

SBSTA 52-55 Article 6 negotiations (Agenda item 15)

01 -06 November

Notes Aglaja Espelage, espelage@perspectives.cc

Not corrected, not edited notes! There may be mistakes and unclear sentences.

01.11.2021 SBSTA Contact Group

SBSTA Chair

- Start with one hour delay due to queues at the entrance
- Resuming at 11:45 as an informal, 11:45-13:30
- From Wednesday onwards, Article 6 meetings in plenary
- In the 6th year of negotiating Article 6- unusually long and challenging progress.
- Options paper to help navigating the key remaining issues and identify packages for concluding of work.
- 22nd of October: HoD meeting
- Organisation of work
 - Technical work cofacilitated by Hugh Sealy, Kim Solberg, Mandy Rambharos, Peer Stiansen
 - Informal consultations, bilateral consultations and informal informals
 - HoDs will be convened
- Need to use informal work on Art 6 since Madrid effectively and move towards a new iteration of the text → new text to be prepared tonight; second iteration of the text by the end of the week.

No request for the floor

01.11.2021 11:30 SBSTA Article 6 informal consultations

Cofacilitator Hugh Sealy

- Will not be business-as-usual, strive to work across organisational issues
- Spend a lot of time in informal work
- Objectives: produce draft decision text for CMA on Saturday
- Ask for mandate to produce new text *tonight* based on all three versions of the respective reference text:
 - Outcome will be a new text, not a revision of v3 of 2019 Presidency text
 - Take up discussions from informal dialogues and bring them into the new text
 - Present options from the dialogue summaries and option papers, recognising that some points require further deliberations at SBSTA
 - Ask for your trust to make this first step.
- Then there would be a HoD meeting tomorrow to hear about the text, then issue-by-issue work in informal consultations
- Ask not to make lengthy statements or general points → want to get down to the real business
 - Please accept that we may ask you to be brief so everyone gets a chance to get heard. Welcome on bridging proposals, packages, and potential common ground.

- We need to move to solutions and focus on the key issues.
- All sub-items are addressed together please specify the agenda item you are speaking to

Egypt obo Arab Group

- Assures that group wants to engage constructively
- Once adoption of decision, need to move to implementation: must keep implementability in mind
- All issues must be captured in inclusive and balanced manner
- Text must deliver
- Important that new text takes all Madrid texts and all inputs from the informal work into account. Need enough time to check the new text and request revisions.
- Highlight some specific issues, other positions are well-known
- Overarching issue: urgent need for capacity building programme to developing country programmes, expect this to be operationalised in Glasgow decision
- Article 6.2
 - Issue of inclusivity: guidance shall not infringe on nationally determined nature of NDC; any quantification in GHG metrics only required for portion of NDCs for policy and measures where ITMOs are generated. Quantification of NDC only specified to the portion it applies.
 - i. → lists all section of V3 Madrid text where this needs to be reflected. Where quantification is specified it is only to be applied to the “portion of the NDC”
 - ii. On scope of NDC: reflected in a clear manner that scope is not only limited to sectors and gases but also policies and measures
 - iii. Non-GHG metrics: guidance to accommodate all metrics
 - iv. Reporting, review, accounting: No reference to 77d or prejudice Art 6 outcome
 - 1. No duplication of work with transparency room, tables, summaries etc. to be negotiated by Art 6 negotiators. Then, close coordination of A6 and A13TER
 - v. Adaptation Finance: should build on v1 of Madrid text → equal treatment 6.2 and 6.4
 - vi. Rules for methodologies under 6.4 shall also apply for standards under 6.2 guidance
- Article 6.4
 - Use of pre-2020 CERs towards NDC: separate option in any text for use of pre-2020 CERs without any limitations and conditions. Still do not support any arbitrary cut-off dates. Rather, as a package solutions that we are pleased to offer, to have cut-off for generation dates of CERs (2009-2010) → open to discuss that. There is a legal liability implication in host countries, this must be accommodated! Many project developers said that even if it is only 1 CER, there will be a legal liability as time and money was spent on the credit. The CDM host Party shall not be required for CA if own use.
 - Avoiding double use for outside NDC: Units from activities outside the NDC not subject to corresponding adjustment. Time-bound exemptions still unacceptable. The scope of NDC is not limited to sectors and gases.
 - Baseline and additionality: not support net-mitigation or going below BAU. Baseline means BAU, taking into account *relevant policies*, up to host country determination. The baseline is informed by national plans and circumstances. Baselines/additionality menu based approach is better than hierarchy. There is no one size fits all. Not mix project and NDC baselines.
 - OMGE: equal treatment between 6.2 and 6.4, avoid disadvantaging one against the other. Avoid double application of OMGE of 6.4 units when internationally transferred. No artificial discounting and tax to real mitigation outcomes. Do not

support options where the host country must undertake CA for the total amount of units, CA only to avoid double use of credits for more than one Party. Rather have technical solutions under OMGE.

- Article 6.8
 - Need to ensure that in the options in the text includes to have a sustainable governance option, such as a task force
- Readiness and willingness to work with you all, reserves the right to come back

Switzerland obo EIG

- Have a very comprehensive package of summaries, notes and option note. Carefully elaborated. Have had a lot and sufficient time to bring ideas and positions forward. Have the feeling that we have a very good understanding of where things are.
- Thank you for the proposal to come forward with new text. Appreciate the very early deadline.
- Look forward to being pushed by you and call on you to be ambitious in that push and curious to see the text iteration.
- Reiterate HoD statement
 - Some things are not reflected in the options paper: open questions on human rights in 6.2 and 6.4; rearrange issues in “buckets”
- Support fully proposed work of time
- Question to Arab Group: Have one question on the capacity building issue: a bit unclear how to tackle it. In which decision should it be tackled?
 - We can refer to the work on the RCCs etc, just an issue of placing in the text
- Question to Arab Group: do you prefer a vintage date approach vs. a project generation approach?
 - Registration date is just easier to identify
- Looking forward to engaging

Senegal obo AGN

- Thank SBSTA chair for option paper and summary note
- Ready to work constructively with other colleagues and have bilaterals to agree on a fair but also robust guidance, robust governance and avoiding double counting
- Advise colleagues to not go back to old positions
- Preference to work based on v1 and v2 of Presidency text, option note and slide package of Secretariat
- Not prepared to have the three texts tonight, need some time to coordinate among our side to provide a list of what they want to see in the text tonight. Ready to have that coordination and provide textual elements
- Some issues were not well-addressed in Madrid texts:
 - Capacity building programme. Decision on this needs to be in the cover decision. Mandates to RCC, Secretariat and A6.4SB to provide specific support to developing countries. Happy to work on text and propose type of support.
 - In 6.2, issue of environmental integrity is not well addressed. When it comes to outside/inside, environmental integrity, etc → all focused on Article 6.4, must be addressed in 6.2 as well. Units coming through 6.2 schemes also must meet certain criteria.
 - Work on mandate, role and function of Article 6 review team, not well addressed. Clarify how recommendations by review team will be addressed and what happens if the recommendations are not addressed?

European Union

- We will be judging any text and outcome on whether it will contribute to or undermine ambition
- Request to produce the most ambitious and challenging text possible, try minimising options on the table
- See 3 basic packages
 - Ambition: carry-over CER, accounting, CDM, consistency with pathway to 1.5
 - Option paper does not summarize this in the right way
 - Clear option on baselines that are based on BAT, forward-looking reference levels. If other Parties want projections, this should include the requirement for discounting with reference to the Parties short and long-term policies
 - Accounting: Opt-out for outside, issues on scope and they link to broader Art 13 issues. Improve text on non-GHG metrics.
 - MISSED third package
- Issues that were not addressed
 - Removals and balance 6.2-6.4
 - Human Rights references
 - Need to see balance of principles on integrity in 6.2 and 6.4
- Heard and responded positively on capacity building
 - What capacity building must be built? Understand that an ambitious outcome will be challenging for some Parties
- Need to refine our text, do our best to define and clarify the issues that can hopefully be closed and refine the package to be forwarded to next week.
- Fix the text as much as we can and then refine the package.

Ethiopia obo LDCs

- Article 6 should be a means for increasing ambition
- Need to move out of BAU way of doing things
- Not in a position to comment on content, trust co-facilitators
- Welcome proposal for new text

Antigua and Barbuda obo AOSIS

- Support preparation of a new text asap
- Meeting was a great challenge, a document will help to focus
- AOSIS positions are clear, concerned with environmental integrity
- AOSIS wants to see the end of this discussion here at COP26, happy to work openly and constructively. Not to come up with compromises but with an outcome that generates a quality market with a definition of quality
 - Emission reduction is not enough, must go beyond
 - Must consider human right
 - Inclusivity of the market and stability and user-friendliness → raise ambition beyond OMGE (which AOSIS feels strongly about)
- Try to get back to facilitators with a written submission

Co-facilitators

- 48 hours of ITEDS had in last year, please be brief in written submissions

Costa Rica obo AILAC

- Welcome text and way forward

- Put forward safeguards on accounting and human rights and indigenous people, clean text on ambitious baselines and clean text of reporting and review and accounting methodologies
- Process has been long, only be considered successful if it encourages to increase ambition and get us back on track

Saudi Arabia obo LMDC

- Thank for informal work, option paper to be of value but not exhaustive. Foresee using it.
- Support the previous statement by the Arab Group
- Agree with AGN on need for more work on environmental integrity of 6.2 and capacity building support for Art 6
- Pose a question for EU: concerned by the approach of reviewing text on an ambition yardstick? Are you using the EU ambition level? This will not be equitable or balanced for the majority of the countries in this room.
 - We are seeking environmental integrity and increased ambition. But ambition must be equitable.
 - LMDC also wants to see ambitious text but a reasonable level that is fair to the majority of the countries participating in discussions and in engaging in Article 6

Senegal obo G77+China

- Welcome proposed mode of work
- Reiterate the issue of share of proceeds/adaptation finance from both 6.2 and 6.4, needs to be addressed and sorted out in the Article 6 discussions

Bolivia

- Covid-19 has set new conditions, increasing debt level that developing countries had to acquire. There is only one way out of this: through transparent and equitable means
- Returning here after Paris COP, the market situation is even bleaker
- The only reliable means of moving forward is to move forward on all tools reflected in Article 6, including necessarily 6.8
- It is the elephant in the room: 6.8 is being done bilaterally done among Parties and in many initiatives among Parties that have capacities to do so but not engaging those who don't → leaving many Parties behind. Very little/nothing was done for 6.8
- Move away from politicised cooperation to real action → action taking through Convention itself: provide financial cooperative approaches to all countries.
- Acknowledging that little was done and 6.8 Madrid text was prolonging operational capacities for NMAs, Bolivia and LMDC group have provided submissions in this sense.
- We will only move forward if NMAs are given the chance and willingness as market schemes that thus far have provided nothing to most of the world.

India

- Article 6.2
 - Balance in administrative requirements and transparency must be ensured: focus on flexibility in reporting and flexibility in defining ITMOs
 - Flexibility in reporting and review cycle: balanced and equal treatment in safeguards and measures; equal treatment of GHG and non-GHG metrics.
 - SoP equal treatment is a matter of principle
- Article 6.4
 - Transition of activities, infrastructure and units

- No CA for activities outside the NDC, countries should have the flexibility to keep the units outside the NDC
- Article 6.8
 - Equal treatment must be given to market and NMAs, needs operational tool
- Willing to engage very constructively

New Zealand

- Support new text and mode of work of direct engagement
- Responding to AGN and EU→ explore how to give greater specificity in 6.2 guidance on stronger environmental integrity level that is not project-specific and corresponding to the different approaches
- Package is not just the ministerial issues: accounting and reporting is also key for both 6.2 and 6.4 and if non-GHG accounting is accommodated that the text is robust. Also clear text on baselines-additionality-crediting periods. Want to see text to speak to human rights/indigenous peoples.
- Want to see strong WP on NMAs
- Support AGN on “let’s go forward not backwards”

Brazil

- Want strong 6.8
- Decisions should be sufficient for prompt implementation
- Both market based instruments must enable the same level of stringency
- In 6.2
 - Loose character of v3 of text is a threat to PA objectives, needs robust safeguards. Willing to discuss on cap for use of ITMOs, etc., need clear timeline on work programme on safeguards
 - Further clarity on work programme to work towards one single method for accounting for single year targets, at least clear timeline
 - MISSED
 - Need mandatory SOP
 - Not convinced by technical difficulties for applying this to 6.2, will provide concrete suggestions
- In 6.4
 - Support using v1 and v2 of the text
 - Agree with using the options paper, comfortable with using it. Specifically on accounting: emission reductions outside NDC do not entail double counting, open to explore a time-bound exemption.
 - No arbitrary criteria for CER transition. Rather maximum use by using Party, to be explored together with general cap on use of ITMOs
- On 6.8
 - Support establishment of task force as proposed by LMDC

Negotiations resume at 15:30

Korea

MISSED

PNG

MISSED

- If pre-2021 CERs are accepted, so should REDD+ credits

Japan

- Need to leave Glasgow with confidence that Art 6 can be implemented from 2022 onwards+ we need a clear roadmap
- Thank co-facilitator for the work done in ITED process
- Support the text to be provided tonight
- Need to be flexible enough
 - Madrid text v3 is the basis, but also the material and issues raised in the other processes since then
- Look forward to more substantive discussions
- Need to have clear options to be developed in the course of this week
 - Option paper Section A and B options must be elaborated further
- On capacity building: not in the option paper as clear option
 - Support the capacity building, required for prompt start of Art 6
 - Need to further explore the kind of capacity building needed: reporting/review, institutional set-up, development of 6.4 activities
 - Support using the existing institutions and arrangements: RCCs
 - → we need to be more specific on arrangement, etc.

USA

- Thank facilitators, etc.
- Most productive SBSTA to date, can support the way forward
- HoD gave specific feedback on options paper, will not be repeated here.
- Calls for contribution for adaptation in 6.2
 - No text option extends to reporting on this issue.
 - The same “no text” option needed for SoP
- Options on non-GHG
 - Address issue that an ITMO is GHG, but NDC target is non-GHG
- Article 6.4: Accounting, Used-based option → a mechanism cannot track how units are used, but can track authorisations
 - Need to apply CA for all 6.4 units
- On 6.2 single year targets:
 - Needs to be reporting requirement on approach chosen for single year target accounting, e.g., on trajectory
- On historical emission baselines
 - Average of 5 years prior to baseline period+ renewal and recalculated every 5 years with the average of the previous 5 years. Baselines cannot be higher than in previous version (TREES approached)
- MISSED some
- Three technical corrections
 - 6.2 recommendations on guidance for work programme → further recommendations for the guidance, not leave key operational issues unresolved
 - Elaboration of special circumstances of LDCs/SIDS → not elaborating what these are, more consideration about what these special circumstances mean for Art 6
 - Technical fix on trigger to determine authorisation: determination by Party what an other purpose is and nothing else

China

- Quite familiar with each other's positions and concerns
- Hope that discussion can be balanced and inclusive
- CA and definition of scope of NDC, CDM transition and SOP need to be first resolved
- Option paper was helpful and useful, happy to hear about the new iteration tonight, hope to be able to engage constructively

Singapore

- Thank SBSTA Chair, Sec and Co-facilitators for work
- Work this week on text should reflect work this year
- This week we need to reduce scope and complexity of the text, hear about priorities and scope for flexibility. Avoid maximalist positions.
- We do not have perfect knowledge of how operationalisation of markets and rules will pan out. Must adopt a decision to start implementing and build in processes for revision.
- If we fail to land Art 6, we fail to send the right signals and run risk of different accounting systems, undermining environmental integrity. Also delays in mobilising revenues for adaptation.

St. Kitts and Nevis

- Trust the chair to produce the text, building also on the bilaterals, wealth of info to draw on
- Process of technical expert dialogues useful
- Gaps
 - Many interventions on reporting and review→ please take up and address
 - Identification of areas of broad agreement (e.g., method for OMGE is agreed with mandatory cancellation, other approaches have little agreement)
 - 6.4 with fixed cancellation
 - 6.2 clarify how for non-6.4 approaches
 - Baselines→ hope that chair can push all with cleaner text
 - Value to also have baseline + additionality in 6.2 text
- Ask for ambition in drafting, face significant 2030 mitigation gap
 - Unhelpful: transition of units, provisions on accounting
 - Hope that text thins out problematic issues and helps with outcome

Australia

- Welcome new text overnight, lots of work to draw upon
 - Section A and B of options paper are all important, balance of the paper is crucial
- Missing issue:
 - Addressing human rights and rights of indigenous peoples, willing to find formulations that are acceptable to all
- Recognise importance that 6.2 approaches to contribute to adaptation in action, financing and (?)
- Looking forward to finalise Art 6 tonight

Canada

- Urge to apply square brackets appropriately
- Issues of environmental integrity- a few little fixes might be helpful
 - 6.2: in the initial report, it would be possible to replicate language on environmental integrity from the regular report. Annual information to specifically relate to

quantitative information. And for regular information, see cross-reference to paragraph 77d and clarify which info must be reported for each

- 6.4
 - Cover decision: task for A6.4SB- establish maximum permissible time intervals in the activity cycle and develop new rules for methodologies and crediting periods, leakage where relevant
 - RMPs, role of the A6.4SB: ensure that mechanism delivers OMGE consistent with 1.5°C.
 - Principles for methodologies: consistency with IPCC guidelines and guidance and best practices as reflected in literature
- Importance of human rights and indigenous peoples-> look forward to work in corridors to find language, but please put placeholders

Ecuador

- Very high importance to deliver concrete results
- Urge colleagues to bring down complexity of negotiations to something understandable and realistic for the people on the ground and also for the political leaders to be able to identify solutions. Respect voluntary nature of cooperative approaches and mechanisms and different types of NDCs
- Balanced treatment of all mechanism, propose way forward
- Texts still have imbalances, specifically on Art 6.8. Need to have equal and sufficient progress for NMA
- Safeguards against speculation and unilateral fixed carbon prices→ respect voluntary nature in market and NMAs

South Africa

- Express gratitude to SBSTA Chair, importance of inclusive/balanced/transparent process
- Support AGN statement
- Madrid text to be considered + options paper
- Key issue is the SoP→ should be treated in balanced manner for 6.2 and 6.4
- CA for inside/outside: hard position on this, but willing to exchange views
- Agree on further work on environmental integrity, echo call for strong accounting rules
- Capacity building only gets you stronger, especially for developing countries
- Look forward to bridging proposals

Mozambique

- Add voice to intervention of ZAF, AGN and PGN
- SoP in 6.4 but not in 6.2 (????), adaptation finance should be not small but big at scale at least 5%, towards Adaptation Fund
- 6.2 should only be from inside NDCs
- Avoidance of double counting, reference levels must be consistent with NIR
- Dedicated CB programme to assist LDCs

Uganda

- Fully aligns with AGN and with LMDC on this important discussion (???)
- Most developing countries NDCs have adaptation as priority: must put forward approaches for cooperation on adaptation-> the right place is Article 6.8
- Article 6.8 needs equal treatment and Adaptation Benefit Mechanism to be clearly referenced→ available for further discussions

Russia

- Missing issue: the issue of dealing with removals and forestry projects in 6.4 mechanism, propose to resolve baseline setting and crediting period elements in this COP. Have work programme on monitoring, reversals and leakage, also needs addition to activity cycle, A6.4SB mandate, etc. Not put removal projects at a disadvantage, want to deal on this as much as possible

Solomon Islands

- Imbalance of other international mitigation purposes and other purposes → needs fixes, also for reporting
- Not just considering consideration of SIDS/LDCs

Iran

- Not reopen language of Paris Agreement
- Should only focus on environmental integrity, not on political language
- Not raise political issues in Article 6

Argentina

- Want to have solution for SOP for both 6.2 and 6.4 + provision of financial support and CB for operationalisation
- Balance with 6.2-6.4 in operationalisation

SBSTA Chair

- Thank you for trust, will do our best
- Draft text will be shared tonight, please keep monitoring CCTV for HoD meeting tomorrow

03.11.2021 SBSTA informal

Co-facilitator

- Encouraging to hear mandate to work issue-by-issue on the text
- No 6.2 discussions 11:45-13:00 to avoid clashes with transparency
- Article 6.2: Corresponding adjustments and accounting, including portion of NDC, non-GHG including workplan, safeguarding and limits, reporting and review and work plan and group of experts, share of proceeds
- OMGE across 6.2 and 6.4, human rights and rights of indigenous people across all three
- Article 6.8 governance and timelines
- Article 6.4: baselines and additionality, functions of host Party, inside/outside, SOP
- Objective: get to revision of the text

Solomon Islands obo AOSIS

- Would also like to have opportunity to discuss issues not on the list

Article 6.2

Co-facilitators

- You can speak about other issues as well

Republic of Korea

- Things that are either new or not clear

- Further guidance on method to establishing trajectory, but unsure about second bracket. When revise a single method for CA cannot be answered in Art 6 room and not now, depends on ICT guidance for NDC where all NDCs are required to provide a multi-year trajectory or trajectories. Guidance decision needs to be taken first, before Art 6 people can consider single guidance.
 - Conflict with para 9→ no infringement of NDC
- Para 4 and X→ needs format for annual format, but no need to agree on outlines of the BTR. No outlines needs to be developed for the information to be provided.
- Para 12 of decision: aligning review process with review of NDC guidance→ CMA 10-11. Allow for more fruitful review of Article 6 alignment
- CA method: disappointed that our request has not been reflected. Wanted more clarity: insert one single word to give clarity→ will be communicated. Communicate “indicative” before multi-year trajectory

Senegal obo AGN

- Only come back on CA, will come back later
- Through the cover decision and in the operational part we haven’t seen elements in relation to the timing of the CA and this needs to be addressed
 - For the selling Party as well as the acquiring Party, we need to clearly define when that CA will be done. Whether for the selling Party at the first transfer and for the acquiring Party at the usage→ that may be very different, needs to be made specific. Needs further work under SBSTA or provision in annex.
 - Co-facilitator: is that not para 3ciii
 - Senegal: not about the year, it is about the difference in years for the selling and the using Party. How to have transparency in the meantime?

Canada

- With respect to accounting, on work programme in paragraph 3c
 - Some issues must be developed directly, other things can be developed later (e.g., carry-over)
 - For any issue we cannot resolve, we are happy to discuss further guidance for the next NDC implementation, not open for further guidance applicable retrospectively for this NDC implementation periods
 - CA method needs to be made operational for this NDC implementation period

Brazil

- Paragraph 4, 7 and 8, there is a reference to the group of experts
 - Would not favour such a setting, had this before in Article 6, not see the point. Such a group could weaken the process. Rather call for submissions and discussions under SBSTA
- On CA
 - Wording in paragraph 3ci, is not enough→ not question of “whether”, should revise guidance for a single method. Question is “when”. Could compromise on a deadline, harmonised with paragraph 12, the revision of the guidance by no later than 2028.
 - If we have to adjust the guidance after the ICTU, we have no assurance on integrity. Then rather put 6.2 transactions on hold until we have ICTU and then have a single method.
 - Echo concerns by Senegal on timing. In the annex paragraph 8, pleased to see annual application of CA, goes in the right direction. But at the same time we need further discussion on how to ensure quantitative quality of applying CA

- Comments on other areas then later on.

New Zealand

- On accounting issues, CA
 - The cover decision, paragraph 3c on further guidance→ this is the core mandate of our work. Needs to be resolved here
- On annex
 - Paragraph 8, CA be applied that does not lead in increase in emissions “across participating Parties”
 - Para 10, non-GHG metrics needs more robustness. Need to see text on single and multi-year accounting text
 - Para 11→ looks like new text, happy to have bilateral on this. Seems to say that if a Party a non-quantified NDC but includes policies and measures it will quantify those policies and measures

Co-facilitator

- Paragraph 8 in annex refers to both GHG and non-GHG metrics

European Union

- Text needs strengthening
- Ambition
 - Text needs to reflect on necessary ambition
 - Reflection of no increase in emissions in principle→ needs to including contribution to the Parties NDC and LT-LEDs (same principle as in Article 6.4). 4f, 18f and 22 b as an additional line→ goes into the direction of balancing as AGN requests
- Non-GHG
 - Put a scrutiny reserve around this
 - Basic concern is that in providing in transfers of non-GHG we do not reach the no increase in emissions
 - Process where non-GHG is converted by GHG with a host-relevant emission factor and then converted back to the non-GHG metric of the buyer→ can be taken up in the work programme
 - Could then have simple text on the non-GHG in the annex
- Accounting
 - Work programme on timing of adjustment→ should be decided here
- Reporting
 - Initial report should be no later than at authorisation, bracket first transfer
 - With regard to review, more elements must be developed, needs coordinative review for participating Parties
 - Have in the review text a chapeau that encourages centralised reviews and then a further work programme on that
 - Also have a sentence that Parties should be able to respond to and address inconsistencies→ no sentence on that yet
- Other uses
 - Spread around the text, need to understand better what the text means
- Removals
 - Remain concerned with the possibility of reversal. Concern with processes between NDC implementation, need to establish need to monitor emissions and removals across several NDC implementation periods. Maybe restrict removals to inside NDC

- Human rights
 - Glad to see the text, brackets removed
- In response
 - Similar concerns on expert groups, needs further elaboration
 - ITL data exchange status could be done entirely technical
- Agrees with AGN and Brazil on annual adjustments

Thailand

- Other international mitigation purposes
 - Concerns on the annex para 16, we consider the text added to the iterations goes beyond the scope of the Article 6.2 guidance. Not the role of the guidance how the mitigation outcomes may be used. Rather that when authorised, then CAs must be applied consistently. Wording in first sentence is problematic.
 - Also different interpretations on what international mitigation purposes are
 - Annex 1 para 4 → after mitigation purposes → other legal obligations to clarify other international mitigation purposes

Arab Group

- Thanks for including addition on NDC portion, important to include NDCs based on policies and measures
- Requirements for quantification must relate to the Party
- Here, we talk about GHG covering CAs and 6.4 activities
 - Any Party wanting to do GHG cooperation and 6.4 activities and they have NDCs with non-quantified policies and measures → must apply to CA only to the portion of the mitigation component of NDC, from where mitigation is relevant
- Open and pleased for discussions and bilaterals with Parties to find solutions and also with examples

Saudi Arabia obo LMDC

- Support Arab Group, note concerns raised on 3c → agree that it needs to be time-bound and linked to paragraph 12.
- Pleased for more guidance on limits and safeguards, including 3cii, iii. Should stay in the text
- Para 12: review → adding the same safeguard to the Article 6.4M, to also allow review of whether activities are achieving the overall mitigation
- Annex section 3
 - Name change has been made for buffer registry, are happy with that. Would like to see how addition and subtraction would occur, for balance of text
 - Paragraph 11 → happy to have reference to policies and measures
- Text on human rights → support of including that text, but would like to stay in line with human rights text in PA, specifically in line 1/CP.21 “respect, promote and consider....”. This text is sufficient, do not have to move away from this text. If important to have reiteration for Article 6 tools, that is ok. But not introduce text on human rights that does not exist under Paris.

Australia

- Paragraph 3c of decision text → anticipate this being concluded here, not work programme
- Group of experts (§4 and 7)
 - Good to hear the historical memory where this occurred. Came out of the blue and keen to interest. Willing to consider it if we understand a bit more. Need confidence on inclusivity and Party-driven process, maybe something like the ITEDs.

- On reporting and review
 - Paragraph 18, timing of initial report, between chapeau and para 18f, potential inconsistency. In initial report copy of authorisation, but if initial report comes before authorisation, that does not work.
- Human rights, pleased to see reflection in the text

India

- Associate with LMDC
- The relevant year for the CA is the year of generation for the host Party, year of use for using Party
- Application of CA, 3b-h. Options on single year NDC. Not look forward to multi-year trajectory, maybe able to examine average
- Paragraph 14-15 on sectors and GHGs→ would like to mention here policies and measures in definition of NDCs. Countries should have flexibility to keep ITMOs outside the NDC and then have no CA for outside NDC. **Cannot consider paragraph 15 at all.**
- There needs to be an economic rationale for limits, not restrict host Party
- On initial report→ want option in line with BTR
- Paragraph 18h→ information may be good information, but maybe not relevant. Not put unnecessary burden with large amount of information.

Solomon Islands obo LDCs

- On Corresponding Adjustments
 - Issue with 8a ii→ averaging. Can't understand the language around "indicative" NDC and apply CA to the average amount in the end year. Some sort of summation of averages→ more clarity regarding
- Like LMDC
 - Confident with new language on buffer
- Para 16 , OIMP
 - This paragraph may not be necessary, defined as ITMO
 - But needs more language on reporting
 - Happy to have bilateral with Thailand on definition
 - In para 1f, the term "authorised" should be not bracketed
- Paragraph 33
 - "entities authorised"→ pick up this concept in other places, particularly in annual information from authorised entities
- Treatment of SOP and OMGE
 - Section 7 does not cover concerns, wants parallel language from Article 6.4
 - Contribution to adaptation financing is too generic, does not deal with the broader concept of SOP. Precludes consideration of SOP.
 - Need to do a lot of work on this section.

Bolivia

- Transfer, limits and liability of usage (?)
- Need to work on limitations
- Not see the required urgency for Article 6.8 as well
 - Paragraph 3-8 for Article 6.2→ everything has a sense of urgency, getting things done by November 2022, getting done by June 2022→ Article 6.8 needs to be on parallel track
- NMAs must be promoted as key tools, soon

Senegal obo AGN

- Not demand no brackets etc., rather than just mention missing elements
- Article 6.2
- In cover decision 3ciii, new condition introduced for the same NDC implementation period. Not seen that in the discussions, was tabled by someone. Need to have better understanding why this was introduced and what the implications are
- On reporting on adaptation finance, this was weakened compared to Article 6.2 text. Not understand where that options comes from.
- Requirements in initial report have been strengthened but need to better address the review process and the implications of not meeting the guidance and if A6TER recommendations are not addressed by the participating Party.
- Need to have better definition of OIMP, CORSIA, IMO also needs to be defined.
- Capacity building programme, cover decision §10→ ready to provide additional elements for the placeholder
- Cover decision, group of experts→ not comfortable on this terminology, need more details on process and mandate

Co-facilitators

Speakers list 6.2: Canada, US, Japan, Norway, Iran, PNG, NZ, Egypt, EIG, Brazil, Costa Rica, Kenya, Saudi Arabia, China

Article 6.8

Bolivia

- In line with some submissions already provided, we need to have a parallel in text with regard to timeframes that are convincing that the Secretariat wants to put in place the tools in the same timeframe
- Timeframes where the proposed approaches are made as possible
- Urgency of 6.2 has to be reflected in 6.8 in terms of operational and institutional arrangements

European Union

- Text in Article 6.8 is a step back, very complicated and unclear whose options is which
- Reassure Bolivian colleague, EU is in favour of enhancing and improving non-market cooperation
- Starting to look like triumph of process over substance. In work programme on NMA we need to start by being open. WP would be better under a forum, appropriate for a time where views are gathered. Many of the institutional proposals are highly elaborated and specific but do not address the mandate. Premature to build institutions without understanding content matter
- Would like to avoid discussions on specific approaches→ needs to be an open work programme where Parties come with their approaches. Broad range of actions out there.
- Support the development of a web-based platform as a useful starting point. But issues on climate finance are to be addressed elsewhere, e.g., SCF
- There is a range of issues in the specific proposals that are duplicative of mandates under the Convention
- Preference for Madrid text

Canada

- Canada has more than 50 bilateral and more than 50 multilateral cooperation, none of which involve ITMOs. Have a lot to say on that in the work programme when it begins
- Look forward to start this work programme under SBSTA as per decision 1/CP.21
- If a Party says there is a lack of urgency but then throws out a text where we worked on for several years, this is contradictory. Not weigh a Party-driven text against an individual group.

Antigua and Barbuda obo AOSIS

- We would like to see environmental integrity reflected in Art 6.8, will come back with further comments

Solomon Islands obo LDCs

- Disappointment with how this agenda item is going, are holding this hostage
- Support option A, NMA forum and process elaborated in option A
- Process and institutional arrangements that are not too complexed, while going beyond just a SBSTA work programme. This is a useful middle group

Co-facilitators

- Must first sort governance, then can address timelines and urgency

Saudi Arabia obo LMDC

- Support statement by Bolivia, 6.8 text requires more work to accelerate operationalisation
- Want similar timelines as for 6.2 and 6.4
- Reflect on an idea of the ITEDs: room for NMAs to behave in a similar way as for oversight→ governance would make sure that any claims on NMAs included in transparency reports have been actually received by participating countries.

Côte d'Ivoire

- Want to see mainstreaming the different options: Can merge options. Support Article 6.8 Committee under the CMA, rather than SBSTA. Arrangements similar to governance for Article 6.4.

Brazil

- In favour of option B, task force, option that can speed up implementation of Article 6.8, also support LMDC and Bolivia statements

Egypt obo Arab Group

- Aligns with interventions made by Bolivia, LMDC and Brazil
- Find a merit in proposal made by Côte d'Ivoire
- 6.8 text needs further work, in a balanced manner with 6.2 and 6.4
- Preferred option on governance is option B
- Need to work on the options in front of us to go further

Co-facilitator

- 5 options:
 - NMA forum
 - SBSTA
 - Article 6.8 Committee
 - Task Force
 - Ad-hoc Working Group
- Must be consolidated in this room

- Not hearing any push back on urgency and parity in timelines→ but governance issue must be resolved

Ecuador

- The countries that have been advocating for balance face unwillingness to take on board the different options to have provided
- Exact name or structure is not fundamental, we have provided different possibilities. At Katowice, we had come very close to agreement. And yet, there were some oppositions and we had to provide further alternatives.
- Parity must be ensured for processes.

Switzerland

- Not yet fully digested and coordinate with EIG
- Share the comments by the EU in that we regard this text as a step back
- Referring back to ITEDs and Madrid
- Madrid text is a very good basis. The text allows a flexibility for Parties to come forward.
- We are not hearing the necessity for the more elaborate governance proposals
- Have read LMDC submissions with great interest
 - In the submission, we have remarked several points that are not compatible with mandate, referring to NMAs solely as a transfer from developed to developing countries. NMAs are available to all Parties, this distinction is not acceptable and not possible
- Governance as set out in Madrid text works, spend a lot of time on this. Have a right to understand why any more elaborate governance is needed. With this text, we have not come closer to resolution

Japan

- Option A is supported
- The current text has some bracketed parts in it, needs further development
- On Timeline, a submission date is bracketed for 2022 and 2023, preference is to start submission by 2022
- Support UNFCCC web-based platform for sharing of information
- Review timeline: Starting point is Madrid text-> review in 2027. Step one completed in five years.
- Article 6.8 committee is different from NMA Forum/SBSTA
 - Article 6.8 will be under COP, this needs further understanding

New Zealand

- We have been so close to reach agreement before, would like to do so here.
- Want a strong and substantial work programme, would like to see the Madrid version we worked on collectively. Wanted under SBSTA, are able to compromise on NMA forum

United States

- This draft is taking a few steps back. Ready to identify opportunities to streamline
- Under Chapter 3, option D is the only acceptable decision in line with mandate of 1/CP.21 (SBSTA work programme)
- Not appropriate to request SBSTA to consider other institutional arrangements in future
- Otherwise agree with process and timelines, happy to consider on how to expedite the work
- Can share comments on other parts of the text
- Section 1 on principles, bi

- NMAs facilitated under the framework present voluntary cooperative actions (instead collective)
- Paragraph 2b: Efficiency and coordinative
- Paragraph 3 → voluntary identified by participating Parties for facilitation by the framework
- Happy to share this with Secretariat

Argentina (Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay)

- Support the idea of a taskforce to explore potential by 6.8, support Brazil
- Want an operational approach, balanced manner. Should be supporting Parties in mitigation and adaptation actions
- Text is open with options. Happy to engage to narrow down the different options.

Co-facilitators

- Urging Parties to have bilaterals and sort this out

Saudi Arabia

- Paragraph 4 of cover decision has changed with many new words, want 4iii-m in brackets to be removed from the text

Mexico

- Wants references to human rights in Article 6.8, gender and indigenous peoples specifically

USA

- Paragraph 4 of the decision text: add two other focus areas
 - Circular economy and (?)
 - Will react on bracketed focus areas in the paragraph
- Can support options A but cannot support options b
- rather than meeting, engagement with stakeholders
- support ?

European Union

- On Paragraph 4 → delete focus areas examples
- Not see Madrid text option clearly in the text. Option A includes additional elements

Ecuador

- Supports Mexico, deliver as in the preamble (?)
- Need to have some more internal coordination. Not support to not have further discussions on Article 6.8, need to come back after more internal coordination

Article 6.4

Canada

- On baselines: paragraph 36 is about performance benchmark, allowing for two different ways to do that. Both acceptable ways to derive a baseline, can be conservative as long as it frequently updated
- Text in 36 a and b is more developed than in paragraph 37 and should replace those. But Paragraph 37d should be preserved, as not all baselines can be benchmarks, some cases where historical emissions are important. Here, frequent updates and fast inclusion of recently credited activities.
- Would like to see 36 a and b to replace 36a to c, preserving 37d
- Will come back on other issues

Thailand

- On functions of the host Party, wants reference to function of accreditation
 - On functions of SB in paragraph 24, vii. Do not think that the approval of host Party necessary arrangements is needed. Oversight ok but approval no. Remove the word approve
- Baselines and additionality
 - Absence in the reference to national, regional and social circumstances that was in Presidency text → must be re-inserted
 - Principle in paragraph 34 must be reflected in chapeau

Senegal obo AGN

- Baselines and additionality: elements that are in 36 can be included in the 37 paragraph

Japan

- Paragraph 36 and 37 require further clarification
- As suggested by AGN, we need to organise the baseline process
- First have a performance based approach to cover BAT benchmarks and relevant approaches. Then we would consider some approaches, including existing historical emissions with use of more conservative approaches and discounting. Alternative approaches could be also proposed and agreed by the A6.4SB in further work programme
- Happy to consult with interested Parties

New Zealand

- Text on OMGE
 - Paragraph 7g in decision text enhanced ambition, accounting and voluntary cancellation by private sector.
 - Other purposes should include voluntary cancellation for OMGE?
- Human rights, pleased to see text
 - Paragraph 13 could refer to that specifically
- Participation responsibilities
 - Pleased with text on NDC and LT-LEDS, could be more specific to reference to long-term goal (6.2)
- Concern on para 26c, more clarity on functions dissolved
- Methodologies
 - In baseline setting approaches, make reference to methodology principles
 - Clear reference to temperature goal
 - ????
- Can support colleagues to expand para 36
- I do not understand here
- Support development of broadly applicably benchmarks for rapid operationalisation
- Additionality 39 → remove first two brackets
- On CDM and CER transition
 - Ready to consider CDM activity transition, but want clarity on expedition
 - On CERs, no text option must remain included

Arab Group

- Capacity building placeholders: assist on participation requirements
- Annex

- Section III, section B, para 25vii. Seek more clarification on the practicability on how this may work or developing country
- Para 26e→ bracket part in third line after authorisation for “how such types”--> there may be outside activities
- Para 27 chapeau: prefer keeping many to avoid undue burden, bracket 27e for that reason
- 27e and b, need to bracket last word (Compatibility on NDC and LEDS, why relevant?), linked to inside/outside issue
- Section 5 methodologies, support para 37 with deletion of bracket around “one” and around “business as usual”
 - One specific approach does not incentivise the action needed by scale
 - Paramount to have the utmost flexibility
- Supervisory Body will assess and approve, will be chosen by Parties, they will deal with appropriateness→ not make too much micromanagement at CMA level
- All approaches must be allowed
- Para 33-34→ seek more clarification of better understanding
- Section 7 on SOP→ percentage under 6.2 should be the same as under 6.4
- Section 9→ need to see clear option of no CA for outside NDC (including policies and measures)
- Transition
 - Para 74, concern of excluding any type of projects. Making any limitation to any type of projects would make a threat for some projects. In favour to allow for transition of all activities.
 - Vulnerability is not clear
 - The dates of transition: later date is needed for project developers to understand and move forward on transition
 - CER transition→ need to have a clear option for use of pre-2021 CERs without limitations
 - No arbitrary cut-off dates for registration, rather according to generation of CERs, with cut-off in 2010. Open to discuss solutions, while not having exclusion

Senegal obo AGN

- Issue of suppressed demand is not addressed in the current text. Have raised this issue many times before. Want this to be included in the draft text.
 - Co-chair: suppressed demand is in methodology principles, is this enough?
 - Yes, is fine for Senegal

PNG

- Paragraph 72, 2 options: do not understand adjustment for something outside NDC. Would like to have the option that all emission reductions must come from inside NDC as option in next iteration
- No mandate for A6.4SB to examine things not used towards NDC, no reference to other uses
- CER transition→ if we include CERs, let's include REDD+ units, important element to reach net carbon neutrality. REDD+ units are covered by Article 5 and WFR. Insist on having this option included.

Solomon Islands obo LDCs POO

- Session must end on time so that LDCs can coordinate
- Clash with coordination meeting of LDCs

➔ Speakers list will be picked up, starting 15:30.

15:45 SBSTA INFORMAL

Article 6.2

Canada

- Further views on 6.2
- Non-GHG metrics
 - Remain sceptical, para 11 is not enough. Need assurance that in the end metrics will have GHG metrics and CA be in CA metrics.
- Quantitative limits
 - Outside the guidance, but any Party can decide on their limits and be invited to report on it
- Non-permanence/risks of reversals
 - Long-term monitoring is needed, but there are different ways to do this. Want specific language proposal, also for outside NDC
- Reporting: para 20, add “quantitative”. Want it included in annex to BTR
- Para 23
 - 23b bis: Net quantitative ITMOs; 23b ter: net CA
- Human Rights/Indigenous people: helpful to reiterate PA language (Agree with Saudi Arabia), in all three Articles (Agree with Mexico)
- Further working on language on social and environmental impacts + sustainable development, without creating new obligations under the PA ➔ working on textual proposals

USA

- 3bi ➔ do not see basis in text for cooperative approaches/NDCs involving one or more GHG metrics, conversion of what into what? Not being discussed at length, must be bracketed
- Need to discuss finality of accounting
- 3ci-iii ➔ elements must be resolved at COP
- No need to just choose one method
- Bracket option to agree on one single method
- Request bracket 3cv as well as related para 11 in annex ➔ unclear, cannot embrace it at this time. Willing to work with Egypt to better understand
- Accounting ➔ annex
 - Para 2: agree that word authorised before other uses should be removed. Strike the word “including” and only keep determination by host country
 - Approach to describing a first transfer has been adjusted in a way that changes the meaning. Paragraph 2b
- Add “across participating Parties” like para 17
- Paragraph 11, first clause, unclear meaning on specificity of “relevant portion”, language is not helpful. Can be moved into work programme. “Relevant portion in accordance with further guidance”
- Para 12 and 3cvi ➔ unclear if that elements are needed, as included in review of the guidance.
- Section C can be cleaned up, distinction is not needed, similar reading to LDC
- Section E ➔ not acceptable, including new elements. Proposed alternative options, not reflected

- Reporting and review
 - When a Party communicates a method for CA, where the Party uses a trajectory/budget, this must be reported in the initial report.
 - Annual average amounts adjusted must also be reported under para 23
- New language 18i and 22f→ make suggestion to add s to avoid, only respect human rights, being consistent with SD objectives; brackets on ambition in mitigation and adaptation ambition and everywhere else
- Para 21b, added bracketed text does not make sense
- Para 22c, the new language add: as referred to in paragraph 17 and 31 of 1/CP.21
- Elements in 23f are requested for each cooperative approach→ too detailed for structured summary in 18/CMA.1. The detailed information can be an annex, aggregation in structured summary. Cumulative emissions are not relevant for all NDCs, only for multi-year NDCs. Must be clarified
- Decision language on review→ helpful to reflect that agreed electronic format would take into account the work developed by the Secretariat in advance
- Work by SBSTA on review guidelines in para 6a→ provisions ensuring that the review, “guidelines for reviewing the consistency of the information provided with the annex”. Reviews would specify recommended actions when inconsistencies are identified.
- Preamble, prefer to recall PA
- In decision, para 3 and 13, Parties will not work on Special Circumstances, they do not fulfil participating responsibilities→ will be developing recommendations/ considerations of these elements
- References to convene interested parties→ make use of virtual formats but concerns with an undefined and unlimited process
- Work on CB, should support development of institutional arrangements

Japan

- Paragraph 10 (non-GHG metrics), requires more work
 - Make para similar to GHG metric, para 9, language. Same treatment, also in operationalising.
 - Refer to paragraph 8 as well as chapeau for CA and that this also applies to paragraph 10
 - Information on non-GHGs must be in annual database and in BTR with the same treatment.
 - Paragraph 23 for each year→ same language as from paragraph 9
 - CAs will be made based on reporting and based on information. References will be useful
 - Could we consider the same structure for non-GHG metrics: ITMOs authorised, transferred, etc. for paragraph 10 as in paragraph 9
- Working on the text and will talk to interested Parties if these changes could be acceptable
- For the development of reporting tables
 - Group of experts is one way to do, supportive, but probably also consider an ITED process, submissions, and a more open format, under leadership of SBSTA Chair with support from Secretariat. But work must start immediately and be completed before June session.

Norway

- Glad that there is language on HR
- Should decide on the year of CA here at COP26

- On participating in 6.2
 - Support new text, contribution to NDC and LT-LEDs, but also should be a reference to temperature goal of PA

Iran

- Saudi Arabia has raised issue/concern with language on HR; support that
- Metrics of CA should be determined by participating Parties. CA must take place for every transfer covered inside NDC.
- Iran disagrees with selective and political language → insertion of human rights language in 6.2 and 6.4 will help us finalise job. Have negotiated languages in Madrid. Re-opening of political language will pave the way for insertion of more political language and prolong this process.
- If HR insertion then also...right to health, right to local communities, migrants, children, people Right to development and CBDR, respect in occupied lands and in lands under sanctioned regimes and economic terrorists.
- HR language not in Article 6 but elsewhere. Rather focus on technical matters
- Priority is long term finance, tech transfer, capacity building
- Political language not helpful in implementing NDC and LT-LEDs

PNG

- Concern on links of Article 5 and Article 6
- Activities under Article 5 will be part of Article 6, specifically under 6.2
- All provisions on forestry must be done according to process and standards agreed with Article 5 (WFR, Article 5 MRV). Not having additional stress for RBCF on REDD+ . Want to see inclusion of provision in decision text with link to Article 5.
- 16d → OIMP, not quite sure we need the word “international”. Need to understand what is meant, no carte balance
- 37-40: had solved this problem in Paris, not included in para 6.2, want to see an option to reflect that
- Paragraph 10, need clarification: improvement on what was there before. Parallels are ok but need to understand the purpose of the metric specific registry account. Metric specific account must be related later in the infrastructure context.

New Zealand

- On reporting
 - Pleased to see new text proposals and support language on SD, safeguards, OMGE and rights. Support Saudi Arabia and Canada on reiterating preambular + see it across all three items
- Additional work required, more clarity on review
 - 33a on consistency checks → support expanding to demonstrate the cooperative approach leads to real mitigation
- Support inclusive process rather than expert groups
- Issue of limits → not supportive of quantitative limits, dilution of possible ambition, not respecting NDCs
- Willingness to work on non-GHGs and para 11 to understand how this could be done. Support Japan suggestions.

Egypt obo Arab Group

- Quantification only for portion of NDCs where ITMOs are generated for 6.2 and 6.4 → often, policies and measures are not quantified. So this acknowledges that you have to quantify the emissions from such policies and measures and apply the CA only to these emissions and sources in that context. There is no alternative solutions.
- Want to allow participation, while ensuring environmental integrity
- The following steps to be taken
 - Define boundary of the portion of the NDC (e.g., all landfills)
 - Quantify all GHGs in this boundary, using approved methodologies
 - Project GHG without activity as baseline and project scenario
 - Identify mitigation scenario from the policy and measure
 - Any methodologies used to quantify need to be approved by governing body.
 - Are not against environmental integrity and avoiding double counting.
 - Still open to discuss, but ask for accommodation of case
- Arab Group associates with LMDC
- Just does not want to be prevented from immediate cooperation in non-GHGs.
- Para 10b, under CB programme. Assistance should not be limited to LDCs and SIDS but also including developing countries
- CA, section III, para 8b
 - Ensure inclusivity here in the process, bracket “interested” until “finding a solution”
- Section III, C, sectors/gases
 - Not limit scope only to sectors and gases but also on policies and measures
- Section III, D, OIMP → needs more clarification
- Section IV; initial reporting: para 18hi → mention preamble in PA. Are we bringing them all into this here? Open to discuss this.
 - Also separate HR from negative economic/social impacts
- Regular reporting
 - Para 22f: need to separate avoidance of impacts
- Section 7 : ambition → must be discussed further
 - Issue must come in balanced treatment with 6.4

Costa Rica

- Cover decision, para 3bi
 - Agree with US → no discussion on conversion between non GHGs, must be bracketed
- Also need CA guidance agreed at this COP
- See merit in only one method, multiple method more a necessary evil. Want easy and robust option
- Element on CB: help Parties to ensure cooperation does not undermine ambition, including through technical criteria
- Reference to long-term temperature goal
- Para 8
 - Shall apply method consistently with all participating Parties, make this explicit also non-GHG
 - 8e → safeguards for averaging needed
- Appreciate inclusion of language on reporting, but that may be insufficient, support comprehensive inclusion
- 18c → application consistently and with all partners through period
- 18e → “for which a Party has a target in its NDC2

- 18h→ support element on reporting on HR, but specific safeguard is needed
- Section 5 review→ shall review data from all Parties in a cooperative approach + participation does not cause increase in emissions. Tend to look at only at one Party, need to look across several Parties
- 32b→ notification of inconsistency noted to ALL parties + to expert team
- 34→ corrections shall be submitted to database
- Clarity on how confidentiality is established and evaluated→ fully understand need for confidentiality but should not cover information that should be publicly available

Brazil

- Support the same method across CA and across Parties
- If there are not enough elements to work further on single method, then transactions are not safe to the environment and should not occur
- Should think on process to work to move towards a single method by 2028
- Paragraph 17, third element of flexibility→ cannot compromise on para 17. Robust limits are important. Happier with this para than the one before but still do not understand why this cannot be strengthened.
 - Mix of agreed language
 - Definition of safeguard: makes cooperative not leading to increase
 - Then the actual limits are in brackets, some should be spelled out. Need more definition→ percentage of average of Parties. Flexible to consider numbers in work programme but need some minimum parameters
 - Wish to see some items from the initial reports→ no fluctuation and prices, environmental impacts, address reversals... Need some reassurance→ not the same impetus as for 6.4
 - Also this language in cover decision, para 3c-d: implementation of limits set out in... and elaboration of “further” limits
- CAs in para 11
 - Could explore language in second set of brackets, working with other Parties
- Report and review section
 - Initial report need further clarity on submission prior to or no later than (compromise)
 - Agree with AILAC on strengthening review process
 - A lot of vague language→ “consistency”, needs more elements and in the terms of reference
 - What body assesses the information?
 - Frequency of reports, need more information and guidance on how to address inconsistencies

Switzerland obo EIG

- Cover decision
 - See no need or basis for conversion between different non-GHG metrics, but for conversion of cooperation in non-GHG metrics in GHG impact→ should be incorporated in annex guidance text
 - Essential to provide as much clarity as possible on accounting method here (3ciff), 3cii→ valuable to agree on this
 - Flexible to hear views
- Other purposes, recalling discussions in Madrid

- Paragraph 1f is good as it stands, emphasizes right for Parties to authorise for other things. Not sure if we still need paragraph 16.
- On paragraph 2, still convinced for 2b the authorisation should be the trigger. Official first transfer would be always be post-authorisation.
- Reiterate comments from different Parties including NZ for paragraph 8
 - Make sure that no net increase in emissions entails all sides of a cooperation
 - Coming back to non-GHG → only like for like trading, need to see GHG impact of this.
 - Agree with LMDC that metric specific registry account is better
- Paragraph 11
 - Thank Arab Group for constructive proposals, happy to engage more bilaterally. Looks like a new thing. But is that not what is needed anyway? Why introducing this concept only in relation to policies and measures?
- Reporting section
 - Applaud additions, in particular 18f, but that can be tweaked
- Initial report for first cooperative approach for the first NDC implementation period, para 19 makes sure that the details on the next cooperative approaches are also available in the same level of detail.
 - Suggestion for para 19 not only to refer to para 18f but to 18g and h that also refer specifically to cooperative approaches → equal treatment to cooperative approaches
- Regular information
 - Not the entire detailed information must come in the structured summary, can be other tab but links must be kept and made right

Kenya

- Paragraph 4 of decision text, associate with AGN
- Uncomfortable with interested Parties, language must be clearer

China

- CA in para 15 in annex
 - Echo opinion made by Indian colleagues
 - No double counting issues for outside NDC scope
- More clarification on long-term low GHG strategies

Saudi Arabia obo LMDC

- Suggestion to specify PA goals with temperature goals- against specification of this certain goal. No justification on concentrating only on one goal. Be inclusive of all the goals of PA.
- Section IV reporting, subsection C, 21c → would like to see this para to go back to Madrid text. Remove principle no net increase in 21d.
- LMDC are showing a lot of willingness to compromise, especially in non-GHG metrics. Willingness to compromise has not be reciprocated, really an issue. At this point, should all be seeking a decision. If there is no compromise shown and continued hard lines, will go nowhere. Issues with paragraph 10 that specifies the operationalise the non-GHG metrics and an issue with cover decision text on two or more non-GHG metrics. If conversion to GHG metrics is required anymore, why additional restrictions to not convert between non-GHG metrics. Not willing to agree to compromise at this point if no willingness to compromise is seen
- Support PNG wording on metric specific registry account, must be streamlined
- Open to considering language provided by Japan
- Sincere hope that other Parties start to show similar willingness to compromise

India

- Associate with LMDC
- Cover decision, para 3biii, the method for applying CA should be in respect for transferred ITMOs only
 - Para 3bii, the relevant year is the year of generation for the host Party
 - 3biii, ensuring first transfer in one NDC implementation → unnecessary constraint, also 3e → there should not be any bar to such ITMOs
 - Para 10b: CB also for developing countries in general
- Annex
 - Para 11 → second part of this para ok, first part to be deleted
 - Para 15 → reiterate that no CA for outside NDC, include policies and measures
 - Para 17 → no economic rationale for this para, not have unnecessary restraints on Parties
 - Para 18 → IR with BTR
 - Para 18h → here, there could be a lot of information but maybe not all is relevant. Want to delete it in IR. Also 18hiii, not supportive
 - Para 20a → voluntary cancellation only

Bolivia

- Support LMDC
- Will be resubmitting submission on options for text in option B, LMDC submission provided prior, in reaction to request by Hugh

Singapore

- Para 3ciii → not right fit here. Provision restricts transfers, therefore a limit. Limits should be considered and further deliberated. Could include all other elements, including elements from para 17 of annex
- Support text on Article 6.2 mandate for review

Thailand

- On reporting provisions
- Initial report → lack of clarity of “where practical” wrt BTR submission. Include: practicality when authorisation of first transfer occurs in the same year.
- Further work on outline for IR + infrastructure obstructs rapid operationalise. 2 approaches
 - Have provisional measures in the meantime + provisional infrastructure
 - Have “late” submission of IR with BTR when due
- On Annual information
 - Inclusion of deadline of 31 March is too premature. No need for deadline.
- Regular information
 - Support provision of qualitative info as annex to BTR, but no need to specify date for submission of reports
- No duplication of reporting by several Parties, suggest to rephrase to refer to submission only of structured summary, then Secretariat extracts info for database
- OIMP → Concur with Switzerland that paragraph 16 is not necessary. Support US in removing word “including” in para 1f. Would like to clarify that interpretation to OIMP only relates to UN agencies or other multilateral organisations.

EU

- Hear the LMDC about the need to be flexible, well heard. Understand that addressing non-GHG metrics is very important to them. Dangers relate to increase in emissions- are also making proposals to also increase stringency of accounting for GHG. Need to talk
- Hear discussions on constraints→ market must operate in planetary constraints.
- On question of limits→ no increase in emissions principle can be implemented in a variety of ways not only through limits of transfers. Needs to be implemented as principle in reporting upfront and regularly + approached by review.
- On paragraph 11 and Egypt: issue relates to scope.
- On China: dispute the notion that there is no double counting outside scope
- But: need to know what scope is and what the impact of exemption is.
- Need to define scope as defined in NDC, can look at all of this.
- We will work to try and deliver a compromise. Must balance the need to generate mitigation outcomes and impact the atmosphere. Need clarity on what scope is, para 11 is not enough yet.
- Did hear from PNG→ original position is there should not be trading outside scope. No trading outside scope option should be in the text. Flexibility for outside scope was shown in trade for CA.

South Africa

- Review in para 25→ clarity is necessary here. Para does not seem to correlate with the other paragraphs
- Mitigation and adaptation ambition (para 38)→ para is now weakened, need stronger language as in Madrid
- Support Kenya on para 4 in cover text→ who are the interested Parties? Whose discretion is going to apply?

Antigua and Barbuda

- Text looks good and is very technical. But nobody understands the impact of these rules.
- Most important question for minister: how can we participate and how can the private sector participate
- So far, this is not helpful
- Chapeau needs to explain the objective, principle in clean English
- Comments on HR, IP and inclusive market systems: not just patting IP on the head. Safeguards are one thing. But we can achieve ambition not only by accounting. REDD+ and other systems have developed procedures to ensure participation of communities. Prices should include all of the benefits of having a high quality unit. Here, we are monetizing carbon dioxide; benefits should be priced, too. Design a market where IP and communities can access and contribute.
- Delegation is looking at language and hope that this can be considered.
- Can expand our idea on ambition→ go beyond mitigation, small projects with SME and inclusive market can also be high ambition market, so that small economies can participate

Ecuador

- Need to keep consideration of emissions avoidance
- Reference on 3ciii could go to limits section
- Support calls from Kenya on deletion of reference to “interested” Parties
- Paragraph 14→ include before social and economic impacts→ environmental, social and economic impacts

- Annex, join LMDC that there is no need to reference LT-LEDs
- Para 17, on limits, support Brazil
- Same language on HR across 6.2, 6.4 and 6.8
- Need concrete SOP for 6.2, need to find that use of implementation of Art 6 is additional in financing adaptation

Solomon Islands

- Section 6 in decision → SBSTA to develop recommendations on guidance from confidentiality.
- Para 15 of decision text → not invite, but request Adaptation Fund
- On HR, like to engage in discussion. Not have displacement of IP due to carbon markets, no repeating.

USA

- Replace authorisation with first transfer. Authorisation is not the first transfer. Retain language that IR to be provided no later than first transfer
- Para 3g → seems to indicate annual balance is only for GHG, but not alternative for regular information
- Para 3bi, not trying to be antagonistic, but does not understand language and reference to annex. Happy to work with Parties.

Co-facilitators

- Good progress today, urge to speak to each other
- Still a lot of work to do
- Resume work tomorrow morning with 6.8, followed by 6.4
- Scheduled to reconvene at 10:00 in rooms 5 and 7

04.11.2021 SBSTA informals

Beginning missed

Article 6.8

Canada

- Indigenous people platform
- No shopping list of approaches

Antigua and Barbuda obo AOSIS

- Forum where all observers and stakeholders can participate, SBSTA is the best place for that

Solomon Islands obo LDCs

- Would be very useful to have a list of some sort to start the work and show some good will
- Should have an informal informal to come up with a short list

EU

- Maybe have a more generic and open list on focus areas, more general descriptions

USA

- Happy to allocate more time on 6.8

Switzerland

- Call for submissions

Bolivia

- Network meeting twice a year to have a look at the macro-level → high level meetings
- Create homogenous base for reporting, work these aspects through
- Consolidate presentation and indicators for reporting
- Registry to list the activities/NDCs of things that do not have access to finance, capacity, technology. Common ground where countries can place their needs and where private funds and countries can search for cooperation
- Will give this to Secretariat and see how it goes.
- Does not want to have bilaterals on this

New Zealand

- Very useful
- Can support AOSIS on environmental integrity wording in cover decision, also human rights
- A more generic or encompassing list may be more useful, happy for informal informal to refine this

Egypt obo Arab Group

- Agree on generic list, not having something prescriptive
- And then have space to understand future implications of each elements and applicability and how to make it operational, not just having a list

Co-facilitators

- Helps to have generic focus areas

Japan

- Support EU, Canada, US, AOSIS
- Sit down to put list in more generic form, support inf inf
- Para 7 and 8 → mentioning of the date → what are these two options?

EU

- Madrid text is the most useful framing for institutionalisation
- Text could be clearer in options
- Names of institutional arrangements are less important than the functions, functions of committee and network are overlapping → rather focus on what should happen and the decide the institution
- Identify the institutions in sliding scale of functions

Ecuador

- Simpler formulation of the options
- Clearer and sooner timelines
- More specific elements on cover decision 7a
- List not balanced on adaptation/mitigation
- Need for clear reference to certain principles + HR/indigenous peoples

Mexico

- Annex 1b, proposal to add biii: to respect, promote and protect human rights.... Or alternatively, we could propose just transition of the work force...
- Annex 12, add 12h → 2 self-designated representatives of non-governmental constituency groups

Sudan

- Option B, paragraph 8; 18 b and c → must be clarified

Senegal obo AGN

- Governance
 - o Ready to work on the options tabled, can have some mixing/streamlining
 - o Just not wait until the governance question is sorted before starting action: network, platform, while further working on final governance arrangements by the end of next year
- We need to be generic on the list, but does not exclude anything already identified. But more openness and inclusion of some other elements and activities.

Solomon Islands

- CD 3 and 4
 - o Further work should not preclude start of week
 - o Shopping list converted better placed in annex for initial work programme activities. Work programme activities are very generic, more procedural arrangements
 - o Should have some initial work programme to get these things happening, get some work started without delaying. Give us something to start on. Did that with the Nairobi Work Programme.

Costa Rica obo AILAC

- Thank LMDC for very clear intervention, found a lot of value and there is space for conversation. Some pillars are very valuable for developing countries.
- Better reporting and common indicators is valuable work.

Nigeria

- Assoc AGN
- Happy with more generic description, reframe introductory sentence: "including, but not limited to the following areas"

Australia

- NMAs should facilitate Parties to protect human rights
- Para 1, when developing and implementing tools, including tools to assist Parties that wish to engage in NMAs to ensure that they can address issues surrounding gender, local communities, people with disabilities, indigenous peoples, etc....

Morocco

- Associate AGN+AG
- Support generic list, but also need to understand the next steps and how to make it operational

Antigua and Barbuda, AOSIS

- Supports to move list to annex, supports Nigeria
- Open to idea of inf inf
- Work programme should get off the ground right here, not detailed
- People should know what to engage in
- Call for CB funding for LDCs and SIDS
- SCF has done a needs assessment room
- IEU of GCF found that SIDS often do not get the funds, international agencies do not want to work with us. If the areas and topics are not clear in the decision, it will be difficult to request funding for capacity building, proposals will be rejected → list must be clear so that national governments understand what to apply for in CB funding. Not be afraid of long list, for inclusivity.

- Support intervention by Australia → under work programme (must be better structured) for issues on HR/indigenous peoples → development of tools should have own section, borrow some language from other processes.

Saudi Arabia obo LMDC

- Moving list in annex and keep it as is not acceptable
- List must change from what it looks like
- Can work on how to reduce complication of this list of options. Concentrate on function rather than name, maybe one option with brackets
- Para 24 of the annex B1 → will accept language that is reiterative of the PA but nothing that strays from that, including paragraph from AOSIS and suggestion of Australia. Would like to see consistency in that aspect.
- Work forward to simplify this text

Argentina (Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay)

- Open to revise the list of the focus areas, list looks to prescriptive, shopping list style. Valuable to keep in main decision, but work on the text
- Support idea of having a task force and facilitative mechanism, open to discuss the main options in the text. Important to have a mechanism that is operationalised that allows countries to access means of implementation.

Canada

- Moving things to the annex might give the list more status
- Reflections note and informal note could take up the note but not give status in decision text, give more time for discussions.
- Lower stake of discussions on what is on the list.

Martin

- Want to elaborate the function first, then form
- Work programme must elaborate what is needed, then see the functions that is needed, then institutionalisation can become more serious

Co-facilitators

- Very good discussion this morning, have a room for an inf inf MR 20, 15:30-17:45
 - o Very small room, does clash with CDM

Article 6.4

Costa Rica

- Ensuring, not striving for gender balance
- Meetings should be webcast+ recording
- SB should coordinate and seek synergies with LCIPP
- Para 31 → subitem on activity → shall avoid lock-in of fossil fuels + shall take place within scope of NDC
- Looking to suggest language on baselines
- 41c → temperature goal
- Section on issuance → mandatory participation requirements checked before issuance
- On vulnerability → language on project activities/PoAs assessed by supervisory Body that would cease operation without revenue

Canada

- Ensuring gender balance

- Para 21, see SB to make publicly available decision making framework, decisions and proposed decision, subject to public comment before adoption
- 6.4 ambition→ long term temperature goal, flexible on placement
 - o If Parties are uncomfortable, open to consider text from G20 leaders→ “key relevance from global net zero emissions or carbon neutrality by or around mid-century”
- Functions of host country→ may. Would like clarity that meth requirements or crediting periods must be more stringent than the RMPs
- Inside/outside: want to avoid talking about week 2 issues in week 1. Could look into categories and pools.
- On reversals: Concerns about removal enhancements. Instead we should use PA language: para 6b to say “appropriate crediting periods ... and addressing leakage and reversals in conservation and enhancement of sinks and reservoirs)
- New task for SB: establish maximum allowable time intervals in the activity cycle→ repeat of the zombie credit scenario in the CDM
- On OMGE: careful drafting needed to make sure the percentage cancellation is not deemed sufficient to achieve OMGE. Percentage cancellation is further mitigation, but entire mechanism delivers OMGE
- On additionality, para 39→ do not support insertion for level of enforcement. No crediting for activities required by law.

Antigua and Barbuda obo AOSIS

- Cover decision, para 7g on OMGE
 - o Percentage cancellation rate must be settled in Glasgow, other decision not tolerated
 - o Make link to forward to mandatory account
- First transfer→ is this the right term here? Wants mandatory forwarding, not tax at first transfer
- Para 58→ clear list is appreciated.
 - o Prefer to have bracketed language in this para
- More brackets around CER transition
- Entire brackets around CER transition
- Will be submitted to Secretariat

EU

- Associate with Costa Rica and Canada proposals, with nuances
- Gender balance ensured
- Ambition elements
 - o Need to see A6.4 text strengthened, in elegant drafting→ contribution to long-term goals of the PA, contribution determined by host Party including through NDC and LT-LEDS and communications made in context of RMPs
 - o See principle of contribution to emission reduction in host country that contributes to NDC
 - o Ensuring the risk of reversals is addressed through monitoring and reporting over long period
 - o See in WP, A6.4SB should prepare procedures and guidance and make recommendations for contribution to Paris goals, NDC and risks and reversals
- Look at Canadas proposal on removals, seems to be ok
- On decision

- Improve SB responsibilities, agree with Canada on need for transparency, public consultation (para 21)
 - Para 24a→ operationalise procedures and guidelines on securing PA and NDC principles→ general responsibility of SB
- Inputs by Host country→ additional to and consistent with general requirements of the mechanism. Disagree with Canada, functions should be shall
- Consistency check of language of contribution NDC/PA goal
- Methodological issue include additionality
- 28b, language consistency
- Explicit link to 31f, but 36 and 39 host country choices should be added
- Meth principles, welcome separation of operational and policy principles
 - 33 policy, 34 operational
 - We need ensure consistent reference to principles
- Para 35 captures SB in 38, still needed?
- Like Can proposal on baselines, combination 36 and 37 with addition of d. But when looking at historical/projected emissions, need option of a discount→ necessary to deliver on principles. Historic/projected cannot be used as such
- Para 39→ need to include transformational element+ would have not happened anyway. Performance benchmark and host Party input. Not agree with enforcement text
- Para 72, agree that there are difficulties with inside/outside definition
 - Cautious about moving beyond sectors/gases
- Para 77, welcome proposals that manage risks
 - Position is that there needs to be application of new rules
 - Assessment of vulnerability is needed (AILAC point), need to know whether activities will continue + application of a discount
- Agreeing with Canada on Zombies→ prevent lack of finality and clarity in proposals

Brazil

- Para 5c→ “other MBMs” under the Convention? If it refers to other MBMs, rather see removed. Not agree with having other MBMs. Suggest deleting but “SB may draw lessons in a complementary manner” from other mechanisms
- Para 11 of annex→ delete. Limiting host Party participation. If Parties are keen on language, other language. Many countries have limited number of experts
- Para 27 should be bracketed. Do not see how this provision benefits the mechanism. Not leave door open for decentralisation, we already have 6.2. May create additional burden. A6.4SB is a technical body, cannot assess political choices of countries. Should not be in design of mechanism
- 24avii→ see this cross-reference bracketed
- 24cvi→ either removed. Add “if applicable”. Not make discussions on inside/outside obsolete, limit potential of mechanism if no outside.
- Also applies to 28b
- Methodologies
 - Pleased with seeing the approaches back in the text, prefer option 37, but open to include language from 36 in 37. Move towards consolidated text
- Para 39→ can be flexible. Positive to reflect level of enforcement. Prefer option “absence of mechanism”, more objective assessment than “activity”.
- Para 43→ have discussed solutions in the ITEDs. Another proposal was put forward by Brazil with timebound exemption. Is para 43 an alternative to paragraph 72?

- 43 need clarification, what does “in conjunction” means? Can use of units be decided at later stage and communicated?
- Paragraph 58, bracket around mandatory cancellation. Not yet settled on this. Part of a package.
- Want seamless transition, with clear timeline and sunset. Needs clarity
- Do not see point of vulnerability, projects have proven their value. A6.4M could hit the ground running, already have a deadline. Can work with a deadline to be clearer, also for the A6.4SB
- Transition of CERs
 - Reserve is not correctly depicted. Is to store unused CERs, flexible to not have final use. Can leave further use of this open. As depicted in 78 is for CERs that make the cut- those will be in the registry
 - Happy to discuss alternatives, can reflect on cap on demand.
 - Not agree with open wording of “future decision on CMA”. Prefer to discuss a,b and c.
- Para 43, accounting for CERs. Part of package
 - Request clarification of OIMP. Need to know what OIMP entails? Just official uses and compliance schemes? Does this entail subnational scheme transfers? What does this entail?
 - Applies logic of 6.2→ need clarity under 6.2 as well

Co-facilitator

- Para 43 and 17 are complementary
- OIMP addressed in 6.2

Solomon Islands obo LDC group

- Brackets must remain in place if no clear indication of removing them
- Para 6b on removal enhancement. Definition is problematic, do not think Canada proposal resolves that, need more generic reference to removals.
- Para 7b, see that placed in brackets
- Difficulty with language in 7f, not review the SOP process
- 7g→ percentage must be fixed here
- Para 8 and 9→ missing words on review process and evaluation
- Section 11, transition of activities→ want this whole section deleted
 - Transition of activities was a compromise proposal NOT agreed text
 - No flexibility of carry-over
- In another room, discussing continuation of CDM, undermining integrity of this system
- No accounting exemption of outside NDC→ not have CDM world all over again. Continuation of CDM is not a bridging proposal. No units out of an unlimited, unreported system.
- Quite disturbed. All section on CDM transition put in brackets.

Norway

- Participation responsibilities, supporting reference to LT goal
- Methodology and activity design→ support overarching framing, para 33 is good starting point but want reference to temperature goal + no lick-in
- 31f, difficulty with CP for removals and how this works with jurisdictional programmes, support work programme, happy to discuss further
- Additionality→ needs robust assessment and conservative baselines, happy to come back with language
- Support transparency and comment on SB

USA

- Got ahead of myself in 6.2 discussion
- Cannot support inclusion of final preambular paragraph in 6.4
- Activity design → supporting Canada with maximum allowable time intervals
- Canada + EU on missed opportunities to enhance transparency on A6.4SB. A6.4M needs to maintain innovation, happy to work on language
- Strongly support gender balance, but firm quota not workable in practice, open to work with Parties on formulations
- Chapter 3A, paragraph 6 → individuals serve in their expert capacity
- Chapter 3b governance and functions, para 24aviii → suggest ensuring that A6.4 activities are implemented in a manner that respect and promote... respective obligations
- Paragraph 27 → host Party MAY specific
- Para 27c → scope of this paragraph is too open-ended, rather identify clear options. Party should have a choice
- Para 28a → delete reference to Article 4 and 4/CMA.1. Maintaining could mean sth different than having an NDC in place
- Refer to policies AND measures (methodologies), not support enforcement language
- Section B → reference to historical emissions. Potentially address some concerns → proposal was not reflected. Baseline set at or below average emissions in the previous every five years, recalculated every 5 year. Or baseline must reflect decreasing emissions over time. Happy to link that with CP of 15 years, additional language here
- On approval and authorisation, paragraph related to authorisation. Still not particularly clear, suggestions were not reflected. Host Party should indicate to SB whether it authorises and issued CER, appreciate and/or. Whether authorises to be used. Remove brackets in that sentence. If host Party authorises, it SHALL apply CA in accordance with chapter below. In any case CA must be applied for SOP levied for full fungibility.
- Text that follows can be cleaned up instead of repeating all authorised uses
- Chapter 9 → authorisation before A6.4ER. No distinction inside/outside. However the para is drafted, keep options distinct.
- OIMP → title on OIMP should be integrated in the paragraph

LMDC

- Happy to discuss vintage
- Hear concerns raised by Solomon Islands obo LDCs
 - o Calling for removal is not a bridging proposal either
- Willing to consider text proposed by NZ for 7g in cover decision
- Heard several Parties mention specifying the temperature goal in several parts of the text → cannot support, Paris has many goals
- Para 20 of annex: would like to see more specificity on who will be determining the confidentiality, in paragraph 23 text clearly say that A6.4SB shall adopt decision with respecting confidential nature of information
- Can support Brazil suggestion for change in 5c in CD to include the 2nd para on units outside
- Agree that para 27 of annex should be in brackets as a whole, pending further discussions

Iran

- Methodologies
 - o Enabling further ambition through encouraging participation, handicap of SOP if not for 6.2
- Transition

- Own use should be allowed with no cut-off, as there are legal liability issues
- On human rights: politicising Article 6 could not lead to convergence, keep to environmental integrity
 - The Convention has no mandate on human rights

Australia

- Section 8 and text on OMGE
 - Primary way for deliver of OMGE is through a well-functioning market with quality units→ governance, high standards, transparency.
 - There are of course other ways to achieve an OMGE, reflected in the text, but fundamental aspect not well reflected
 - Propose: paragraph 68→ reflect that Parties have implemented the shall aim through the mechanism design
 - Noting that these RMPs aim to deliver an OMGE, referring to different sections. This chapter provides to deliver a further OMGE.
 - Paragraphs 69, 70a and 71→ all ways of delivering this OMGE
 - Change chapeau of 69 and 70. 70b and 70c could be deleted, since they are not operational here but in 68 and operationalised elsewhere.
 - Moving to decision text, para 9 (review para for OMGE)
 - If there is an explicit link in para between RMPs and OMGE in para 68, the review of the delivery to be harmonised with the review of the RMPs (decision para 11), commencing in 2028→ can pick up all of the ways.
 - Not the simplest proposal, sorry for not speaking with many of you, welcome opportunity.
- Proposal on maximum allowable time intervals→ fully support Canada and EU
- On HR on 6.8→ proposal was that all Parties would want to be confident that in doing this and in allowing the private sector that this is done in the way the standards they would like to apply. Like to suggest the same proposal here. Suggests the provision of tools, capacity building tools available for Parties. Flexible on the full set of language. Also suggest a similar text in 6.2 decision paragraph 10c
- Support AILAC on para 24 regarding indigenous peoples, local communities, Gender Action Plan
- Would welcome improvement wording on gender balance, striving is not enough.
- On level of enforcement→ do not support taking level of enforcement in regulatory additionality into account

Russia

- On CD 6b appreciate engagement on formulation, look forward to work on wording. We do not need mentioning CP here, if we agree on it in the annex, that would be preferred.
- Annex section III, associate with US position on gender parity issue. Firm quotas not the best way
- On methodology section→ add removals when mentioning emission reductions.
- On 37a-iii, substitute investment with barriers to implementation
- On 37c--< changing wording to most economically feasible (same wording as in i)
- Change wording on SB, has a place
- 39, associate with EU, Canada, US, do not need the bracket with level of enforcement
- Prefer additionality in absence of mechanism
- Believe that historical approach could be maintained, discounting not useful, as long as principles are in place in 33 and 34→ these are sufficient to make sure that historical approach also is ambitious enough

- On OMGE
 - o Thank for interesting proposals
 - o OMGE is and shall be delivered by mechanism in general

India

- MISSED
- Paragraph 4 a-c, at least six members from UN regional groups must be developing countries
- Paragraph 24, governance and functions
 - o Subpara ? deleted
 - o Subpara cii, appropriate measures for regional availability, with addition “especially in developing countries”
- 26b
 - o Agree that it is not a problem to report on SD in general. But cannot support any requirement that benefits of each activity must be specified. Full stop after SB
- 26e
 - o Article 6.4 activities can be outside NDC, so the expression in this paragraph about achievement of NDC must be bracketed
- 27a,b, and c
 - o A6.4 activities can be outside
 - o Supervision of the SB in relation to host Party cannot be supported
- Para 28b, see it bracketed
- Para 31a, including reducing and/or avoiding emissions.
- Para 31c→ emission reductions or avoidance
- 31diii→ avoid or minimize significant environmental and social impacts
- 31f→ cannot have ad-hoc years here, has to have regard of on-the ground realities. Could be much longer for the forestry. Much longer time is wanted. Requirements of renewals would increase risks , not in favour of this here
- Para 33→ ok with long-term goals of PA, but paragraph goes beyond this, broad language. Factors that are external to the projects, not helping the mechanism.
- Para 35→ support it
- Para 36 and 37, prefer 37
- Paragraph 39→ would like to see that in absence of the mechanism to be bracketed, taking into account all relevant policies, afterwards too prescriptive
- Para 41a→ host Party. 41c→ activities could be outside NDC host Party.
- Para 47 payment upfront barrier for small scale project proponents. Should not be handicap
- Para 56 bracketed, this introduces avoidable project risk
- Para 58 bracketed
- Para 74→ all the project activities and PoAs must be transitioned without handicap, send it in writing
- Para 77→ no arbitrary dates. No limits.
- Para 79b, cannot support it, irrational penalty

Senegal obo AGN

- Participation requirements, in 26e→ wonder how this will be done in practice→ at each approval, every year, subject to review? Need more clarity
- Para 27, host country functions→ have concern. This is an international mechanism. Own rules can be done under 6.2. Needs to be reviewed
- SOP→ are fine with the text. Just restate that the level 2-5 needs to be in the text. Need to bear in mind that whatever is in the text needs to be reflected in 6.2

- Avoidance of double use→ have addressed that, mistake to address CA for A6.4Er under heading of OMGE, needs to be addressed in CA section.
- In avoidance of double use, option no use of pre-2020 CERs not clearly stated.
- On grievance: prefer having independent appeal mechanism, can go with text but further elaboration
- Chapter 11, reiterate our support for transition of activities and bridging proposals agreed previously. Happy to work with them on concerns on environmental integrity and ambition
- On CDM activity transition, do not have many disputes. Vulnerability must be better defined, have some concerns with definitions and projects listed provisionally.
- Annual reporting by the Secretariat to CMA + encompassing all the functions under Article 6, not just the review team.

Co-facilitators

- Can we run overtime?

Solomon Islands obo LDC group

- Willing to go overtime

Philippines

- Reiterate on emissions avoidance, wants consistency across subarticles and consistency on LT-LEDS
- Annex 31→ insert avoidance, as stressed by India.
- Support minimisation of risk to reversal.
- 32d→ insert avoidance

Switzerland obo EIG

- First taking floor as group, may need another session
- Gender balance, 2 per regional group, way to operationalise is to ensure gender balance across group
- Agree time intervals, no zombie
- Para 27→ minimum here is may for function. Do not understand the issue, any Party can give conditions for authorisation
- Para 24a on HR and SD→ A6.4SB to operationalise them, integrated in activity design (31e)
- Methodologies→ support Can and others to add reference to best practices in 33. Some concerns about elements in 33, on equitable sharing of mitigation benefits (how operationalised as part of methodology? → rather in authorisation?)
- Good proposals on combining 36 and 37. Note in case we do that need to reword chapeau, common principle of below BAU
- Echo concern around 37d around historical emissions, thank US for concrete proposal. Clearly specify conditions for this approach.
- Discount hear some support, some rejection. Key point in some cases this is the only approach, just clarify when acceptable
- In 36 and 37 in the chapeaus we only refer to 33, also needs reference to 34. Maybe refer to section B
- On 39→ level of enforcement can be deleted
- Also want to say that absence in mechanism is not right, regulatory additionality must be kept
- Wonder on whether waiving of additionality is really appropriate
- 43→ do not understand why having a two tiered system, reflecting 72. Cannot issue A6.4ERs without accounting, can only apply for specific exemptions. Needs to be reflected also in 54

- Grievance: 61 is not operational, already sth like submitting this to SB, look into interim grievance body through decision
- On 74, appreciate vulnerability. Has to be defined. Definition by AILAC and EU is very good starting point. Vulnerability explanation can also be integrated in 74a

Co-facilitators

- No informal consultations this afternoon
- Want to flip the text tonight
- To be able to do that, invite all Parties to provide suggestions by 6pm tonight that have broad support and have been well consulted informally
- Use remaining hours this afternoon to work on that. Please consult each other
- Clarify who is supporting the proposals.
- Informal informal on 6.8
- If there is agreement, informal informal on baselines with late work, after 20:30
- If there is a decision to work late tonight, proposals can be sent later

Antigua and Barbuda

- Task the A6.4SB to design and put forward units with range of qualities. Will send text to Secretariat. Enhance ambition

New Zealand

- Echo grave concern by LDCs about dilution of ambition
- Will yield the floor

Saint Kitts and Nevis

- On Section 8, para 68 and 69→ mandatory cancellation with full CA as also necessary for SOP
- Need to put heads together with AGN
- Need to move beyond offsetting

Saudi Arabia

- POO meeting is running over
- AGN and India were cut short, the same language was not used for other groups

Saint Kitts and Nevis

- Disagree with Australia's input that RMPs of A6.4M will deliver OMGE
- Para 70→ question placement . 70a is redundant, 70b relate to environmental integrity. 70c relates to environmental integrity
- Para 71→ another voluntary element, does not respond to OMGE

China

- Share concerns with mention of long-term goal, more clarification of how to align project baselines with targets of nations
- No CA for outside scope NDC
- CER transition is important

Bhutan

- On participation responsibilities. Clarification of impact for interconnected grids and requirement to contribute to mitigation in host Party (don't understand)
- Support India with no SOP for small scale projects, not upfront
- On the issue of light touch regulation for additionality for SIDS and LDCs, should not lead to increase in burden, should go by the text

Egypt obo Arab Group

- Support LMDC
- Support new Zealand on 7b?
- Propose language in reporting section?

Ecuador

- Support LMDC + India inclusion of avoidance of emissions, in parallel to Art 6.2
- Will send language on para 24, HR references and for para 30diii
- 33, share views on goals of the PA
- OIMP needs clarity
- Para 61 proposal on need for independent, transparent and equitable Grievance Mechanism separate from A6.4SB

T&T

- Support India on Section 8 (????). Not sure if several options will deliver environmental integrity, needs further engagement

05.11.2021 17:15 SBSTA informal

Cofacilitators

- Hearing back form Inf Infs

Cofacilitator 6.8 inf inf- Maria Jishi, Saudi Arabia

- Consolidation/prioritisation of work programme activities
 - o Some progress on agreement that a consolidation was necessary, but no concrete proposals were agreed
- Discussion on simplification of governance of the framework
 - o Some consensus to merge some of the options in the paper: option A and option B in the first iteration
- Discussion on list of focus areas which resulted in option A of the second iteration note text
- Generally agreed that this phrasing was a good starting point for a generic list on focus areas

Cofacilitator baselines and additionality- Mbaye Diagne, Senegal

- 20:30-00:00
- Very fruitful discussion for better understanding
- Many Parties, many colleagues helped to merge para 36 and 37 in a single paragraph and to be options in both paragraphs
- Very interesting exchanges on the understanding of some concepts and some clarifications were provided by the proponents of the options/sub-options
- Attempted to provide textual proposal, one on 36 paragraphs including some 37 options; a second one on 37 with some aspects from the 36
- After exchange, there was no consensus about what text can be forwarded to the cofacilitators
- Did not provide text and came back to the previous proposals, must be merged at some time

Cofacilitator

- Work through key elements of the text
- Article 6.8
 - o Much more aggressive on the timelines, anytime there was an option with 2022 and 2023, went with 2023

- Tried to be bold and put forward a bridging proposal- have tried to bring issues of facilitative mechanism and the registry under the NMA forum
- On the list of items under the work programme: there is always a problem with a list. Will try to address concerns from Uganda if there are no objections.

Solomon Islands POO

- HOD was not provide textual proposals, uncomfortable with what the cofacilitators will take on board or not

Cofacilitator

- Article 6.2
 - Presentation of non-GHG, made some changes to paragraph 10, based on proposal to align it with paragraph 9
 - There may be confusion with the mathematics as depending on the metric CA requires addition or subtraction
 - OIMP
 - Focused the definition of OIMP in 6.2 text and have ran that through both texts
 - Heard requests and concerns of limits
 - Paragraph on limits in the text and other limits placed in work programme
 - Work programme items added
 - SOP- options are still clearly there.
- Article 6.4
 - Tried to integrate feedback from the inf inf, tweaking 36 and 37, took out overlaps
 - Insert option of no CER transition, tidied up the entire option
 - In term of volume of text, smaller changes in other sections
- Concerns identified
 - 6.2 presentation of GHG
 - OIMP
 - Limits
 - Work plan items
 - SOP in 6.2
 - Baselines and additionality in 6.4
 - SOP and OMGE
 - Governance options in 6.8
 - Other issues

Republic of Korea

- Article 6.4 on para 36 and 37
 - We need some bridging paragraph as chapeau

Egypt POO

- Before proceeding need to understand how to proceed in limited time, remaining time will not be enough for all Parties
- What is the timeline for making inputs?

Cofacilitators

- Informal until 19:00
- Inf Infs after 20:00 until 11:40
- Revisions to text by tomorrow morning

- Contact group tomorrow 12:00

Republic of Korea

- Article 6.4 on para 36 and 37
 - o We need some bridging paragraph as chapeau
 - o Need to have dynamic terms on options that can be chosen
 - o Will submit text later today

Antigua and Barbuda obo AOSIS

- Article 6.8, para 4
 - o Financial policies and measures and research and development to generic list
- Governance structure for Article 6.8
 - o AOSIS appreciates written options, will get back to you

Senegal

- Article 6.2
 - o Article 6.2 on ambition in mitigation/adaptation action
 - Reporting on that ambition, we have Parties “shall” and “encouraged to”. In the Madrid text we only had “shall” for the reporting, hadn’t see any colleagues proposing to delete “encouraged to”
 - o On work programme for engagement in infrastructure
 - Can be waste of resources, can be developed by Secretariat, building on the CDM, basket paras 8-10
 - o Paragraph 12- report to be prepared by the Secretariat, want annual report relating to all activities under the Article 6.2, not just review
 - o Article 13 of CD, want to include option of annual compilation
- Article 6.4
 - o Para 5, want collaboration with the CDM EB, allow for this collaboration
 - o Para 15, capacity building
 - o CDM activity transition→ still have the option of only when A6.4M is “fully operational”, CDM to continue until A6.4M is fully operational
 - o Share of proceeds, we have too many brackets with no opposition. Only the issue of the percentage 2-5 needs to be bracketed
 - o Baseline, para 37→ have worked last night. Maybe at this point, we have some proposal that can come from that discussion
 - o Para 5b of the cover decision, methodology revision→ placeholder for CMP decision on which methodologies to be swiftly transitioned

EU

- There should be a cluster around ambition, accounting and finance
- There are some weaknesses in some packages
- Baselines in ambition , non-GHG in accounting
- Issues with Limits and OMGE, both in ambition package
- Are working with other Parties with a clearer proposal on paragraph 36 and can hopefully come forward with a clean text, beg your indulgence, will be put together

Brazil

- Article 6.2
 - o Incorporate of 6.4 paragraph on linkages to the rest of the Paris Agreement

- Pleased to see in paragraph 3e there is a list for minimum safeguards and limits. List must also be incorporated in paragraph 16. Can compromise to discuss details in further work.
- Item 1 of para 15b should go to para 3civ in brackets
- Initial report, §17→ have we discussed who provides the authorisation? The UNFCCC focal point? Or Parties communicate this?
- §17g, mention to 77d→ publicity to the document (hyperlink in document)
- §23c, also link to 77d
- Item 17h, new iii→ move safeguards and limits, as this refers to environmental integrity
- See some stronger language on review process, para 25 of annex→ “to the extent possible”, seems like a favour need to have both Parties providing information
- See more definition in annex and link to Work programme on requirements for review process
 - Paragraph 7d CD→ Parties shall respond to recommendations
 - Mention regular intervals in para 24
 - Introduce an objective besides just offering consistency review, construction and improvement of national arrangements for developing countries
- Must be requirements for Parties to provide simultaneous information for information to be reviewed at the same time.
- Initial reports cannot become after authorisation, must be a way of revocation of authorisation if there are threats to environmental integrity
- Will provide written comments if possible
- Need mirror decisions with CMP
- Echo comment by Senegal wrt IT Log, not start from scratch on infrastructure

Thailand

- Article 6.4
 - Suggest to other than including previous subparagraph on functions of host Parties; include text that existed in Presidency COP25 version: national arrangements for accreditation of national entities as 27c.
 - On baselines/methodologies. Concerns with definition of BAT. Suggest including the word before BAT “where practical”. Recommend adding after environmentally sound course of action, “taking into consideration availability of data and accessibility of technologies”
- Article 6.2
 - Lack of clarity on OIMP, supported by other Parties
 - Add another section under para 1 to refine OIMP OR add “defined by the CMA”, CMA to define OIMP in cover decision or in further work
 - On reporting, raised concern with regard to timing of initial report. Our concern has not been addressed. Suggest different formulation:
 - Para 17: and where practical with the BTR as determined by the participating Party
 - Concern on deadline of annual information→ this deadline is premature. Date should be in bracket; in similar manner in para 20. Deadline in brackets

Cofacilitators

- Plea: we are running out of time. We need your time. Focus interventions on fixes and bridging proposals.

Egypt obo Arab Group

- Article 6.2
 - Do not understand why removing brackets of 3b
 - Para 12: have concern with interested Parties, removing the word interested
 - Para 12b: should also be covering developing Parties
 - Annex
 - Section III CA. Seek clarity on reason for mentioning the word “net”, just to understand
 - Para 10, group would like to bracket “the same”
 - No bracket around para 11
 - On subsection sectors and gases, remove brackets around policies and measures; clear option “shall not apply”
 - Initial reporting, thank you for 17f
 - Regular report, remove brackets 22i
 - Always clear unbracketed text on policies and measures
 - Ambition in mitigation and adaptation, fully align with AGN, no brackets and welcome addition of “stakeholders”
 - §37 remove brackets around shall
- Article 6.4
 - Decision
 - Para 15→ concern with interested Parties
 - Reason for deletion for second bullet of para 15, “assistance to meet participation responsibilities”
 - Section IV
 - Para 26e→linked to inside/outside discussion
 - Para 27 chapeau, remove brackets around “may”, no undue burden
 - Para 27b, clarify addition of “shorter” crediting periods
 - Section V
 - Para 33→ started fruitful discussion, but for now still must bracket entire Para
 - Para 37→ need to bring back emissions from a technology from an economically course of action taking into account barriers to investment
 - On SOP
 - Don’t hear many objections
 - On OMGE
 - Support option in para 69
 - On Section IX
 - Para 17, support keeping policies and measures and activities
 - Missing clear option of no requirement for CA
 - Para 78, preferable option is to be based on generation date of CER, open to work on exact date
 - Para 78f, support removing brackets around shall not be required for CA

Cofacilitators

- This text has way to many brackets, now some are coming back. Really have a task to do.
- Interested Parties is a normal term

PNG obo CfrN

- Both iterations did not reflect inputs

- Article 6.2 text additions
 - o Decision text: 11bis: “technical analysis and regular information required for forestry activities, recurrent to BTR”
 - o Annex ITMO definition: 1h “emissions reductions and removals resulting from 14/CP.19 beginning 2015
 - o Section VII, para 36. Add in brackets “and by directly financing adaptation projects”

India

- Article 6.2
 - o Para 14: delete
 - o Paragraph 19, with deletion of term mandatory
- Article 6.4
 - o Balanced representation
 - o Support policies and measures
 - o Every time where is alignment with NDC, insert the term where applicable (as in para 33)
 - o Emission reductions → change to emissions reductions or avoidance
 - o No “mandatory” cancellation
 - o Support AG on 75
 - o Para 61 → “appeal to whom”
 - o Para 70 → 70b not supported
 - o Para 71-79 → should be transitioned without any handicap. Support Egypt comments.

Saudi Arabia obo LMDC

- Align with Arab Group
- In terms of require SOP similar to 6.4, align with by G77
- Article 6.2 CD
 - o Para 3b bracketed
 - o Para 3c, option was removed that should be come back → “ensuring first transfer and use happens in one NDC implementation period”
 - o Para 12, echo Arab Group, have interested in Parties and include developing countries in 12b
- Article 6.2 annex
 - o Para 4f, is missing a coma, like to see in brackets
 - o Para 9, like to see more parallels between non-GHGs and GHGs
 - o Para 10, see the same language, bracketed
 - o Open to considering suggestion by Kim on options A and B could be clarified
 - o Remove brackets around para 11
 - o No brackets around policies and measures
 - o Para 36, remove brackets around stakeholders and “shall” and “commit to”
- Article 6.4
 - o HR language must be fully reflect PA language
 - o Para 27, remove words “more stringent” and “shorter”
 - o Under methodologies, under para 36, bracket that host Party determines more ambitious level at its discretion
 - o 37ai, add where appropriate
 - o Bracket word below in chapeau of 37
- Article 6.8

- Had constructive engagement, currently working on a bridging proposal of the different options. If you are interested and have ideas, welcome your involvement.

Guyana

- Support AOSIS
- As member of CfRN, support PNG intervention

Solomon Islands, LDC Group, POO

- How we will proceed, want to listen to all Parties in informal mode
- Some Parties have not been playing fair

Meeting adjourned, continuation in informal

05.11.2021 20:48 SBSTA informal

Costa Rica obo AILAC

- Relevant, substantial issues with text
- Some things without push back not inserted
- Align with G77 on adaptation finance
- Article 6.2
 - 3i→ it is converting between non-GHGs is the issue, why converting between non-GHG metrics
 - Replicate limits in annex
 - 12→ requested inclusion on capacity building on ambition for technical elements
 - Annex
 - Definition of ITMO→ emission reductions and removals or enhanced removals. Emission reductions and greenhouse gas removals
 - Para 8 on CA, asked for application consistently with all participating Parties
 - Reporting, para 17 “with every partner”. Non-GHG ITMO metric consistent with NDC metric target
 - 17→ report on representativeness of averaging
 - 25→ no increase in emissions, supporting Brazil
 - 32b→ Article 6 review team to be notified by inconsistencies so they can review them
 - Support Brazil that corrections shall be done and initial report before initial authorisation
- Article 6.4
 - Annex para 4→ striving to ensure gender balance is insufficient
 - 19→ SB meeting, webcast and recording→ transparency and inclusiveness
 - 24→ happy that full HR are mentioned but at least local communities and IP.
 - Link to LCIPP and GAP
 - 31f→ avoid locking in levels of emissions
- Reserve right to come back to 6.8, collaborating with other Parties

USA

- Do not support Paris Agreement preambular language in 6.2, but not happy with reflection in the annex. Will work with proponent
- Comfortable with information reported but now some requirements are duplicated and conflicting, should be streamlined
- Para 22b→ reference to average does not make sense
- 22g, add e

- Some sections are very problematic, e.g., limits. Some limits go beyond authority of the CMA.
- Article 6 TER report that is forwarded to A13 should also include the underlying Party information
- Opportunities in limited time remaining progress can be made, includes baselines, reported information, happy to work
- Reference to no net increase in emissions in and between NDC implementation periods→ must be reconciled and clarified that it is for across participating Parties. Also better clarify proposal for accounting systems.
- Agree with Brazil that evidence of authorisation can be provided through a weblink, but not relevant information under 77d. But form of hard evidence must be provided.
- Work programme under 6.2 should be bracketed where it relates to single/multi year accounting and recording of CA
- Article 6.4, language on authorisation and uses was streamlined but sometimes lost language on OIMP
- Article 6.8, appreciate work done. Tweaks to HR language. Appreciate generic list. On institutional arrangements (SBSTA work programme)

LDC group

- Article 6.2
 - o 3(d) in decision text→ AILAC proposal of referring to greenhouse removals useful way forward
 - o Para 7, expert review processes. 7g consideration and development of guidance of how confidential information can be treated by the expert review team
 - o Annex 1f, OIMP and authorised for other purposes. Language does not give sufficient comfort level
 - o On averaging, do not understand mathematic of last sentence, wording needs fixing
 - o Para 15, need to deal with OIMP→ there should be reporting on to where transfers to go, report on the entities engaged
 - o Struggling with ambition section, bring in language from 6.4
- Article 6.4
 - o Issue with removal language
 - o OIMP was removed on this, this needs further thought. If we bring the OIMP term into 6.4, we need to define it.
- Article 6.8
 - o Note the work on list of activities, “social inclusivity” is a concept not an activity. Want to see real NMAs. Principle, but not focus areas.

European Union

- Structural options and technical fixes
- We had asked for adjustment for units within the same period→ finality of adjustment and accounting. We’d like it in the work programme.
- Concerned about non-GHG accounting. Para 10 does not deliver. Conversion in and out of GHG, needs further work. Can work with proponents.
- Close look at other uses, draft is not clear enough also on triggers
- No increase in emissions must be get right and consistent
- Clear options on ambition
 - o Baselines
 - o Across 6.2 and 6.4

- 24cvi: reference to 24a (Contribution to NDC and long term goals) + work programme
- Baselines
 - 37c needs reference to discount or adjustment
- In section on transition, 78d and c→ must be reference to finalisation of transaction. How is use identified?
- On limits: no increase in emissions, including through limits
- Agree with comments of AILAC on transparency
- Happy to support indicative trajectory on CA
- CA also to be done in NDC final year
- Difference in references to achievement or implementation of NDC, consistency needed

China

- Support LMDC and India intervention
- Clarification: low carbon LT-LEDS and long-term goal of PA. How to do the linkage of project to such a long term target?
- On baselines→ how does BAT work? How to generate additional ER?

New Zealand

- Additional work needed
 - 3ci-iii should not be part of work programme
 - Hear Parties on non-GHG accounting. Welcome improved language. Para 11 should be reordered to clarify intent.
 - Request specific mentioning of A6.4 activities
 - Simplify 3c→ Clear trigger of CA at first transfer
- Not yet satisfied with text on baselines
- Reiterate position of quantitative limits.
- Human rights text, welcome text in 6.2 but is insufficient. Wants HR in participation requirements and reporting.
- Support AILAC in 6.4 language
- Encouraged by discussions on 6.8

EIG

- Article 6.2, 17(i)l, 21f→ economic and social impacts, could be please include environmental impact
- Article 6.4→ include language HR to the activity

Mexico

- Support EIG, support HR
- Transversal wording on just transition of work force, will send proposal directly

Canada

- Article 6.2 CD, if there is a work programme on accounting must be implemented from 2030 onwards
- Not accept WP on land sector and limits. Does not want to open work programme with land experts, traumatized by that.
- Against limits, but if Parties want to impose limits, do not want to prejudice that
- Prefer tables over outlines, consult with transparency negotiators
- On non-GHG measures and policy and measures NDCs.

- Non-GHG clarity that GHG emissions balance and impact of ITMOs will be seen, no replacement of 77d
- If a Party has both sectors and gases AND policies and measures, CA to sector emission level
- Annual information: in some cases the using Party may not be known or not serial number
- Regular reporting: can live with information being in the annex as long as legally part of BTR
- Relevant year→ year in which BTR is due
- 22b and d→ delete the word average amount
- Article 6.4, CD
 - Last preambular paragraph is redundant. Can accept the split if SB considers whether to apply CDM methodologies
- Annex, para 10, logical inconsistency to paragraph
- Para 12→ why reference to SBI?
- Para 43 and 44, different meanings of authorisation, find different meanings
- On Article 6.8→ just reduce status of list

Japan

- Article 6.2 initial report (missed)
- Support technical workshop
- Capacity building Article 6.2→ support for reporting obligations in addition to institutional arrangements?
- Para 10→ discuss better how to reflect para a and b
- Para 11→ try to have similar paragraph to para 9. Each participating Parties with cooperative approaches involving ITMOs that are inside policies and measures in the mitigation component of its NDC. Delete that is not quantify. Just “shall quantify” emissions resulting from such policies and measures... pursuant to para 8 above. Quantify emissions by sources and removals by sinks.
- Article 6.4, decision text on capacity building→ also propose to support development of A6.4M methodology

Dominican Republic

- REDD+ to be part of Article 6.2, Article 5 and Article 6 to be linked

Gambia

- In the hope of solving issues in another room (CMP), please consider a new proposal
- Article 6.4 CD, paragraph 5 with requests to the Supervisory Body
 - 5g “to promote the participation of vulnerable populations in the mechanism through development of methodologies that promote technologies that help improve livelihood of these populations”

Egypt

- Regular report, 22a→ exemption for NDCs that include policies and measures
- Paragraph 11, welcome proposals from colleagues, ready to discuss
- Not quantified important as it is for NDCs that have not quantified targets
- Reference to 6.4activities because at transfer 6.2 guidance applies

Australia

- Progress on paras 9 and 10 is pleasing, thank you Japan for bridging text on 11
- Suggested solution by AILAC works
- On limits→ do not see need for WP on limits.

- Have deliberately not talked on brackets to go on, speaking in detail about brackets is disappointing
- EIG 21f, environmental impact inclusion supported

06.11. 12:30 SBSTA Contact group

Chair

- Only take floor if there is need to see change

PNG obo CfrN

- Disappointed, draft text is not reflected
- Cannot accept draft text as submitted

Solomon Islands obo LDC Group

- Texts are an improvement and represent progress
- Need better treatment of SoP and OMGE
- Cannot pass this issue to future meetings and processes
- Not seeing bridging proposals for carry-over units from the CDM
- Have offered bridging proposal for carry-over of activities; some Parties want to carry forward the CDM
- See carry-over of units + no CA for outside NDC → this is continuation of CDM. New CDM in Paris Agreement. Both options are not acceptable, undermines integrity of the Paris Agreement.

Costa Rica obo AILAC

- Not all views were systematically integrated in the texts
- New system has to be inclusive
- Willing to continue on the basis of this text, like assurances that we will not be systematically ignored in the future

Antigua and Barbuda obo AOSIS

- Texts are a good start but more work is needed
- Needs clear language on SOP and OMGE to be comfortable

Senegal obo G77+China

- Still much to be done to reach a balanced agreement
- Finance for adaptation remains a cornerstone

Senegal obo AGN

- Ensure accessibility and simplicity

Saudi Arabia obo LMDC

- Text is an improvement
- Equal representation from Annex1 and non-Annex 1 Parties
- Instead of supervision and review
- Want alignment with NDC to be “if applicable” → inside/outside
- Add avoidance as option to emission reductions
- “Longer crediting” periods for removals
- No SOP for small scale activities at registration?

SBSTA Chair

- Very technical interventions, new additions
- Close contact group and send back colleagues in informal sessions
- Resume in informal later

06.11.2021 SBSTA informal consultations

SBSTA Chair

- Move to contact group as soon as issues in the text are resolved
- Holding off SBSTA contact group and plenary
- Not adopting text today, just need to agree to pass them over
- Reissued texts will highlight in text

Article 6.2 comments

Senegal obo AGN

Cover decision

- Para 7e→ shall instead of may, in brackets and what shall be the implications in case of unresponsiveness
- Para 13→ broader report on review+ activity results

PNG obo CfrN

- CD, 11bis: technical analysis in XXXX (decision missed) containing modalities for MRV of activities in decision 1/CP.19 para 17 recurrent under review of Art 6 (not fully understood)
- Annex, 1h: "emission reductions and removals from 14/CP.19 beginning 2015"
- Decision under WFR says that any action of REDD+ will be recognised, this is rationale for the insertion in ITMO definition
- Article 5 is part of the PA, not isolated
- Raise scale of adaptation financing in section VII.
- Para 36 after Article 6 para 4: "and by directly financing adaptation projects"

Egypt obo Arab Group

- Not suggesting something new, but missing elements requested before that affect consistency with A6.2 guidance
- Explicit reference in guidance: wherever there is a requirement of quantification in NDCs for policy and measures NDCs as described in para 11, want clear reference only to the relevant "portion" of NDC
- CD Deletion 3civ→ must be finalised here
- Annex, para 22a→ para is not consistent with rest of guidance, 2 solutions
 - o 1. Covered by its NDC or a portion of its NDC (as part of 77di information), bracket "from sectors and GHG"
 - o 2. Add in the end: "this does not apply to policy and measure type NDC"
 - o → flexible on the option

Ghana

- Supports text by PNG

Brazil

- 3g→ elaboration of elaborating a single method after completion of review after 2030
- Completion in the same NDC implementation period, also in annex
- Para 7e→ covered by AGN

New Zealand

- Brackets around 3c in CD, accounting elements must be agreed here
- Request brackets around last part section para 16 in annex

European Union

- Would like improvements
- On Capacity building→ launching programme is subject to discussions by Parties
- Unhappy with non-GHG para in para 10→ need to see improvements
- Like NZ and Brazil, agree with their proposal on finality of accounting IN the text
- Trigger for initial report needs consideration and definition of first transfer in para 2b
- Article 6.4→ deregistration is cut out, concerned. Must be addressed
- Introduction of avoidance is not supported
- Article 6.8→ focus areas need to be defined by Parties rather than here
- Concerned with registry in A6.8 and like to consider governance further
- No brackets, but take note of our concerns

Thailand

- 3g “Consideration of the scope and definition of OIMP” referred to in paragraph 1f of the annex

Solomon Islands obo LDC group

- Note Thailand’s discussion, need more consideration there
- Add in annex, add 17g add “and authorised entities”
- In annex, 19b, participating Party and authorised entity as soon as it is known

Turkey

- Constant attempt to include language on Annex I of the Convention, but we are in a world of collective efforts. Annex I does not reflect development level. Add language on Annex I is attempt to slow down efforts. Will not accept any decision that contains this language.

Mexico

- Lack of HR approach in operative part of the text
- Annex para 17 and para 21f→ “and social impacts, respecting gender considerations”
- Article 6.4, 24ax→ environmental safeguards, respecting gender considerations
- Article 6.8→ civil society organisations in annex para 2aⁱⁱ and 10bⁱⁱ

Saudi Arabia obo LMDC

- Brackets of 3b in cover decision 6.2

Iran (cannot make text proposals)

- No brackets around Adaptation Fund
- ITMOs to include avoidance
- HR reference not necessary

SBSTA Chair

- Surgical insertion A6.4 and A6.8

Article 6.4 + Article 6.8

AGN + G77/China

- New section X on OIMP to be put in brackets

Brazil

- Bracket para 11 of the annex
- Bracket 45 of the annex, rejects “in conjunction with”, does limit sovereign process by host Parties to put in place in which conditions and when they authorise A6.4ERs
- Paragraph 56, linked to paragraph 45

European Union

- Elements on CB in 6.2 and 6.4 to be more specific on CB
- Bracket non-GHG para 10, could be improved
- Bracket trigger in initial report
- Definition of first transfer in definition of ITMOs
- → reluctantly, but if other are marking their areas of concern in brackets, would also want to see brackets

06.11.2021 Contact Group

SBSTA Chair

- Appeal to your trust to present draft conclusions to the SBSTA Plenary
- Conclusions state that text does not represent consensus among Parties and further work is needed