

Noah Hagen, Washington University in St. Louis

12/6/19

SBI/SBSTA informal consultations on the scope of the next periodic review of the long-term global goal under the Convention and of overall progress towards achieving it

SBSTA 7a

Room 5

15:00

- Text had been modified during informal-informals
- China
 - On behalf of G77-China
 - Regarding bullet 4b
 - Instead of having “on or and” just say “including” scenario
 - 4c
 - Must keep “adequacy and”
 - “Taking into account” not serious enough, change to “in accordance with”
 - 4d
 - Keep “and solutions” - solutions diff than opportunities
- EU
 - Thinks they made a lot of progress this afternoon
 - Haven’t had much time to review text, but still have some major concerns
 - In light of discussions they’ve had here, also have other elements that need to be looked into
 - Conclusions section
 - Proposal - replace “the scope of” with “provisions related to”; delete “as defined”
 - After “conducted” add “in accordance with the scope as defined in para 4 below”
 - We’ll maybe have more comments later
- Facilitator
 - Any other changes?
 - (None)
 - Great - moving on to para 2
 - (None)
 - Great - moving on to the preamble. Comment on para 1?
- US
 - We made some good progress in our discussions today
 - We are recalling all decisions in the preamble language - wondering about whether or not we really need to mention CP18
 - To streamline text, should we remove para 1? To reduce redundancy/confusion
- Canada
 - We support the EU’s changes and the US’s changes
 - Recall the relevant decisions related to previous review

- China
 - Speaking in national capacity
 - If we feel it's important to repeat paragraphs then that's okay. It makes things more clear.
 - We propose keeping para 1
- Saudi Arabia
 - We also support retaining para 1
- Brazil
 - Speaks in support of Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay
 - Keep para 1 as is
- Ghana
 - Must emphasize key paragraphs to emphasize why the review is being conducted - so, keep para 1
- India
 - We should leave with draft text dealing with text in clearest way
 - Speaking on behalf of LMDC
 - We don't have time to make these minor streamlining changes. Let's just move on.
- Facilitators
 - Okay - US? Canada? Opinions?
- US
 - Let's just bracket "recalls" and then come back to it later
- Facilitators
 - Okay, para 2
- EU
 - Wait let's go back to para 1
 - Could see deleting it
- Canada
 - All of para 1 should be bracketed
 - Emphasize that the next review will be conducted in light of the scope they have set up
- Costa Rica
 - Looking at EU's proposal, para 2
 - Agrees - discussion of para 1 is not necessary.
- Barbados
 - [AOSIS]
 - Keep para 1 - sets the scope.
- Facilitator
 - Para 3?
- US
 - More clear to revise sent to say, "notes that there is new information relevant to the second PR available...." and delete clause at end
- Facilitator

- P4 - intro?
 - Part A?
- Micronesia
 - Had lengthy convo with the US about recommendation
 - No conclusion about clause in PA
 - Crucial to mention “along the lines of the long term global goal”
- India
 - Let’s not talk so much about science
- US
 - No, keep the part about science in. this is about the long term goal.
- Costa Rica
 - Please US reconsider.
- Georgia
 - There is some grammatical ambiguity in that section.
- BUA - Brazil
 - Doesn’t make sense to add specific science language to the periodic review
- Ghana
 - Would be nice to have a narrower definition of the report
- EU
 - Needs some review, especially since how broad it is
- China
 - Following changes ->it’s just measuring how many (?) we’ve developed
- Subparagraph C
 - EU
 - Want to delete paragraph
 - Too much overlap with GST
- China
 - Every country works constructively, but nobody thinks anything is gonna get done anything soon
 - Let’s please work together to have an outcome!
- Canada
 - Comment on subparagraph C please
 - Reference on paras 5-7 - issue is the level of specificity with which we define the aggregated efforts
 - Better to have a more general statement that would allow for some discussion
- India
 - Interesting that specificity is Canada’s biggest issue.
 - Shocking that we want to talk about science but we don’t want to actually review it
 - Review takes into account party commitments, keeping into account principles of convention
- Australia

- “Adequacy” -> “effectiveness”
- Brazil
 - It’s disappointing that we’re STILL discussing this now
- Korea
 - Duplication of obligations has been well noted
 - Effort tough to find common ground
- Saudi Arabia
 - On behalf of arab group
- China
 - Sounds like some parties don’t want to listen to science
 - Science tells you what’s adequate
 - Efficiency = cost and value of our efforts

[see Canaan’s notes for first part of discussion]

- Canada
 - Took us a 6 hour session to finally make progress
 - We’ve cut the brackets down to a small area
- US
 - We do think we started a helpful discussion
 - To keep clarify of decision, request additional time to continue discussions
- Saudi/Arab
 - IPCC reports - shouldn’t be an obstacle when we start defining timeline.
- India
 - Speaking in national capacity
 - Global stocktake starts after PA -> overlap between PR and GST is minor
- Ghana, EU
 - (could not hear)
- China
 - Propose putting brackets on paragraphs in question
 - If we haven’t come to a conclusion then we can’t say we’ve fulfilled our mandate
- USA
 - Still agree that the paragraph is redundant, but we can work with the text here and maybe suggest “with the scope of the first periodic review” to clarify which part of the decision refers to what
- Costa Rica
 - Para 1 - @US, if we accept this modification, would this give you more assurance that we can delete the reference to science in 4a?
- USA
 - Thanks for the effort to strike a compromise. I think we feel more strongly about the science effort than about the wordsmithing in the first para. Clarity here is v important to us.

- EU
 - (could not hear)
- Norway
 - Science is very important to us also
 - (couldn't hear the rest)
- China
 - Sometimes the COP has a bad memory and we need to remind them of things
 - In support of redundancy
- USA
 - It's important to recall previous decisions, but we've already done that at the beginning.
 - Unnecessary to include an outcome at the very beginning
- Brazil
 - Remove brackets in paragraph six
- Canada
 - Confused - we've heard for a week about what's within and outside the scope
 - This para is about the outcome - having trouble how this is consistent
 - Don't think this is necessary
- Saudi
 - We're not inventing something new here @Canada
- India
 - Co facilitator is urging the parties to consider something, but there's a lack of faith in this idea
 - Don't see how this is directing any kind of outcome, can we move on from a non issue and move on to something actually substantial??
- Facilitator
 - We can't keep asking for additional time any longer
 - Please prepare for discussion tomorrow.