

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

Monday, 13 November 2017, 11:00-13:00

Note taker: Mitchell Etchason, B.A./M.A. International Studies, Indiana University
metchaso@indiana.edu

The meeting began at 11:16 due to schedule clashes

Initially many delegations were not present due to scheduling clashes.

Started with the finance matters and then took up the last non-financial matter in the last hour

Philippines:

- Suggested we wait for other delegations before commencing work

Continued the work from Friday

First Topic: Initial guidance by the CMA to the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund in accordance with decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 58:

Chair outlined additional questions relating to this topic:

1. When should the mandate be issued to the SCF to prepare the draft guidance to the LDCF and SCCF for consideration by the CMA? Similar to previous matters, what factors are relevant to your views on timing?
2. Which governing body should issue this mandate to the SCF? The COP of the CMA?
3. What could be the timeline for the SCF to complete its work on this initial draft guidance for adoption by the CMA?

Philippines:

- The SCCF and LDCF are Convention funds established under COP
 - Funds are voluntary – no specific funding channel
- First question – who will the guidelines be provided to?
- What kind of guidance will be necessary?
- And to whom will you address guidance? To the COP in general?
- The CMA reduces guidance
- There is no need for initial guidance, has already be articulated early
- The CMA will have to develop guidance, give it to the COP
- Last consideration is timing
- The CMA can only give guidance to SCCF and LDCF on matters related to the CMA

- Can only give guidance pertaining to the NDCs
- Delegation could not see that these funds will move to guidance by the CMA

Chair

- Acknowledged the meeting was joined by Malawi, which represents LDC Group

Australia:

- The appropriate way to guide the SCCF and LDCF is already articulated by the GEF
- Guidance will not need to be expanded until the future

South Africa:

- Spoke on behalf of the African Group
- Echoed Sentiment of Philippines and Australia
- The subcommittee on Finance doesn't issue guidance on SCCF and LDCF
- The LDCF isn't really part of the financial agenda
- LDCF guidance isn't treated the same as other finance questions

Japan

- Supported views expressed by Australia and others

European union

- Agreed that guidance for LDCF does have a different entry point
- Doesn't see a need for further work on the issue of guidance for the LDCF

Malawi:

- Apologized for arriving late
- Shared the sentiments of the African Group and others
- Wanted to add a proposal that says the APA should comment that this matter should be taken up by the SBI
- Feels that the COP gives a mandate to the SBI, and should start now

Philippines:

- Supported Malawi's suggestion that guidance should be under the SBI
- Reiterated that the guidance that will come from the CMA can only relate to actions on adaptation related to the matters that are under the CMA, mainly this would be the NDCs
 - The nature of the guidance would have to be related to the specific nature of the CMA
- Guidance cannot be given by the SAF
- Reiterated that the LDCF is a convention fund

Chair:

- Clarified that so far, originally the question of guidance was thought to be a matter of the Standard Committee on Finance however this meeting suggests that guidance should be dealt with as a COP Agenda item or the SBI
- This can be done under the COP agenda
 - Through the SBI

South Africa:

- Spoke for Africa Group
- Would support proposal made by Malawi
- The Standard Committee on Finance isn't the most technical body for guidance of the LDCF

Australia:

- There is no need to consider the guidance now
- This proposal to move guidance to the SBI isn't something we can support at this stage

European Union

- We don't need to establish new procedures
- Will have to reflect further on Malawi's proposal

Canada:

- Share sentiment of Australia and EU

Malawi:

- Humbled by the support of the African Group and Philippines
- Clarified: Their understanding is that CMA I is interpreted as the formal agreement that is being dealt with

Philippines:

- Reminded that the SCCF and LDCF should be administered by the GEF
- Therefore, no one can say that guidance should not be articulated by the APA

Japan:

- The Mandate to draft guidance of the LDCF is delegated to the another body
- Supported the idea of Australia, EU and China

China:

- Take up issue of how to trigger the discussion of guidelines
- Could be triggered by a report by the standing committee on finance
- Wasn't sure if it is necessary to trigger a discussion and add another item to the agenda

Chair:

- Recognized that many experts are leaving due to a scheduling conflict with the GCF contact group
- Moved to facilitate the next section, which addressed the only non-finance matter
- Will have one more finance matter to take up tomorrow, from 11:00-12:00
 - Will return to proposals made at this session

Second Topic: Guidance by the CMA on adjustment of existing NDCs under Article 4, paragraph 11 of the Paris Agreement:

Chair outlined additional questions relating to this topic:

1. Which subsidiary body could be mandated to take this work forward to prepare draft guidance for consideration and adoption by the CMA
2. What could be the timeline for work on this matter to be completed for the CMA to adopt this guidance?

Australia:

- It is not within the mandate to give guidance on the NCDs

China:

- Shared similar view with Australia
- It is not mature to discuss this issue
- Article 4, 11 of Paris does not require the development of new guidance by the APA
- Article 4, 11 is principled that if a party wants to adjust its NDC it has to improve it

Singapore:

- Agreed with Australia and China

Japan:

- Their view hasn't changed
- It is premature to initiate the drafting of guidance
- Better to wait until the other NDC related guidances are completed

Chair:

- There were no more requests for the floor
- Recalled that there were differing opinions back in May and asked the body if anyone wanted to speak up with an opinion different from those articulated

The body exhausted debate on the remaining non-finance issue and postponed the debate on financial issues due to the schedule clash

The chair adjourned the meeting at 12:11