

Phoebe Lytle, Indiana University Bloomington

APA agenda item 4: informal consultations on further guidance in relation to the adaptation communication, including, inter alia, as a component of nationally determined contributions, referred to in Article 7, paragraphs 10 and 11, of the Paris Agreement
November 11th, 2017, 11:00am-12:00 noon

Speakers:

Saudi Arabia – Arab League of States	South Africa –African Group
European Union	Norway
United States	Malawi
Canada	Colombia - ILAC
Argentina – G77 & China	Jamaica - SIDS
Ecuador - LMDC	Uruguay
Japan	

Notes:

Co-facilitator:

- Another reiteration of the skeleton draft was completed with a few modifications so that there would be no further confusion about headings
- Note has an explanatory heading at the top
- One submission came in after deadline, so it is not reflected in the document
- Opened floor to reactions on this skeleton draft, asked if they missed anything from the submissions that were made last night and if you see any areas we can consolidate

Saudi Arabia – Arab league of States

- Surprised to find that the second iteration was published on the APA website
- They were expecting another iteration, and believe that the publication should be removed from the website. Stated that it was unfortunate that co-facilitators have acted in this manner, posting the iteration.
- Suggested 3 options:
 - o Common adaptation communication guidance
 - o Common adaptation guidance +vehicle specific guidance
 - o Vehicle specific guidance,
- Do not agree that this will be a considerable basis for work
- Do not agree that their input was not captured in the iteration

European Union

- Believes that the document could be a good starting point for solid
- Saw that their ideas are somewhere in the document
- Believes that a discussion about structure is still necessary
- Suggested that headings should be clustered for now, rather than coming up with specific titles
- Suggested that for now the focus be put on grouping possible headings into clusters, rather than having discussions on specific wording

- Recognized the three options, but stated that option 2 and 3 can be found in other paragraphs and suggested that they are not necessary

United States

- Agreed with Saudi Arabia; they understood that they gave the document to the co-facilitators so that they could discuss it, not publish it
- It would be a shame to go into 2018 without having a clear way forward

Canada

- Agreed with Saudi Arabia; they also understood that that mandate was given to the co-facilitators to discuss and to be used as a tool to help make forward progress
- Supported returning to headings once the actual substance of the document was filled in
- Suggested that options 4 and 5 be combined together or that they be reflected in other portions of the document

Argentina - G77

- Options:
 - o Option 3 is very proactive
 - o They don't want to merge option 1 or 2
 - o Stated that a common understanding of the options is necessary
 - o They want to have the ideas very clear and are opposed to merging
 - o Of the opinion that everyone must be clear and to be on the same page
 - o Approach:
 - Repetition is something that they should try to avoid

Ecuador -LMDC

- Aligns with Argentina
- Are willing to operationalize different articles
- Mandate clearly states that this is for further guidance for communication
 - o They would like to be clear on this
- Would like to highlight the approach that was taking on the formal note
- Sees value in conversation with colleagues on which headings
- Agrees that there are some repetitions in the approach

Japan

- Shared similar view that this is a good starting point
- Paper identifies core understandings
- Discussion about the process
 - o May be useful to discuss headings before content
 - Hard to fill in content without headings

Co-facilitator

- We did ask people to focus on headings, but we did ask people to also list key words under those headings... lots of opportunity to provide to contribute to the inputs of this grouped

Saudi Arabia

- Concern without mandate or agreement in room
- Will not accept
- Concerned with the co-facilitator's proceeding
 - o Are disappointed in the progress of this item
 - o Hereby request the removal of the informal note

South Africa - African group

- Understanding that this node should build on APA 1.3 informal note
- Take into consideration the submissions that have been made
- Are a number of headings that say "heading" without actual title
 - o What is the concept that we are trying to place in there?
- Support for developing countries is crucial

Norway

- Believe the node is exactly in line with when they left this room yesterday
- Agree that it is a useful starting point
- Can't identify anything missing
- Paper could take advantage of some sorting
 - o Merging headings
 - o Preamble: relevant references to PA articles would be very useful here
 - o Guiding principles: exact references to PA articles
 - Should see if it is possible to merge these
 - o Pleased to see section 6 being filled with subheadings, there are quite a few useful elements in this
 - A few of them are the same as option 1
 - o Useful for further deliberations what our criteria are for these subheadings

Malawi

- Support Argentina/South Africa
- Seek clarification
- Concerned with number 7
 - o Why is it necessary to get the specific elements for NDCs

Colombia-ILAC

- Associate with Argentina
- Recognized that it is difficult to include all the views of parties
- Understanding that they are not in the stage to discuss all details
- Need to ensure that no one is left behind
- Believe that this exercise of populating points is the way forward
- Reiterate that guidance is subject to evolution over time

Jamaica- SIDS

- Recognized the statements by Argentina
- Take note of the document that has been presented

- It could be a good starting point
- One side step: last discussions—it was their understanding that they would have been presented with a document that would focus on the headings, while they are happy to see further elaborations on the headings
 - It would be good to have a skeleton with just headings to see if they are appropriate for further deliberations

Co-Facilitators

- Four speakers still remain on the list, but time has run out
- There are procedural issues to be dealt with
- Asked that interventions be focused

United States

- Was happy to hear that other parties agreed that the document was a good basis for moving forward
- Wanted to clarify their position

Uruguay

- Associated with Argentina's remark
- Highlight importance of having two sets of elements
 - In order to be able to have elements that
- Support to developing countries

Co-facilitators:

- The secretariat has sent the message, the document note will be removed
- Content of the document: we need to reconcile
- Give floor back to Saudi

Saudi Arabia

- This was initially raised in response to item 7
- Apologize for not engaging in this discussion

Argentina

- Thanked the co-facilitators for removing the document from the website
- Was happy to provide the mandate for the reiteration

Co-facilitator:

- It will not be possible to produce another iteration of the document before the next session at 3:00pm.
- Will continue to discuss headings and footnotes in the next session.