

APA Agenda Item 8a
Upper Conference Room, Bula 2
Monday, 13 November 2017
Sunjana Supekar, UCLA

Meeting Notes

Introductory Notes by Co-facilitators:

- G77+China felt that their view was not adequately represented
- We all seem to agree that a CMA and CMP decision required
- Some decisions taken first and others in next step
- Some convergence on need to decide on accountability

The co-facilitators asked the parties two questions:

- Question 1: Which issues should go into CMA decision and CMP decision?
- Question 2: How we can capture G77+China's draft decision in an informal note?

Bahamas

- With regards to first question:
 - G77+China have already submitted a text for what we think needs to happen (draft decision).
 - Until everything else matures under APA, there will be a period of time where may have other funding mechanisms

Belize

- Adaptation Fund serve Paris Agreement
- Adjustments for Parties to Paris Agreement to serve on the Board

Mexico

- Fully supports Adaptation Fund
- Direct and efficient access to adaptation projects
- Transitional period that will allow fund to be fully integrated into CMA or other appropriate mechanisms
- Must maintain required levels of funding by predictable sources that support demand for adaptation

Argentina on behalf of Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay

- To answer question 1:
 - Proposal that G77+China made is very simple: Adaptation Fund shall serve Paris Agreement
 - Establish relationship with CMA
 - 2nd paragraph takes care of concerns of some of our colleagues.
 - We think these is enough but we are open to edits by our colleagues

- We are open to hearing them elaborate on some of these amendments
- At last meeting some parties said that we haven't had time to talk about these elements
- We tried to talk about them in May
- For whatever reason that didn't happen
- It's time for us to really understand
- Not all of them can be addressed by these parties
- Nevertheless we would very much like to hear what these concerns are so that we can understand each other.

Switzerland

- We can't tell you what would be in CMA and CMP
- Majority of decisions would have to be taken in CMA and not CMP
- Prefer to have both decisions taken at the same time in 2018
- CMA would decide the list of elements together with the list of policy issues
- CMP would have to take some type of decision because it comes out of Kyoto
- 2020 new instruments should be in place

Philippines

- There has to be a sequencing
- Adaptation shall serve Paris Agreement
- Only then will you trigger the requests of the other parties
- 2018 not that far away
- Decision taken by CMP and then later decided by CMA
- We are doing the decision by the CMA
- But ideal – both the decisions taken by both
- Suggestion: consult the websites and look at these decisions
 - Look at the body of decisions that have been taken, see which apply and which do not apply to CMA
- But once it is accepted that AF shall serve PA, decision must be taken now (trigger)
- Request that Secretariat to make documents available
- Governance is another thing: Board cannot be parties to PA

Norway

- We agree with Philippines that there is a trigger in the CMP
- We see discussion as one complex set of issues
- It is difficult to separate CMP with CMA on this issue
- The first CMP would just be a trigger.

Japan

- What kind of decisions need to be made in 2018?
- Need more clarification.

Co-facilitators

- We try to incorporate your ideas into documents
- Which issues go in a CMP decision and which in a CMP decision?
- How to capture the draft table/submission from G77+China in informal note?
- Our idea is to explore here with you if we have common ground

EU

- We would like to give some rationale for how we see the questions you asked
 - We see it very much in the way that the CMP is a servant
- Adaptation Fund would continue to serve CMP until 2021
- A first attempt to answer your questions
- We may also have to address sources of funding
- We would like to see mandate to World Bank check trustee arrangements
- We need text on who Adaptation Fund serves, and who it is accountable to
- Say that it's not part of Financial Mechanisms
- Question 2:
 - Continue to work with informal notes

Bahamas:

- The EU made a reference to resources
- Taking a decision now will provide for a continuity of functions until time changes
- Taking a decision now and having reports in 2018 and 2019 would be beneficial
- Feedback to CMP about adjusting
- Bits and pieces will develop
- No clarity as to what adaptation funding will mean
- We need something to happen so that we can have feedback

Philippines

- The informal note has no legal standing but a draft table report from a group of countries has a legal standing
- In Marrakech we had a legal opinion that could be attached
- When you table a draft decision, you include the legal conclusions
- It's a draft but it still needs to be negotiation
- Reiterates earlier request –
 - Make available on website previous decisions because that will enlighten our partners on what are the institutional agreements and safeguards, operating modalities
 - Then we will know what they are talking about
 - What more do we need
- Last point – are we hearing that we are moving the AF from the CMP to the CMA? This implies that the Doha Amendment will never come into force. Is that the intention of

our colleagues, especially those that are parties to the Kyoto Protocol? Until such time, we believe that the AF should stay in the CMP.

- The implication of the proposed suggestion that the Adaptation Fund is removed entirely to the CMA is that we have no hopes ever of having the Doha Amendment come into force.
- I would like this to be stated if that is the case.
- We know that this is the basis on which we will look at the Adaptation Fund
- No way will the Doha Amendment come into force

Australia

- We support your proposal to continue working through the idea of an informal note
- It just makes logical sense to maintain this
- 3 broad points:
 - I've heard a lot of colleagues talk about the Adaptation Fund serve the Paris Agreement
 - The CMP does not have this authority
 - It can only just give up sole authority
 - Sequencing – CMA will have to pick it up
 - Taking decision this year
 - It's not actually clear what the decision is
 - Couple of workable options
 - Adaptation Fund should serve Paris Agreement
 - Threshold question: We need to determine whether the Adaptation Fund serves the Paris Agreement exclusively, or the Kyoto Protocol and Paris Agreement simultaneously w/transition
 - Doha question is immaterial
 - Capturing G77+China proposed text
 - Start thinking about what the decisions are under 2 different scenarios
 - Adaptation Fund only Paris Agreement
 - Adaptation Fund both
 - What do these 2 situations look like?
 - Gives decision makers 2 sets of options to look at
- We're very happy to work on this and we think it's an important issue.

Japan

- Support your suggestion to informal note
- Response to question 1:
 - CMP doesn't have legal right to decide where funds go
 - CMP and CMA are 2 different treaties
 - One treaty cannot ask another treaty to do something
 - It's a legal question
 - But in our view CMP no longer provide guidance from a certain date (2020 or 2021)

- CMA must decide
- We're not of the view that CMP has authority or legal right to decide
- Response to question 2:
 - How to incorporate suggestions by G77+China
 - Informal note already has some of the suggestions
 - Basic statements incorporated in the informal note
 - And of course that we have different views
 - But informal note already captures basic notes of G77+China.

Argentina:

- We agree with doing an informal note
- Sequencing is something we all agree on

China:

- We support opinion of Bahamas about arrangement that Adaptation Fund serves Paris Agreement

Last informal consultation is tomorrow (14 November).