

Session Title: SBI informal consultations on common time frames for nationally determined contributions referred to in Article 4, paragraph 10, of the Paris Agreement

Date & Time: 6 December 2018 1000-1100

Notetaker: Elinor Martin

Institution: University of Oklahoma, South Central Climate Adaptation Science Center,
American Meteorological Society

Co-facilitators:

yesterday provided an iteration of the text.

procedural conclusion kicks in when we don't have substantial agreement on the text.

Some parties indicated they want this procedural conclusion.

Go through new structure:

para1: organizing the progress that has been made. 2 options.

para5: legal team may need to look at this. need for technology may have different meaning

para 7: procedure that sends this piece of work to subsequent discussions

South Africa: proposal by south Africa isn't fully reflected. removed the every 5 years updates. want to take a substantive decision. having a procedural conclusion is disappointing. heard little from the EU. surprised to see 2041 - had expected to see 2031 (2041 is not acceptable). will take procedural conclusions but want to see their proposal included.

Saudi Arabia: on behalf of Arab group. disappointment at the paper. in Bangkok we were promised that the bullet points have been drafted. last session the procedural conclusion isn't included. How can i trust you. want to see our discussions reflected. more clarification.

China: on behalf of LMDC. [??] glad to see some things captured. couldn't participate in inf-inf last night. hope that doesn't influence 2nd iteration. some placement wrong for our option (not included in para 5 and 6). submissions and updates. request SBI to decide what should be submitted in what years (5 year versus 10 years). This is not our choice to include combined proposals. hope that our proposal is complete and clear. now see conflict with para 4 and 5 - decide this way and this way. confusing. one more clarification para 5: way point at 5 year mark. confusion. keep as clean and independent proposal. if 5 and 6 is another proposal then have option 3 or 4.

Marshall Islands: this topic always gives me a headache. thank China on behalf of other LMDCs. Agree with many of the things just said. Especially as landing at a procedural outcome but also having options and an addendum that decides something. This issue is a priority for our constituency. We are not going to converge here at 5 years or 10 years - we don't have a conclusion and in national capacity I don't have room to move. We really like option 2 in terms of clarifying their proposal, it clarifies what we are trying to do. Although fundamentally it delays what we want to do, it is presenting what they want to do in tack. Remove 2041 in paragraph 7. Common notion is there but times are different, just don't think we will converge. Could have a procedural conclusion with a view to reaching an outcome but please capture the

LMDC as a clean option (and others in annex/addendum that aren't decision language but are in tact).

Singapore: thank the co-facilitators. echo what parties have said regarding procedural outcome capturing the options. express disappointment with certain (para 6 2a and 2b). Reinterpret and distort article 14 of Paris agreement. GST timing related to NDC time frame. Mandate is to consider common time frames. if we aren't adding anything new then why do we need these paragraphs.

Japan: express appreciation. echo other parties. have made progress. more optimistic in last session that we would have a concrete decision. as Marshall Island articulated a procedural decision may happen rather than locking in common time frames. We have made some decisions - should reflect these (not even in decision language) so we can build on this progress. terminology here is complex.

Russian Federation: acknowledge efforts. i found myself confused in this iteration. we had quite clearly displayed options (5, 10 or both). However, the two options now are quite confusing with a lot of conditionality's. Cannot support any of the options - we supported 10 years and updates every 5 years - just isn't clear enough in option 2. procedural conclusions supported. prepared to start discussions from a blank sheet.

Saudi Arabia: you were going to come back. please clarify my question from earlier

Co-facilitator: clear from intentions that we are likely going to do a procedural conclusion.

Saudi Arabia: thank you. Support Russia that there is no annex or addendum attached to this

South Africa: disappointed in procedural. reserve our right to keep our option on the table. We could use para 7 to some extent with 2031. Agree with what China explained - if we aren't deciding anything cannot put decisions in annex. South Africa will not accept a decision that will extend compromise in the future. Your options were very clear 1 -3 (5,10. both). include an addendum with these and would come back next year.

co-fac: give guidance on Russia/Saudi Arabia have no addendum but some proposing

NZ: thank you. it is short and substantive. Thank you for China for LMDCs for laying out proposal with clarity. whatever our views about that proposal, it reflects that there is agreement that we want to convergence (should be reflected in procedural conclusion). Work that has been done should not be lost. No one is speaking for view that national determined common time friend. Like Singapore wasn't sure with para 6 options - do they fit our mandate?

India: support china on behalf of LMDC. need that option presented by LMDC should be clearly presented. Singapore & NZ highlighted incoherence of para 6 wrt mandate. language in 4b - should be to communicate or update by 2030 (how para 24 of PA reads). para5 could be deleted.

Bangladesh: on behalf of LDCs. appreciate that you have captured the progress we have made. we have some understanding of the proposals by various group - this should be reflected in totality/precision. we support option 1. Need to capture progress in next iteration. We have to capture progress, including in procedural conclusion. make clearer and playable.

Zimbabwe: on behalf of Africa. Thought we had made progress but still hopeful that we will converge. Want to see our options are reflected. not committed to annex or not but want to reflect progress (as annex or paragraph).

Indonesia: procedural text okay at this stage. prefer annex. 5 or 10 year (if 10 need a 5 year indicative target). Para6 belongs to another APA agenda item.

China: support procedural decision. will provide some draft text later. do not want to see confusion in different options. could have footnote with reference to other document rather than annex (preference is link with footnote).

Chile: option 1 5+5 is coherent and could accommodate everyone. from original south Africa is captured in option 2. suggest a wording edit - and including in option 1. should have clear date for outcome.

Marshall Islands: making progress here. moving towards procedural conclusion but capturing progress (some nervousness about how to do this). China made some suggestions for PC text - want to see that. 2023 is absolute latest for a decision. Concerned about how we have little time left - want to hear from co-fac about what is next. Time to consider PC language - manner in which progress is captured and the language. Need some inf-inf to discuss. reiterate that we won't be able to merge options. Need to capture options in facts made by parties.

Brazil: would like to agree on common time frames but understand limits. like LMDCs put forth. like to see whatever comes out (annex or footnote - no preference). Procedural conclusion versus decision are different. Decision would be better but conclusions can still be helpful.

co-fac: heard the options. will make a draft

Russian Fed: quite unhappy with last draft. absence of square brackets around paragraphs suggests text is agreed. Why we support not including it in the annex. why we are prepared to start at a blank sheet. Everything annex should be in [] and it will be a mess! need guidance about how to proceed. hoped for a decision in light of this not being the most important issue

Saudi Arabia: echo Russian Fed. don't accept addendum/annex but accept that parties want to capture progress. footnote.

co-fac: appreciative that even though we don't have a firm substantive decision we have had good discussions and progress. We will prepare a procedural outcome from the session. Difference of opinion on how to capture the progress. Link to a CRP as done in previous sessions. Hear need for inf-inf space for how to capture procedural outcome - we will make space available. Draft by tomorrow. Have a final session on Saturday.

Marshall Islands: please don't clash inf inf with APA 3 as many of us negotiate that.

Saudi Arabia: please don't go after 6pm.

Meeting Adjourned