

Open ended, informal consultations with the Presidency on COP agenda items:

2(b) Adoption of the rules of procedure;

14(b) Proposal from PNG & Mexico to amend Articles 7 and 18 of the Convention; and

16(d) Decision-making in the UNFCCC process

7 Dec 2019, 1430h | Meeting Room 7

Chair: COP Presidency

Prepared by: Eric Bea (National University of Singapore)

Chair: No objections from parties - This informal consultation proceeds in open session. Starting with agenda item 2(b). This has been unresolved since the second COP in 1996. I now open the floor.

Again, anyone wants to take the floor?

Saudi Arabia: Our view is still the same, we are satisfied with how we are currently making decisions, regardless of the Paris Agreement. We would like the current arrangements to remain.

Chair: Can I take there is no consensus? Under the Draft Rules of Procedure, Rule 16, this will be included in the next agenda.

Proceeding to the next agenda item, 14(b). This was held in abeyance in COP24 and included in COP25 agenda under Rule 16. Mexico, as the proponent, you have the floor.

Mexico: As our co-proposer, Papua New Guinea, is not here, we cannot speak on behalf of both parties.

Chair: The floor is now open on this agenda item.

Saudi Arabia: There seems to be a bid to make this a short session. Anyhow, our view, is that this item should be deleted since there is no value to discuss this further. Unless the proponents would like to make a case for it.

Chair: Can I take there is consensus to refer to COP27?

I see Russia would like the floor.

Russia: From our discussion with our Arab friends, we understand there are other urgent points on this agenda, and this agenda item is irrelevant. Therefore we are in agreement with Saudi Arabia.

Chair: Can I take there is consensus to refer to COP26? Since Papua New Guinea is not in the room.

Saudi Arabia: I don't hear any objection from the others in the room to deleting the agenda. While we respect the country, we see no value to continue the agenda. There is no time for this discussion. I don't see this is the right approach. Assuming the agenda is referred to the next session, maybe we need a legal opinion on whether the agenda item can be removed in the absence of the proposing party.

Chair: We can move to the next agenda item first, 16(d). Parties first considered this at COP19 in Warsaw. During these discussions, parties could not reach a decision but indicated willingness to continue discussions.

Saudi Arabia: Clarification, which agenda item are we talking about?

Chair: Now, we are considering agenda item 16(d). We are awaiting legal advice on 14(b). Saudi Arabia?

Saudi Arabia: Our proposal is to not to consider this item further.

Chair: It is clear from the views we have here that we have divergent views on this topic. Therefore, Rule 16, which states that "any item of the agenda of an ordinary session, consideration of which has not been completed at the session, shall be included automatically in the agenda of the next ordinary session", will be applied to agenda item 16(d).

Secretariat: We note Saudi Arabia's remarks. However, as this is an informal session, we cannot remove item 14(b) from the agenda. That is our advice.

Saudi Arabia: I think the Presidency should approach the proponents. Otherwise, we will continue to be in the room and the agenda item will remain in the agenda. Since there are no opposition to the deletion of the item, the Presidency should take this chance to reduce the number of agenda items. Maybe you can approach the proponents and report back to us in informals.

Kenya: We want to support the Secretariat. We should be building consensus in this COP. Climate change needs consensus. We are still in the nascent stages. It would be very drastic to delete the agenda item when the proponents are not here. Their absence should not mean the deletion of the agenda item.

Chair: The Presidency will commit to contacting Papua New Guinea and return when we have a response. The meeting is closed.

(meeting ended 1520h)