

Developing countries make strong call for text-based negotiations

Bonn, 2 September (Indrajit Bose) — On day two of the ongoing climate talks at Bonn, developing countries demanded text-based negotiations during the facilitated group on mitigation, co-facilitated by **Franz Perrez (Switzerland)** and **Fook Seng Kwok (Singapore)**.

Perrez proposed that Parties discuss themes of possible convergence and report back from the two spin-off groups on differentiation and non-market mechanisms. (Following the facilitated group on mitigation on 31 August, Perrez had proposed three spin-off groups: differentiation, non-market mechanisms and joint implementation, as next steps. See TWNN Bonn News Update #2: *ADP discussions move into eight facilitated groups with deep differences remaining.*)

Perrez added that the objective of the spin-off group was to advance the work of the specific issue and to develop common understanding in a small group and to then bring it back to the bigger group. He also sought Parties' views to conduct more spin-offs on response measures, collective efforts and its link to the long-term goal, the design element which would look into the balancing or mapping between agreement and decision, progression and international transport.

Speaking for the **African Group**, **Algeria** said while it was ready to engage in any organisation of work, it was not ready to endorse the responsibility of any delay the process could have, keeping in mind the target in Paris. "Can you clarify when do we start negotiating on text?" asked Algeria and added that the necessary understanding of the issues could be achieved through text negotiations.

The **European Union** sought feedback from

the spin off groups and said it wanted to "make good use of time".

Brazil also called for a report back from the spin off groups and added that Parties were way past the state of general views and were ready to identify what was missing in Part 1.

(The Co-Chairs' tool is divided into three parts. Part 1 comprises provisions that are by nature "appropriate for inclusion in an agreement"; Part 2 contains provisions that are appropriate for inclusion in a decision; and Part 3 contains "provisions whose placement require further clarity among Parties in relation to the draft agreement or draft decision", as per the Co-Chairs' scenario note issued on 24 July.)

Australia said it was concerned how the issues (for spin offs) were being prioritised and proposed the issue of markets, formalisation of INDC (intended nationally determined contributions) and accounting could be considered for spin-offs group discussions as well.

Perrez responded saying markets and accounting could be on the spin-offs list as well. Responding to Algeria, he said the first step is to look at text to discuss concepts but he was not sure whether it was time to negotiate word by word. He said he agreed with Algeria in that there is a problem of time and speed and the need to move to negotiations and to look at text. He also added that deepening an issue implied looking at text. He added that spin-offs were tools to come together to develop an idea and bring it back to the bigger group. He said he would be happy to do whatever Parties wanted.

In response, **Algeria** said that all the issues are very important. "In our perspective they are of the same importance. There is a need in this

second round for textual negotiations. It is better to have on the screen the first reading on Part 1. This would provide more clarity for us to move coherently. More issues cannot be put on the table unless negotiations begin,” said Algeria.

South Africa supported Algeria and asked Part 1 of the Co-Chairs’ tool to be taken up. Pointing to the limitation of spin-offs, South Africa added that for spin-offs, Parties only looked at one issue. It would be useful to have an overview of all the parts and to have three columns to see what could be moved from Part 3 to Parts 1 or 2.

Speaking for the **Like Minded Developing Countries (LMDC)**, **Malaysia** stressed that time was of essence and pointed out that spin-offs in the abstract may not quite be the valuable use of time. Calling for a coherent text, which could be a Paris agreement foreshadow, Malaysia said that Parties had already indicated what was missing and what should be included and what should be deleted. “It’s not that we are going to transfer or migrate the whole thing and populate Part 1, but we want certain issues.” It gave the example of transparency and said there could be three options: one system, two systems and no system, with the idea of capturing all the options in Part 1 so that “all positions are reflected in one document to facilitate negotiations”.

In response, **Perrez** called for report back from the spin-off groups and to continue with other topics. After the report back, there would be an assessment of the next steps, he proposed.

Malaysia clarified that the idea is to not have more spin-offs. The idea is to keep this group intact, it said. “We can have feedback (from the spin-offs). But we must proceed to try to shape Part 1 with all our views intact, so at least we see it as an integrated cohesive document and then decide on the next stage what to do. If there is need to deepen our understanding and to come to grips with specific issues, we can make a request for a spin-off,” said Malaysia. “To sum up, no spin-off on a blanket basis. Put text on screen and let’s shape a text,” it added.

India added its support to the LMDC and said that while the Co-Chairs’ tool was not perfect,

the idea was to make it perfect so that it becomes the basis for negotiations. “If we can go paragraph by paragraph and see it holistically, then we can bring sections from Parts 2 or 3. While doing this, we can always discuss ideas if we are not clear,” said India.

Algeria said it had not heard any opposition to use the tool as the basis for negotiations. “The time allocated for spin-offs is four-and-a-half hours. If we used this time for negotiations, we would have advanced somewhere,” said Algeria adding that the Africa Group was not clear about what Parties would end up with in this session. “Would it be a text for negotiation or another mandate to the Co-Chairs to produce a new text?” asked Algeria.

The **United States** added that some of the colleagues had a “narrow” idea of what negotiations mean. For the US, clarification was also part of negotiations. It said moving text from one part to the other would not be good use of time.

Iran reiterated that according to the Co-Chairs’ scenario note, Part 3 belonged to the area that lacked clarity and for it to be included in Parts 1 or 2. It said good use of time would be to start the first phase of negotiations, which would be placement and this would entail an exercise to place Part 3 to be put into Parts 1 or 2. Having done this, Parties could embark on the second phase of negotiations, which would be to look at language.

Perrez then proposed to first have feedback from the spin-offs and to then discuss the next steps.

Report back from the two spin-off groups followed. **Bolivia** reported on non-market mechanisms and said that non-market was not a standalone issue and it needed to be understood holistically.

South Africa reported back on the spin-off group on differentiation, and said there was a broad range of views on differentiation and that the speakers’ list could not be completed due to lack of time.

China said the spin-off group on differentiation did not resolve the issue or come to landing zones. “There is no consensus on common but differentiated responsibilities or how to reflect that. The key point was whether we want reference to developed

countries and developing countries in the mitigation section. That's the key part of the question," said China.

Malaysia said if Parties are looking at negotiations in a narrow way, what was the broad way. It said the report back on differentiation presented a range of views and wanted to know how did it relate to the negotiations. "Which text relates to what? We need to relate to text. This will emerge from text negotiations," said Malaysia.

The **EU** said it did not expect to find agreement at this point. It added that there were broad concepts and there would be key political alternatives when the time was ripe for that.

Perrez proposed that the second step for the differentiation spin-off group would be to build and come back with "bridging proposal to crystallize text". On non-market mechanism, he said he had heard there was a need to understand the concept before the idea was brought into the agreement.

Brazil expressed support on continuing the discussions on differentiation in a spin-off group and suggested Parties discuss Paragraph 4 from Part 1 of the Co-Chairs' tool, titled "individual efforts". The **US, New Zealand** and **Canada** supported Brazil.

As next steps, **Perrez** proposed that spin-off groups should continue. He also proposed to begin the next facilitated session on mitigation on 2 September with a table comprising headings of all the three parts of the Co-Chairs' tool so that Parties don't lose sight of the overview mitigation section. This would help Parties agree on which issues to get deeper into, he said.

Argentina expressed that it did not make sense to put the titles and have a discussion and that they would prefer to see text and negotiate.

Perrez responded that they would post the table and Parties could decide what to do with it.