

## APA item 6 (GST) Round Table (5 Nov. 2017) – Group RED breakout group report

### Modalities:

- ***There should just be one “technical phase” that also encompasses the requests for and receipt of inputs***
- ***Parties aren’t as far apart as it seemed wrt how long the technical phase will take... assuming that we request the inputs and they are developed by the various bodies (SCF, AC etc) between 12-6 months before they are “due”***
  - Inputs should be ready at least [2 months] prior to their consideration during the technical phase [e.g. May 2023]
  - The technical phase needs to be over by the last meeting when all Parties are present prior to the COP in 2023 [so, presumably at the inter-sessional in 2023]
- **Who decides which inputs?**
  - The 2018 GST decision could recognize the inputs that we’ve already agreed and then:
    - Some thought that it might be a non-exhaustive list of inputs – avoid exclusiveness
    - But others thought that the various existing bodies under (SCF, AC, PCCB, TEC) could be tasked with decided which inputs to provide into the technical phase discussions at the intersessional in 2023
    - One open question was how to decide what to put forward for mitigation and who would be responsible for it since there is no “mitigation body”
      - In terms of who would be responsible, some thought the Secretariat could be tasked, others thought the Prez could manage it and yet others suggested that we might have something like the Structured Expert Dialogue to manage the preparation for the technical discussions on mitigation
      - In terms of what would be needed
        - Everyone agreed on IPCC
        - Seemed likely that we’d do another NDC synthesis report like the Secretariat did before and after Paris
        - There was a question on whether and how to use the transparency reports since we won’t yet have the first set of reports under the PA and will probably not even have all of the reports under the BR/BUR system for 2020 yet

- In terms of how the work streams or themes would work... the main point of contention seemed to be whether they would
  - run in parallel or consecutively
  - and whether they would have different co-facs or one set of co-facs.
- There is a significant disagreement as to whether we will have many themes covering each aspect of the PA or have just the three themes called out in the PA
- We had a short conversation about what the input from non-party stakeholders would be
  - Some in the group questioned the value of including non-party stakeholders because they're not officially responsible for solving the climate problem
  - Others thought that the non-party stakeholders in particular the private sector have a critical role to play in pointing out challenges and solutions
- In terms of what the actual text would look like:
  - The GST decision should reaffirm all of the inputs already listed in para 99
  - And then it would need to task the various bodies deciding on which reports/information to provide and with developing the reports or information
  - Decide to convene a joint SB contact group to run the in-session part of the technical phase during the intersessional in 2023
    - Decide the modalities for that intersessional
  - Maybe there could be a provision to ensure that these modalities could be adjusted in 2021 or 2022 based on experience in the Talanoa dialogue as well as after 2023 based on the experience in the first GST

#### Output:

- Did not have much discussion on output
- How to frame the inputs for ministers?
  - They will want to know the context (the scale of the problem and new options for raising ambition... i.e. new technologies, cooperative mitigation initiatives, cooperative adaptation initiatives, innovative finance initiatives/models) for domestic consideration
  - Report of the political phase should have a discussion of the opportunities and challenges for raising ambition for political phase ... maybe discussion of best practice