

Session Title: **SBSTA informal consultations on research and systematic observation.**

Date & Time: 6 December 2018 1700-1900

Notetaker: Elinor Martin

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

Co-facilitators:

- welcome. Approach as follows:
- we have done good work. final version was shared at noon today.
- incorporated changes in track changes
- General consensus reach in most paragraphs
- will show text on the screen.
- propose accepting paragraphs that have been agreed

Switzerland: can you display the text please

co-fac: aim to find consensus on para 3, 11, 13. This is the final session so aim to finish discussion. para 3 - remove bracket in sentence 1 and text from 2nd part of 2nd sentence.

St K& N (ASIS): deleted part of 10C?

co-fac: based on discussions removed talk of NDC in paragraph

St K& N (ASIS): proposal put forward by Belize. proposal: add text.

Canada: In this case this paragraph is talking about observations through climate services and value to decision making at a whole range of scales. seems odd to be singling out NDCs here. Not comprehensive enough. Preference for alternate language, similar to para 9 where it states decision making on adaptation and mitigation. Do support NDCs.

St K & N: this would be acceptable

Canada: edit text. Thank you st kitts for compromise

India: curiosity. wasn't there at last meeting. what is the difference between knowledge and information - what are we trying to say?

Canada: it was Canada's intervention that led to knowledge being added. Encompass traditional knowledge that is distinct from other sources of information.

co-fac. para 10 is now agreed. move back to para 3.

Saudi Arabia: not clear. can you show on the screen. Repeat the same exercise from the last section that we don't highlight any particular report. Why only picking two.

co-fac: in previous SBSTA the same language was used.

Saudi Arabia: we have the footnotes, others can look to make their own conclusions. don't want to specify or give more weight to any program or organization.

EU: iterate what said before. would like to emphasize the importance of expressing concern about reports from WMO. Main indicators of climate change have deteriorated and we should note that with concern.

StK&N: support the EU comment.

Saudi Arabia: we still think "with concern" should be deleted or kept in brackets. The concern is always there or we wouldn't be meeting. Climate indicators cannot be degraded - this is an exaggeration.

Kuwait: i would prefer to delete/bracket with concern. And end para after "above". Do not need to note indicators. Receivers of report can highlight whatever they need to. We don't need to guide the reader to any pathway.

Tanzania: support the language that highlights our concern. We are concerned. This language should be maintained. Suggest a compromise: to include concern, but not mention 2a and 2b and indicators.

Canada: echo statements of EU and StK&N and Tanzania that they have concern. Basis for concern is evidence presented in documents (primarily in 2a and 2b). Want to keep 1st sentence, can be flexible in 2nd sentence. Preference would be to keep 2nd, but more important is 1st sentence.

Switzerland: echo statements made by EU, StK&N, Tanz, Canada. We are concerned so want to keep the word concern. This is like the language we approved last year so want to stick to it.

co-fac: keeping with concern in []?

Kuwait: slightly lost with suggestions - there were many.

co-fac: i suggest we keep 1st sentence as it is and delete [] consistent with previous reports.

Saudi Arabia: would like to keep brackets and move to next paragraph for the sake of time.

co-fac: we will delete. If you want to keep them in you can bring them up in plenary.

Saudi Arabia: our position is to keep brackets.

co-fac: noted. also other parties more concerned, so keeping previous language. If you want [] bring up in plenary. Next paragraph

Kuwait: echo intervention of Saudi to keep [] and take to plenary. Since it is not agreed we must take to plenary with brackets as this is a party driven process.

stK&N: moving forward explain what has been proposed to submit to the SBSTA chair.

co-fac: delete brackets in second sentence. with concern kept in brackets to be resolved at the plenary.

stK&N: if first sentence not resolved, then keep second sentence in brackets too.

Saudi Arabia: I maintain my position.

co-fac: given interventions we will bracket second sentence in entirety and take to plenary. Now para 11.

Belize: since it was the COP that requested the IPCC to do special report. I suggest we welcome the report.

Fiji: fully support the sentiments of Belize to welcome the report.

Norway: I agree with Fiji and Belize. The Paris meeting asked for the report and we should welcome it. Also support the remainder of the paragraph.

Saudi Arabia: concerns in welcoming (implies accepting). Noting is recognizing. Acknowledge the report has some knowledge gaps.

Canada: I don't have magic words. Echo interventions that we invited them to undertake the report, that we should use positive statements that they completed that work in a short timeframe. We want to keep the word welcome.

StKN: strongly suggest we use the word welcome as it was on the request of parties.

Kuwait: echo Saudi Arabia. Since outcomes were not agreed by all parties we just take a note of it.

Russia Fed: show concerns expressed by Sa Arabia and Kuwait, we all know the weaknesses of the report and noted is neutral and most appropriate. We welcome the presentations but welcome isn't the right word for the report.

EU: we should welcome the report. Acknowledged could be an alternative but noted is not acceptable. funding gaps doesn't come from the reports, so should delete that bracketed text

USA: support the EU question/clarification. funding gaps addressed in next paragraph. SBSTA "note" the report and note with appreciation the scientists that contributed to it.

India: suggestions... one thing is certain, because everyone will be hit by climate change there is no winner. whatever you keep we will be happy. But we must do something. On one side we are trying to welcome the report. Intentions are not very clear. We have nations that are in danger - acknowledge is a stronger word than welcome. Who says it doesn't help funding gaps - lots of gaps listed in report in last chapter. Removing something that is so vital for small developing nations I don't know what we are trying to do. I can't solve your problem but I have frustrations and we should be consistent as how we project our ideas. We are happy with whatever we collectively decide. Importance is we do something.

co-fac: welcomed or acknowledged?

India: can live with both. Also the final. Don't remove the funding.

Japan: As we requested report, we should respect the effort by the authors. Can say welcome the effort of the report. Consistent with text in the last session. Read text.

Norway: fully agree the funding gaps for observations is important but not sure it was covered in IPCC report so could be in para 12. Surprising and sad that some countries don't want to welcome the report. Scientists have worked hard. The outside world would not understand why we aren't welcoming. Noted is not acceptable. Key is that we need to welcome it otherwise we can't ask them to do reports anymore. This is crucial for SBSTA.

co-fac: i hear you - but how do we move?

Belize: Norway stole my thunder - i agree totally. IPCC did not address systematic observation funding gaps (although I agree we want to capture that sentiment in para 12).

Switzerland: we welcome the IPCC report. Many comments were addressed in the review of IPCC report. It cannot have weaknesses.

co-fac: even if you do not like a person you still welcome them

Saudi Arabia: can live with noted. and welcome efforts and presentations.

co-fac: some parts acceptable by all. Lets work on what we are happy. Lets move funding gaps to para 12 line 3. what about this so far. No flags. Flags..

Canada: support sentiment but need to make sure it reads logically

co-fac: para 11 - accept sentences 2, 3, and 4. As a matter of compromise want a positive tone about special report. Is acknowledged a compromise? It is weak but has a positive attitude. Take time to consider this among yourselves.

****time for discussions between parties, not in session****

**** return to session****

co-facs: thanks for effort but we don't have final solution. Funding issue is included implicitly in para 12 as enhancing. & maintaining can't be done without funding. acceptable?

Belize: thank you. in spirit of compromise that is acceptable.

co-fac: para 11. accept final two sentences. keep the three options in brackets and take out compromise from japan.

Saudi Arabia: cannot accept this

Brazil: ??

co-fac: funding is implicit in here

Brazil: want it to be here explicit. will work on text.

India: Are we implicitly welcoming the IPCC report as a committee so could we remove that sentence? As a compromise.

Brazil: text to add.

Belize: also proposal that is agreed language from SBSTA 39.

co-fac: language proposed by Brazil shorter but similar? happy with suggestion from Belize? Lets use Belize. Para 12 solved.

EU: nice compromise. lets delete funding gaps from para 11.

Kuwait: para 12 - two different topics now? securing funding and observations are different?
para is now confusing.

co-fac: sentence at end of para 12 would make connection better. other option would be to have a separate paragraph.

Belize: thanks to colleague. better to have funding info at end of para 12

Co-fac: better to have new para in that case.

Kuwait: now it is better. thank you.

Fiji: cannot say in this regards at the beginning.

co-fac: accepted 12 and added 13. Now back to 11. lets work from end of paragraph. can we accept last sentence?

Norway: cannot work backwards as it is all connected. That is my reservation.

co-fac: you are right we should work logically.

Japan: our intention is to separate the evaluation of the report and the efforts of the report. We recognize that this does not work for some parties so can delete suggestion.

USA: I though the conversation we had did reflect the differentiating between the findings of the report and the effort of the authors. It represents some progress.

Russian Fed: thank you Japan as it reflects my intention. SBSTA welcomes the efforts of the report.

Norway: in that case we should say welcome with appreciation of the efforts.

Saudi Arabia: I propose some language. What i understand from m colleagues that we have to appreciate efforts of all scientists that contributed to report. We consider the findings of the report that there are gaps. suggest text. we appreciate their efforts.

StK&N: we are going around in circles. Preference is to welcome report. Willing to discuss acknowledge. We don't want to just welcome efforts - suggests it incomplete. Bracket the three and take to SBSTA.

Belize: I agree with ASIS colleague. Two issues: we must acknowledge the efforts of the authors who worked pro bono to complete report. We should encourage them to continue. However, we should also welcome the output of the report. Should be in two separate sentences.

EU: Afraid I don't have a sentence. I agree with Belize.

co-fac: we are not getting closer. We take out the intervention from Japan as it is now included in second sentence. Keep bracketed options and go to plenary.

USA: I support your suggestion on para 11. Please clarify where we landed with para 3 regarding the indicators.

Russian Fed: I am sorry but I would like to keep suggestion of Japan in first line but keep in brackets in second line.

Kuwait: for 11, as Saudi Arabia said, we need to bracket the whole paragraph.

co-fac: find a solution to take out some problems with para 11. We all agree that we welcome efforts and presentations - we could single that out in separate para and keep issues in another.

Saudi Arabia: i think we have agreed on the second part. We will do anything as long as we use noted. we need to bracket the whole paragraph until we reach a solution.

EU: would be happy to agree on second sentence but need to add IPCC experts not just IPCC.

co-fac: could the second sentence be its own para?

Saudi Arabia: it is not acceptable to separate. We must resolve or bracket.

co-fac: go back to 3 and bracket off 11. We have 3 brackets in para 3.

Saudi Arabia: are all brackets there?

co-fac: yes, brackets are there, as is with concern, in brackets.

Kuwait: para 2cis was not discussed. why is this one here?

co-fac: outcome of discussion this morning proposed by ASIS in inf-inf. 2bis bracketed as missing a representative.

Kuwait: on prior version it was deleted. also intervention on para2 on welcoming the following statements. also intervention about 2bis - does it replace 2? no it is not? now we are welcoming GCOS? who are we going to welcome next? My proposal is to take 2bis and 2cis out. too many repetitions

Canada: clarify the origin of 2cis. this was previous 2f and it wasn't a formal submission to SBSTA which is why it got moved.

St K&N: Canada is correct.

Kuwait: still not acceptable. EU says that report was not presented so how can we welcome it?

GCOS: report based on 2016 Marrakech decision.

Saudi Arabia: the point for 2cis is weird. why are we pushing to accept. Kuwait and Canada showed that it was not there. it should be removed.

EU: makes it clear that 2bis is important from conversations today.

co-fac: should we include WCRP in 2bis also.

Kuwait: 2bis is a repetition. would like to bracket 2bis and 2cis.

co-fac: lets remove 2bis and 2cis and focus on 3.

St K&N: it is getting late. GCOS report was a request from parties so we were okay with placing outside two lists. Do not support the delete of 2cis.

co-fac: have to leave, will take to SBSTA chair. Thank you for the discussions.