - application time of the guidance
 - Second and subsequent round of ndcs
- Para 15 text
 - Don't support a revision for the act of guidance
- Para 17 - guidance for accounting
 - A
 - parties account for emissions and removing
 - How is this covered into this option
 - Propose formal language - parties "shall provide the methodologies and information on the indicators used
 - B methodology
 - Support what's being submitted under arab group
 - Comparable methodologies and approaches
 - To explain other types of ndcs - policies and stuff. And ITMOs, definitions use, ensure methodological consistency on reporting on ndsc
- Para 18
 - A iii
 - Idea that parties begin over/under estimating re. Accounting - we understand and think it's a good idea, but think from practicability and implementability, don't see how it'll be implemented
 - What's criteria for overestimating?
 - Very subjective
 - What's normal for me could be over for someone else
 - So, no issue with idea concept, but close to impossible to implement in real time
 - He thanks secretariat for explaining but still
 - C

- Removals and stuff - differentiation we need to see here, developed account for economy wide emissions targets while developing countries may provide [missed____] in accordance with cbdr
 - E - Double-counting
 - Avoiding on double-counting in the most simple language please
 - Without corresponding adjustment
 - Not clear for use
- Para 26
 - Related to the transparency
 - Haven't been able to compare - need clarity in this regard
- Para 27
 - Revision on accounting; need to look over this more
- Will send more comments to the secretariat

Iran

- Aligning with China on behalf of LMDC
- Same concerns on features, information and other items raised by them
- Highlight two points
- Under article 3 on preamble - need clear language on full scope of NDC
 - Believe mitigation action, implementation on national level requires support in tech and capacity building and financial resources
 - Could happen from developing countries - having balanced text covering NDC fullest scope
- Para 7 for differentiation
 - Need very clear language
 - Operationalization leans on full scope of NDC
 - Paris agreement to enhance implementation of the convention and implemented based on quality and CBDR
 - So it's our mandate to formulate NDC doc that could support parties to implementation with balanced stakes based on convention and Paris agreement
 - If there's no consensus on substantive element - it doesn't mean exclude convention of Paris agreement
 - Need clear language - otherwise, will be facing obstacles on implementation from developing countries
- Differentiation reflected in convention - can't exclude important info from the text
- If you implement in Paris agreement and on the national level - as a developing country, we need support

New Zealand

- I think our positions are well known, so won't spend too much time
- Broadly, points that guidance applies to all NDCs as applicable
- Differentiation we think is reflected by nature of NDC - but agree on capacity building

- Understand scope of this is mitigation - parties can include anything, but that'd be linked to guidance developed elsewhere
- Think any guidance can and should be reviewed as it's fit for purpose
- Hope this guidance is applicable at the earliest moment possible - so we think important part of enhancing NDC as we re- submit by 2020 is to apply ICTU since it'll help everyone understand what's in the NDCs - valuable enhancement
- Around particular points
 - I think we can hit landing zones on lots of technical material
- ICTU
 - Reference to IPCC guidelines, but should be guidance
 - Planning processes section
 - Insufficiently recognizes situation of rights holders
 - More than just participation - those in society with rights
 - Reference to long preamble is insufficient
 - So we think it needs work and para d is important
- Accounting
 - A3
 - Reference to article 4.14 to anchor
 - E - avoidance of double counting
 - More work needed - I was involved, trying to find language under e2
 - Non-article 6 avoidance
 - Inadequate - states principle but doesn't give guidance or address underlying mitigation
 - Would be looking for something referencing corresponding adjustment - to article 6
 - Article 6 will describe how you do corresponding adjustment - will see reference there important
 - Para 25
 - Confused why article 6 puzzled up - don't think it's helpful
 - Para 26
 - Quite reasonable to refer to structured summary
- With all these pieces coming together as a package - idea of waiting for others in other rooms to do stuff - we think is insufficient so reference we would like to see retained
- And also think more work needed on capacity building
 - Important principle, but need right references in right places

Australia

- Support New Zealand
- Discussions before of place of paragraph 3 - suggest bracketing this before
- Para 4- new - thought it would make things clearer.
 - Lets bracket this - less clear
- Format

- Should not prejudice if single or separate decisions
 - Poss of diff decisions on this doc should be reflected and retained
- Agree with Brazil about accounting
 - Just state what data sources are (remove “”)
- China
 - Multi-year targets I don't think is about multiple year targets; referring to carbon budgets, countries whose target expressed over a period rather than a future year
 - If confusing - maybe multi-year timeframe reference could be better explained in this text
- C 4
- D - planning processes
 - D i. C - reference to the GST
 - Agree that others - agree with China that not all parties have long-term strategies completed by this time
 - Maybe add “if applicable”
- D but the second i
 - Align language of the PA
 - Consult with GST
- D. i. D
 - Sustainable development and stuff word: “along with any other particular issues’ would fix 0 dont need all these words
- D ii
 - How parties would do
 - Concerns from parties - imply that all countries would have to use certain methodologies
 - Take this concern away add “if applicable
 - If using existing methodologies, have to explain it
- Adslf;s
 - Weird language here - maybe let's have a check
 - Removal of ndc specific information - why has this been dropped?
- Accounting
 - A ii
 - Suspect grammatical issue
 - Written to suggest that no party is allowed to use ipcc guidance
 - Missing “...who...” there
 - E ii
 - Support New Zealand
 - Further thinking
- Timing
 - Our previous opinions remain

Peru (on behalf of AILAC)

- Reference to article 3 - outside the mandate of this work on apa 3
- Paragraph 2 recognizes diff starting points in conj. With article 4

- Consider it is sufficient for differentiation
 - Unnecessary to further elab on differentiation
- Can live with proposals on:
 - Paragraph 7 should be all parties should compare “as appropriate”
 - Expect each party that has the thing apply to them to use it
- E
 - Now most appropriate place for this
 - All the information related to the diff items of NDC - this language is now gone.
Want to propose diff language
- Overlap between
 - A 5 in page 2 and b 4 in page 7
 - Second reference is much more complete
 - Eliminate the first one

Zimbabwe behalf of AGN

- Re-iterate reference to articles 3 and 4 that give full scope of NDC - emphasize on recognizing developing countries points
- Provided in preamble - Operationalizing differentiation in the guidance
- On further guidance on features in
 - Conclude work on further guidance on features in the session
- ICTU
 - Important to explain how differentiation will be operationalized
 - Need to demonstrate how guidance will apply across the board
 - Have developing countries that could use NDCs that are probably quantifiable, but the way they may implement guidance is different than developed because of landing places
 - So want guidance to be robust but not a straight jacket and have is prescriptive
 - ‘As appropriate/applicable’ - when referring to elements important since not all elements will be important to all indexes or parties
 - Capacity building
 - Propose that instead of saying enhanced capacity building support, we indicate ‘enhanced support including that for capacity building’
 - E - Article 6 reference re. Avoidance of double counting
 - Don’t prejudge article 6 discussion
 - Timing of guidance
 - As applicable in second round of NDCs but parties can use earlier
 - Processes
 - We may not need to micromanage countries, but make reference that parties may consider how they look at SDGs which will cover issues around poverty eradication, sustainable dev, women in power - can make one statement - communicate to parties that NDCs are submitted 9-12 months before
 - Have already provided language - think it’s important to ensure differentiation reflected across - we understand how everything will fall through
- Thank you co-facilitator

EU

- Thanks for taking things forward, want to share our concerns
- Not comfortable with format - which prejudices format of final outcome - expect it to be addressed next week
- I see the text on capacity building - we appreciate good discussion yesterday
 - Same lines re. Concepts - just need to work on the language. Will work on this language with others tonight.
 - I.e. - capacity building support but should be 'support for capacity building actions'
- Re. revisions dates -
 - Appreciate improvements but not there yet
 - Need to fit need for all mandates
 - Guidance finalized by 2023 so they can apply for 2025
 - Accounting can have more time since parties need experience for applying guidance
- ICTU
 - Agree w Japan and others on deletion of 'target-specific information' - don't understand why it was deleted; [something about h-n]
 - Welcome improvements in quantifiable info reference point and planning point
 - Agree with australia and others about "if applicable"
 - To be provided as annex has been dropped - quite concerning for us - want to ask countries how they provided their ICTU - don't have to ask about annex, but at least indicate where it is
 - GST bullet
 - Not procedural ambition, but important one since it's in Paris
 - Emphasize point that some bullets don't apply to specific NDCs and think it's okay
 - Taken care of in para 7 - as applicable point so don't see need to add it in later
- Accounting
 - Headings improve readability
 - Have concerns with bullet and common metrics - think reference to GWP is important
 - C1 - comparison with categories and inventories - aim not to require parties, but in the case where they don't use IPCC, we expect them to explain how they relate to IPCC
 - Land points
 - Still considering, but asking for info, not numbers which we think is important
 - 'Provide estimates for these removals'
 - **Most important point** - e2 accounting
 - Appreciate work by others - but support New Zealand that this bullet doesn't prevent double counting - very very concerning
 - Current language doesn't cover whole issue like double claiming and issuance
 - Alt language - "where a party authorizes the transfer of a mitigation outcome other than the purpose of the achievement for an DNC - party should ensure double counting is avoided by corresponding adjustment [something I missed] sources and sinks - to do so consistently with decisions adopting to CMA article 6"

- Again article 6 not dealing with this issue, so very important to us
 - Have to make sure the entire purpose of the Paris agreement is not eliminated by allowing double-counting
- Support suggestion not refer to 6.2 6.4 and 26 has to remain and PAWP will come as package, so will see how they evolve

South Africa

- Para 3
 - Wants to delete any further work on features
 - Then, if we have to, should change to “concluding the work not “continuing the work
- Want everything in the text, not having an annex in the shaded area
- para 7
 - Prefer not to have e2
 - A i. A - want to take out, but would make “domestic institutional arrangements” once you say such as you start to allow a number of things to be included
 - D would end at sustainable development because if you look at SDG they touch other issues
 - Sustainable development goals already list a bunch of the things listed here
- Please make sure all of the roman figures and stuff make sense - u
- Best practice
 - Would delete that. We just determine what is best practices, this doesn't mean anything
- Para 7
 - f - intervention on the IPCC
Want to reiterate asking IPCC to make report about how to judge what is fair and ambitious
 - Delete roman 3-6 [I think she said?]
- Accounting
 - Shaded area
 - B - iv - want to add after the .. “apply to successive ndcs”
 - B - v - transparency report - don't think we should allow changes for implementation of NDCs - this would basically mean a party could commit to something and then half-way through the process they could decide to change it

Norway

- Agree about how the key issues should not be deleted
- Need to be clear about what these issues are
 - We've done this more this meeting
- Should be simple but also needs to be useful
 - Details or not useful
 - Simplicity and usefulness need to come together - doesn't want a minimalist outcome
- Capacity building - appreciate this work, has more to add and to contribute to this
- Structure
 - Pre-empting the structure of the outcomes

- Para 18 guidance on accounting
 - We want to see this in the annex of ndcs
 - This is preempting stuff
- References to article 3 if kept in, noticed brackets around 3 and article 4
 - Clear that if article 3 remains it should also be a place where it's highlighted that the guidance under art 4 shall apply for mitigation only
- Para 4
 - Differentiation is important in article 4, esp 4.4. But also recognize 4.4 in the context of 4.2, that we all should provide a nationally determined contribution and we will do so with progression
 - And highest possible ambition
 - Also, diff is reflected in 4.3
 - That frames our nationally determined contributions
 - Not like the ICTU guidance determines NDC - what actually determines the NDC is article 4
 - Only Thing we are deciding on this guidance -
 - Ensure that you will provide information to give clarity and understanding for your NDC, which you have chosen yourself.
 - Clear - only provide info that fits your ndc, so you won't apply anything not applicable to your ndc
 - Calls guidance a restaurant with a menu, starters, main course and dessert
 - You don't need everything on the entire menu
 - As Brazil pointed out, if you fill out that info, you'll fill our many many pages.
 - Make this point without talking about differentiation -
 - The ICTU doesn't decide your ndc.
 - But when you do decide your ndc, we want it to be applicable in your way
 - To frame in a menu - make it "shall, as applicable"
 - Against additional text that calls attention to differentiation
 - 4.8 - we are to provide CTU
- ICTU elements
 - A - should all be kept
 - B -
 - Someone wanted that deleted.
 - As Australia, we want to keep it and also get more clarity.
 - C - Scope and coverage
 - Something has been lost - # 4 and 5 from previous version
 - We, as AILAC, think that land and forest issues need to stay.
 - D - planning
 - i b, I am a woman, but don't want to be treated as a group. Not sure if this sentiment is useful. Maybe should change wording so it says it like acknowledges gender situation
 - Refer to gender responsiveness, public participation of engagement

- Also groups - mention a few from PA - children, people with disabilities, migrants, etc.
 - Not appropriate to cherry-pick from the paris agreement
 - Global stocktake
 - Want to keep it in
 - Important that we all need to take it into account. This
 - Best practices and experiences
 - Unclear
 - What is this? Want to learn more about?
 - Methods/assumptions
 - Support most issues here
 - Ii - inconsistent with what is said in the accounting part
 - Accounting : draw upon vs. here it is taking into account
 - Iv - add an additional d - approach to setting ____ reference levels
 - Fairness and ambition
 - Scope for further streamlining here
 - 4.6 wonder about - makes it appear more voluntary for SIDS and LDCs
 - Do not necessarily have to prepare. 'May prepare'
 - Don't understand fair and ambitious here
 - Ndc specific info seems to be taken out
 - Don't like this
 - timing/applicability, and others
 - Week 2 issues.
 - Many want to keep in, take out, etc. better now to leave it and make sure there are clear options for second week
- Accounting
 - A - ii needs more work and clarity
 - B - work is still ongoing on consultations, but like the outline here.
 - C - add insertion from EU
 - D - add 'explain why' categories in inventories are excluded in your ndc
- Further guidance
 - Refer to paragraph 26 which we do support
 - Hear egypt that this does not accommodate policy mitigation things, should add here.

Switzerland

- Welcome the new text
- Concerned for lack of balance throughout the text
- NDC specific guidance is missing - no agreement on this issue, so has to be agreed on later, consistent with what was said with others - can't accept it's been removed
- Reference to article 3 as to article 4.4
 - Part of broader discussion, might not be solved for a while, so can't accept this
- No need for capacity building for the communication

- Understand need in preparation - such support is, and will continue to be available
 - Best to bracket it, we know discussions on going
- Para 12 and 22
 - Avoid duplications of words, GCF and EGF
 - E2 - we support EU
 - Making corresponding adjustment on decision of Art 6 from Paris
- Accounting
 - 25 - in line with Japan, general reference to article 6 bc SBSTA ongoing
- Features important to us, we support AOSIS
 - Want option of features like quantifiability in g

US

- I apologize for this- we've been referring to first and second week issues and people have been raising second week issues, don't want to, but given that we've been talking about it, I want to raise a statement
 - To be clear, US opposes inclusion of Article 3 that speaks to 7, 9, 10, 13
 - Doesn't just speak to article 4
 - One thing to say article 4 exists, but another to say 'developing' take steps and developed do more
 - But if people want to take this idea of differentiation and expand it to make it become what really becomes bifurcation - it's not something that we can support.
 - Others have said it in more measured tones - but if there's no reference to article 3, then 4.4 references need to be bracketed
 - I've heard Egypt and AGN points about needing as applicable, but the entire thing is as applicable because not all elements apply to you - if you have policies and measures NDC then you don't need reference point, for example
 - Needed to emphasize it and be sure there's understanding of our position
- Few highlights to say
 - In general, lots of good discussion yesterday and appreciate the work
 - New text that reflects work there, I appreciate and want to keep working on it - even where I can't expressly support
 - Under planning processes
 - Concerns about references to preamble because not content, but it's legally trying to operationalize something that by definition isn't
 - We recognize importance of capacity building - want to work on language, concerns with 11 and 12
 - Like Switzerland with mandate to GEF and GCF - but I think we can find fixes on that, happy to work on it further
 - Among points, I've heard concerns from a few different parties on quantifiable info
 - To me, makes sense what's in there, but makes me wonder what's important here and in accounting
 - Quantifiable info is the thing you should provide, not what you provide at the end(?)

- So i think a lot fo that will work
- Features
 - Scope and coverage - note that roman should 4 be deleted.
- Assumptions and methodological approaches
 - Appreciate mention that it's long
 - Happy to give suggestions for streamlining
 - Some concerns about fairness and ambition length - reasonable
 - On revision of guidance - not sure why such a concern (timing or something specific?) but different things will need to be revised at different times - if we can reassure parties there's a fairly easy fix - everything will be revised eventually, nobody locking in forever
- Avoidance of double counting
 - The one thing I want to make clear under e2 is that it only applies to outcomes party has authorized - if you have a market outside of borders and you don't count it in NDC, you shouldn't have to do separate mechanism
 - E1 double counting - certain parts should be streamlined
 - Language doesn't track exactly to 6.2 so some discrete edits to make it clearer - happy to discuss with parties
 -

Canada

- Agree with Japan, Australia, AILAC - article 3 doesn't belong in this text
- Norway's proposal that article 4 is about mitigation
 - Even if that's true, still can't put in article 3
- Capacity building paragraphs
 - 2,3,11, 12, 22, 23
 - For communication of ndc - communicating your ndc means putting it in the registry
 - I understand communication = putting it in the registry; we're not in the business of giving internet access
- Features
 - Agree with AOSIS, switzerland,
 - Removal of certain species is unfortunate
 - Review of features
- ICTU 2- agree with switz, Norway , etC
 - bout the loss of types of ndcs
 - Losing things about accounting, etc.
 - Also suggest removing h-n of ictu guidance if that's the case [unsure what that is]
 - A 5
 - Reference points
 - If party changes/updates the indicators; basically changing NDCs
 - Talk about
 - C 4
 - Not helpful to leave week 2 issues in there, so it should be deleted
 - Planning processes

- Appreciate helpful engagements
 - If applicable/ if appropriate debates
 - Idea - make if applicable for the whole thing
 - Make if appropriate to some
 - Applicable - gst and reference to joint action and mitigation co-benefits
- Agree with New Zealand
 - The rights of indigenous peoples, and others have really fallen out. Although grateful that they are here.
- Assumptions and methodological approaches
 - Strongly disagree with Brazil that policy indicators and reference points [?] not necessary - think its very relevant to understanding
- E 5
 - B and c
 - Understand mexico's rationale for e 5 c
 - But also could perhaps be merged with b
- Accounting
 - A and b - would have liked to see more detailed, but you know, not time to introduce new. Can live with
 - C and d can be merged under "comprehensiveness" and agree w norway
 - E 1 - promoting enviro integrity
 - Article 4 term but art 6 is stronger
 - Use article 6 not article 4 here
 - E 2
 - Not article 6 outcome - about mitigation outcomes, in article 4, like 4.7
 - Internationally transferred mit outcomes (ITMOs)
 - Transferred outside the scope and coverage of an ndc
 - This is crucial paragraph. Look forward to working with others.

Russia

- Agree with most interventions- new zealand, canada, others
- Additional work on text
- Couldn't read it all but
 - Paragraph 7d, i, and ctf stuff -
- Para 7
 - D and i - need to work to have text in front of us as a stand alone document.
 - E - agree with us - streamlining ; some in e v because some unclear in meaning and applicability is quite problematic.
- Accounting
 - It needs proofreading; lot of issues with grammar and stuff
 - If all categories need to be reported, but what if [hard to understand]
 - Additional proof-reading and edits can be done we can work on this

China (LMDC)

- Still concerns on accounting and will touch on ICTU
- Para 26 structure summary
 - Don't see __
 - To our understanding, our room is discussing things with __ and ex post is apa5
 - So we can't control another room to have form to submit information
- Our mandate - 31a-d
 - What we provide here re. Accounting is 31a-d
 - Things apart from that is not the mandate so reluctant to see this arrangement in our room even in brackets
 - 31a-b text is messed up since it's duplicated APA5
 - Right now common metrics and method consistency already in APA5
 - May see accurate text in APA 5 on this arrangement - so keep consistent outcome of APA5 - more efficient way to apply
 - 31 C,d
 - Might be another point about how to apply the scope and cov in ICTU
 - Might not have to include in accounting
- Another point - a lot of parties might not be on same page
 - At the end of scope and coverage - could include sectors guess and categories, but can't go along with general description of target
 - Tin 27 - trying to describe out target, can't include here - notice it's coming from other part in October note - not necessary to have general description of target-- will mess up logical thinking
 - Everything here is explaining the NDC - why also need a summary? This is waste of time.
 - Concerns on emissions reductions, intensity, etc policies being listed here too
 - Think it's necessary to exhaust all types [or not necessary?]
 - In adoption info, description of action, plan, policy, quantifiability, cooperative program, forest cutting system, construction of emergency and disaster system
 - We have different types of adaptation and finance targets - insurance, trust funds, financial management, etc and diff types of technology - gov incentive,s joint R&D,
 - diff types of capacity building - personal training, mechanism building, encouraging, policies - so reluctant to make these things complicated
 - If there's something weird to mention under scope and coverage, hard to read and understand so we want to delete first point to keep clear mind on scope and coverage
- Important - we hear party say something we haven't discussed yet
 - Revision issue - if this is the way to move forward, i hope there's consensus we can bring everything here - let me bring very important thing here
 - We must see under planning process "how parties' ndc demonstrates leadership under article 4.4" - very important to implement and make 4.4 operationalized
 - Crucial point to operationalize differentiation
- Best practices
 - Once more, clarification that it's important for developing countries to share best practice for preparing and communicating since many don't have institution to do this work - so if

they can share with each other about how to make it work and allocate capacity, people, tech support, will be better to implement using this guidance - important to include and we want to emphasize

- Capacity building
 - Willing to be further engaged and happy to see one paragraph guarantee it's mentioned
- We're close to first week work and might be crucial issues left to the ministers - but we've already achieved consensus to clear as much as possible of the substantive discussion so it's near clean - so we want more time to talk with each other and work before passing to chair and higher level
 - Want to solve more problems - as much as possible - so could we have 1-2 day delay? To pass to chair
 - Reluctant to pass substantive elements with divergences to the chair
 - Also believe it's thinking from parties here

Costa Rica

- See elements they consider important lost
- Bring back elements already mentioned in preamble

UAE

- Identify with Saudi arabia - agree with Egypt
- Needs to have clear reference to differentiation in align with PA
- 14 - prefer option of second and subsequent NDCs
- 17 b and c
 - Ensure some form of flexibility
- Methodologies
 - Delete _ b _ [missed this]
 - Would like to see differentiation applied in 18c.

Co-facilitator- federica

- Thanks for all those views. Constructive afternoon.
- Note apprehensiveness and concern
- Clear that any suggestions/materials informally will be treated in a sensible way by the co-chair. Ensure balance of paper.
- China we hear you
- Lots of good suggestions - refining capacity building languages
- Invite you to keep on working on that

Room tomorrow open from 7-10 morning. For inf infs[?]. Meeting room 22.
Please get us things tonight

Saudi Arabia

- Still have no answer for my question

- Mechanism for you to receive the text?
- How do we ensure the consensus

Co-facilitator

- Co-chair will tackle this. Suggest for you to provide language agreed by parties in the group
 - Capacity-building text still needs to be fine-tuned.

Saudi Arabia

- How to be sure that no one party will send in text and lie about there being consensus about this?
 - Laughs from others, he says I'm serious

Federica

- Trust each other
- We will make sure of this though, noted.

5 Saudi Arabia

- Still trust concerns

Brazil

- Not a matter of trust, but we're all tired and working beyond what's reasonable for humans
- So what we need from you is more clarity on the process forward - there was a briefing for the heads and they outlined how it'll work
- But this would help if idea for timing, cutoff, when revised might come out

Co-fac

- Deadline for further work around 10 pm tonight for collecting views and language on further elements
- As far as more specific way to proceed - as mentioned before - somehow outlined by text and in co-chair hands
- They're running bilaterals to make sure whatever comes out of draft decision doesn't cross red lines or cause issues to delegations

Follow up

- Tomorrow morning 7-10 am mr 22 - unsure if inf inf or inf

Take away

- US is pretty strong on their stance noted above that could cause issues
- There's still many divergences, China even asked for more time, so will be interesting to see how much they can get done
- Also came up the emphasis that each country will have different NDCs that are using these as guidance, but few things being very strict/emphasized
- Some common topics
 - A bit more work on the language of capacity building, but it's doing well
 - More streamlining of the text

- Some countries feel strongly about having no mention of article 3 and mention of only article 4
 - Paragraph 7 is a wildly complicated, detailed one that was brought up a lot
 - Still some more to be done on the double counting work
- Issue of annexing ICTU and Accounting info to countries' NDCs
 - The second iteration of the text took away the option to annex info in accounting to NDCs; this concerns parties
- On differentiation
 - While Norway and the US stated that there was no need to explicit differentiation because there is already differentiation mentioned in the PA, it seems the G77 + China will not agree to exclusion of it
- China requested to add 1-2 days to work on the text before bringing it to the floor at the very end of the session
 - Unclear how other parties feel about this
 - Unsure if this may be a strategy to delay a decision