

SBI 49 agenda item 5 Common time frames for nationally determined contributions referred to in Article 4, paragraph 10, of the Paris Agreement

Thursday, 6 December 2018, 10-11am, Meeting Room 2

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 meeting began at 10am.

Co-Facilitator opened the meeting and noted the new iteration Version 05/12/2018 17:05 [here](#).

South Africa

- Para 2b in para 2 in original proposal and every five years – integral part of our proposal
- With two NDCs, need to show progression after 2025
- Disappointed that only procedural, little from EU
- Disappointed to see 2041 – had conversation with LMDC on this. At Bonn we said this is not acceptable to us.
- Only procedural conclusions, we would for now just like to see our proposal full reflected

Saudi Arabia (Arab Group)

- Thank you for new iteration of draft decision
- Disappointment at this paper
- Bangkok – bullet points will not be reflected as draft text but it has
- Last meeting – procedural proposal to be reflected as an option but not reflected
- Promises doesn't help us, how to trust you
- Clarification from your side requested

Co-Facilitator said they will come back to this after hearing from other Parties.

China (LMDC)

- Echo Arab Group position
- Procedural decision should be an option
- One clarification – unable to participate in the inf-inf last night, and hope formal slot views will be captured
- Slight placement issue raised on LMDC position; Option 2 ending etc.
- Why 2041 onwards? We just copied what happened up to now according to para 23.
- Request SBI to do work on what Party should submit; 5 year time frame – 2035 to 2045; 10 year to 2050 – depends what the Party chooses (10 or 5+5)
- Not our choice to combine our proposal with others. Hope to see our proposal as a clear one. Some logical conflict with para 4.
- Doing it this or another way conflicts with one another
- We cannot allow both.
- Want to copy right now what has happened

- If this para appears here it is kind of confusing for us
- Seek clarification on para 5 – indicative way point at 5 year mark. Based on reading here, 2 things – this proposal come from what Party wants to see, and indicative in the future. Do not catch concern from this proposal.
- My suggestion is to organize this draft this paper to keep LMDC proposal as a clean one due to conflict in logic.
- Independent logical thinking
- We have made great effort and try to find some language to move forward
- Add “otherwise decided by CMA...”
- ...

Marshall Islands

- Doubly horrific this morning
- LMDC clarification
- Agree with many things said particularly on landing with a procedural outcome but somehow capturing the options
- If we had procedural outcome, not consistent with addendum which purports to decide something
- Priority for our group and national delegation
- Not going to converge in next 30 mins and next session on 5 or 10 years
- Even in our group we don’t have a single view
- In my national capacity, I don’t have room to move on an option
- Honest with each other that we are not going to have a common 5 or 10 year timeframe – that’s just not going to happen
- We really like what China has done on behalf of LMDC in Option 2 in clarifying their proposal – first time I’ve understood what Parties or Groups of Parties are trying to do
- Although it’s clear, and fundamentally I don’t agree (cause it delays what we want to do) but we respect that LMDC wants to present their option intact – we respect that
- Fundamental difference is – common timeframe that run from 2030 (us) / time of application is different between us
- Happy to capture this distinct difference – don’t think we are going to converge in Katowice
- we don’t understand where 2041 came in – like some clarification
- pick up from China
- like to see SBI to continue work
- but please capture LMDC option as a distinct, clean option but also other Parties’ options in bullet points so at least we come back next time having captured the discussion and come back to it
- support procedural outcome, capture options intact as parties put on the table but not in decision language but options language in an annex or addendum
- position to take out discussions forward

Singapore

- thank you for work on first iteration

- Echo what Parties have said on a procedural outcome
- Wide spectrum of views
- Like to express disappointment with certain paras – 6 2a & 2b
 - appears to distort Art 14 – puts obligation on Parties where there isn't one
 - urge clear focus on our mandate
 - para 23,24 1/cp21 & ... not clear why this is necessary
 - concept of progression already in Art 4.3
 - not adding anything new from temporal perspective, then not clear why this is here

Japan

- Express appreciation for this iteration
- Not going in detail for this text
- Echo other Parties' interventions that we've made progress this time on this matter
- Last session – more optimistic that we might have more concrete decision at COP24 but as Marshall Islands have articulated, we might need to have a procedural decision to lock in consideration of common timeframes in the future
- But we have identified 3 options: 5,10, 5 & or 10
- Second round of NDCs (timing issue complex) from 2031 onwards
- Two important aspects should be reflected in the decision so that we do not discuss the same thing and build on progress
- Whatever the format, document capturing common understanding. Shouldn't just be decision language but to capture progress
- Minimum requirement from my delegation

Russian Federation

- Acknowledge your efforts
- Confused when I received the iteration because we had quite clearly displayed options and we were thinking that this options could be addressed in this iteration for negotiations
- Delicate language that suits all Parties concerned
- However, 2 options are quite confusing
- Choose between 5 or 10 years but both options have a lot of conditionalities which language – in our view- deviates from the language of para 23 and 24 of the Decision 1/CP.21 and so cannot support any of the options
- Our position is 10 years and update of NDCs every 5 years
- Even in option 2 you cannot read it clearly – cannot support option 2 either
- Have procedural conclusion and no Annexes to it
- Prepared to start discussion from blank sheet

Saudi Arabia requested for the Co-Facilitator to be

Saudi Arabia echoed Russian Federation to not have an Annex.

South Africa

- Disappointed on procedural outcome and reserve right to see the document

- Could use para7 to some extent but not with year 2041 but 2031
- Emerging consensus
- Agree on China's explanation
- Cannot put decisions into the Annex
- Want to come back next year
- Want to be very clear that South Africa will not decision here or next year – understand para 23 and 24 as a compromise and to extend that into the next decade
- Would see some version of para 7 with that year change being essential
- Suggest without prejudice your addendum in para 1 – 3 options more clearly expresses options
- Like to see the options in an addendum
- See simply to copy & past options 1-3 but not option 4 (entirely defeat the purpose of having this negotiation) – it would be absolutely clear and agree to come back next year

Co-Facilitator suggested following Parties taking the floor to comment on the suggestion by Russian Federation on whether or not to have an Annex or Addendum.

New Zealand

- Thank you for this paper
- Short and substantive
- Thank you to China for LMDC for laying out that proposal and clarity that is there; now do understand it
- Whatever our views about that proposal, what it does is it underpins what we like to see captured: agreement that convergence is what we are aiming for
- Importance of convergence
- Converge on common timeframes at a time
- Not a blank sheet – work that has been done should not be lost; those 3 options in addendum are good ones to have
- 4th one – not one is speaking for nationally determined
- Common timeframes should be consistent with 5 year heartbeat of the Paris Agreement – something we'd like to see
- Like Singapore, not quite sure about para 6 options – didn't particularly seem to belong to Option 2; not clear they fit our mandate or are part of our mandate; worth talking about though

India

- Support colleague from China on behalf of LMDC that there is a need that option presented by LMDC clearly reflected
- Thank you for the clarification on Saudi Arabia's question – procedural outcome
- Singapore and New Zealand have highlighted incoherence of para 6 with mandate that we have; para 3 in previous version / those views have not been captured
- In this paper, para 4b, bears close resemblance to para 24 in terms of the timelines we are looking at but the language is slightly different – para 3 above contains up to 2040 to shall update these NDCs by 2030... should be "to communicate or update" must stick to that language
- Para 5 – could have it deleted

Bangladesh (LDC)

- Admit that you have put a sincere approach to capture our progress
- Feel that you deserve the appreciation from all of us
- Wrt to text you have put forward, we got some understanding of proposals of various groups
- Strongly feel we should capture proposals already put forward by Parties – should be reflected in totality
- Group strongly feels we have to capture progress (responding to Russian Federation proposal)
- Next iteration, make it more clear and palatable avoiding any confusion
- Options 1,2,3 – additional option that has been captured in para 1 should be reflected

Zimbabwe (African Group)

- Thought we had made progress in Bonn in terms of convergence but in Bangkok the whole convergence disappeared and we hoped we can converge here in Katowice, still hopeful
- Following your guidance that we may have procedural conclusions due to different views among Parties, we want to see our options reflected
- Not fixed to an Annex or not
- Bangladesh's suggestion to capture progress, we have invested a lot of time – either as a paragraph in procedural conclusions or Annex ok

Indonesia

- Prefer Annex
- Capture 5 and 10 year option and if 10 year cycle / 5 year indicative target
- GST – does not belong to this Agenda item but APA 3
- Para 7 – starting point 2031 or 2041 and focus on that discussion at next session

China (LMDC)

- Support procedural decision captured in big option
- Suggest language – similar to para 1, decides that Parties shall apply CTF... from 2030 onwards
- Request SBI to continue consideration with a view... to recommendation at its sixth session November 2023 session
- Before 2025 is enough time – open to be Nov 2022 or Nov 2021
- Will prepare draft language and send you via email
- We do not want to see confusion on different options in Annex text language; but suggest to do footnote about linking document that captures views rather than an Annex to the decision – prefer the link with a footnote (CRP or other status) instead of an Annex

Chile (AILAC)

- Option 1 that suggests 5+5 is coherent since it could accommodate to all of us
- From original South African proposal in Option 2 – allows us to... wording as follows...
- Consistent with progression in light with most recent information
- Harmonization 2025 is consistent timing to submit a second NDC
- Reflect progress on our discussions from last night's inf-inf

- Postponing decision – we should have a clear date on that before we present our second NDC

Marshall Islands

- Making progress here
- Thank China on behalf of LMDC that even I can understand
- Moving towards procedural conclusion
- Parties want to capture progress but some nervousness about the status of that capture – respect that and open to considering how that can be done
- China made some suggestions from text – interesting and we'd like to see that
- 2023 is the absolute latest and like Chile, it needs to inform the next round
- Good to see the drafting
- Concern: that we have little time left until – when?
- Need some more time among Parties to understand how we are going to – on language around procedural conclusion – and what's that going to be
- Need time to ensure manner and content of capture
- Suggest you produce a new iteration and we'd need some time in inf-inf to consider it
- Need to capture options intact as made by Parties – not time to converge; mode of capturing option – need some comfort around that and need to give Parties comfort that their options are without prejudice to outcome; latter is going to be the part that needs the most time

Brazil

- LMDC proposal constructive to keep us moving
- Welcome progress
- Apply common timeframes after 2031
- Welcome decide... to give time to input to second NDC
- Like to see annex, paper – open to discussing
- Procedural decision/conclusion
- Think that a procedural decision would be useful to keep parity in keeping with PAWP but that does not exclude that this carry forwards the work done

Russian Federation

- Notes absence of square brackets
- Prepared to start with blank sheet
- A mess to put everything in the Annex

Saudi Arabia

- Do not accept annex but ok with CRP or paper in footnote
- China (LMDC) need to change language of decision and make it bullet points

Co-Facilitators said that they appreciate the Parties' views and discussions and that they will find a way to make progress of issues and willingness to consider further will be captured:

- Will prepare procedural outcome from this session
- Note difference of opinion

- Heard bridging proposal: Link to CRP
- Inf-inf space to discuss procedural outcome can be captured – time and room will be made available
- Appreciate proposals on content to be forwarded to us
- Next iteration by tomorrow and final session on Saturday.

Marshall Islands suggested for inf-inf not to clash with APA 3.

Saudi Arabia also echo Marshall Islands and not after 6pm.

The informal consultation ended at 11.05am.