Informal Consultation on APA Agenda Item 3 Further guidance in relation to the mitigation section of decision 1/CP.21 on: (a) Features of nationally determined contributions, as specified in paragraph 26; (b) Information to facilitate clarity, transparency and understanding of nationally determined contributions, as specified in paragraph 28; (c) Accounting for Parties' nationally determined contributions, as specified in paragraph 31

Wednesday, 5 December 2018, 5-6pm, Meeting Room 3

COP24/CMP14/CMA1-3/SBI49/SBSTA49/ APA1-7

Note taker: Melissa Low, Research Fellow, Energy Studies Institute, National University of Singapore (esimlyx@nus.edu.sg)

The informal consultation started at 5.05pm.

Additional tool available on the UNFCCC Website:

- For APA agenda item 3 iteration informal document, Version 05/12/2018 14:36 here (Document no: APA1_7.DT.i3)

Co-Facilitator noted the considerations for the iteration text:

- Based on discussions
- Para 10 and 19 same text in October text – still waiting for Parties to conclude negotiations on this
- Basis and starting point and engage on the substantive issues
- One hour today to hear from you your preliminary views
- Open the floors for intervention

Egypt

- Thank Co-Facilitators for what they have done. More focused and streamlined now.
- Preliminary views
- Some issues of concern that are missing
- Few issues to comment on:
- Opening para 1 – refer to PA, maintain focus and add "in particular Art 3 and 4" as they are the most related to the features
- OP 2 – recollection from discussion, growing consensus that we don't need to come back to that; suggestion to delete
- General observation on operative para – departure from mandate in Art 4; clear in the Art 4.4 on different treatment of developed countries (economy wide emissions reduction targets) and developing countries – implies info will be different etc.
- If we see in document same treatment, I believe departure from the mandate. Point of concern to flag out. Need to stick to the mandate that there will be different treatment for different countries. Need to keep in mind.
- Will come back with more detailed remarks after listening to colleagues.

Co-Facilitator drew attention to para 6, on reference to developed and developing countries.

Marshall Islands (AOSIS)

- Thank you to Co-Facilitators and Secretariat for turning around a revision so quickly.
- Some concerns – need more time to read this, small delegation e.g. Heads of Delegation meeting elsewhere
- Sequentially:
    - *Recalling* is vague; pre-ambular language, broad
    - Features section – wanted to see Option B in the text. We saw this first iteration as capturing low-hanging fruit and streamlining to remove duplications, repetitions etc. didn't see near convergence to remove substance on features. Major concern for us. Expect that stuff to be resolved later in the week or go to Ministers. Don't see where the instruction came to do that (on quantifiability of countries that spoke to the issue)
    - Ref to 2024 is not acceptable – appears in more than one place, e.g. revision of CTU; 2024, 9-12 months before relevant COP. Revision of CTU or features have to be done in 3 months. Revision or adoption of guidance or features is our mandate, won't have an impact on 2 rounds of NDCs. 2024 is not an acceptable year for this group.
    - Para 6 – *Decides* – capture the differentiation and binding-ness but note in general terms that our group view on CTU accounting guidance shall apply to all Parties.
- Need to go through in more detail
- Fairness and ambition – features of geography, climate and economy are important to SIDs
- Example of how you've handled – mitigation is compulsory, that should only apply to NDC // info on adaptation – like the way you included that. i.e. don't replicate work elsewhere
- Only headline comments but haven't had time to coordinate as a group

Singapore

- Align ourselves with Marshall Islands on behalf of AOSIS
- Capacity building remains an important element in the text
- ICTU – scope and coverage 2,3,4 and 5 can benefit from further reorganization
- Like the bullet points on key domestic institutional arrangements; can go along with points on assumptions and methodological approaches…
- View this as a space that Parties can bring across points
- Support geography, climate and economy as part of countries national circumstances
- ICTU guidance should be general and apply to current and future
- On ?, can go along with structured summary from the EU

Norway

- As others, not able to get in depth from this document but some general remarks
- Structure:
    - ICTU and accounting – overarching element in both places
    - Hear comment on work from other rooms, waiting to engage on that
- Paras on flexibility – Art 4.8 and 4.13 do not include language related to flexibility
- ICTU – in pretty good shape

- Scope and coverage – note insertion of larger debate on scope and respect different opinions on scope issue. Prefer kept in one place as in previous versions. Does not take it off the table but see that coming in a clear and gathered place.
- Pleased to see participatory process include several important considerations coming forward in planning section. Do consider in planning section still lengthy and might be useful to look at how to streamline further.
- Regret to see LULUCF, REDD+ removed – issue of complexity and need some further guidance; like to come back with more specific guidance on that
- Some more streamlining for fairness and ambition. Agree with Marshall Islands that 2024 is too late. That year is preparation for 2025 communication of NDCs too.
- Accounting – support insertion of structured summary, well reflected. Proposal from EU.
- IPCC guidance
- Missing points – references to parties H classes (?)

Switzerland

- Thank Co-Facilitators for preparing first iteration.
- In general useful
- Initial reactions and major concerns with document
- Need time to look into detail
- Welcome streamlining that has been done; more readable but in some places it does go beyond streamlining
- Features:
    - Some within our group that feel strongly about substance
    - As Marshall Islands has said, need to see option of features in the document. Quantifiability etc.
    - Revision date is too late. At latest 2022 for guidance to be applied accordingly and CTU and accounting
- CTU and Accounting:
    - Text did improve but specific elements missing
    - Accounting needs a lot of work to get to specificity level we want
- Obviously two big questions at least:
    - Scope – differentiation, proposal not reflected, concern for us

Brazil (ABU)

- Improvement from 20+ pages to 9
- Thank you to Co-Facilitators and Secretariat
- Preliminary comments, haven't finished reviewing the text
- Features – need para 1 at the most, do not see need to continue discussion on what we understand as existing features. We see contradiction between 1 and 2. Not to touch on the agreement, renegotiate what we agreed 3 years ago
- CTU – useful to have for clarity sake para 3 and 4 spelled out in as much as it does not prejudge discussion of rest of the elements.
- Para 6 – differentiation in implementation itself for CTU elements; do not need differentiated approach here for groups of Parties. Also feel that preference would be to not have a rediscussion of shall/should/may/include inter alia. Prefer "each party to provide" or "decides

that each party provide… information contained in Annex, para ….” As applicable to its NDC, as the country sees applicable… maybe a useful notion to put in this paragraph

- Page 2 a 4 – questions and doubts on conditions for updating reference indicators. Perhaps in an informal setting/later on
- Agree with Singapore on making 2,3,4,5 work together as they speak to the same issue
- Planning issues – agree with others, looks too chunky. Are to provide more information on implementation of NDC – feel like going into too much detail in that area e.g. para 2 domestic mitigation measures – already doing it in BURs, correct vehicle to report on them; original proposal was to have legal, laws, relevant to planning of implementation you can present but detailed language on specific mitigation measures or measures wouldn't be useful
- Component of best practices – that might not be the place to have this reflected. Looks like an ex post discussion rather than ex ante information to be provided.
- E 4 a – baseline reference levels including key parameters – Q: are these examples, do we really need them? Open the door for us to present lots of information / that the international community may not want to receive. How do Parties who want this see this playing out?
- E 5 – that would fit best under planning processes and not under methodologies and approaches i.e. on if you intend to use Art. 6
- Prefer consistent…
- On 3 – looking at language replace ref to LULUCF and REDD+, don't see need to have sector specific para on CTU. Wording that build on this, something that's useful.
- Subsequent removals – clarification to better understand why… e.g. natural disturbances
- H 2 b – baseline – like to have clarification if this refers to baseline for BAU projection or static baseline i.e. reference to the past. Linguistic issue that some of us might have.
- Important that we kept paras on adaptation support finance technology – initial idea to have placeholders but also ok to look into them when we have more time
- On accounting, surprised you put everything together and not with sub-headings. Still have to get there. Some preliminary comments and will come back with more details.
    - A – common metrics and methodologies, APA 5 discussion; preference to have text here / common metrics and GTP
    - M – (Brazil national position) carbon units – legally we cannot speak to carbon units authorized for other than purpose of achieving NDC – Art 6.2 specific provision that says those ITMOs will be for achievement of NDCs
- Capacity building – still can think about whether 2 or 1 – open to discussion. Important to have a strong paragraph.

United States

- Also offer preliminary observations
- Thank you for this text. By and large accurate reflection of options Parties have asked to be included
- Concerns by AOSIS and Switzerland on features, respect their concerns
- Text is currently easier to consider – will help as we move through specific issues we need to consider
- In side conversations, Parties are working on particular issues. Good work being done outside of the rooms. We welcome that.
- Specific elements and guidance – offer preliminary observations:
    - Capacity building will change the text –understand why it hasn't been updated; single reference at the top, consideration for somewhat later

    - Para 12 – GST in 2023, communication in 2025 and assumption is that review needs to be initiated earlier to reflect in 2025 communications.
    - Desire of Parties to bifurcate – we do not view that as consistent with the clear language of 4.13 or para 31.
    - Page 7 g sector specific levels – language needs to be consistent. Everyone has to report on sector specific things – depending on NDC
- Art 6 refs in a number of places – some of those can be streamlined and systematized as we have further discussions

European Union

- Text is step forward but some concerns
- Preliminary points
- One decision on APA 3 but try not to preempt discussion at higher level on the outcome
- 2023 for 2025
- Features – support Switzerland and Marshall Islands. What we have now would be disappointing outcome
- CTU – 2020 – working with Parties on language, for second iteration
- Scope and coverage bullet 6 should be reflected elsewhere – park contentious issue all together
- Brazil's suggestion – related to NDC that decides what information you include. Not discretionary.
- On accounting – most concerning part of document – appreciate structured summary but not appropriately reflect our position e.g. merging two concepts BTRs (transparency); accounting decision, tool used to account. Has to be in APA 3 room. WHAT to report. HOW is in transparency APA 5 room.
- On substantive elements – appreciate streamlining but key priorities no included. Headings for sub-bullets – substance underneath now gone. Concerning. e.g. 31a – inventories for accounting; 31 b working with colleagues to flesh further.
- Bullet M – this needs to be kept but split into two decision provisions because two different issues 1) avoiding double counting 2) avoiding mitigation outcomes that does not go towards achieving NDCs
- Prefer not to have separate refs for 6.2 and 6.4

Mexico

- Thank you for good work.
- Happy to have this as basis for further discussion.
- Need more time
- Preliminary views
- On features – support Switzerland's comments, required for guidance and timing of revision (expressed by other colleagues Marshall islands, US and EU)
- Scope and coverage – general description of target not enough. Add info specific to target important
- Planning processes – happy of the mention/inclusion of gender and human rights in description
- …
- On long-term low GHG emissions strategies

- E – assumptions and methodological approaches – 4 b further specification of methodological approaches in IPCC important and like to see language for non-CO2 gases such as short lived climate pollutants
- Support EU intervention on accounting – Mexico of the view that accounting section is a disappointment. Hope to engage with colleagues on this, particularly on issues related to Art. 6

Japan

- Thank you for drafting this text
- Weird format
- On differentiation – others have shared. Shouldn't have.
- Accounting
- Important elements
- Scope and coverage
- …
- Assumptions and methodological approaches – 1,2,3,4,5 very important
- CTU – timing not 2024
- Accounting – very streamlined but still have lots of important elements e.g. c on pg. 7 important. Wording "encouraged"... not sure if this is appropriate
- Brazil's intervention
- Para 21 (?) important for us
- Capacity building an ongoing process, should be in decision text

China (LMDC)

- Preliminary reflection on this iteration and speak to points by colleagues
- Strong concerns
- Everyone has expressed our views but our views not well captured
- Not consensus
- Preamble – crucial problem for us – didn't see our concerns on *Recalling* Art 3
- Features – Art 3 not reflected and even Nationally Determined not reflected – crucial; decides... Consideration for features. Not agreed language. Should be in bracket. But LMDC suggest to delete as did not agree on this. Not consensus at Bangkok session or October note but new mention last night.
- Recalling Art 4.8 twice in paras 3 and 5. Para 27 – to our understanding application of guidance, don't want misleading to Parties that elements and substantive elements are included in guidance. Adopt whole guidance. Now para 5 enhanced what LMDC against this kind of expression. Not our interpretation on what APA 3 will achieve. Guidance including all instead of just the substantive elements (?) – some misunderstanding
- Noticed under Scope and coverage – whether NDC includes mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation. Mitigation is removed. Language from Bangkok – mitigation is in brackets but cannot accept deletion of this word mitigation here for LMDC. If a party includes adaptation, we are just seeking to include guidance on how will they communicate their adaptation information. Not trying to duplicate the word.
- We will be reluctant to work on substantive items if Parties are trying to remove our suggestions.

- Disappointed to see valuable points removed without discussion e.g. Oct note pg. 9 climate benefits and co-benefits resulting from implementation of NDCs – crucial point. Best practices is reflected. Should share our best practices, to have sufficient people and capacity to do that.
- …

Co-Facilitator noted:

- Continued list: Canada, Fiji, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Zimbabwe, Marshall Islands, India, Iran
- Tomorrow's meeting: 12-1pm in Room 22.
- 10-12pm room available for inf-inf at Room 14.

The informal consultation ended at 6.05pm.