

Name: Aura Silva

Institution: College of the Atlantic

Tuesday, November 7th

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

Questions

1. Is preparatory work on this matter currently being undertaken? If so, where?
2. If there is no preparatory work being undertaken on this matter, is preparatory work required, and if so, by which body?
3. What should be the timeframe for completion of this work?

Issue

- Modalities for biennial communicating finance information on the provision of public finance resources to developing countries in accordance with Article 9.5 of the PA
 - What are those specific additional procedural matters concerning Art. 9.5 that are not being addressed by the COP 10(f)?
 - What is the appropriate forum for considering these additional procedural matters?

Philippines

- Paragraph 5 relates to 1 and 3.
 - Par. 3 related only to mobilizing climate finance.
 - A biennial for the mobilization and provision of final resources.
 - Par. 9.3 - Could support country-driven strategies, taking into account needs and priorities of developing countries.
- Yes. There is something on the report, but the objective of it and the reason why it is here under the PA and not under the COP.
- Since the transparency framework discussions are based on existing processes, it takes it forward from there.
- Discussions under 9.5 will help us also under the discussions of the transparency framework
- The SBSTA discussion of modalities is only part of what is needed, we also need ex ante information
- It is not just finance information
 - Par. 5 - Indicative, qualitative and quantitative information and projected levels to be provided by developed countries
 - We are talking about enhanced action and this has to be met by enhanced support
- We are building upon existing processes

Canada

- Art. 9.5 and par.55 of 1/CP.21 are clearly setting the path for this discussion. This was also reflected on the COP agenda of this issue.

- The agendas that we have, APA and SBs are already very busy for finalizing Paris work by 2018. Some parties are already complaining about too much work and the inability to cover all the extensive items.
 - Don't think it would be beneficial to duplicate work that is already being done somewhere done.
- Not neglecting to recognize the concerns of other countries on some issues that they feel are not being discussed to their satisfaction.

CO-chairs

- Have heard one speaker in favor of keeping it here, other said it is being discussed under COP 10(f)

EU

- Art. 9.5 is really important. We also think that this is addressed under 10(f).
- This is a process question.
- We are willing to engage under 10(f)

Colombia (AILAC)

- We are already advancing this under the COP agenda item for this decision. We believe this is the best way to proceed to have fruitful decisions to inform the COP and take this as an input.

South Africa

- Second attempt at addressing this issue
- Would like clarity of whether the understanding during the contact group there were discussions undertaken under this agenda item would be catch up in an informal note. We had a proposal from the floor supported by other two parties. We want to make sure that this is indeed your understanding.

Co-chairs

- Informal note was created in May. We are proposing to do something similar this time. Create some informal notes to address the remaining 5 procedural matters.
- In the CG while nobody spoke to object to the proposal put forward by China, we proposed to wait and it will be taken up in the informal consultations.
- If there are parties who wish to make some comments on that particular issue they are invited

Australia

- Our recollection was that the mode of work was agreed. We were not aware that we were negotiating the mode of work. We don't support the proposal put forward by China. We don't think this is necessary
- This is a matter of process, not substance

South Africa

- Secretariat could show footage that could prove the agreement was reached on the procedure

Co-chairs

- We couldn't have made that decision there on the spot.

Japan

- Echo statement from Canada, EU
- Mandate from Art. 9.5 - Identify information to be provided by parties, based on this mandate the work has been undertaken in COP 10(f)

US

- Contact group - You noted the proposal and said that the discussion of the proposal would be discussed at the informal consultations. To be clear, we do not support the proposal. We don't think additional work should be undertaken with regards to Art. 9.5
 - Matters relating to Art. 9.5 are under COP 10(f)

India

- G77 support
- 9.5 is intended to provide accountability and predictability, with consideration to national needs and priority
 - Needs to be taken under the PA

Norway

- Did not perceive that we were making a decision on the proposal.

China

- We made that proposal because even though COP 10(f) exists it is very difficult to make any progress under that item. You promised to ensure that all items make progress on coherence and balanced manner under the APA.
- There is no discussion like the items that we have on APA that include headings, subheadings, options, and narratives
- We want to have substantive discussions on this matter allowing parties to produce a note
- COP makes no progress, no material, no note, no document

Co-chairs

- We are responsible for the APA, not about all the items under the Paris work program
- We will prepare an informal note on this item that we are facilitating to reflect the discussions that are taking place in the room.

Egypt

- Substance
 - Art. 9.5 - People are forgetting that it is part of the PA, and we need to cover it in the Paris rule book and it has to be part of the outlines of the elements of the outcome of the discussion and elements that need to be ready by next COP.
 - 9.5 does not standalone, it comes in a context (9.2, 9.4, 9.7)
 - There is no preparatory work or modalities that are being discussed anywhere else
 - SAying that modalities are not mentioned here would mean that many APA items would also have to be revisited
 - Work on the modalities at the APA
 - And should be part of the outcome or outline that should arrived to at the end of this session
- Procedure
 - It is not a substance discussion
 - It is a procedural proposal, what China proposed
 - Contact group no one opposed.

- It seems like decisions taken at contact groups can be revisited in informals... Is this how we are working now?

Ecuador (LMDC)

- There are two types that need to be done in the PA with regards to developed countries and finance:
 - Information and modalities are discussed in SBSTA. Categories of data. Modalities are consideration, methodologies, underlying assumptions. So that information is rendered comparable
 - Ex ante report is discussed in COP. If we don't discuss modalities somewhere else we will only have information on methodologies
 - There is no mandate to discuss modalities under 10(f)

SA

- Need to be fair to the process and we need to hear a response on the issue raised by Egypt.
- In yesterday's discussion, the AG presented a specific concern in the framing of the question regarding procedural matters regarding Art. 9.5
- We are here to discuss the process on how to arrive to the information. This is a reflection of the lack of political group.
- Yesterday the AG presented substantive views on the matter.

Philippines

- You are only discussing procedure not substance. The APA should prepare the entry into force.

Egypt

- Waiting for the answer from the legal advisor
- Question of procedures is not up to questioning. Rules of procedure should be clear. Waiting for legal advisor.

Co-chair

- Will undertake 9.5 again, will resume 3rd formal consultation next meeting on Friday. We have an APA stock taking for tomorrow afternoon.