Report from spin-off group on

Section I - transparency for action and support (differentiation/ flexibility)

Version 3 September 2015

Parties were requested to discuss flexibility and differentiation associated with the transparency framework post 2020.

At the outset, Parties discussed the need for using the same terms (i.e., framework, system, provisions) when discussing differentiation/flexibility.

Regarding the text of the tool, Parties saw a value in merging options 2 and 4 of article 30. Some Parties thought the text could be further condensed by merging options 1 and 3, but other Parties viewed those options as sufficiently distinct concepts.

Several Parties have different views on the need for a bridging proposal. Parties also identified a number of concepts that should guide a proposal:

- We should build on experience with the current system;
- No backsliding/forward progression;
- Support for transparency is needed.

Parties have different views on whether flexibility/differentiation should apply to specific aspects of transparency (eg, quality and accuracy of reporting, acccess to data, frequency, scope, and special consideration for LDCs) or whether there should be entirely seperate tracks. Parties also have different views on whether flexibility would be determined by category of Party or would be self determined on the basis of capacity.

In terms of the bridging proposal itself, two key concepts emerged:

- Such a proposal should consider the timeframe, whether the system should start in 2020, or whether it should start after 2020;
- The system could be described as a "robust transparency system".