

Informal consultations on matters relating to Article 6 - SBSTA 51 Agenda Item 12(a) (5/12 3pm)

https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/SBSTA51.DT_i12a.pdf

- Brazil
 - Need more focus on mandate of negotiations. Should focus on guidance to operationalise principles rather than flesh out new implementable methodologies. Infeasible for substantive progress in 1 year.
 - 2(h) – need more focus on “framing” safeguards and limits. Broad point that ITMOs should not undermine ability to achieve NDCs.
 - 4 – Need elaboration on what is meant by infrastructure to ensure accuracy and transparency in information exchange.
 - 10 – The Secretariat is not necessary to assist developing countries. This is “patronising” and should be deleted.
 - 15 – Should be included.
 - Annex I – Don’t think there is mandate to develop rules on ITMOs themselves. Need more focus on broad guidance. Should not be applying rules for domestic action. There is also inconsistent usage of emissions reductions/removals terminology. Prefers language that uses “removals” as is used in the Paris Agreement (*note that the Paris Agreement includes both “removals” and “reductions”*).
 - Annex II. 4(d) – May establish work programme on this topic for next year, text should reflect this.
 - Annex III. C – Bracket sectors and gases text because of inconsistent use.
 - Annex III. D – Hard time understanding language. Contradictory language. Domestic treatment of ITMOs should not be addressed. 3D can be deleted.
 - Annex III. E – Need consistent language with 6.2
 - Annex V - Mandate for this should be more focused.
 - Annex V. B – Need to support consistency in language (eg. Not just Article 6 database).
 - Broadly, need a more focused work program.
- Singapore
 - Annex III. B – This is an improvement on clarity and substance. But need balance in ensuring consistency and national determination. ‘Nationally Determined’ part of NDCs needs to be captured. Need to be able to incorporate other methods in the future.
 - 8(b)(ii) – Would prefer clean application on first time use.
 - Annex III. F – Inconsistent with work programme on safeguards and limits. Quantified limits presented, but these should just be complimentary to NDCs. Limits may affect high ambition for adaptation.
 - Annex VI. – para 46 sounds like a loop with no trigger point; para 38 (from Annex V. B) is unclear. Only one expert review or something else?
- Thailand
 - Text needs to be more streamlined.
 - 2(e) – Prefer original text language. Supports preparatory work.
 - Annex I – Need to reference IPCC guidelines, not a different decision (18/CMA.1).
 - Annex IV. C – Need to better reflect information in initial report. Para 30 – should parties jointly provide information to increase efficiency?
 - ITMOs checks for corresponding adjustments should be by technical expert review.

- Switzerland
 - Supports Brazil's point that there is no place for Secretariat supporting countries. Secretariat is not suited for that job.
 - Annex 1 – clarify that it is ITMOs created after 2021, need to have time consistency.
 - Annex III. B – happy with changes. Potential to bring into work programme to discuss if adding further methods is possible.
 - Para 9 – instead of “participating parties”, should say “each participating party”. Applies for each country but not necessarily each pair cooperating.
 - Para 15 – supports previous wording that allows for purposes other than NDC achievement. If countries choose to authorise for broader purposes, they need to have the option.
 - Para 22 – discussion not ready, 22(c) in particular is unclear (before Paris regime? Extends beyond NDC timescales?).
 - Para 28 – annually quantitative information was previous agreement, text needs to be updated?
 - Paras 34 & 35 – need to be able to track units, not just report annually and look back.
- Saudi Arabia
 - “Thank you for large spacious room”
 - Asks how Secretariat will capture views with text coming out tomorrow night. Have been using informal informals so far. Should stick to either informals or even informal informals.
 - Para 2 - implies a WP but needs clarity on what are outcomes, delivery, which for which items. Older version also had text which said “this guidance supersedes” previous decisions, but is missing from current text.
 - (e) – should not be giving NDC guidance. Should be nationally determined.
 - (h)(ix) – add avoidance of coercive measures.
 - (h)(xi) – had long discussion on human rights, so this should be bracketed. If human rights must remain, then text should include “the rights of people under occupation, the rights to development, the right to sustainable development, rights to CBDR&RC, and equity”.
 - Para 6 – need clarity and content. Indicate what the work is or remove this text.
 - Para 10 – don't like.
 - Para 11 – is a nationally determined process and should be removed.
 - Supports para 15
 - Para 18 – no obligation for developing countries to contribute to trust fund, need to add wording that removes developing country responsibility.
 - Annex I – ITMOs and mitigation outcomes?? Should be ITMOS.
 - 1(b) – allow all removals to be considered.
 - 1(e) – should be removed because this markets content is already about achieving NDC.
 - Annex II, 4 – good but needs to remove (e).
 - Annex III. A. 6 – remove “consistently”.
 - Annex III. B – need to have menu-based approach. Need to cover all methodologies. No default. Support Korean suggestion to bring back all previous options.
 - Annex VII. – prefers option b, proceeds should go to adaptation fund.
 - Annex IX – option needs to remain.

- Discussions on baselines and additionality need to be further discussed. Still unfinished business on 6.4.
- Tuvalu point of order
 - Mode of work?? Saudi Arabia intervention went through entire text. If so, put up text and go line by line. Thought we were trying to get general opinions and whether there are bridging positions. Expressing previous opinion and positions on brackets is too inefficient.
- Chair – point of order sounds more like a complaint :^). Tuvalu correct that Parties were restating positions when they were asked to not do so. Parties were asked to guide the Chair and negotiations to possible landing zones. Get together 9pm after coordination meetings. Large open list of countries to be addressed.
- Tuvalu
 - Continuing on the list is okay, but is an informal informal. 9pm is an informal informal. Get together is something else. Need clarity on mode of operation.
- Chair – 9pm will be an informal informal.
- Tuvalu says the process is jumping around.
- Chair – The open list of countries will continue in an informal. The 9pm informal informal will address baseline and additionality issues.
- Tuvalu asks if the informal informal can start at 8pm?
- Chair - doesn't want to cut into coordination times.
- EU point of order – confusion with informal and informal informal. Informal = more structural comments. Informal informals = more focused comments?
- Chair – Informal informal open. Notes that over 70,000 person days have been spent on article 6 over 7 years. “Do the maths”.
- Egypt point of order – still confused about process. Was going to raise reflections on draft text in this informal. Which is doing what?
- Chair - First list of outstanding speakers from this morning's get together (now called an informal informal), will be picked tonight. This informal has list of outstanding speakers, will not be picked up tonight. Will be picked up in the next informal tomorrow.
- China point of order – informal informal is specific discussions. Informal is comment on whole text. What purpose of inf discussion? With limited time, the Chair needs to consider what is informal's purpose? Why have an informal here (BAKER)?
- Chair – for transparency.