

Prepared by: Julia Greensfelder, Sara Mesiano, and Canaan Hancock, Washington University in St. Louis

Date: 12/4/2019

Session/Agenda Item: SBI/Agenda Item 5 - Common time frames for nationally determined contributions referred to in Article 4, paragraph 10, of the Paris Agreement

Location: UNFCCC COP 25, Madrid, Spain

Room Number: Room 5

Date and Time: 1600-1700

Participants(name and organization): Large Session

Notes/Summary :

???: missed this information

- Co-facilitator
 - Should report back monday to SBI with conclusion with informal doc
 - Only have one more meeting before monday, so we need to work quickly
 - Want to hear views on 3 questions:
 - Which option(s) best reflect your views?
 - Changes to your preferred options?
 - Suggestions on how to move this agenda forward?
 - (no country wants to talk, so he repeats the questions)
 - Silence for awhile
- Switzerland
 - On behalf of Environmental Integrity Group
 - Spain, Chile, Sweden
 - Informal note good start for discussion
 - Technically straightforward, can't postpone decision bc it will hinder ambition
 - Want this to be decided at COP25
 - Need to narrow down options
 - On behalf of Switzerland, they believe option 2 is best
 - Would suggest concerning that para 2 should include a sentence like "to do so every five years thereafter" so not to start discussion again in the future
- Brazil

- Absent process from awhile, hard to read informal document
- Preference is reflected in submission from 2018
 - Option 1 within option 2
- No changes
- Re suggestions to make agenda move forward
 - Agree with Swiz that we need decision sooner rather than later BEFORE countries are locked in to their national processes to prepare NDCs
- Agree that there should be CTFs, now discussing WHICH
 - Reassuring bc people were first debating whether we should have them at all
- Might be making lives more complicated than necessary
 - From convos, sense that a lot of confusion when people speak of 5 year time frame vs 10 year time frame
 - Need to clarify instead of picking one option
- Understanding is NDCs from 2031 onwards (which is mandate) will be communicated in 2025 informed by GST
 - Maybe not common understanding?
- Having clarified, the moment this NDC is communicated upon starting point, then choice about end point of NDC
 - 2025 NDC should be communicated by 2035 or 2040
- If 2040 option, don't understand why we need 2 GSTs
 - Instead of making this a discussion about preferred time frame for national processes, first need to clarify when the NDC can be communicated from 2031 and what is end point
 - Leave end point open
 - Discuss implications of different end points
- China - On behalf of LMDCs
 - Provide clarification on LMDCs position on previously achieved options
 - Support option 3 and option 6
 - 6 options have diff logic
 - Format different comparatively
 - Other 4 (not 3 or 6) are more permanent and party will do that forever
 - Option 3 and 6
 - Decide what happens in second round
 - Option 3
 - 2025 communications can include 5 and 10 years
 - Domestic policy range is different
 - Don't need to exclude one of the time frames
 - Same spirit as p23 and 24

- Revisit after next NDC
- Option 6
 - 3 suboptions in p2
 - Reiterate request of p23 and 24
 - Invite party to submit 2030, 2035, 2040 NDCs to be communicated in 2025
 - INDC is not automatically transferred into NDC
 - NDC doc will be submitted in 2020, time frame is 5 year time frame
 - Keep option b to keep possibility w language of other possibilities for other options here
 - Good ambiguity
 - Clear what party will do in 2025 and then will have to do so every 5 years thereafter
- Want to emphasize that GST is doing progression stocktake instead of taking stock of target
 - Doesn't matter if timeframe is 5 or 10
 - Don't need to talk about this topic in this room
- Time frame might have some related to ambition, but not only driver
 - Support, tech dev is bigger decider NOT whether you choose 5 or 10
- EU
 - Importance of striving towards CTF in order to make good progress towards Paris
 - Really hard to hear
 - Still possible to make progress, invite to reconsider note so work can be done to it
 - Present diff options in a more similar way (draft decision text)
 - Option 5 not supported by anyone
 - Remove outdated content (option 3 p2, sentence has already been agreed)
 - Can agree that can give sec task for next session
 - Continuing work is important bc Katowice decision implies that this decision is to be made by 2022 or 2023
- Bangladesh - LDCs
 - Understand importance of discussion
 - Hard to understand
 - At this point in time, working around 5 and 10 years
 - Option 1 and option 2
 - 1
 - Endpoints in 5 years
 - Should not get bogged down w 5 vs 10 years
 - Challenge colleagues to think carefully that we need to synchronize CTF

- So it can be in alignment with GST
 - Agreed upon that it will be applied from 2025 onward
 - Second round of NDC by 2025
 - Aligning w previous speakers
 - Can have decision like option 3 and some elements of option 6 that all parties submit by 2025 their next NDC and to do so every 5 years thereafter
- Colombia - on behalf of AILAC
 - Every 5 years and targets are set for every 5 years
 - Support option 5
 - Need to make edits
 - Opportunity to operate NDCs in light of available science
 - 2031 NDC should be first communicated in 2025, but updated in 2030 so it reflects 2028 GST and latest science
 - If some parties set targets for 5 years, but others for 10 years then 5 year GST will be more onerous for some parties than others
 - 5+5 is with most present information
 - Communicate and implementation starts within 9-18 months of communication and then this is done for every 5 years subsequent period
 - 3rd Q
 - With to conclude this topic at this session
- Chair requests Colombia to send option 5 amendment to chair
- Argentina
 - Join others in saying we need decision ASAP since important implications for GST
 - Prefer option 2, though some text operations they are happy to send in text in email
 - No suggestions for modifying text in p1
 - P2: amend point in 2040 so that it would read parties communicate 2 successive NDCs starting in 2025 starting Jan 1 2031, Jan 1 2036 with endpoint in 2040
 - P3: textual proposals
 - Merging option 4 and 6
 - Urges each party by 2025 to communicate up to 2035 or 2040 including indicative ????
- Zimbabwe - African Group
 - Affirm position that support 5 year CTF in order to avoid lock in and facilitate for ambition which would be informed by GST
 - Support option 2
 - Want to conclude this agenda item at this session

- Brazil
 - Defer to other speakers
- Saudi Arabia - Arab Group
 - Support China's intervention re options 3 and 6
 - Encourage colleagues to look at other options like 3 and 5 and see how they are inclusive (this doesn't make sense)
 - Ambition isn't decided with time, it is decided with tech and support
- Indonesia
 - Option 1 and 4
 - Want 5 year cycle but can also support 10 year cycle with note that 10 year NDC should include indicative target at 5 year mark
 - Point out time of application
 - Under option 4, mentioned that to apply CTF to NDC to be implemented from 2021 onwards
 - Moving forward
 - NDC being implemented
 - Some parties already have started NDC update process
 - 2nd NDCs
 - Starting process of LTS as mandated by PS
 - Need to be decided now
- Japan
 - Countries have different domestic processes
 - ???
- Brazil
 - In regards to update - update is already in a decision in regard to INDCs, our understanding may apply to first round of NDCs but don't see update as a way to enhancing ambition midway. Decision is clear that ambition is from one NDC to another, not revising midway. It'd be impossible to have ways to measure ambition in such little time as 5 years. If you make an NDC with a longer target, it raises the question if are willing to have a time to update midway.
 - That's why we appreciate 5 year NDCs consecutively without midway points, because energy sector planning takes far too long for updates?
 - Brazil will not again have a 5 year NDC if countries are putting forward 10 year NDC, and if we do that, we will not revise midway because it affects planning for everyone in the country
 - Whoever puts forward a 10 year timeframe will be pressured to revise midway, and we don't want to do that
- EU
 - I take back my comment about option 5, i was reading the wrong thing

- Bangladesh
 - Been hearing from colleagues the different rationale and arguments for each options
 - It is obvious every country should submit a new NDC every 5 years, if we have 10 year NDCs what would happen to subsequent NDCs? Lose progress towards ambition with this
 - Clear with article 4 that must show progression and ambition, and must consider all of this together.
 - Want to consider adding 5 year time frames official language that captures all concerns, especially the LMDCs
- Co fac
 - Only have one more hour of negotiations this week
 - Countries need to submit proposed changes to incorporate for next session
 - Remove archaic elements to ensure everything is up to date, especially with decision timing
 - Other suggestion to help move forward is to develop all these options into decision text, noting that some look more like decision texts than others
 - Fourth proposal was to organize the paragraphs of these options into a single decision text with sub options which would eliminate redundancies in each option
 - Any objections?
- China
 - Confused by last proposal - how do you combine them all into one draft decision text? Informal note or annex?
- Co-fac
 - Parties informed me of redundancies that exist in several options, so they want to reorganize in a way where you can see the differences much more quickly between options
 - It will still be an informal note, just written sounding like a decision text
- Saudi Arabia
 - Want clarification on the proposal
 - Confirming that no text will be deleted, but redundancies will be removed
 - Will same text be there?
- Co-fac
 - It would involve putting the current options within options within options
 - Not delete any actual text, just removing redundant text
- China
 - How can we adopt this as a draft decision when some people want 5+5 but others want other stuff?
 - How can we create a draft decision text when we have so much disagreement?

- Co fac
 - What?
- China
 - Should keep informal note so we keep progress
- Co fac
 - So we should make decision texts for each option?
- China
 - Yes
- Co fac
 - LMDCs preference is 6 options remain in tact
 - Propose that we prepare new informal note version which takes on insertions proposed by parties
 - If necessary, if time updates and so on, make those updates and come back w draft procedural conclusions that take note of that
- Brazil
 - May be too early to go into just draft procedure conclusions. Cant lose records of communications reflected in informal notes
 - If you're going to do this, we need to keep option open for countries to submit more options
 - Could give mandate to update this informal note with minor edits and then add mandate to come up with additional part of streamlined texts that reflects current options on the table
- Co-fac
 - Run out of time
 - Understand Brazil, to give co-facilitators mandate to develop another annex to informal note that would be a clean decision option?
 - Objections?
- China - LMDCs
 - Not sure what annex looks like bc currently 6 options are fully reflecting diff concerns
 - Agree w Brazil that could give mandate to give slight changes
 - Some groups want to add one more sentence, but don't see value of doing co-chair additional summary bc options are already very clear
 - Want draft decision w progression and footnote with updated version w slight changes
 - Reluctant to see another further annex of summary of options
- Switzerland
 - Like many, would like to see progress which is why they support Brazil
 - Trust co-facilitator's work

- Co-fac
 - Officially closing list
- Bangladesh
 - All parties are willing to see progress made reflected in update
 - Want to see progress
 - Made some proposals and had discussions and need to see update reflected in new version
- Co-fac
 - Will prepare conclusions that take note of updated version of informal note which takes on insertions read in during this session and will be forwarded by email
 - Any language that is no longer possible with absence of time travel, will make sure that language is there
 - Will develop bulleted paragraphs to look more like decision text
 - If parties want to propose option 7, can do so and pls send to Secretariat
 - Objections?
 - No

Follow-up :

- Friday at 11 am, room to be confirmed
- Come ready to complete the conclusions bc co-facilitators do not like to show up w sad face to SBI chair