Name: Aura Silva

Institution: College of the Atlantic

Tuesday, November 14th

APA agenda item 8: informal consultations on issues except Adaptation Fund

Seventh and final informal consultation. Prepared a first iteration of an informal note to capture the exchange of views on the four out of five additional matters discussed, and propose a way forward for each of them. At the meeting today, they considered the final potential additional matter: the new collective quantified goal on finance (1/CP.21, Par. 53). **G77 + China, LDCs** stressed that this new collective quantified goal is a mandate from the CMA and that work needs to start immediately; they also highlighted three points that make this new collective quantified goal different from the Cancun pledges: (1) it has an annual floor of USD 100 bn; (2) it's in the context of Art. 9.3 of the PA which makes direct reference to the "supporting country-driven strategies, and taking into account the needs and priorities of developing country Parties"; and (3) this new goal should be based on a scientific assessment that will take into consideration conditionality of NDCs. **Australia, Japan, EU, NZ** stated that the new collective goal on finance only needs to be agreed upon by 2025, so there is no rush and there is more urgent work; would be good to incorporate lessons learnt from pre-2020 goal. **China, India** highlighted that this task is already under the CMA agenda in a footnote that references 1/CP.21 Par.53, which would mean that it would never disappear from the agenda until solved; also suggested that the COP agenda item on LTF only deals with pre-2020. **Japan, NZ** opposed this interpretation of the footnote. **AILAC, Arab Group, LMDC** called for the process to begin in 2023 taking lessons learnt from the MRV of support, the FD and the GST. **NZ** made it clear that the GST could be a valuable input for the conversation on the new collective goal, but not the other way around. No clear way forward was established with regards to the proposals put forward by the **African Group** on Art. 9.5 becoming a stand-alone APA agenda item, and the **LDC** proposal to have the CMA direct guidance on the LDCF and the SCCF to SBI 50. Another informal note will be prepared today.

Co-chairs

- Seventh and final informal consultation
- We have discussed four possible additional matters
- As an outcome of these discussion, we prepared the first iteration of an informal note, made available yesterday
    - Exchange of views on the four possible additional matter and proposes a way forward for each of them
- Today we will consider the new collective quantified goal on finance
- Then consider (b), taking stock of progress made by the subsidiary and constituted bodies
- SCCF and LDCF
    - Parties have a shared understanding that the draft guidance would focus on issues related to the PA (e.g. NDCs)
    - Some parties thought that the SCF should prepare the guidance for consideration by the CM
    - Others thought that the SBI would be the appropriate body, and that at CMA 1 a mandate could be triggered for this to happen at SBI 50

- ADjustment of existing NDCs
    - Most parties thought that it would be premature to initiate discussion at this stage, but would be better for the CMA to consider this at a latter stage.
- Matter for today: “Setting a new collective quantified goal on finance in accordance with decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 53.”
    - At such time as the work to set a new collective goal is initiated, which body should
- Additional questions

Philippines

- Look at the mandate that we have (Par. 58 of 1/CP.21). Developed country parties put in Cancun in Par.99 or 100 in 1/CP.16 pledges. An existing collective mobilization goal: 100 bn annually until 2020, which now became 2025 in the PA. So the mobilization goal goes up to 2025.
- The COP *shall* serve a new quantified goal. Now it is the whole of the Parties under the CMA that will establish the new quantified collective goal. This is a mandate for the CMA.
- The big difference between the differentiation goal that was undertaken by developed Parties in Cancun, is that now the COP is going to do this from a floor of a hundred bn per year. But it puts something really important in the end “taking into account the needs and priorities of countries” in line with Art. 9.3.
- Biennial submissions have attempted to show the quantitative and qualitative pathway to scale up financing, under the LTF submissions.
- We still have a big gap in the preparatory work, the last part of Par. 53 with regards to needs and priorities of developing countries.
- The work is starting under the COP with regards to LTF. Timeframe is also given to us in Par.53 → Floor up to 2025 and from this floor, we will set the mobilization goal.
- Many NDcs are saying that they would need financial support and technological and capacity building. Only on this basis can you set a new collective quantified goal.
- Work has to be started now to attain that kind of progress.
- This new goal will be based on something. The 100 bn was no part of any scientific assessment. In the words of the former executive secretariat: “this is not going to be a sum like that, but be a sum that addresses the needs and priorities of developing countries”.
- This will helps us do the equitable share that corresponds to us in fulfilling the PA.
- The work is being done right now under the COP under the LTF process. Then the collective goal would be set up by the CMA. It is clear who will take the work. The CMA should have in its agenda to continue work on LTF. We are just now initiating the process to identify needs and priorities through strategies.

Co-chairs

- Referenced the current work being undertaken by the COP. You think that this relevant work is undertaken here.
- At a point of time, it will also need to be under the CMA in order to fulfill the gap.

Australia

- Back in May we outlined that there is no need for preparatory work need at CMA 1. 1/CP.21 Par.53 says that the new target will be established before 2025 (i.e.g 2024).
- We think that the work on this item should not begin until we have seen how we did for the 2020 target, but also until conversations under COP on LTF are done. We also want to learn how developing countries can contribute to this new collective outcome.

China

- Par. 24 of your informal note from May is the important summarizing element.
- Timing: Before 2025 we need to finish the task. But if you look at how long this task will take, you realize we need to start early. The 100 bn target proposed in Copenhagen (2009), now the first initial roadmap of that target just proposed in 2015. It took 6 to 7 years for you to develop a roadmap.
- We need to take into account the needs and priorities of developing countries (Par. 53). This also needs time.
- We propose to initiate as early as this session, CMA 1.2
- **This task is already under the CMA agenda: item (3), matters relating to the implementation of the PA. This paragraph has a footnote to Par. 53 and it is already included in the text.**
- If we don't make a decision, when and how can we trigger the discussion later? Procedural question.
- It would be appropriate to invite SBI and SBSTA to be mandated to undertake the task.
- There might be some relevant work undertaken by the COP LTF agenda item. But the LTF agenda item only deals with pre-2020 work. There is no relevant work being undertaken post-2020 and less post-2025

South Africa (AG)
- Important that space is provided soon for our discussion in the global goal.
- Important that we start to get a better sense in mapping which bodies are most appropriate.
- We need a decision here, or that the APA co-chairs can recommend a procedural decision so we can get inputs as soon as possible.

EU
- Agree with Australia
- Preparatory work
    - There is no current preparatory work. But there is a reason. This has been mandated to the CMA, but not CMA 1. We need to focus on more immediate issues. The decision does not speak of a process or a roadmap.
    - When we have the discussion of the new collective goal, we should learn from the experience learn from the 2020 goal
    - Timing: at this time we focus on what we need to do about the PA work program and issues mandated for CMA 1.

Japan
- Echo Australia, EU
- Point made by the Chinese colleague in regards to the footnote on item(3). Your interpretation is inaccurate. We have a different view, and this particular agenda is not yet a part of the agenda of item (3).

Colombia (AILAC)
- This process should start soon, like for example 2023…
- Important matter for the implementation of the PA, but currently there is a goal for developed parties to mobilize 100 bn by 2020.
- We propose this timeline because we consider than in setting the new goal, it is important to take into consideration lesson learnt by MRV of support, the Talanoa Dialogue and the GST.

Saudi Arabia

- Par. 53 and 99 - Safe destination can all be taken up by the GST. The discussion of LTF or the provision of finance is already captured in the scope of the GST.

Ecuador (LMDC)
- Support the G77 + China, China, AG, Saudi Arabia
- We don't understand Par.53 as an outcome that would not be part of a process. We don't understand this as something that needs to be mandated for a certain number of CMA. The context of this Par.53 is different from the current goal that we have now, because it links the setting up of a new goal with the needs and priorities of developing countries. This should begin to be discussed as soon as possible. We would see this process as being undertaken in different streams: LTF in the GST, or as an agenda item under CMA.

Malawi (LDCs)
- Support the G77 + China, AG, LMDC, China
- We believe that coming from the decision that we took in Paris, it is time to begin thinking about setting this new climate finance goal.
- The new call would have to be linked to what has been discussed in LTF. But next year we will have the FD and the GST will be important as well. These two will have to reflect this issue as well.
- 100 bn dollar goal was not scientifically generated. We would like to change this.

Pakistan
- G77 + China, LMDC, AG, China
- Par. 53 mandate is really clear. This issue is not being discussed anywhere else. We need to kickstart the discussion as early as possible.
- COP LTF mostly focuses on pre-2020
- GST - This is a point where things can conclude, whether or not we have been able to establish the goal or not. MOI are very important for developing countries to implement the PA.
- Without predictable finance it is hard to fulfill the targets from the PA.

NZ
- Inputs: closure of the LTF, communication of post-2020 NDCs, GST
- CF is dynamic. If we discuss this too early, we may undershoot. We need to discuss this further on.
- Agree with Japan on their interpretation of the footnote.

Switzerland
- Australia, EU, Japan, NZ
- LTF under the COP is strictly to the pre-2020 finance and not the new collective goal.
- We will take on this work later on, no later than 2024

Belize
- Timeframe: we emphasize the importance of adequately defining the new collective goal in line and taking into account needs and priorities. We need more of a technical approach for the definition of this new goal. We need to draw from experiences from the processes that we have under the PA (FD, GST, and the transparency framework where developing countries will identify their needs).
- There should be an early process to begin identifying the collective goal.

China

- We agree that the GST and the FD should also take into account this very important financial information.
- If we are told not to start the discussion now, then how can we take this into consideration in the FD next year?
- Understanding of the agenda of the CMA
    - Footnote of the CMA agenda makes reference to Par. 53. Our understanding is that once an item include in the agenda, it will continue to be there until its conclusion. We want clarification from the legal team of the Secretariat.
    - We are trying to finds a body, the CMA, and identify another body (SBI and SBSTA) to take the work and when to initiate it.

Co-chairs
- We need to go back to Art. 9.3 and we promised to go back to this.
- Aware of the question over the timing and the links or not
- We have noted everything so far. We will reflect this.

Philippines
- We are talking about progression on Art. 9.3. It speaks of needs and priorities through country-driven strategies. This needs need to be articulated in order to have a well-funded goal. We need to start now!
- This is very clear in the GST.

Australia
- Process going forward from here. We thank you for the note posted.

NZ
- The GST is a valuable input for this item, but not the other way around. What we are discussing here is something different. We would like to have a bit more time to see the informal note.

Co-chairs
- You will have the chance to send us by email inputs.

India
- Support G77 + China and China
- Issue is already in CMA agenda
- If you don't start the discussion, in the forthcoming FD and GST there will not be any substantive discussion in these spaces.

EU
- Similar to Australia and NZ

Co-chairs
- Give a moment to fulfill the promise, SA who came up with a proposal, a CPR on Art. 9.5
- They will share this with the group.

South Africa
- The group made this submissions because we think that there is a need to start developing the modalities under Art. 9.5
- This is necessary to capture progress in meeting the financial obligations of the PA.
- We need to agree on the vehicle for communicating this information

- This is discussed in COP 10(f), but we want a new vehicle for such communications. The way in which we record communications, a registry kept by the Secretariat could be an option.
- The fact that it is biennial does not mean that the period to be covered in this communications is 2 years.

Co-chairs

- Guidance for the LDCF and the SCCF proposals have not been put forward.
- Bring this meeting to a close.

Philippines

- G77 + China support the AG proposal