

Prepared by: Canaan Hancock, Washington University

Date: 12/5/2019

Session/Agenda Item: SBSTA Agenda Item 7a/SBI Item 7 - Scope of the next periodic review of the long-term global goal under the Convention and of overall progress towards achieving it

Location: UNFCCC COP 25, Madrid, Spain

Room Number: Room 5

Date and Time: 1100-1200

Participants(name and organization): Large session

Notes/Summary :

???: missed this information

Co-fac: Co-facilitator

- Co fac
 - Tuesday had first informal
 - Able to carry forward some aspects of tools from SB50
 - Based on some views during consults, made draft available after Tuesday
 - Invite some views on it - made up of draft decision text with 3 options, while being loyal to the mandate, and also included some party views that dont relate as much to mandate
 - Para 1 includes scope of review from Decisions 1 COP20, among others
 - Para 2 ???
 - Preamble includes relevant decisions on the matter
 - Added decisions on the GST
 - Added specific requests to para 6, at the end of that option youll see subparagraphs
 - Para 7 applies to options 1 and 2
 - Para 8 applies to all options
 - Before opening up floor, would like to ask from the consultation group on this topic
- China
 - Yesterday had constructive dialogue with parties on draft text from US
- Co fac
 - Reactions?
- China

- On behalf of G77 and china
- Propose changes:
 - ??? wants to change text in para 1 to recall multiple COPs as references in decision text
 - In para 2, want to change wording
 - Para 3 - there are multiple reviews, so we want to remove “scientific” in second row, and in third row, want to insert “including inter alia the IPCC assets” as well as a few other changes (I couldn’t get them all down)
 - Para 4 - want to incorporate options 1 and 2 into para 4 by making certain textual changes that references best available science and propose removing option 1(?)
 - The second periodic review should follow the modalities under the guidelines on the expert review, and avoid duplicaoin of work and follow Paris Agreement
 - Para 7 - second periodic review should start in 2020 and completed in 2022
- Co fac
 - China, thank you and Please send proposal to secretary
- China
 - On behalf of national capacity
 - Option 3 is out of our mandate because our view is that all COP decisions apply and all revisions should be reviewed, and option 3 doesn’t allow
- ???
 - Our reaction to changes:
 - Option 1 is the scope of the next review as we see it if we decide to have it
 - Option 3 is not outside the scope of the consideration because we need to ensure it doesn’t duplicate other processes such as the GST
 - Currently no agreement that review should begin in 2020, so if we agree that it is duplicative of GST, we should come back together later
 - Need to come back together later after first global stocktake to discuss the scope of long term review
- EU
 - There is some convergence around some of the paragraphs could be a good starting point as a way forward, otherwise we’ll have a text full of brackets and nothing will get done. We need to be more concrete, like china was in their proposal
 - We think there was quite a bit of convergence in the room yesterday that there is new scientific evidence available that means we should review the review

- Focus of the science could be interesting in deciding which way to go
- Some parties look at it from a different perspective, and we had conversations yesterday that we could approach the review differently. If those parties think there is a possibility to define the scope of the GST and long-term review differently, we need to explore this
- Need to take a step back from a more scientific perspective, which could lead to more convergence
- This isn't our position, but we heard yesterday that some key concepts to explore would be progress, challenges, and opportunities in a context of a scientific approach
- If there are more concrete ideas brought to this table, it would be useful as a better way to look at it from a more scientific perspective and avoid overlapping with GST
- Brazil
 - Speaking on behalf of Bra, Arg, Uru
 - Agree with China on behalf of G77
 - Asked for clarification to confirm that option 1 and option 3 are standalone options?
 - Comments on review:
 - We decided in COP17 in decision 2 that we decided the long-term review should happen every 7 years or after every IPCC report, so next review should start in 2020, 7 years after that meeting
 - Should not be having this kind of discussion jointly under SBSTA and SBI, if we're talking about it from a scientific perspective, we need to be under SBSTA
- Co fac
 - Yes option 1 and 3 are standalone options
- Japan
 - Welcome this text
 - Want to echo what EU said that we need this from a scientific perspective
 - Previous decision has said periodic review must come from best available science
 - Option 1 and 2 say understand how to enhance furthering global goal, so request another informal session to discuss all this
- Norway
 - Want to focus on what EU said
 - The reason we want to focus on science is to avoid overlap with GST, and that's why we use best science available and emphasize this
 - Want to underline the scientific aspect of this

- Australia
 - Want to reiterate we agree with comments from G77 about producing suggestions, but we consider it as a different option than the current 3 because it is so different than all of them
 - We are too distant from agreement to take off any options
 - Agree with japan, norway, and eu that must emphasize best available science
- India
 - Behalf of LMDCs
 - Align with Brazil's statement
 - Matter of surprise that one option sounded very similar to the title of this agenda item already that we are negotiating, so need clarification
 - Periodic review is vital to furthering our goal of stopping global warming (i missed some stuff)
- Saudia Arabia
 - Behalf of arab group
 - Align with G77 and LMDC statements
 - Support option 2 because next periodic review is is vital, and is mandated by previous decisions
 - Indeed, scientific information is important, but there is more vital info needed that is mandated to be reviewed, such as means of implementation, tech transfer, how paris agreement is coinciding with Kyoto protocol and other agreements, etc
 - Want to revise the text to include these concerns, as G77 said through China
- Barbados
 - Behalf of AOSIS
 - (did not get what they said)
- Costa rica
 - Align with AILAC and G77
 - Appreciate the text to be added proposed by G77, Brazil, and LMDCs
 - Mandate is not to consider review, already many decisions that mandate the review. That should not be under consideration
- China
 - Like to support Brazil, LMDCs, Barbados, and costa rica in their statements
 - If review is supposed to be all about science, why not just go to IPCC?

- If argument is that convention covers everything, why do we have the Paris Agreement? I don't think the duplication/overlapping with GST should be an issue. We just have to implement the COP decision
- Canada
 - Science is important in the context of the review, and need para 3 to stay as is
 - To address china's statement comparing science and implementation, I don't think there's a division between science and implementation.
 - I appreciate the suggestion the EUs suggestion that even withso much divergence there is enough agreement to move forward in some area
- Co fac
 - Please make statements short, and please respond to EUs statement about moving us forward
- Brazil
 - Would like to clear up misunderstanding, we are not against science. Propose constructive new text that we include China's as well as keep references to IPCC and past decisions
 - We appreciate the science, we just want broad consideration of all factors
- Sierra Leone
 - Behalf of LDCs
 - Think that the mandate is to halve the next PR, should start in 2020
 - Request choosing optoin 3
 - What china said is the way to go
- Ghana
 - Behalf of African Group
 - Associating ourselves with G77s proposal
 - There will be another PR this time, and there needs to be one every time there's a new IPCC report
 - ???
- US
 - Want to affirm EU, Canada, Norway, and others that science is vital. Appreciate Ghana's, Brazil, and G77's proposal, but it makes it sound like it is a separate option entirely
 - Without agreement from the cOP, PR wouldn't automatically happen in 2020
- Eu
 - Want to respond to put forward by China and other

- Preferred option is to close the review, but we are trying to be flexible to make this review something positive that has added value in this whole process
- Dialogue was really good to improve scientific value to it
- Ipcc has its own role and we dont want to interfere, but there is a need to have a good science policy interface
- Want to clarify why we insist avoiding duplication, and we have a mandate to do that from a decision a few years ago
- China
 - There is nothing to review NAPAs or NAMAs or other components, so this is why we need the PR.
- Co fac
 - Want to have a formal/informal session this afternoon at 3, is that okay?
- Saudi Arabia
 - I cant come at that time
- Co fac
 - What time can you? (no response that I heard)
 - Is anyone else unavailable?
 - This room will be available between 3 and 6, but some G77 colleagues are available, so it'd be helpful if we could make some progress on the options today
 - Next room is friday 3-4 in room 5