

## **More detailed comments including on Options A and B Preference for Option A**

(The comments summarized below were made by the delegate from the country in bold. The countries sharing the seat are included although it is sometimes unclear as to whether the speaker is speaking for all, or individually)

**United Kingdom** (Netherlands and Australia): wants this open, transparent and inclusive process to continue. Supports Option A as an initial list, which should be relatively long, inclusive and reflecting discussions in the OWG. Documentation should include the Millennium Declaration and Outcome Document for the UN General Assembly Special Event. Goals and targets should be looked at together as inextricably linked and not just goals alone.

**France** (Germany and Switzerland): strongly supports process outlined by the Co-Chairs. There is already a lot of substance available. The final report should be an objective summary of targets for a fresh exchange in March. Would like to continue in the current format of the open working group. Would be in favour of the suggested complete list of possible goals and targets after OWG-8 and before the negotiations start. Attempt not to move back to a silo mentality.

**United States** (Canada and Israel): supports Co-Chairs pulling together something that can also be made more actionable. Best way to start with a draft would support Option A. All will need to show an “intellectual flexibility” in thinking about goals, targets and cross-cutting issues. Should strive for an agenda that is the most ambitious list of goals and targets. All should come to the debates willing to open and inclusive and discuss their rationales. Advise that the Co-Chairs be as inclusive as possible in the stock-taking paper.

**Italy** (Spain and Turkey): has had a fruitful exchange of views on the various clusters that should continue for up-coming meetings. Moving from narratives to proposals, need to understand the methodology for this and the transition should be as clear and coherent as possible. Referred to the High Level Panel Report. Need to include those issues that are “less politically attractive”. Preference for the work to start on the basis of the option A, as the way forward.

**Italy (2)**: wishes to repeat that we should look into a compendium of goals and targets including those not politically attractive. Appears to fit with Option 1.

**Colombia** (Guatemala): looks forward to giving Co-Chairs the reins. Strongly favour Option A, but is confused insofar as discussions and dialogue based on a document produced by Co-Chairs themselves, under their own responsibility. Question of loose ‘text’ insofar as Option B would be a description with paragraphs on different topics. Does not understand what it will look like, as the OWG will be developing a “metric” rather than text. Assumes Option B will be a looser goal framework. Delegations need to have something before the March meeting to consider.

**Japan** (Iran and Nepal): expects a paper for the March session. Confusion between Options but prefer Option A, although does not see much difference between the two options.

**Peru** (and Mexico): prefers Option A as more direct and easy to reach the targets within the time frame.

**Slovenia** (Montenegro): there is a need for list as soon as possible after OWG-8.

**Croatia** (Bulgaria): The focus should be to deliver ambitious outcome in a timely fashion. Supports Option A

### **Option B**

**Brazil** (Nicaragua): strongly supports Option B, as going from a “listening mode” to negotiating was a huge jump and that the list would be developed by “a few hands only”. Only a few countries would be ready for this and there would be a need to consult domestically. The second option was more progressive. Preference therefore was for a looser document rather than jumping into a listing. It was important to figure out what the goals are and how they would be framed but until have an idea of this cannot discuss targets.

**Saudi Arabia** (Bangladesh and Republic of Korea): fully supports intervention from Brazil. Should meet as inter-governmental parties in March. Need to be sure of where they are going.

**Cyprus** (Singapore and United Arab Emirates) supports Option B.

**Venezuela**: supports Brazil’s proposal.

**Morocco** (Algeria, Egypt and Tunisia): supports Brazil

**Egypt** (Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia): thought originally that the proposals were clear but has become confused and would like more time to consult with capital. Supports Brazil and Option B. As far as documents are concerned, the mandate comes from Rio + 20 which is the basis for the work of the Group.

### **Other comments**

**Argentina** believes that it has become clear that there is no clear understanding about the two options. It would be difficult to give a mandate on something on which there is no clarity. There is time and it can be done intersessionally. Has a preference for Option B. Emphasized the need to consult with capitals. Would like a more detailed proposal with a deadline for comments.

**Sweden** (non-member) sees need to structure ideas after February session. Hope discussion in a broadly consultative manner. Could be a good idea to invite stakeholders to contribute focused guidelines. Not clear on nuances and would suggest something between Options A and B, not too directive and not too loose.

**Denmark** (Norway and Ireland) would like to be presented with a report including a list of goals and targets as a starting point for the discussions. Agreed with Colombia that should focus on content of proposed goals. Echo what USA said on integration of parameters in the discussion.

**India** (Pakistan and Sri Lanka): options have been outlined in good time; transition has to be made from brain-storming to the next stage; need time to reflect on the proposals so a final decision cannot be taken today. Need to consult and come back in February meeting with a mandate for the way forward.

**Benin** supports the proposal as made by France for negotiation in an open working group as opposed to an open-ended working group.

**Zimbabwe** proposes allowing consultations between now and next meeting.