

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

Date: 12/6/18

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 by the presiding officers of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Paris Agreement, the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice and the Subsidiary Body for Implementation Addendum 1 – part 1](#)

[Draft text on APA-3 05/12/2018 14:36](#)

Notes

Co-facilitators

- Starting with order from last time

China (on behalf of LMDC)

- Concerns
- We notice important things are missing and hope this iteration captures all views - could be in brackets, but can't be removed
- In preamble we emphasized that article 3 should be mentioned
- For features
 - Article 3 and nationally determined not mentioned to help guide features
 - Paragraph 2 also not consensus
 - Deletion of second item
- ICTU
 - Confused why 4.8 is repeated in paragraph 3 and 5
 - Might be misunderstanding how to adopt guidance
 - As we mentioned in the first slot, we think that everything included in guidance should be content of guidance instead of substantive item of guidance?
 - Paragraph 5 misleading on how to adopt the guidance so want rephrasing or deletion paragraph 5
 - 5. *[Adopts the guidance for the information to facilitate clarity, transparency and understanding of nationally determined contributions contained in annex X[, pursuant to Article 4, paragraph 8, of the Paris Agreement];]*
 - Wants: "Information to be provided by parties - may include, inter alia"

- Specific expression they'd want in para 5 instead of saying adopt guidance here
 - Understanding that elements on annex are guidance but other paragraphs aren't
 - Scope and coverage
 - Emphasize that NDCs are full scope issue and article 3 already provides this arrangement - proposal whether NDC includes mitigation, adaptation or more means of implementation
 - Now mitigation is deleted, so we hope to bring it back - could be in brackets but not cool with full deletion since mitigation is mandatory and others are not
 - Not gonna forced all parties to submit other components, just can't close door for other components in NDC - many countries already submitted NDCs with adaptation and other stuff
 - We achieved consensus from Bangkok and we can even see it in october note - other co-benefit regarding lifestyle and want to bring it back - haven't touched on too much detail of substantive elements
 - Best practices (someone mentioned it could be deleted) but we think it's very important for parties to share
 - To clarify, it's how the parties arranged and communicated their NDC and having more people share their process would be helpful
 - Page 5, para 9 only references 4.6 and we're confused
 - I hear some views about revision issue - in our understanding, what we achieve this year will be very informative and we're open to discussing elaboration of specific elements
 - Should be confident with what we achieve this year and no more value to do revision and we can't revise guidance before 2025-
 - No value to doing the revision before 2025
 - Support revision on accounting with needed changes on methods
 - Hope this view captured in next iteration
- Accounting
 - Current structure confusing should be more logical
 - Didn't see a, b, c, d structure under 31 - want restructure to capture which bullet goes to which item under 31
 - To be coherent with Paris language and keep original language/spirit
 - Support views on mentioning article 6 in decision and want concise summary of article 6 somewhere
 - Think develop parties emphasized that for first iteration, differentiation not reflected clearly - nor a sense of implementing it
 - What makes us even more disappointed that 4.4 doesn't appear nearly anywhere - we hope this guidance doesn't dilute differentiation and we emphasize that differentiation should be clearly reflected in main decision
 - Language on ICAO and IMO - supports Brazil [i think to remove it?]
- General
 - This guidance isn't a *shall* but a 'may include inter alias'
 - Want differentiation reflected clearly in an operationalized way, not closing door with other components and might be captured to some extent, but want it more enhanced
 - We're putting lots of time into this and think all parties want strong outcome

- Expectation to make positive progress - to build on confidence to achieve this guidance to accommodate for all
- Otherwise, will be very disappointed on arrangement that might bring greater burden to developing and we want to contribute but feel like we weren't included much
- To secretariat: wants this text here:
 - "Decides that the guidance for features, info, accounting for NDCs shall be in accordance with principles and provisions of paris, in particular article 2, 3, 4, 7, 9 10 11 13 relevant decisions of 1.cp21 as well as para 37, 51, 55, 57

Canada

- We see mandate as further guidance on mitigation (para _48?)
- We agree that 4.4 exists and don't want to re-open and agree on positive approach sentiment
- Features
 - Agree w Switz and Marshall Islands that they were dropped - quantifiability and [something else; I missed this]
 - Will need to be addressed later date
 - Every reference in brackets, which shouldn't be
- Info
 - Need units of measurement under quantifiable info
 - Planning processes - covers key concepts
 - Para 1 covers 3 concepts - first domestic institutions w agencies, process itself, participation w indigenous and consideration of it
 - Participation and engagement including with indigenous peoples
 - 3 rights of humans indigenous and gender equality
 - 3, 5, 7 deal with such considerations and should be grouped
 - Disagree with Brazil about removing subsequent removals
 - On 5 - inclusion of ITMOs, parties should specify method or approach for corresponding adjustment consistent with 6 guidance
 - H streamlined, but i-n could be better
- Accounting
 - Agree w China needs most work
 - On pg. 6 we see that it recalls 4.13 but also needs to recall 4.14
 - Also agree headings make it hard to follow
 - A-d paragraphs - methods and common metrics
 - Folks working on it
 - Muddles 4.13 and para 31 of decision
 - 31 asks for guidance on existing approaches and 4.13 is that parties should..
 - Don't want guidance to replace 4.13 but meet mandate of 31
 - Methodological consistency
 - Parties working on it
 - J-I -> confused on j, k relationship
 - On m - another chunk on avoiding double counting
 - Article 6: Authorized transfers per use that don't contribute to NDC achievement and avoidance take place in structured summary
 - 17

- Should just be cross reference to article 6 (prejudice)
- Capacity - appreciate ongoing work
- ITMOS Parties should say diff ways to quantify

Fiji

- In relation to capacity-building, AOSIS has repeatedly asked to recall 4.5 - want that in the text
- Fairness and ambition
 - National circumstances in f roman num xi- prefer this sentence structure. This is relative to SIDS
 - More accurately captures how we see that point
- Features
 - Heard argument that Para 1 of preamble is sufficient for features
 - Wants to recall the mandate of APA decision 1/cp.21 - we have been requested to develop further guidance on features to be adopted by the COP
 - If we have paragraph 1 alone, this doesn't fulfill our mandate.
 - Want option b (where?) - quantifiability and other issues
 - in absence of b, at least there should be paragraph 2 in the iteration so this could be decided further at a diff time. If we can't do what we've been requested to do, at the very least we should say we should do it later, not just not do it at all

Ethiopia

- Capacity-building text: that's going well
- The text to read out has been agreed by majority
 - Capacity on developing countries
 - In accordance with 4.5, support should be given to developing and in accordance w 9-11
 - Recognizing that developing countries have different starting points
- For info on clarity transparency and guidance
 - natl circumstances, etc. s needs developed countries to provide capacity building to provide help
 - Provided to developing countries parties to increase their developing countries over time to increase their ability
 - Asks GTF and [] to be taken into account.
- Still working on this, will let you know of new version will send it in
- Continuous support should be provided to increase capacity over time

Indonesia

- Support LMDCs on scope and coverage that mitigation should be included
- ICTU
 - Planning process - see small roman numeral 6 - best practices- shouldn't be in section
 - Point e - assumption and method approach -iii
 - Delete including
 - H
 - Support Singapore for deletion since it's similar to c(?)

- Para 7 also deleted
- Accounting
 - G - re. Reference indicator and baseline - propose same language in joint reflection note pg. 17 since it's unbracketed
 - 17 paragraph 3 - sentence to replace G
 - J
 - Parties try to include... delete we propose since it's in ICTU
 - K
 - Parties account for alt categories
 - Add according to NDC
 - If the ndc doesn't cover all categories, the accounting can't cover all

Zimbabwe (behalf of AGN)

- First part of features - recall article 3 and 4 - don't think we need extra work and work on it later
- ICTU
 - After para 28 - add 'slash cp28'
 - No.5 - adopting guidance including in annex x - propose option that possibility of 1 guidance so we don't prejudge this discussion's outcome
 - A- Quantifiable info
 - We've proposed language to clearly differentiate how it applies to parties
 - Developed countries announce re. Base year and reference points and developing submit as applicable
 - Important since this has minimal differentiation if it somehow exists
 - C. Scope and coverage
 - Important to reflect differentiation
 - D. Planning and processes - submit 9-12 months in advance
 - Don't think we have to macro manage parties w how they're doing
 - E. Assumptions and methodological approaches
 - Under article 6 that it makes reference to what's happening in SBSTA - especially for parties using ITMOs - when you look at detail of guidance on corresponding adjustments
 - Propose paper from IPCC on methodological approaches to determine whether they're fair and ambitious
 - Don't think we'll have info on multiple mitigation targets - that info for ICTU should be enough
 - Dev countries capacity - welcome their language and view as good starting point - establish incentive mechanism
 - If it remains don't say 'incentive mechanism' but 'mechanism to encourage and support' developing countries
 - Information revision
- Accounting
 - Remove ICTU revision
 - Methodological consistency
 - We proposed language and feel like it should clearly reflect differentiation where parties maintain consistency in scope and coverage and

developing countries may choose to move towards best consistent methods they can achieve based on capacities and national circumstances

- Support component
 - Developing should account for issues re. 4.5 on 9-11 in paragraph 57 of 1/cp.21
- Land use
 - Existing methodological approaches, including those under convention
 - Look at methodologies proposed under land use and REDD+

Saudi Arabia (Arab group)

- Surprised, emotional. Happy but not happy. Thought would have 3 hours before first session after the paper dropped
- Aligning with LMDCs)(china spoke on behalf of)
- Differentiation not operationalized
 - Super crucial for all developing countries
- Two options
 - Paragraph china made- will have under next iteration
 - Nine pages- went from 9 to 21 pages. Wants more streamlined, even less pages.
 - Make it easy and simple for developing countries to present their ndcs
 - Not prescriptive, not details
- Features
 - Share voice with ABU, AGN, and LMDS
 - No more features. Let's agree on features once and not look at it again
 - If were looking for something again, let's look at all in package
- ICTU
 - Adopt should be in the top; all in one package, not substantive package of info or something
 - Support AGN - annex x; do not prejudge outcomes from here about putting in an annex
 - Support AGN proposal - operationalizing differentiation is crucial.
 - Scope and cov
 - 3, and 5 should be under accounting not Information
 - Planning process
 - Don't want to micro-manage the NDC when it's being prepare
 - In line with AGN
 - Page 3- point 3
 - Assumptions and methodologies; want to include "...if applicable"
 - Don't need more detail (the other type of NDC processes)
 - Capacity
 - Support LDCs
 - Will work with other groups on those issues
 - 11- decides that the info to ICTU
 - When communicating NDCs by 2020, this is not agreeable for us
 - Want it to be an option but to required
 - Second and subsequent ok

- Don't want to reinvision NDC guidelines, like AGN said
- Point 12
 - african group say they don't want revision or nDC guidelines
- 7
 - Align with ABU and LMDCs want to delete that point

Marshall Islands on behalf of AOSIS

- Differentiation bindingness
 - Agree to leave this until week 2, focus on substance
 - In article 4: CTU and accounting applies to all parties
 - Be consistent with wording in PA- shouldn't use word 'flexibility' (a13 wording)
- Capacity
 - Support inclusion of Ethiopia's text that was read ut.
 - Reference to 4.5 is critical
- General
 - Recycle referring to 4.4 would also be helpful?
- Agree with China LMDCs
 - Positions need to be reflected in square brackets if not consensus
 - No consensus to remove option b in features
- Dates
 - Has to be 2023 or won't be relevant in next round; effectively this is delaying by 2 rounds of ndcs if not
- Don't agree with language of including mitigation as an optional thing. Mitigation is not optional
 - Will talk with UNFCCC legal office here if needed on that
- CTU text
 - Areas outside mitigation
 - Not preventing parties from not having other things
 - Needs to be clear that guidance only applies to parties that have these things in their ndcs
 - Fairness and ambition
 - Geography, economy, ... - request square brackets removed seems like everyone agrees
- EU structured summary
 - Into this structured summary
 - Want to know what the position of those
- Accounting
 - Detail is being lost
 - Common metrics and consistency
 - Need to reach view if it's consequential
 - Land accounting is very important for enviro integrity
 - How to assure this
 - Are we there yet? Not sure
- Double-counting
 - Hasn't heard parties say they want double-counting
 - Anyone? Suggests they come forward

- How can we capture the wording without infringing on other countries?

India

- Aligns w China and LMDC
- Initial reaction
 - Been a costly treatment to topic of differentiation and haven't seen it operationalized well and caused us and others discomfort
 - Need better balance on these issues - political issues dealt with letter, but if operation is going to disturb political balance, we must reconsider our path
- Content
 - Want article 3 reflected in preamble and features
 - Scope issue for us and must be reflected in manner to respect views of parties here
 - Para 2 - not sure if there was a consensus, so surprising that it's unbracketed and it wasn't even there in Bangkok
 - Ideally delete, but if parties want it, at least bracket
 - 4.8 I see being recalled in a couple places (para 3,5) - a bit of unbalanced treatment to it, could get rid of it in 5 (?)
 - Para 6 - 'may include, as appropriate, inter alia' as option for developing countries
 - *6. Decides that in communicating its nationally determined contribution, each [developed country] Party [shall provide][may include, as appropriate, inter alia,][and each developing country Party [shall provide][may include, as appropriate, inter alia,] over time] the information [contained in annex X][in paragraph X below], as applicable to its nationally determined contribution;*
 - Not how we want differentiation operationalized
 - India also has proposal and if other parties is reflected, we want ours reflected as well
 - Substantive elements
 - At cost of repetition, there's no differentiation mentioned except article 4 mention to fairness and ambition
 - Scope and coverage
 - 3 and 5 - most relevant for accounting
 - In 6 word 'mitigation' has been dropped and want it read as NDC to include mitigation, adaptation and/or support
 - Delete h
 - Para 11
 - Application of guidance - our preference is second and subsequent NDCs
 - We have indicated that we can't apply this guidance from 2020
 - Don't prefer review under ICTU guidance but okay in accounting
 - 'Adopt the guidance' should go to the top so that the message is clear that we're adopting the whole thing
 - Accounting
 - Para m - will give comments later, still looking
 - 17, 20, 21, 22, 23

- Language should be bracketed since we're still digesting contents and will reserve opinion
- Question of differentiation looms large here and until we treat it in a balanced manner, proposal from China has given us small paragraph that must reflect all parties interests go ahead

Australia

- Review should be included instead of initiated by second NDC
- By 2023 and 2024 so that it can apply
- Consider option you've presented if there's time
- ICTU
 - Point d2 - domestic mitigation - as NDCs before implementation, domestic measures and planning process
- Accounting
 - C
 - Substantive elements, confusion on this and seems like it's repeated Paris 4.14
 - If party draws on existing approaches they should explain how - idea for how to change it
 - D
 - Maintain consistency and be aligned in things like scope and coverage
 - Methodological consistency also in scope and such
 - F
 - Might be concerns that it means only GHG inventories applied in accounting - only where GHG data methodologies are used it should apply
 - G
 - Something strange - shouldn't say over/under estimate and instead 'avoid' it
 - H (updates and changes)
 - Only changes that don't flow from inventory changes that are natural - so that could be reflected and should be statement of intention rather than outcomes
 - That technical changes not aimed at reducing effort
 - Format of decision/outcome - I understand diff views how it's captured and understand/respect but ICTU and accounting remain on table

Saudi Arabia, EU

- Points of clarification - they close the list (it's very long) - going over
- Want a longer session, or later session in day.
- ~5 min - Lots of back and forth over when they can keep meeting, available rooms, etc
- Co-facilitators say we cannot have another informal today.
- Go for another 10 minutes

Iran

- Associate with China on behalf of LMDCs

- Believe PA is balanced; want new NDC document at the end of the convention
- Preamble
 - We need reference to article 3 regarding relevant PA articles
 - When we talk about NDCs- just lead us to article 3 of PA.
 - NDCs: mitigation, adaptation, should all be considered.
- ICTU
 - Planning processes - suggest line 3,...” including “if appropriate,” indigenous people”
 - Ok with 2nd NDCs, but problem with 2021.
 - Differentiation is important in ICTU also accounting
- Differentiation
 - Should be highlighted and clear and in regard to accounting
- Mitigation should be reflected in relevant paragraphs but can't close door on other components
- Seeks document that can lead to implementation of the paris agreement
- My delegation can't prepare ndc without help

Korea

- ICTU
 - Quantifiable on the reference point. This is better than before, but still better improvement seems possible and necessary
 - Assumptions and methods
 - Element 4a seems too detailed to be provided ex ante
 - In 1: want another inclusion = parameters
 - 5th element: change expression to “intention to use” instead of “intent to use”
 - Diff types of mit targets: thinks there is a needed amount of information there unless same or similar level of clarity provided somewhere else.

Mexico

- Quick intervention for proposal
 - Climate enforcers included in NDC not covered by IPCC guidance - provide guidance on how they're estimated
 - 14a - emissions or substances for which no GWP reported for common metrics - be accounted...’ separately than those that are reported for the emissions and removals to supply info for the inventories
 - [specific text about that section that they're going to propose]
 - Co facilitator asks them to shop around w other parties also
- Still reviewing accounting section

Colombia on behalf of AILAC

- Waited so long that we're not completely ready
- Heard about differentiation - different interpretations by different countries, so we need reflection of that
 - They think differences should be reflected under guidance
- Features

- Inclusion of features like quantifiability and replicability
- Diff target and NDC
 - Want to see indicative trajectories incorporated as well and inviting parties to present language
 - Paragraph confusing so suggest brackets around some of the words to streamline
- Option to not include references to adaptation since it's beyond the scope here - we understand there's brackets but since it's going to ministers, option to not include could be good idea along with clarification as to why
- Mitigation - as others have said, not optional for us including
 - Have to have
 - If we had time, would have asked for ways to streamline text

Norway

- Like Saudi said- when everyone is equally happy and not happy- good sign
- Accounting
 - Structure must be made more practical and easy to use for practitioners
 - Lumping it from a-m, hard to recognize what fits where
- Respond to the
 - A-d should be under heading responding to 31a
 - E-i responds to 31b
 - Methodological consistency
 - Support Australia
 - J-i scope and cov [something]
 - Scope and coverage
 - M heading on avoidance of double-counting
 - Agree with Canada
- Appreciate Ethiopia's Capacity-building thing and ready to engage on more discussions
- Norway- do support differentiation as it's expressed in the PA
 - 4.4 and 4.6
 - But not necessary to express diff. In the guidance itself
 - Only applies guidance as it fits NDCs
 - So wants: "shall, as applicable"
- Scope
 - Mitigation in scope -- must be misunderstanding because surely they don't mean that min is optional in NDCs
 - Support was Marshall Islands said

EU

- Features
 - Disappointed as it stands. Agree with Canada and
- ICTU
 - Description of target = important info
 - Now have paragraph on this in c1
 - But still info is missing
 - Extent to the mitigation thing (a percentage, the policies, specifics)
 - Want a dedicated heading "reference point" not just scop and cov

- Accounting
 - Agree with Brazil, China, Canada
 - About headings. They were disappointed to lose the headings that was in every previous iteration but this one
 - Headings we know and love
 - Methodologies and common metrics 31a
 - Text on page 7 not consistent with mandate
 - 31 clearly refers to the metric adopted by cma
 - Needs to include this metric
 - GWP100 from 4th IPCC assessment report
 - Specific approaches
 - ^^^ put it in methodologies
 - In paragraph d - doesn't cover things well
 - Need things on natural disturbances
 - Disturbances
 - If they want to exclude
 - Needs to provide information of approaches used and add how it's consistent with ipcc stuff
 - Parties need to use one single approach. We have preference for the production approach
 - Capacity-building
 - Welcome ethiopia's thing
 - Thank the parties involved in coming forward with language
 - Good starting point from what they've heard
 - Gef, gcf
 - Request co-secs to add some financial stuff into the guidance

US

- I had hoped we'd get into discussion
- Many of us have shared issues about methodological approaches, way things are talked about in fairness and ambition
- We have had number of statements that, while I appreciate they're important, they won't be resolved in this room [?- what why]
- I hope in sessions later today that there's a willingness to engage on technical issues and happy to go into those in less formal setting
- As these points have been made about 'second week issues'
- Don't think differentiation needs to be operationalized
 - They were upset with actually having more differentiation than they wanted; more in this iteration than in the previous versions
 - So focus on what they can resolve here and make remaining issues as easy as possible for higher ups

Russia

- Given interventions here, we have to admit that lots of work has to be done to the text to streamline and improve - so work of co-facilitators has to be enhanced
- Grey shaded text (annexes) [I didn't think it was decided if they'd be annexes or paragraphs yet?]

- Based on my experience, these are the core elements that should be considered under review of NDCs - subject to decisions made under transparency and compliance agenda items
- Looking at this annexes, feel parties will have challenges in implementing them
- D, k, others - they have cross reference to IPCC guidelines to bullet a
 - But if you look at bullet a there are methodologies assessed to IPCC but they've been produced by then
 - When we're looking for ICTU and accounting issues and we want to be clear how we'll meet Paris provisions in article 2, we need to have clear, transparent, comparable outcomes - otherwise nobody can assess
 - whether we have done it

Egypt

- Associating with AGN and LMDC and Arab Group
- First para
 - As far as we are concerned, NDCs should contain all elements of PA in article 3
 - Think the wording "recalls" is too vague, need clear reference (mit, ad, moi)
- 2nd para
 - Delete this
- Disappointed about differentiation
 - Not clearly reflected
 - Has to be and operationalized
 - In accounting and ICTU
- ICTU
 - Keep with mandate- so far, the quantifiable info needs to be more clear
 - Very strong advocate for: Developed countries shall provide information.... And developing countries may submit as applicable....
 - For some ndc types, countries won't be able to have base years and ref points
 - Scope and cov
 - Developed shall include all sectors associated with absolute economy-wide mitigation targets
 - Developing encouraged to move over time to this.
 - Consistent with level of support provided by developed countries
 - Developed countries should include: co2, methane, and all gasses in the
 - Planning process
 - Not in position to micromanage this issues - national prerogative
 - Simple language
 - Encouraging countries to submit 9-12 months before cma
 - Submit information
 - So detailed
 - Too detailed
 - Seeking differentiation
 - Developed apply TAC
 - Developed countries need to take into account
 - F- fairness and ambition
 - Support African Group proposal

- Additional info on diff type of mitigation targets -- this should be deleted. No need for this additional information here. No need to have this additional info for ICTU
 - Capacity-building
 - Welcome ethiopia's proposal
 - Do not support the revision of ICTU at future COP ; only for accounting
 - Second and subsequent NDCs and important for info on adaptation and support
- Accounting
 - It is a procedural obligation under our mandate
 - Need simple and concise way to do this
 - Still see need of the streamlining on accounting
 - Methodologies and approaches - not common!
 - No one size fits all
 - Operationalize differentiation under accounting
 - Accounting for support component important to have included
 - Need developed countries SHALL use ____ and for developing countries, they may choose to apply their own methodologies as appropriate.
 - GHG methodologies
 - Developing countries need to be allowed to apply own
 - Categories of emissions and removals
 - Need differentiation here
 - Developed shall account for economy wide emission targets
 - And developing - CBDR
 - Article 6
 - As simple language as possible
 - Avoidance of double-counting into the technical details under being discussed SBSTA 6
 - When proposing corresponding adjustment here there
 - [says a lot of things, I missed some]
 - SBSTA 6 should handle

Malaysia

- Capacity support highlighted
- Accounting
 - Agree with Norway on more practical structure
 - 16h and other parts confusing
 - 16g - think it could have been covered in integrity
 - Don't think countries would over or under estimate on reference levels
 - Still working through 16m

Japan

- Accounting
 - Support australia, canada, norway - modification
 - Don't want deviation of names of land use and forest
- ICTU
 - Good job under ICTU
 - We already said yesterday that some important stuff was lost

- Capacity
 - Support intervention by EU
 - Appreciate LDCs work and having extensive discussion on issue
 - Divergence if they should have ____ (hard to understand)
- Don't want to touch differentiation and scope but
 - Our mandate doesn't have to do with differentiation
 - On scope, there are other conversations happening that might be (useful?) here; will bring up in inf infs
 - In other rooms, there are some things being worked out on differentiation.

Co-facilitator

- Will take into account
- Urge to continue with your homework
- We need parties to engage outside the room, to huddle and figure out some of the key text; esp what we've heard in the room
- Room 13 is available for inf infs - for continuation
 - 3-5
- Next informa: 10-12 in room 22
- At 5 pm will report to contact group on development

Saudi Arabia:

- Willing to communicate and work with people on methodologies and stuff
- Want to tell parties that we have other meetings - esp. Meeting with co-facilitators - may miss the party inf infs

Follow-up :

- Inf infs (room 13) and session tomorrow 10-12 in room 22

Take Away:

- Differentiation
 - Many countries wanted more reference to common but differentiations (African Group, Arab States, LMDCs, AILAC)
 - Egypt - especially wants it to be common thread through whole paper
 - Vs: US, Norway: differentiation is already mentioned in PA, we should not have it mentioned here; this is not the place
- Many mentions to small, textual changes that countries want made
 - Attempts to get rid of unnecessary text/conversations taking place else
 - Attempts to get rid of repetitive things and combine other elements
- Preamble
 - Disagreement on whether it's clear that guidance should apply to mit, adaptation, and means of implementation; if there are enough references to PA
- In features, many want quantifiability (and the units) at least and then consensus that they'll have to come back to it later
 - Some expressed that while accounting and ICTU could be re-addressed in future, features should not
- China (on behalf of LMDC), India, others want article 3 reflected

- Going to build new working text and submit today
- Seems like capacity building text is almost done from Ethiopia and consensus is that it is a good start
 - No direct complaints/disagreements with this text
- Some countries want to include something about sharing planning processes
- Tons more streamlining and work to do - will be wild for them to finish this up by Saturday (in my opinion)
- Accounting
 - There is disagreement about to what extent countries should be able to use own methodologies. Brazil, Arab Group, and some AGN countries especially want developing countries to be able to use own methodologies
- Many Parties expressed worry that they would have enough time to figure this out; they requested another informal in the afternoon but the co-facilitators just scheduled an inf today