

Notes APA informal on matters relating to global stocktake (APA Agenda Item 6, Article 14 of the Paris Agreement)
Nov 10, 2017, 10.15am
Written up by Naveeda Khan, JHU

Got in easily although checked for ticket. The co-facilitators had circulated a draft text to which parties were responding. In their introduction the co-facilitators said that they had presented the building blocks of the agenda item and that activity A of the modalities of the GST had been covered, based on the roundtable and the submissions from parties. The text had been posted to the GST website the night before. Activities B and C were now to be looked at, that is, to be put into building blocks with a focus on equity in GST and issues related to output and outcome.

First statement by Philippines on behalf of G77 (and China?). The party said that the two columns in the table presented in the text were not being considered final with the left hand column with headings and subheadings to be shifted around to construct the GST and with the understanding that further headings could still go in. Did the second right hand column constituted the content to go under each heading? They did not count as any kind of definite content with respect to the left column. Also, could there be another meeting on equity?

Columbia supported the statement of G77 and China. Appreciated the work that had been done and said it would be good to move forward.

The co-facilitators affirmed that the left was not confirmed and there was yet the possibility of the headings being moved around. Equity was in the second page. Was there sufficient level of comfort with the process? Left side to be discussed. The right side was just put in to show where content would go, no point getting too caught in the specifics. Wanted to know if this was the right degree of detail. They would like to encourage their colleagues who feel that their interest not being reflected to intervene in a constructive way. They are really moving forward.

India said that it was still digesting the text and that it might require more time. But they supported statement of G77. They needed more sense of process and context (why are they doing this?). Later they will move to issue of governance. This is an evolving text and it well captured earlier conversations. Their discussion is party driven so they have to know how party submissions are to inform this process. The speaker said that he did not understand the difference between technical process and political process because as far as he was concerned textual work was political. He suggested that they use different terms, perhaps initial and final plans? Finally, how was equity going to drive the process?

Maldives (spoke on behalf of SIDS? Didn't catch this) supported the statement of G77. Speaker stated that he didn't understand the right side of the table.

Solomon Islands spoke on behalf of LDCs also in support of G77 of China. Lets not repeat the work that has already been achieved in May. Mindful of the outcome of the right table, some of the things that they have been saying are not showing up. They are making very slow progress. Look at the other groups reporting at the APA stocktake. You (meaning the co-facilitators) have put a lot of fear into the heart of LDCs with your...Global stocktake should be about enhancing ambition. Mention is made in your note in which you note that the global stocktake is not linked to...Focusing on equity will help.

Georgia on behalf of EIG. Supported statement by G77. They liked the text. There was a good spirit of collaboration. They had some specific statements should there be time...pause, are ignored by the cofacilitators who move on to next party.

China next with a super long statement, close to 7 minutes. The speaker spoke fast. I am not sure that I got everything but here is what I have. Please cross-check. They supported the statement on behalf of G77. They recommended that the focus be on the right column of the table. They requested general principles, content, etc. before they come to modalities. They iterated the need for adding mandate and objectives to the GST. Article 14 of Paris Agreement clear but was equity to be in the guiding issues? Good governance. Good action. They needed more on the management of balance across the different elements, adaptation, mitigation, loss and damage. What was the role of the CMA? What was the role of the subsidiary bodies? There were missing elements. The focus should be on the right side of column...

At this point only 5 minutes remain of the hour consigned to the informal consultation, that started 15 minutes late. The co-facilitators continue to take statements but warn that time is almost up.

Brazil speaking on behalf of Argentina, Uruguay...expresses support of statement of G77. Says that they are moving in circles. Offers some specific suggestions: Activity B needs to spell out timing, duration and frequency of GST. GST is dependent upon preparing inputs...Governance needs to be moved into building blocks. The process needs identification of additional inputs and linkages.

Norway says that it has already submitted a lot of input. Instead of taking statements, better to assume that parties are submitting to the direction of the co-facilitators: "we give ourselves to you." With respect to interventions made by China, Norway supports text that would recall the relevant parts of Paris Agreement within the GST if it gives "comfort" to China. They would even support putting in more on general framing. They would also work with putting in more specifics re: mitigation, etc. They also support a session on equity.

...speaking on behalf of EU says that they can engage this table. It is a very good tool. Useful. They also think useful to reiterate Art 14. Also GST should address other articles and interlinkages. Equity is important, it is a cross cutting issue and could be integrated into the building blocks. This table, especially the left side, is just a

checklist. They don't see very substantial language on the items on the right side but congratulations on the format.

Canada likes the table. Supports China. Everything is in Article 14 but worth recalling it in GST.

New Zealand supports G77. Left column is not final. Right column is not final. They represent broad understandings. Would prefer not to spend too much time on left column and go instead into the right. They should not repeat NDCs (?). They should recollect progress and hierarchy of priorities.

Australia speaking also on behalf of Brazil (?) says that it's a lot of material to digest. G77.

Japan requests that they not expand the template. The focus should be on submissions including roundtable. What they want is more specifics and ideas on equity.

Saudi Arabia aligns itself with G77 and China (not sure I got the nuances of this one. Please crosscheck). Feels that the table has serious problems. A few specifics are articulated: there are three existing models from Climate Action, Climate Support and Loss and Damage. What are to be the principles, context and operationalization? With these three models in mind, we need direction on context. What are to be convergences, divergences and optionality?

Botswana supports China and New Zealand and asks for focus on equity.

Mexico expresses regret that this consultation did not move the work forward and aligns itself with Norway in asking that submissions be discussed.

Iran asks for a revision of building blocks, says that the process needs more time and feedback. There are too many elements and they are too complicated. They need to be simpler...

Philippines, speaking on its national capacity, says that it requires context, linkages, coverage on the issue of Loss and Damage. Governance should be a separate heading.

Summary statement by co-facilitators that they will provide the way forward. Thanks parties for their constructive input. Will work on the template and will address issue of the impact of equity on the GST. People trickle out.