

Session Title: **SBI informal consultations on gender and climate change.**

Date & Time: 6 December 2018 1200-1300

Notetaker: Elinor Martin

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

Co-facilitators:

- happy St. Nicholas day
- have new draft conclusion posted Tuesday evening (for SBI and COP)
- need to present draft conclusion to SBI chair today
- if we cannot agree then rule 16 will apply and return in June
- confident that we can come to agreement
- will read through draft text and explain relevance.
- para 4 - square brackets: because we didn't discuss that topic on Tuesday. Feel this is a reasonable reflection on information present. should we remove square brackets.
- SBI conclusions and COP conclusions
- Invite parties to share: be concise and present options for textual changes

Norway: suggest new text. "read text". for SBI conclusions. Additional paragraph with reference to material in para 3. para 3bis.

co-facilitators: interventions for this suggestion? None. Move on.

Australia: propose changes to COP conclusions para 4. read text. keen to see substantive part of LWP (Lima Work Programme) review discussion happen in session (due to travel constraints) but very happy to see support for other events to happen to feed into synthesis report

co-fac: thoughts on Australia suggestion?

Costa Rica: thank you for efficiency. Support changes suggested by Australia.

USA: echo the support for Australia proposal. Regarding Norway - clarity about national positions.

co-fac: come back to Norway. Lets focus on Australia. Have three options in this conclusion. can we remove the others?

Costa-Rica (and Peru). Go with Australia.

co-fac: para 4 done. Lets go back to Norway text. clarify what you mean by national positions

Norway: preparations for COP in order to advance work under agenda items.

co-fac: USA are we happy?

USA: still confused? gender in COP agenda items?

Norway: consider gender in national preparations for the COP meetings.

USA: that is more clear.

Costa Rica: (and Peru) Article 2 for COP. Para 2 sorry. not used to “terms of reference” propose textual changes.

Malawi: thank you. Support the proposal by Costa Rica. We were also wondering how we were going to develop the terms of reference as SBI. the new in session about how to initiate the review, suggestions by Costa Rica, addresses this part of the review.

EU: express support of Costa Rica, Malawi, USA, Norway. Is the word national applicable to the EU as it is not a nation?

co-fac: EU has a status to speak on behalf of its member states. EU needs to consider whether they are happy with this word.

Sudan: associates with statements by Malawi

Australia: thanks to Costa Rica for suggestion. Support that.

co-fac: return to Norway point while we think about Costa Rica/Peru structure. Parties within the EU would consider gender as they look at their own considerations in preparing with the EU

Mozambique: request additional text. Data collection and analysis regarding gender (in relation to LWP & gender action plan - GAP).

co-fac: that sounds like a decision and this should be a conclusion. will come back to that

Nigeria: the word national in preparing positions - could just say “preparing positions”

co-fac: thoughts

Norway: fine with that

co-fac: remove national if in agreement. start with Mozambique. read text from GAP. To my mind we already have what you are suggesting within the GAP.

Malawi: support what Mozambique has said. We have conclusions that look at the review. Still need to continue implementing the work on LWP and GAP in 2019 concurrently with the review. Examples by Mozambique is one, also engagement.

co-fac: have this text in SBI para 3 and 4 already. Do we need to strengthen? is Mozambique happy? I suggest we don't add a new para

Mozambique: thank you. I don't see sex disaggregated data in the paragraph

co-fac: directly referring to activities of the GAP where the desegregation data is explicit. If we refer to one component do we need to refer to all?

Uganda: support ideas of Mozambique, but they are all captured in para 3.

co-fac: Mozambique - happy? okay. Lets look at other square brackets. Orig para 4. Happy to keep this?

Costa Ric & Peru: agree to remove the brackets.

Ethiopia: thank you - remove brackets.

co-fac: one down. now para 3bis. Norways suggestion. Any objections? Need specific text that starts with The SBI... (technical). Next in the COP text - happy to accept?

USA: go back to Norway.

co-fac: I'll go back to that. are we going to accept that text in COP para 2? need to be clear on what the inputs to the review are going to be. not included the how we will initiate something in June 2019.

Zimbabwe: disjoint between SBI and COP conclusions as far as review goes. SBI is asking for submissions, COP is saying a review. Normally refer to elements for the review rather than terms of reference. Include "developing elements".

co-fac: review would include any submissions and work carried out by secretariat. pause while wait for secretariat

Australia: thanks to Zimbabwe for pointing this out. Ensure para 3 and 2 are aligned (wrt to terms of reference). Thoughts about the timing on seeking review inputs.

co-fac: now editing for consistency. we are clear that the review at COP25 will be based on the synthesis report and all the inputs, not new things

Peru: what is the difference between para 6 and para 3?

co-fac: para 6 is the submitting information

Australia: echo comments from Peru. para 3 isn't adding any value? could we delete?

co-fac: delete para 3. happy?

Ethiopia: think "developing terms of reference for the review" should not be deleted. Guides how to prepare the information needed.

Peru: no mandate to have terms of reference. COP22+23 is clear that we have to have a review but we don't have to have a terms of reference.

co-fac: reading and clarifying para 2 about what the basis of the review is (submissions etc.). Can we give the structure without using the words terms of reviews. Lets go back to Norway.

USA: still unclear. could be refocused - especially "gender considerations" and "positions" is still broad. "consider the implementation of gender related activities". We would prefer to leave it in brackets at this point.

co-fac: brackets are not an option. would you want it removed?

USA: yes

co-fac: thoughts?

Norway: we argue that new 3bis would be a good measure to capture gender considerations in different work streams.

USA: what is different between this and goals of GAP.

co-fac: in LWP - includes integrating gender. Come back to this at COP25. Are we already doing this? Include in review. Don't need this text right now as we already have in LWP.

Norway: okay

EU: support erasing.

USA: para 7 clarification "further information". how is this different from 6? redundant, propose to delete.

co-fac: anything that encourages more submissions for synthesis report is good. think keeping in is good.

USA: still unclear what further information is but okay with keeping in.

co-fac: need information about what the basis of the review is. what it is informed by. suggesting basis of all submissions and reports

Costa Rica +Peru. In favor of clearing this and are happy that this is included.

co-fac: done. any other questions that aren't cleared up? Run through the conclusions that we have. Thank you, will forward text to SBI chair.